

**GLOCALISATION OF MEMORIES: REPRESENTATION
OF SPACE AND IDENTITY IN SELECT POST
MILLENNIUM HOLOCAUST AND
NAKBA FILMS**

*Thesis submitted to the University of Calicut
for the award of the Degree of*

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN ENGLISH

by

FARSANAH MOOSSA KAPPIL

Under the supervision of

Dr. ABIDA FAROOQUI

Associate Professor, Department of English
Government Arts and Science College, Kondotty



**RESEARCH & POSTGRADUATE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
POOKOYA THANGAL MEMORIAL GOVERNMENT COLLEGE
PERINTHALMANNA, MALAPPURAM**



(Affiliated to the University of Calicut)

2024

Declaration

I hereby declare that the work presented in the thesis entitled “**Glocalisation of Memories: Representation of Space and Identity in Select Post-Millennium Holocaust and Nakba Films**” is based on the original work done by me under the guidance of Dr. Abida Farooqui and has not been included in any other thesis submitted previously for the award of any degree. The contents of the thesis are undergone plagiarism check using iThenticate software at C.H.M.K Library, University of Calicut, and the similarity index found within the permissible limit. I also declare that the thesis is free from AI generated contents.

Malappuram, Kerala

Farsanah Moossa Kappil
Research Scholar

Dr. Abida Farooqui
Research Supervisor

Acknowledgement

Words cannot express my heartfelt gratitude to all those wonderful people who helped me materialise my doctoral thesis, but I am registering it here nonetheless. First and foremost, I am grateful to God Almighty for His blessings throughout my research work and for helping me conceptualise this thesis.

I acknowledge my indebtedness and sincere gratitude to my research supervisor Dr. Abida Farooqui, Associate Professor, Department of English, Government Arts and Science College, Kondotty, for her unwavering support starting from the very inception of the topic and all the way through the writing process. She has been immensely encouraging and constantly inspiring. Her dedicated guidance and involvement in every step throughout the process helped me complete my thesis. I thankfully remember the painstaking hours she had spent correcting my preliminary drafts. Without her astute and timely interventions, I would not have finished my thesis. Apart from being a guide, she is my mentor, who trusted in my ability, and helped me overcome obstacles while working on my thesis. I consider myself rather fortunate that I got the opportunity to work under her.

I am thankful to Dr. Umer Thasneem, Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Calicut, for his invaluable comments and advices he rendered throughout the course. I express my deep gratitude to Prof. A.K. Ramakrishnan, Centre for West Asian Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, for his scholarly suggestions which helped me in forming conceptual clarity and theoretical

framework. I would like to thank my former professors in University of Calicut for their initial guidance while beginning my research.

I express my gratitude to Dr Afsal Jamal P, Acting Principal, PTM Government College, and Dr. Aboobacker (late), the former principal, for their sincere help in both academic and administrative aspects of my research. I would like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Faisal P, Head, Research and Post Graduate Department of English, PTM Government College, for his support and timely help. I would also like to thank all the professors of the English Department for their help and valuable pieces of advice they rendered. I would also like to thank the staffs of the college library and administrative office of PTM Government College for their helps.

I would like to immensely thank my professors Dr. Sherin K Rahman and Mr. A.T. Mansoor for spending their time to engage in erudite conversations to help me update my knowledge. My special thanks to Dr. Abdul Jaleel T, Assistant Professor, TMG College, for offering suggestions in developing the historical context of my thesis and his assistance with my fellowship. I would like to thank my fellow researchers, Ms. Sheniya Jose, Ms. Swapna and Mr. Jouhar K, for their support and encouragement. My special thanks to my dear friends, both on and off campus, who provided emotional and technical support throughout my research journey.

I would like to thank the organisers of the different national and international conferences which I attended, that offered platforms for erudite lectures by Prof. Astrid Erll, Prof. Aleida Assman, Prof. Michael Rothberg, Prof. Pramod K Nayar,

Dr. Avishek Parui and others, who have enriched the theoretical foundation of my work. Beyond the wealth of knowledge presented, these conferences provided invaluable opportunities for engaging in personal academic conversations with renowned theorists in the field.

Finally, I wish to extend my gratitude to my family, especially my mother, father and mother-in-law for their incomparable support. Thanks to my husband for his constant encouragement. He understands the importance of my personal space and fostered an environment for me to thrive in my studies. I couldn't have done this without the endless patience of my amazing kids Zeeshan and Ezrin. They were by my side through thick and thin, always cheering me on. I am also grateful to my siblings for their helping hands and motivation.

Dedication

*To the children who endure the unimaginable, facing the harsh realities
of genocides with courage and resilience.*

Contents

Introduction	Historicising Memory and Memorialising History	1 – 68
Chapter One	Cinematic Journeys into the Shadows of Genocides: Echoes across Space and Time	69 – 142
Chapter Two	Mediated Memory Constructing Identity: An Unabating Event	143 – 230
Chapter Three	Glocalised Memories: Reimagining Genocide Memories in the Post Millennium	231 – 308
Conclusion	Imagination and Ethics: How Glocalised Memories Function in the Present Society	309 – 338
Recommendations	Further Avenues for Inquiry	339 – 345
	Works Cited	347 - 359

Abstract

The twenty first century is witnessing a significant shift in the representations of the Holocaust and Nakba genocides. The post-millennium filmmakers explore the multidirectional spaces and multifaceted identities embedded in the Holocaust and Nakba memories, instead of viewing them as a monolithic national narrative. The thesis explores how the select filmic representations contribute to the ongoing discourse on memory and its influence on shaping the thought processes of both local and global communities.

The thesis delves into the politics of memory construction, shedding light on the ethics and morality in remembering, forgetting, and reimagining the genocide memories of the bygone event Holocaust and the ongoing event Nakba. The thesis elucidates the concept glocalisation of memory, to bring out a new dimension to emphasise the need for a more nuanced understanding of the significance of human suffering, experiences and disturbing memories of the two genocides. It throws light on the interplay between the global awareness and local perspectives in shaping collective memory and historical narratives related to the two genocides.

This research explores the mediated memory produced by the Holocaust and Nakba films through the digital communication outlets that massively store and selectively retrieve history and memory (thereby politics and culture) as a virtual heterotopia. While recording history and memory serves to highlight the consequences of genocides and create a cohesive narrative about the collective victimhood identity, the act of recording and engaging with them is, paradoxically, a dynamic process which transforms over time and has multiple functions that yield various meanings. Different individuals and groups may approach the history of genocides from different perspectives, shaped by their own experiences and beliefs. This diversity of interpretations through the recollection of memory is essential for understanding the multifaceted nature of victimisation and its enduring impact. The chapters in the thesis look into the liminal spaces and spatial palimpsest created while addressing the two genocide memories through the lens of film chronotopes.

The study revisits the history of the Holocaust and Nakba through contemporary international films, which opens up spaces for contesting histories and contemporary discussions related to the formation of modern Israel and Palestine in 1948. The thesis discusses the idea of memory glocalization. Glocalised memory emerges in the spaces where global and local memories related to an event intersect,

dialogise, contest, and coexist. Glocalisation of memory is a process in which universalisation and particularisation happen simultaneously. Through the films discussed in the thesis, it can be understood that this process overcomes the limitations of both globalisation and regionalisation of memory. It opens an unbounded space to engage with the processes of remembering, forgetting, constructing, breaking silences or silencing counter narratives. This means that every mediated collective memory of different communities, including the Holocaust and Nakba memories is continuously being recollected and reconstructed while undergoing the process of transmission.

The research primarily addresses the multi-layered memory of the Holocaust and Nakba survivors and victims, represented through films. It seeks to explore the complex interactions between the notions of victimhood of the Holocaust and Nakba experiences. Through the memory representations of Holocaust and Nakba victims, this study tries to recognise the two phases of memory: the Holocaust victims working through memory and the Nakba victims living through memory. It also discusses the subjectivity of memory and ethical ramifications in the dissemination of victimhood memory leading to multifaceted impressions in world cinema.

This research addresses the complex interaction of conflicting representations of victimhood identities in the Holocaust and Nakba films within the contemporary space and time. The thesis analyses the efforts taken up by the Holocaust film directors to conceptualise and institutionalise victim identity and their vital role in disseminating Holocaust awareness throughout the world. It attempts to trace the Israeli-Palestinian conflicts dealt explicitly and complicitly in recent films by international directors. Through these objectives, the thesis addresses the unsettling condition of the survivors and the present transgenerational and intergenerational Holocaust and Nakba memory bearers with respect to their living space and identity.

Choice of Films:

The six Holocaust films chosen for analysis are *The Grey Zone* (2001), *The Pianist* (2002), *Remembrance* (2011), *In Darkness* (2011), *The Zookeeper's Wife* (2017), and *Jojo Rabbit* (2019). The six Nakba films chosen to study are *Lemon Tree* (2008), *Salt of this Sea* (2008), *The Time That Remains* (2009), *Omar* (2013), *3000 Nights* (2015) and *Tel Aviv on Fire* (2018).

Key words: Holocaust, Nakba, genocide, glocalisation of memory, mediated memory, film chronotopes.

പ്രബന്ധസംഗ്രഹം

ഓർമ്മകളുടെ ഗ്ലോക്കലൈസേഷൻ: ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ് നക്ബ പശ്ചാത്തലത്തിൽ നിർമ്മിച്ച പോസ്റ്റ് മില്ലേനിയം സിനിമകളിലെ ഇടങ്ങളും സ്വത്വങ്ങളും

ഇരുപത്തിയൊന്നാം നൂറ്റാണ്ട് ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റിന്റെയും നക്ബ വംശഹത്യയുടെയും പ്രതിനിധാനങ്ങളിൽ ഗണ്യമായ മാറ്റത്തിന് സാക്ഷ്യം വഹിക്കുന്നു. സഹസ്രാബ്ദത്തിനു ശേഷമുള്ള ചലച്ചിത്ര നിർമ്മാതാക്കൾ ദേശീയ വ്യാഖ്യാനങ്ങളെ ഏകശിലാരൂപമായി കാണുന്നതിനു പകരം, ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റിന്റെയും നക്ബയുടെയും ഓർമ്മകളിൽ ഉൾച്ചേർത്ത ബഹുമുഖ ഇടങ്ങളും ബഹുമുഖ സ്വത്വങ്ങളും പര്യവേക്ഷണം ചെയ്യുന്നു. മെമ്മറിയെക്കുറിച്ച് നിലവിലുള്ള വ്യവഹാരത്തിനും പ്രാദേശികവും ആഗോളവുമായ കമ്മ്യൂണിറ്റികളുടെ ചിന്താ പ്രക്രിയകളെ രൂപപ്പെടുത്തുന്നതിനും തിരഞ്ഞെടുത്ത ചലച്ചിത്ര പ്രതിനിധാനങ്ങൾ എങ്ങനെ സ്വാധീനിക്കുന്നു എന്ന് പര്യവേക്ഷണം ചെയ്യുന്നതാണ് ഈ പഠനം.

ഓർമ്മ നിർമ്മിതികളുടെ രാഷ്ട്രീയം, ഓർമ്മപുതുക്കലിന്റെ നീതി, ധർമ്മ ബോധ്യങ്ങളിലേക്കുള്ള വെളിച്ചം വീശൽ, ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റിലും നക്ബയിലും നടന്നതും നടക്കുന്നതുമായ വംശഹത്യകളുടെ പുനർവിചിന്തനം എന്നിവയാണ് ഈ പഠനം അടിവരയിടുന്നത്. ഓർമ്മയുടെ ഗ്ലോക്കലൈസേഷൻ, മനുഷ്യയാതനയുടെയും രണ്ട് വംശഹത്യകളുടെയും അനുഭവങ്ങൾ അസ്വസ്ഥമാക്കുന്ന ഓർമ്മകൾ എന്നിവ ഈ പഠനം വിശദീകരിക്കുന്നു. സഞ്ചിതമായ ഓർമ്മകളും ചരിത്ര വിവരണങ്ങളും രൂപപ്പെടുത്തുന്നതിൽ സാർവ്വലൗകികമായ അവബോധങ്ങളുടെയും പ്രാദേശികമായ കാഴ്ചപ്പാടുകളുടെയും പങ്കിനെ ഈ പഠനം വിശകലനം ചെയ്യുന്നു.

ഈ ഗവേഷണം ചരിത്രത്തെയും ഓർമ്മയെയും (അതുവഴി രാഷ്ട്രീയവും സംസ്കാരവും) ഒരു വെർച്വൽ ഹെറ്ററോടോപ്പിയയായി വൻതോതിൽ സംഭരിക്കുകയും തിരഞ്ഞെടുക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്ന ഡിജിറ്റൽ കമ്മ്യൂണിക്കേഷൻ ഔട്ട്ലെറ്റുകളിലൂടെ ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ് നക്ബ സിനിമകളിലൂടെ നിർമ്മിച്ച ഓർമ്മകളെ പര്യവേക്ഷണം ചെയ്യുന്നു. ചരിത്രവും ഓർമ്മയും രേഖപ്പെടുത്തുന്നത് വംശഹത്യകളുടെ അനന്തരഫലങ്ങളെ ഉയർത്തിക്കാട്ടുന്നതിനും ഇരകളുടെ പൊതുസ്വത്വത്തെ ആഖ്യാനിക്കാനും ഉതകുന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിലും, അവ രേഖപ്പെടുത്തുകയും അവരുമായി ഇടപഴകുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നത് കാലക്രമേണ രൂപാന്തരപ്പെടുന്നതും വിവിധ അർത്ഥങ്ങൾ നൽകുന്ന ഒന്നിലധികം പ്രവർത്തനങ്ങളുള്ളതുമായ ഒരു ചലനാത്മക പ്രക്രിയയാണ്. അവരുടെ സ്വന്തം അനുഭവങ്ങളും വിശ്വാസങ്ങളും അനുസരിച്ച് വ്യക്തികളും കമ്മ്യൂണിറ്റികളും വംശഹത്യകളുടെ ചരിത്രത്തെ വ്യത്യസ്ത വീക്ഷണങ്ങളിൽ സമീപിക്കാം. ഇരയാക്കലിന്റെ ബഹുമുഖ സ്വഭാവവും അതിന്റെ ആഘാതവും മനസ്സിലാക്കുന്നതിന് ഓർമ്മയുടെ വീണ്ടെടുക്കലുകൾക്ക് ഈ വ്യാഖ്യാനങ്ങളുടെ വൈവിധ്യം അത്യന്താപേക്ഷിതമാണ്.

1948-ലെ ആധുനിക ഇസ്രായേലിന്റെയും ഫലസ്തീനിന്റെയും രൂപീകരണവുമായി ബന്ധപ്പെട്ട ചരിത്രങ്ങൾക്കും സമകാലിക ചർച്ചകൾക്കും ഇടം നൽകുന്ന സമകാലീന അന്താരാഷ്ട്ര സിനിമകളിലൂടെ ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റിന്റെയും നക്ബയുടെയും ചരിത്രപഠനം പുനരവലോകനം ചെയ്യുന്നു. നക്ബ അതിജീവിച്ചവരും ഇരകളും, സിനിമകളിലൂടെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കപ്പെടുന്നു. ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ്, നക്ബ ഇരകളുടെ അനുഭവങ്ങൾ തമ്മിലുള്ള സങ്കീർണ്ണമായ ഇടപെടലുകൾ പര്യവേക്ഷണം ചെയ്യാൻ ഈ പഠനം ശ്രമിക്കുന്നു. ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ്, നക്ബ ഇരകളുടെ ഓർമ്മകളുടെ പ്രതിനിധാനങ്ങളിലൂടെ, ഓർമ്മയുടെ രണ്ട് ഘട്ടങ്ങളെ തിരിച്ചറിയാൻ ശ്രമിക്കുന്നു

(ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ് കഴിഞ്ഞുപോയതും നഖ്ബ നിലനിൽക്കുന്നതുമായ സംഭവമാണ്). ലോകസിനിമയിൽ ബഹുമുഖമുദ്രകളിലേക്ക് നയിക്കുന്ന ഇരകളുടെ ഓർമ്മയുടെ ആത്മനിഷ്ഠയും ധാർമ്മിക പരിണാമങ്ങളും ഈ പഠനം ചർച്ചചെയ്യുന്നു.

ഒരു സംഭവവുമായി ബന്ധപ്പെട്ട ആഗോളവും പ്രാദേശികവുമായ ഓർമ്മകൾ വിഭജിക്കുകയും സംഭാഷണം നടത്തുകയും മത്സരിക്കുകയും സഹവർത്തിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്ന ഇടങ്ങളിൽ ഗ്ലോക്കലൈസ്ഡ് മെമ്മറി ഉയർന്നുവരുന്നു. സാർവത്രികവൽക്കരണവും പ്രത്യേകവൽക്കരണവും ഒരേസമയം സംഭവിക്കുന്ന മെമ്മറിയുടെ ഒരു പ്രക്രിയയാണ് ഗ്ലോക്കലൈസേഷൻ. മെമ്മറിയുടെ പ്രാദേശികവൽക്കരണത്തിന്റെയും ആഗോളവൽക്കരണത്തിന്റെയും പരിമിതികളെ ഈ പ്രക്രിയ മറികടക്കുന്നുവെന്ന് പ്രബന്ധത്തിൽ ചർച്ച ചെയ്തു സിനിമകളിലൂടെ മനസ്സിലാക്കാം. ഓർമ്മിക്കുക, നിർമ്മിക്കുക, നിശ്ചിതകൾ തകർക്കുക അല്ലെങ്കിൽ വൈരുദ്ധ്യാഖ്യാനങ്ങളെ നിശബ്ദമാക്കുക തുടങ്ങിയ പ്രക്രിയകളുമായി ഇടപഴകാൻ ഇത് പരിധിയില്ലാത്ത ഇടം തുറക്കുന്നു. ഇതിനർത്ഥം, ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റും നഖ്ബ ഓർമ്മകളും ഉൾപ്പെടെ വിവിധ കമ്മ്യൂണിറ്റികളുടെ മധ്യസ്ഥമായ എല്ലാ കൂട്ടായ ഓർമ്മകളും പ്രക്ഷേപണ പ്രക്രിയയ്ക്ക് വിധേയമാകുമ്പോൾ തുടർച്ചയായി ഓർമ്മിക്കുകയും പുനർനിർമ്മിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു എന്നാണ്

ഈ ഗവേഷണം പ്രതിനിധാനം ചെയ്യുന്നത് സമകാലിക ഇടങ്ങളിലും സമയങ്ങളിലും ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ് നഖ്ബ സിനിമകളിലെ ഇരകളുടെ സ്വത്വങ്ങൾ തമ്മിലുള്ള വൈരുദ്ധ്യാത്മക പ്രതിനിധാനങ്ങളുടെ സങ്കീർണ്ണമായ ഇടപെടലിനെയാണ്. അനുഭവസ്ഥരുടെ സ്വത്വം സങ്കല്പിക്കാനും സ്ഥാപനവൽക്കരിക്കാനും ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ് ചലച്ചിത്ര സംവിധായകർ നടത്തുന്ന ശ്രമങ്ങളും ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ് അവബോധം ലോകമെമ്പാടും പ്രചരിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിൽ അവരുടെ പ്രധാന പങ്കും പ്രബന്ധം വിശകലനം ചെയ്യുന്നു. ശക്തമായ കാവലുകളെയെല്ലാം മറികടന്ന് അന്താരാഷ്ട്ര സംവിധായകരുടെ സമകാലീന സിനിമകളിൽ ഇസ്രയേലി ഫലസ്തീനിയൻ സംഘർഷങ്ങൾ വ്യക്തതയോടെ കൈകാര്യം ചെയ്തത് എങ്ങനെ എന്ന് കണ്ടെത്താൻ ശ്രമിക്കുകയാണ് ഈ പഠനം.

ഈ ലക്ഷ്യങ്ങളിലൂടെ, അതിജീവിച്ചവരുടെയും ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ് നഖ്ബ മെമ്മറി വഹിക്കുന്ന പുതിയ തലമുറയുടെയും, ഇന്നത്തെ സങ്കർഷാവസ്ഥയെയും, അവരുടെ ഇടത്തെയും വ്യക്തിത്വത്തെയും സംബന്ധിച്ചാണ് ഈ പ്രബന്ധം ചർച്ചചെയ്യുന്നത്.

സൂചകപദങ്ങൾ: ഹോളോകോസ്റ്റ്, നഖ്ബ, വംശഹത്യ, ഓർമ്മകളുടെ ഗ്ലോക്കലൈസേഷൻ, ഫിലിംക്രോണോടോപ്പി.

Chapter 1

Cinematic Journeys into the Shadows of Genocides:

Echoes across Space and Time

Genocide memories are a cluster of dispersed thoughts extricated from the minds of individuals who had to experience indiscriminate extermination and mass displacement. These traumatic experiences are threaded together to assert the identity of an ethnic group who were silenced by obliterating their state of existence including the traces of the space they occupied, the culture they followed and the history they preserved. These memories are transmitted to individuals, who lived with the survivors and victims of genocides, who had suffered from panic attacks, anxiety, fear, mood swings, hopelessness or even post-traumatic stress disorder. The collective consciousness of victimhood produced by the genocide memories of the past acted as a unifying force within the subjugated society, leading to shape a collective attitude, nation's grand narratives, territorial frameworks and their version of history. This becomes the 'collective memory' of the later generations.

The conceptualisation of 'collective memory' by French philosopher Maurice Halbwachs in the early twentieth century, led to the separation of memory from the theories of history that held liberative possibilities. As a result, memory was recognised as a discipline, and Halbwachs, along with Durkheim, was one of the pioneers in this intellectual genealogy following Freud. Even though he did not coin the term "collective memory," Durkheim thought that all societies exhibit a sense of continuity, which is demonstrated by the rituals of remembrance that early societies used to create the social memories necessary to uphold shared morality and

social cohesiveness. These intellectual ruminations led to the institutionalisation of memory.

Freud placed memory in the biological realm where memory is understood as a symbolic history of the subject that leads the subject to an internal psychic struggle between the conscious, subconscious and unconscious. Whereas, Halbwachs moved memory from the limits of the human psyche and placed it in the social realm. While Freud recognised memory on the basis of repression and forgetting within an individual's psyche, Halbwachs perceived memory as a collective mental construct within a society. He calls it the collective memory. He advanced this concept in the twentieth century through his seminal text *La Mémoire collective* (1950). He defines collective memory as a pool of information that consists of memories shared by a social group, community or nation which are significantly associated with their identity. It influences the construction and conceptualisation of an individual's memory. The collective memories shared and transmitted through narratives (like oral stories, novels, artworks or films) to later generations are acquired by the individuals of the present generation. It leaves an indelible impression on their psyche and moulds their perceptions.

Theorisation of memory helps to identify the difference between history and collective memory. In terms of space, history of an event limits and situates it into a specific physical space whereas memory of an event gets transmitted through space and time opening uncontrollable multiple possibilities that mould the present.

Though collective memory is owned by a group, it is grounded by loosely bound mounds of individual memories spread across time. Hence collective memory is a social process always under construction. The method, depth and impact of

memorialising are significantly different from the process of historicising. Revisions in history happen only after scrutinising the facts, interpreting them and filtering those memories which are considered to be local little narratives and minor counter stories. Therefore, historical narratives shape a group of people who consume the definition of a specific collective identity which has a set of properties, principles and orientation. Whereas, memory narratives expand, deepen, reimagine or counter historical narratives as it is a dynamic process.

Memorialisation of genocide is a complicated process. Initially, genocide memory appeared as an offshoot of ‘trauma’, which is described by Cathy Caruth as “an overwhelming experience of sudden or catastrophic events in which the response to the event occurs in the often delayed, uncontrolled repetitive appearance of hallucinations and other intrusive phenomena” (*Unclaimed Experience* 11). Holocaust and Nakba were memorialised through documentaries, photographs, public memorials, newspaper articles, autobiographies, biographies and other media. The questions of hegemony in the process of collective memorialisation, submerging many individual memories to downplay or hide the contestations inherent within collective memory, attribution of victimhood to a few cultures and neglecting others as counter narratives emerged as vantage points in the later discussion of memory.

With the passage of time and space, remembering and contextualising genocides like the Holocaust and Nakba became a deliberate act to evoke, study and interpret memory. This gave rise to individual memories which were suppressed in the earlier process of collective memorialisation. The inclusion of popular culture into the academic sphere, challenges the historians, researchers, and philosophers who were previously solely responsible for historicizing events. In popular culture,

commemoration is being carried out by the diverse ways in which the current generation communicates. In popular culture the memories and experiences of the genocide through paintings, museums, books, sculptures, graffiti, graphic novels, music, movies, and social media platforms.

This research addresses the potential of mediated individual and collective genocide memories mainly through films. This chapter problematises the notion of space in the act of representing Holocaust and Nakba memory through the twenty first century world cinema. The intention is not to draw a historical analogy of the Holocaust and Nakba (which has been done concisely in the introduction), but to address the spatial palimpsests accumulated to define the present. It includes the correlating and contesting narrative spaces, the possibility of transnational resonances and the way genocide films work as memory sites, chronotopes and become heterotopias simultaneously. The four films which will be discussed in this chapter are *The Pianist* (2002), and *Remembrance* (2011) set against the backdrop of the Holocaust; and *Lemon Tree* (2008), and *The Time that Remains* (2009) in which Nakba is the context.

Roman Polanski's Academy Award-winning film, *The Pianist* finds its script by the synthesis of two Holocaust survivors' minds. It is an amalgam of the life story of Władysław Szpilman, the Polish composer and pianist's traumatic ordeal during the Nazi occupation of Warsaw and the director Roman Polanski, a child survivor of the 1939 German occupation of Krakow.

The film is based on Szpilman's memoir *Death of a City* written in 1946, in which he recounts his isolated traumatic journey of survival by hiding in the debris of war, and the atrocities and extermination which his entire family had to face along

with millions of other Jews in Warsaw. His memoir (written down by Jerzy Waldorff, Polish music critic and Szpilman's friend) was a realistic narration of the brutalities executed by Nazis, it was "immediately withdrawn from circulation by Polish factions of the Stalin regime, Szpilman's book languished in relative obscurity for decades" (Stein, "Music and Trauma" 755). The book was translated and republished in English only in 1999 by Anthea Bell under the title *The Pianist: The Extraordinary Story of One Man's Survival in Warsaw, 1939–45*. It was adapted to screenplay by Ronald Harwood for the director Roman Polanski.

The Remembrance, a German fiction film directed by Anna Justice, depicts the events that follow the resurfacing of suppressed memories in the life of a Holocaust survivor. Past is unrolled through the memory of Hannah Silberstein, who occupies the central position in the film. The movie fuses the gripping Holocaust terrors with a passionate love story of Tomasz Limanowski, a captured member of the Polish resistance and Hannah Silberstein, a young German Jew in the work camp. Though the film is set in New York City in 1976, it is intercut with the memories of the Nazi concentration camp of Poland, in 1944. Hannah's tormenting memories of her life in concentration camp, Tomasz and Hannah's escape from the Nazis, the unexpected twists in their life while hiding, the incidents that forced them to get separated and eventually believing that their partners have been lost forever collides with an incident in the present in Hannah's life, after thirty long years, where she recognises Tomasz in a television interview.

The Israeli film director Eran Riklis tries to knit together the life of a Palestinian and an Israeli family contesting for retaining and destroying a lemon grove respectively, through his film *Lemon Tree*. It is based on a real incident that

happened in 2005 (appeared in *Al Jazeera*); Shaul Mofaz, the Defence Minister of Israel, files a case in the court complaining about the insecurity in sharing the boundaries with a Palestinian woman's citrus grove. He lives on the Israeli side of the Green Line (separation boundary) with the West Bank.

Israel's Supreme Court sanctioned the uprooting of the Palestinian woman's citrus grove on the grounds that it impedes security for Defence Minister's home, denying the rights over her property. The film throws light on the conflicting opinions about the Green Line, the de facto border called as the Armistice Line. This term emerged during the period of land occupation by the Zionist government in 1948. Though it was intended as a temporary demarcation line between the Israeli state and the unoccupied Palestine, later it turned out to be the boundary between the two states despite the resistance. The film problematises the lives of people on both the sides of Green Line border between Israel and the West Bank, after Nakba. The Green line symbolically represents the subdued voices of victims who had to face the consequences of Nakba, Naksa and the futile Oslo Accords.

Israel's Nazareth serves as the setting for Palestinian filmmaker Elia Suleiman's film *The Time That Remains*. The film was awarded the Asia Pacific Screen Award's Jury Grand Prize in 2009. It is a visual representation of a family saga which is semi-autobiographical. Suleiman takes the narrative thread for this film from his father's private diary, his mother's letters, and his own experience. The film captures a long period, from 1948 to the present, and fits it into its timeframe. It portrays an account of displacement and dispossession of Palestinians, the formation of Israel and the daily life of the Palestinians who did not flee during Nakba and remained in the Palestinian region which became a part of Israel's territory. They were labelled as the 'Israeli-Arabs' who are living as a minority in

their homeland. The film is divided into four episodes, featuring the life of Faud and Elia as key characters and their relatives, neighbours, friends and colleagues playing different roles. The subtitle of the film *Chronicle of a Present Absentee*, alludes to the absurd condition and the stagnant life of the Palestinians who were called Israeli Arabs becoming minority and fugitives in their own land.

The use of the terms Holocaust and Nakba and its representations have been a volatile and highly political act during different periods after the World Wars. They have been projected, undervalued, erased or ignored with respect to the definitions of space that they represented at different times and the temperament of the generations after the World Wars. Norman Finkelstein in his book *The Holocaust Industry* (2003), stated that during the initial phase after the World War II, forgetting the Holocaust was given more priority by the American Jewish elites due to multiple political reasons that he mentions. This controversial book that drew both praise and criticism, traces the different phases of Shoah memory representations after the World War II and states the following:

The Final Solution was a taboo topic of American Jewish elites. . .

Everything changed with the June 1967 Arab–Israeli war. By virtually all accounts, it was only after this conflict that the Holocaust became a fixture in American Jewish life. The standard explanation of this transformation is that Israel’s extreme isolation and vulnerability during the June war revived memories of the Nazi extermination. (4)

Although about one third of all killed victims were Soviet citizens who often met their death in camps on the occupied territories of the Soviet Union, the Holocaust incidents were largely suppressed by Soviet historians and Jewish elites

due to Stalinist anti-Semitism and personal interests respectively. There were a few instances of enquiry and representation in British, Swedish, and Finnish newspapers as seen in the book by the historian Antero Holmila titled, *Reporting the Holocaust in the British, Swedish and Finnish Press, 1945–1950*, but there were notable differences in national responses to the Holocaust: the way the memory of Holocaust was marginalised or downplayed by the metanarratives of Cold War.

The conditions changed with the fall of the Soviet Union. Holocaust memory gradually became a universal epitome of genocide across the world. The gradual recognition and relevance given to the Holocaust memories followed by institutionalisation of them, led to the proliferation of ideas related to cosmopolitan moralities about human rights, dominating the late twentieth century. At the same time, Nakba became a counter narrative that was sidelined in the name of the struggle for the survival of Holocaust victims.

The term Nakba (Palestinian catastrophe), which meant ethnic cleansing and geographical erasure of Palestine, was first used by Syrian Arab intellectual, Constantin Zureiq. Palestinians see the Nakba as a living reality, not as a historical event, the iniquities of the present are reiterations of the injustices of the past. Whereas Palestinians' Nakba is Israeli Freedom Movement for the Zionists and immigrated European Jews. As a fundamental event in their freedom struggle, they perceive it as the War of Independence. Professor Motti Golani (a Jewish-Israeli) and Dr. Adel Manna (a Palestinian of Israeli citizenship) in their seminal text *Two Sides of the Coin: Independence and Nakba 1948*, published in 2011 state,

The Palestinians regard the Nakba and its repercussions as a formative trauma defining their identity and their national, moral, and political

aspirations. As a result of the 1948 war, the Palestinian people, which to a large degree lost their country to the establishment of a Jewish state for the survivors of the Holocaust, developed a victimised national identity. From their perspective, the Palestinians have been forced to pay for the Jewish Holocaust with their bodies, their property, and their freedom instead of those who were truly responsible. Jewish Israelis, in contrast, see the war and its outcome not merely as an act of historical justice that changed the historical course of the Jewish people, which until that point had been filled with suffering and hardship, but also as a birth – the birth of Israel as an independent Jewish state after two thousand years of exile. (14)

The above observation implies that Palestinians and Israelites saw the war as a formative event in their respective histories. Though the 1948 war was seen as a significant event in the history of Palestine with respect to loss of their land, using the term Nakba for developing nationhood in the minds of Palestinians was a gradual and dreadful process.

Daina K Allen, in her article “The Politics of Witness: Remembering and Forgetting 1948 in Shatila Camp” notes a few instances related to contesting affairs in commemorating Nakba just after the event:

During the early years in exile, the term “the Nakba” had not cohered as a national symbol and 1948 was more often viewed as a moment of weakness and humiliation that needed to be exorcised than as an event to be actively commemorated. Refugees—or “returnees” as they insisted on being called—expected that their exile would be temporary, and often actively resisted using the term Nakba because they feared that it lent permanency to their

situation. In the 1950s and early 1960s other more euphemistic terms were employed to describe the events of 1948, among them, *al-ightisab* (the rape), *al-ahdath* (the events), *al-hijra* (the exodus), *lamma sharna wa tla'na* (when we blackened our faces and left). While Palestinian nationalism thrived in Lebanon in the 1970s, the focus was on revolution and renewal, making the invocation of 1948 memory neither desirable nor appropriate. It was not, therefore, until the 1990s, largely in response to the perception that Yasir Arafat was on the point of signing away the right of 1948 refugees to return in exchange for Palestinian statehood, that a renewed interest in the Nakba developed among institutions representing Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. (253)

For the Palestinians, Naqba memory serves to remind the international community that the rights of Palestinians are still unresolved. Furthermore, Palestinians see the celebration of Israeli independence as a denial of Palestinian history, dehumanisation of Palestinians, and betrayal of the refugees' hopes of returning to their homeland. When the Holocaust victims suffocated under the Nazi regime, the political Zionists and British Empire paved way for them to occupy (in the name of returning to Promised Land) or colonise (by propagating the delusion: "a land without a people for a people without a land", as stated by Diana Muir in her article "Texts Concerning Zionism", an often-cited phrase in the Zionist narratives) Palestinian region, leading to unresolvable problems with the passage of time. Thus, in contrast to the Palestinians, who see the Nakba and Naksa as ongoing events, Israel's official policy is to deny the memory of the Nakba and Naksa, and erase or fabricate the history of systematic violence before teaching the younger Israeli generation about it.

Due to the Western empires' sense of guilt over their silence and inaction during the Holocaust, they decided to establish a new home for European Jews in the Middle East. This choice resulted in the displacement and murder of another group of indigenous people causing the Nakba, a new humanitarian catastrophe for which the Palestinian people are made to suffer needlessly as a consequence of the crimes committed by the Nazi regime.

This chapter discusses the ways in which the Holocaust and Nakba films address the multi-layeredness and multidirectionality within the two collective memories. Holocaust as a bygone event, the physical space and atmosphere of Nazi occupation has to be reconstructed by the film directors to commemorate Holocaust in this century. Whereas, Nakba being an ongoing event, setting the film space within the real physical space was highly challenging due to state surveillance and censorship.

The postcolonial and cultural theorists redefined the notion of space from a fixed physical space prone to dispossession and erasure to a phenomenon which is dynamic multidirectional and that cannot be easily destroyed. This space is an elaborate visualised reality which encapsulates multiple layers like physical, mental, individual, collective, cultural, political, institutional, mediated and other discursive spaces.

Films about the Holocaust and Nakba genocides are examples of visual expressions that can bridge different discursive spaces. In the local and international communities, these movies serve as heterotopias, helping people understand the trauma and memories of the genocides. Heterotopias, according to Michel Foucault, are real spaces that exist outside the established social order. The films analysed in

the thesis also function as creative spaces that offer a critique or commentary on the prevailing societal structures or mainstream narratives while operating within various communities worldwide. Narrativisation of traumatic memory is a process that involves recollection, selection, controlled deliberation, integration of individual experience into collective memory, and verbal narration or visual representation.

Mikhail Bakhtin's idea of 'artistic chronotope' can also be applied to the Holocaust and Nakba films. He states in the essay "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" from the book *The Dialogic Imagination*,

In the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterises the artistic chronotope. (84)

Holocaust films, both collective commemoration through mnemonics and individual narratives create chronotopes in which the audience enters into a specific space, time and context, producing multiple meanings and mobilising memory. Holocaust films in the twentieth century mostly depicted the dichotomy between the victims and perpetrators, not giving due representation to the grey zones of history and complexity in characters. In the post millennium phase, a shift is perceptible in focus with respect to the theme and form of memory representation. Jovan Byford in his article "Testimony" states that, it can be observed that there has been a shift from event centred (related to collective memory) to victim and witness centred approach (explore individual memory rather than living with collective memory) to address multiple perspectives in the act of framing memory (205).

While analysing the postmillennial Holocaust movies, it can be observed that the Holocaust chronotopes are created largely through individual narrations or by recreating the psychic space of a survivor as seen in movies like *The Pianist* (2002), *Remembrance* (2011), *Ida* (2013), *The Lady in Number 6: Music Saved My Life* (2013), *The Book Thief* (2013), *Son of Saul* (2015), *The Zookeeper's Wife* (2017), *The Photographer of Mauthausen* (2018), and *The Accountant of Auschwitz* (2018). The films point at multiple perspectives and grey zones within the translation of the Holocaust. It has superseded the Hawlbachian notion of collective memory as a holistic entity and interprets it as a complex mobile archive with myriad individual experiences. These experiences are self-reflexive resulting in the evolution of a new memory space that is multidirectional.

The Pianist is the most important film in Polanski's cinematic oeuvre as it is his first film that dealt explicitly with the Holocaust. He had declined Spielberg's offer to direct *Schindler's List* saying that it was necessary to allow a certain time to pass by before he could get involved in a project discussing the Holocaust. This time period was necessary for him to mentally detach from the trauma and to view the Holocaust from an objective position. He wove an account of the Holocaust unrolled through the life of Szpilman. Whereas, Szpilman could narrate his experience in 1946, just after detaching from the immediate physical space of the Holocaust. They are the first-generation Holocaust memory bearers who created a visual 'artistic chronotope' to sustain Holocaust memory.

Polanski's *The Pianist* stands distinct from most of the twenty first century Holocaust films for its realistic depiction of the barest nature of humans. The film unrolls through the stark portrayal of the lead character, the Polish Jewish pianist,

Władysław Szpilman's (starred by Adrien Nicholas Brody) extraordinary journey of survival amidst horrifying Holocaust events in Warsaw. This autobiographical narrative of survival brings an ordinary man who is not much heroic or brave to the limelight, through a detached and non-judgemental tone.

The chronologically arranged film begins with a black and white video footage depicting Warsaw in 1939. The narrative begins with a close-up shot showing Szpilman's fingers playing the piano and then the camera zooms out to show Szpilman for the first time and the studio in which he is sitting comfortably with a blank expression or immersed in the musical note. He is well dressed and seems to be from a well-off family. Then the camera shifts to a coworker in the next room, who is nervously looking out of the window several times. Suddenly the music is interrupted by the sound of a bomb exploding, causing Szpilman to flinch and stop playing for a brief moment of time. The camera then cuts back to the shot of the room outside, and several panes of glasses are shown breaking and a man frantically signals him to evacuate. Fear and confusion can be seen on Szpilman's face as he continues to play the piano, and with the next blast he is blown off. The next shot shows people running around and down the stairs frenetically and a woman named Dorota notices Szpilman amidst the chaos. She is Szpilman's friend Jurek's sister, Dorota. The audience watches a brief and light conversation between them. These beginning shots indicate how the Polish community refused to believe that the Germans would attack them or that they did not heed the warnings.

The camera switches to the settings of Szpilman's home and family. They have just learned that they will soon be deported. A wide range of responses can be seen from his family members of different ages and attitudes, rather than just simply

feeling sorry for themselves. His parents and one of the sisters are shocked and wish to move out of Warsaw. Szpilman and another sister wish to stay back. They seem to have an apathetic feeling towards the impending danger. Szpilman wishes to die in his own home/homeland whereas his brother Henryk is a more courageous man who wishes to fight and resist the Nazi attack in the initial part of the film. Through these diverse responses of Szpilman's family, Polanski represents anxious Polish people's multiple attitudes towards the German attack in the 1930s. Holocaust films have the ability to bring back the victims to life through representation of different times before and during the Nazi attack, highlighting the absurdity of the situation.

The next scene focuses on the family listening to the radio broadcast and they feel slightly relieved by the news that the British and the French governments have declared war on Germany. The camera cuts from a joyous scene of family dinner, celebrating the declaration of war on Germany to a disappointing shot where the Nazi troop marches into the city and the Polish people including Szpilman, Henryk and their father stand idle watching it.

Then we see a clear picture of how the Nazi government executed *Lebensraum*. *Lebensraum* was a strategy adopted by Hitler to expand his territory in terms of living space and resources for Aryan Germans. The concept of *Lebensraum* served as a guide for the Nazi military conquests and racial policy. The occupied Poland gradually became an inescapable claustrophobic space for the Polish people. The well-planned, meticulous operation that targeted the Polish Jews and other minorities was designed to destroy everything, including their home and their possessions, and ultimately result in their deaths. Every stage of stigmatisation and deduction of the living space is well depicted by Polanski through the film.

Polanski uses architectural space as a mnemonic device to evoke memory. It helps to project the deteriorating state of life. The film begins with a long shot portraying the contented life in Poland. The narrative begins by showing the comfortable interiors of the Warsaw Studio and then the camera shifts to the well-furnished and luxurious interiors of Szpilman's home. The plight of the Jews is charted by Polanski through the depiction of different stages in the reduction of living space, both social and private.

In the film, after the scene showing the fear and frustration of Polish people (through the tight medium shot showing the expression of Szpilman, Henryk and father) while the Nazi troop marched into the city, the next scene moves to Szpilman's household where his mother and sister are fixing the cracked window and his father counting the leftover money, and there is a discussion on how to hide their money as a decree came ordering that Jews should possess only a limited amount; the stages of deteriorating space builds momentum from then onwards.

One of the piteous moments that comes next is a scene in which Szpilman and Dorota finally meet and indulge in a romantic and light conversation. They walk down the street and are shocked to see 'No Jews Allowed' (00:08:42), written on a board hanged in front of a restaurant before they entered into it.

Dorota: This is disgraceful! How dare they! Szpilman: They want to be better Nazis than Hitler. Dorota: I'm going in there to complain.

Szpilman: Don't, don't. It's better not. Believe me. Dorota: It's so humiliating. Someone like you!

Szpilman: We'll find somewhere else. Dorota: We could walk in the park.

Szpilman: No. We can't. It's an official decree. No Jews allowed in the park.

Dorota: Oh my God, are you joking?

Szpilman: I'm not joking. It's true. I'd suggest we just sit on a bench somewhere, but that's another official decree, "No Jews allowed on public benches".

Dorota: This is absurd!

Szpilman: I tell you what we can do. We can just stand here and talk. I think we're allowed to do that, don't you?

So, you play the cello, Dorota, that's nice. (00:04:45- 00:09:33)

The above distressing exchange between Dorota and Szpilman reminds of how most among the Polish community and Germans were indoctrinated by the ideological insanity of Hitler and his party. They too stigmatised Jews and supported the new decrees for their own advantage leading to the spread of a dangerous hatred and divide within Poland, symbolising the whole of Nazi occupied nations. Though Dorota is shocked and calls it to be 'disgraceful', Szpilman looks at the irony of Polish people trying to become better Hitler. His later conversation and his attempt to change the topic by coming back to the discussion on music is a verbal cue signalling his ability to withstand adverse conditions and the tenacity of the human spirit to move forward or survive as seen in the later part of the movie.

The next scene is set in Szpilman's home, where his father reads the newspaper and the latest decrees related to wearing armbands with the Star of David. Though Henryk states that he will not wear it, the next shot slides into Warsaw Street where Szpilman's father walks through the street wearing the armband. The Nazi officers abuse him and treat him inhumanly. The next scene shifts back to his house, where Szpilman is idly working on the music notation. His

sister brings in the newspaper, revealing the recent order to relocate to the crowded ghetto, or the Jewish district, as their mother bemoans running out of money. It can be noted that the script continuously oscillates between public and private spaces which symbolises the existential crisis that the Jews faced due to denial of their sense of belonging. This led to the gradual alienation of the Jewish community.

By 31st October 1940, Szpilman and his family are forced from their home into the isolated and overcrowded Warsaw Ghetto, where conditions only get worse. People are not allowed to leave the ghetto, unemployment and poverty are increasing, which worsens health conditions and causes mental retardation in some people. The environment is filthy, starving children are abandoned, and dead bodies are all over the place.

In addition to depicting horrifying instances of Jewish suffering, Polanski throws light on the politics of Jews who belong to the different social and economic strata. The post millennium Holocaust films opened spaces for such representations of the internal class struggles. Unlike the earlier Holocaust movies, they delve into the psyche of both the victim community and the perpetrators. Polanski shows a family dining scene at Szpilman and his family's apartment in the ghetto, in which he brings the above to discussion. Henryk tells an instance of a Polish doctor who is allowed into the ghetto to operate on a Jew but is shot by the *Schutzstaffel* (abbreviated as SS officers). Their duty is to enforce the racial policy of Nazi Germany and general policing, who are also called as the political soldiers. The conversation becomes more serious and accusing when he states that Szpilman is playing the piano for the parasites. Here parasites are the elite Jews who have been portrayed even in the earlier scenes (as in a Jewish restaurant in the ghetto where Szpilman works), who led a rich life by bribing the Nazis and remained unconcerned

of the victims who perished, without realising that they too are under threat. The father blames the American Jews for the cause, his opinion is that the Jewish bankers should persuade America to declare war against Germany.

The dining scene is suddenly interrupted by the sound of an army vehicle. Terror spreads all over the ghetto and people in all the apartments shut their lights including that of Szpilman. Then the lighting focuses to one window of the opposite building. Szpilman witnesses an entire Jewish family being persecuted and killed by the SS during a round-up, including an unsettling and shocking scene of dumping an elderly man in a wheelchair through the window. A man tries to climb the wall built to divide the Jews from the Poles, but he too is shot down. The vehicle moves by running over the half dead bodies lying on the street. Szpilman's family is shocked and traumatised to see the sight.

In a scene, that is seen through the eyes of Szpilman who is waiting on the street to save imprisoned Henryk, Polanski merges a number of emotionally disturbing shots: an insane man playing with kids and entertaining SS officers, a man snatching food from a woman which falls down and he eats it off the ground and so on. Next, we see Szpilman running for an employment certificate for his father (Szpilman's friend calls it to be a 'historical imperative') to avoid deportation, which later proves to be of no use.

The film scenes vacillate between hope and despair. The next despairing scene shows the closing of the ghetto on 15 March 1942, Szpilman, his family and all other Jews are moved to an overcrowded ground bounded by walls. The audience witnesses the complete rejection of private space and further contraction of public space. After showing the suffocating atmosphere through a pan shot, the camera

shifts to a medium shot showing the imprisoned Jews. Polanski focuses on a conversation between the elders among the imprisoned including Szpilman's father.

Dr Ehrlich: We're letting them take us to our death like sheep to the slaughter!

Father: Dr Ehrlich, not so loud.

Dr Ehrlich: Why don't we attack them? There's half a million of us here, we could break out of the ghetto. At least we could die honourably, not as a stain on the face of history.

Elder man: Why you so sure they're sending us to our death?

Dr Ehrlich: I'm not sure. You know why I'm not sure? Because, they didn't tell me. But I'm telling you they plan to wipe us all out!

Elder man: Dr Ehrlich, what do you want me to do? Do you want me to fight?

To fight, you need organisation, plans, guns.

Father: He's right. What do you think I can do? Fight them with my violin bow?

Elder man: The Germans would never squander a huge labour force like this. They're sending us to a Labour camp, it's obvious.

Dr Ehrlich: Oh, sure. Look at that cripple, there. Look at the old people, the children, they're gonna work? Look at you! Well, you're going to carry iron girders on your back? (00:43:43 - 00:44:30)

This clearly recreates the fear and uneasiness the community faced. As the Nazi noose tightens many people are well aware of what will be the next step but are helpless as they are not equipped with weapons though they are huge in number

enough to organise an attack. This scene powerfully depicts the trauma of the people awaiting extermination. Films have the ability to float back and forth across time and space, it brings back the dead to life in the form of representation.

On 16th August 1942, they are about to be transported to an extermination camp (probably to Treblinka, as it is mentioned later). A poignant instance while all the imprisoned people move to the station is when Szpilman looks at his sister Halina and says, "It's a funny time to say this but. . . I wish I knew you better" (00:49:24-00:49:29). The scene at the station is pathetic: the huge mass of imprisoned Jews is forced into the train by the Jews themselves, who are now the police doing their service for the Nazi government. It is disturbing to know that Nazis could tactically self-divide Jews and assign one group to send the others into the 'Melting Pot' (a term used by Jewish police in the film). While all the people are forced to get into the train, Szpilman's friend who is one among the Jewish Ghetto police under Nazi pulls him out of the group, separates him from his family and lets him to escape.

The second part of the movie tells the long and incredible story of how Szpilman survived the war by hiding in the ruined Warsaw. The scene following the deportation of a huge mass of people is the one in which weary and dejected Szpilman walks through the debris of the Nazi attack. The background settings with abandoned belongings and dead bodies pull the audience into the narrative to travel along with the alienated Szpilman. He gets into the restaurant where he worked and hides there with his friend who was there too. Later he becomes a slave labourer and gets a chance to enter into the Polish gentile's residential area. While in the camp, he learns from his friend that many trains take people to Treblinka to exterminate them.

He also comes to know of an upcoming Jewish revolt planned by the imprisoned young Jews. He helps the resistance by smuggling weapons into the ghetto, on one occasion an officer suddenly entered into the storeroom where Szpilman was about to unload the weapons. He narrowly escapes from the officer's suspicion.

The film interestingly portrays Szpilman's will to survive the catastrophe. He asks his friend Majorek (who goes out of the labour camp to collect food) to help him find the address of his non-Jewish friend Andrzej Bogucki. Szpilman eventually manages to escape and goes into hiding with the help of Andrzej and his wife, Janina. He is shifted to a small storage space hidden behind a shelf, in the basement of an office for a day. Later he is taken to a flat near the ghetto wall. Though he feels comfortable, his mind is still disturbed by the traumatic experiences in the ghetto: "But sometimes I am still not sure on which side of the wall I am" (01:17:20-27). Szpilman and the audience watch the upcoming uprising, the Nazi attack and the destruction of the ghetto through the window of the flat. The window opens to the most important instances in the Holocaust history while both the protagonist and the audience are within the four walls of a comfortable flat. This window scene that draws the audience too into the Holocaust history becomes a chronotope.

On 19th April 1943, Szpilman watches from his window the first of the two uprisings - Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, which he aided, unfolds and ultimately fails. Soon thereafter, the Polish resistors are also arrested including Andrzej and Janina. Szpilman starves due to inadequate supply of food. While searching for the leftovers, plates fall from the shelf making a huge noise. A neighbour discovers Szpilman hiding in the flat. She becomes furious of seeing a Jew and he is forced to flee to the next hiding place. He meets Dorota again, as he was given her husband

Michal Dzikiewich's number in case of emergency. His new hiding location is another vacant apartment, "a very German area near a hospital, safest place to be, right at the heart of the lion's den" (01:34:24- 44). It has a piano in it which he feels drawn to play; but he does not, as he must keep quiet to avoid discovery. He imitates playing the piano. This hallucinatory playing of music while in hiding is a coping mechanism used by Szpilman to escape from the frustrations of isolation and to attain a mental equilibrium. While in hiding he becomes ill due to malnutrition (the Polish man provided very limited food supplies and at the same time collected money from people by exploiting Szpilman's fame). At the same time, there is an air of hope that Germans are being attacked. Dorota, Micheal and a doctor save his life.

On 1st August 1944, during the Warsaw Uprising, the Home Army attacks the German Hospital building across the street from Szpilman's hideout. Tank shells hit the apartment, forcing him to flee. He strategically escapes from the vicinity of the army, even by posing as a corpse. He spends a few days in the debris of the hospital, and escapes to the backyard while the buildings are being demolished. The next scene is the most heart-rending scene in which through an aerial shot, Polanski tries to show the post-apocalyptic view of the destroyed and desolate Warsaw after the Holocaust. The shot shifts the viewer's perspective from the standpoint of a participant (while being in Szpilman's shoes) to that of a viewer, allowing them to see the effects of the Holocaust from a higher vantage point and developing a comprehensive understanding of the past event even in the twenty-first century.

Szpilman is left alone to search desperately for shelter and supplies among the ruins. He eventually makes his way to a house where he finds a can of pickles. While trying to open it, he is noticed by a German officer Captain Wilm Hosenfeld,

who learns that Szpilman is a pianist. He asks Szpilman to play on a piano in the abandoned house. The decrepit Szpilman manages to play. Hosenfeld spares Szpilman's life and lets him hide in the attic. Hosenfeld regularly supplied him food too.

In 1945, the Germans retreated from the Red Army. Hosenfeld met Szpilman for the last time, promising he would listen to him on Polish Radio after the war. He gives Szpilman the coat of his uniform to keep him warm, which later turns out to be a threat to his life as Russian army suspects him to be a German. The next scene cuts into the shot in which the former inmates of a Nazi concentration camp pass by a Soviet prisoner-of-war camp holding captured German soldiers and verbally abusing them. Hosenfeld, being one of the prisoners, overhears a released inmate lamenting over his former career as a violinist. He asks him whether he knows Szpilman, and begs him to tell Szpilman that he is in the camp. The next scene shows Szpilman playing the piano comfortably in the Polish Radio Station. The violinist from the cabin meets the eyes of Szpilman and a spectrum of emotions appears on Szpilman's face that encapsulates his past and present. Later, the violinist and Szpilman reach the camp but finds it abandoned. Finally, Polanski shows Szpilman performing Chopin's musical composition to a large prestigious audience. The film ends with a textual epilogue which states that Szpilman died on July 6, 2000, at the age of 88, and all that is known of Hosenfeld is that he died in 1952 while still in Soviet captivity.

The twenty first century representations generate fear and frustration that grips the audience and at the same time, these emotions are gradually superseded by the will and determination to survive. In *The Pianist*, Szpilman's stoicism, self-

control and mental agility helps him to survive the Holocaust. Reifying the memory of Szpilman through his memoir and later by Ronald Harwood (screenplay) and Roman Polanski through the film has made him a 'site of memory' like Anne Frank as in *The Diary of a Young Girl*, Antonina Żabińska in *The Zookeeper's Wife* and so on. The phrase 'site of memory' coined by French historian Pierre Nora refers to the places that evoke memory, as Jay Winter quotes Jan Assman's translation in his article "Sites of Memory", to assimilate to a "collective shared knowledge . . . of the past, on which a group's sense of unity and individuality is based" (132). Szpilman's character has become a site to sustain the traces of past catastrophe which has been reinvested through memoirs, translations and film adaptations.

The aesthetic modality of the screen adaptation of Szpilman's memoir by Ronald Harwood has been successful in memorialising the massive atrocities of the Holocaust, though the focus was narrowed down to an individual's experience. Like in every adaptation, there are many compressions, distortions, omissions, and additions which have been done while shifting from a textual narrative space of the memoir to a kinetic narrative space which amalgamates sight and sound into the spacio temporality of film. Harwood and Polanski adapt many symbols and metaphors to project the memory space of Szpilman.

The architectural space has been employed to depict the physical and mental torments of the victims: the step-by-step reduction of physical space and later the post-apocalyptic view of complete destruction of the city describe the plight of the Holocaust victims as discussed earlier. It can be noticed that almost half of the film is seen through different windows present in Szpilman's hiding place. It metaphorically represents the isolation of the Jewish community. It acts as an outlet

to observe the escalation of violence of Nazis and later resistance of Jews. For example, in a scene where the German troops come to the Jewish district, all the lights are shut off in the houses and we see the soldiers entering into a building opposite to the apartment where Szpilman's family lives, persecuting an entire family traumatising the viewers. Windows in those scenes symbolise the vision of the haunted community who are helpless witnesses to the decimation of their own community. Later we see Jewish resistance or the Warsaw Ghetto uprising through the window of rooms where Szpilman himself is trying to resist or escape from Nazis.

Another recurring symbol is the dividing wall built by the Nazis to separate the Polish and German people from the Polish Jews. Initially, it represented the rigidity of the Nazi agenda and the condition of people on either side of the wall. The Jewish side consisted of labour camps and buildings, claustrophobic atmosphere and people competing for survival. The bleak Jewish quarters show construction activities of buildings that are meant to ghettoise them, whereas the German area is comparatively comfortable and hygienic. At one instance after Szpilman's escape from the labour camp, he is still confused to which side of the wall he belongs, hinting at his inner conflict of not resisting Nazis like a hero rather escaping from them like an ordinary man for his own survival. After the second half of the film, resistance breaks out and the walls are crumbled, marking the nearing end of the Nazi rule.

Visualisation being the major aesthetic mode used to portray Szpilman's experience, music becomes the second and equally aesthetic mode of representation that coexists in the film *The Pianist*. Music is used by Polanski and his team as a

vital metaphor to synthesise and decipher the incommunicable spectrum of emotions that ran through the mind of Szpilman. Szpilman is an expert in playing the compositions of Chopin, a classic Polish music composer of the romantic age. Alexander Stein, in the article “Music and Trauma in Polanski’s *The Pianist*” states, In the context of its compositional history, it could be heard to signify parallel interrupted trajectories, between Szpilman, the consummate Chopin interpreter, and Chopin himself, the de facto Polish national composer, representing the truncated lives of half a million Polish Jews (761).

Polanski merges music into the narrative in such a way that every crucial stage in Szpilman’s life depicted through the film is accompanied by Chopin’s musical notes. The rhythm of each bit of music is given life and meaning by Polanski by juxtaposing it on Szpilman’s life. The film begins with a music composition played by Szpilman as a celebrated pianist while in the Warsaw studio. He again reappears as a musician after shifting to the Jewish district as a Jew pianist in a restaurant entertaining the elite Jews. Then while in isolation at a flat in the German area, he mimics playing piano by suspending his fingers just above the keys of a piano and imaginatively conjures an audience listening to his music; he is transposed to a calmer and more peaceful world through his music at least for a moment.

Later this fantasy is fulfilled at the end of the film, after the war when the audience witnesses Szpilman performing the same music accompanied by orchestra in a grand concert hall filled with audience. His career also became a lifeline when he confronted Captain Hosenfeld; the rhythm of the music played by Szpilman at this point resonates the mental crisis and anxiety in the climax of his journey of survival

through the social insanity. Music is used as a filmic narrative device by which Polanski portrays Szpilman as a musician who relies upon his intimate relationship with the piano and his connectedness to a receptive audience either real or imaginary to cope with the dread, isolation, loss and existential crisis. Hence music becomes an abstract auditory space.

The chronologically arranged events form parts of a giant wheel like image that begins at the radio station and later ends there; Szpilman takes the central position as the pianist who connects all the events through his journey of escape. The audience is caught within this traumatising giant wheel that begins with existential crisis and gradually becomes a story of determination which finally leads to survival. This visual memoir acts as a chronotope which recreates the space and time of the Holocaust into which the people of the present enter. The Holocaust films have the ability to evoke memory, develop social behaviour and construct the identity of individuals. This merging of filmic aesthetics with real life incidents places the bygone event Holocaust in an ambivalent liminal zone between history and memory.

Another riveting post millennium Holocaust movie which is inspired by real events is *Remembrance* by German director Anna Justice. The American screenwriter, Pamela Katz penned this biographical fiction after around five years of research on the pre-war and wartime history, Holocaust condition, psychology of the survivors, individual memories, archived documentaries about the realities of the Auschwitz camp, and national narratives.

This film has its genesis in a documentary presenting the life of two Holocaust survivors, Jerzy Bielecki and Cyla Cybulska. Due to her German lineage (her father was a German Jew who immigrated to the United States with his family

in 1936), Katz progressively developed into a vicarious witness of the Holocaust, experiencing indirectly the psychological effects of the horrific events that her parents and other people belonging to her community went through.

The film begins in *media res*, which shows a young woman who writes a letter and gets ready to leave a house in winter. This scene cuts into another, set in 1976 New York, where Hannah Levine sits in her study and writes her diary. Anna Justice adds a voiceover to accompany this scene marking the beginning of unravelling the fragmented horrifying memory of Hannah. She states, “A memory does not come as a whole; it’s torn from the start. The edges are piercing and sharp. They pierce the skin and make you bleed” (00:56:00- 01:10:00).

In the following scenes, the audience is gripped by the fast-paced editing of shots set in the Auschwitz concentration camp of 1944. The camera focuses on a young German Jewish woman Hannah Silberstein (starred by Alice Dwyer) running with a wheelbarrow followed by several consecutive shots of a brief duration showing the imprisoned Jews engaged in work and Nazi officers hurling abuse at them. These shots convey the chaotic situations of the victimised. Tomasz Limanowski (Mateusz Damiecki), a Polish political prisoner is introduced in between the shots, conversing with Hannah about their hope to escape, by standing on the other side of the barbed wires. The audience gradually realises that the film is centred on the love of Tomasz and Hannah which blossomed in the Nazi concentration camp. Pamela Katz in her discussion on the film with Susana Styron (at Rivertown Film Society) stated that, her research ended up discovering that around six hundred people tried to escape from the Nazi camps and there were four instances of couples trying to escape in 1944 (00:05:18-24). The tense, bleak and

pulsating scenes are interrupted by Hannah's present, in 1976, New York, in which she goes to a laundry to collect dress for the party at her home.

Therefore, it can be understood that the film is set in two physical spaces, one in New York juxtaposed with the other in the Auschwitz concentration camp in Poland. New York is where Hannah is physically present. She is in her fifties and she is supposed to be the hostess at the party to celebrate her husband Daniel Levine's success in his career along with his colleagues. Daniel and their grown-up daughter are puzzled by the sudden change in the attitude of Hannah during the party. She spent time to desperately call the Red Cross after thirty years to reopen the closed case of missing Tomasz who was assumed to be dead. She broods silently, refusing to talk to her husband and daughter about her anxiety. The film uses flashback technique to bring back Auschwitz camp to life. Young Hannah and Tomasz who had established a deep relationship between each other, plan to escape.

The film provides a brief but vital picture of camp hierarchy, privileges, and the freedom and mobility of the imprisoned. As Tomasz is a political prisoner and not a Jew, he has a relatively privileged position, working as a clerk. This distinction can be clearly understood from an excerpt of the Polish born Jewish survivor of his life in the concentration camp, in the article "A Lesson in Camp Hierarchy". He states,

There were some who were neither "Prominenz" (prominent camp officials) nor the dispossessed. They were something between the two; they undertook less arduous work and did not go hungry. However, they did not enjoy the authority of the "Prominenz" and so were dependent on their patronage.

Prisoners in this category obtained bread and luxury items such as soap,

alcohol, tobacco and chocolate to bribe the camp “Prominenz”.

Probably Tomasz would have belonged to this category, while Hannah, who belongs to the camp brothel, spends most of her time on her knees, cleaning floors. Though in confinement, the size of the space provided and restrictions of mobility varied for different communities. Occasionally, Tomasz collects scraps of food for her, a means to show his love. He bribes the SS officer with bottles of vodka, so that he can spend time with Hannah privately. He even stole a Nazi officer's uniform, which he hides until the time is right for them both to break free from the camp.

Meanwhile, as part of resistance, Tomasz's task in the camp was to capture photos of the horrifying tortures by Nazis happening in the camp, and secretly take the negatives to Warsaw, which will reach London as per the plan and reveal the crimes to the outside world. Tomasz's resistance duty is unknown to Hannah. Though the execution of this plan was a fictional input by Pamela Katz into the movie, the Spanish biographical film of 2018, *The Photographer of Mauthausen* shares a similar narrative. It depicts the real life of Francisco Boix, a Catalan communist who was imprisoned in the Austrian concentration camp. The negatives that he provided became valuable evidence and played a decisive role in the Nuremberg Trials.

The two places, New York and Poland, set in two distinct decades are merged into a single timeline through a television interview of a Holocaust survivor that Hannah watches while she is in the laundry shop. From the anecdotes told by the survivor, she recognises that it is Tomasz who she believed was dead. Seeing Tomasz triggers Hannah's memories which she thought had done with. She is struck with anxiety and uncontrollable thoughts due to post traumatic stress. She feels

emotionally numb, she feels detached from her family and does not engage completely in the party that her family is hosting, she even leaves her home during the party startling her husband. She is overwhelmed with guilt and refuses to share the trauma with her family. She distances herself from her ordeal. Her mood changes, and she gets irritated, shows anger, acts aggressively and lashes out at her husband who tries to resolve the issue. She shuts him off from her trauma.

Anna Justice crafts certain shots in such a way that they manifest Hannah's post-traumatic stress disorder and its symptoms. As Hannah's past takes hold of her present, young Tomasz occupies Hannah's present space too in the form of an apparition that can be seen only by her. The surreal techniques used in the movie allow young Tomasz to invade Hannah's physical space and she feels that he is closely watching her while she is in her apartment in New York, he appears again and is seen as having food from Hannah's dining table set with feast for the dinner party and he reappears when she tries to enquire his number. Tomasz's ghostly figure in the striped uniform of the Holocaust victims drags Hannah back to the past. Her accidental stumble into her past makes her temporarily cohabit in dual spaces: one space with young Tomasz which was an unexpected encounter and the other space in her apartment where she and her family are hosting a party with Daniel's colleagues as guests. This leads to split mindedness showing symptoms of schizophrenia.

Apart from her hallucinations, social withdrawal and her trouble to concentrate on the present events, she even showed behavioural changes that surprised Daniel. For example, in an instance during the party Hannah suddenly starts smoking a cigarette, a habit that Daniel had never seen before. The director

juxtaposes two spaces to show her dilemma; he brings together two smoking scenes - while she is in the apartment and while she was with Tomasz in the stolen car.

These shots imply that Hannah is unable to live in the present without confronting her past. It can be understood that the core of the whole movie is the traumatic memory of the female first hand victim, Hannah. Though she is displaced from the real space and time of the Holocaust, she is haunted by the past from which she cannot detach. She refuses to share it with her family since she believes that they will not be able to relate to it and might trivialise it.

Remembrance becomes a revolutionary film when compared to many other movies of the twentieth and twenty first centuries because of its strong engagement with women's memory and perspectives of the Holocaust. In the contemporary period, there has been an extensive discussion of the roles assigned to women in the Holocaust movies, the way they are represented, how the audience relates to their characterisation, and which aspect of every gender gets internalised or sidelined by vicarious witnesses. In *The Social Inheritance of the Holocaust* by Anna Reading, she observes, "Films are a key medium in our social inheritance of the history and memory of the Holocaust" especially in this period when the Holocaust survivors are becoming fewer in number (100). In this circumstance representing women survivors is also important to claim their space and identity. Many studies like Ingrid Lewis' *Women in European Holocaust Films* and Judith Greenberg's "Paths of Resistance: French Women Working from the Inside" have helped to realise that the Holocaust films reinforce the dominant, male perspective and the women are given peripheral positions: as a flat character being the token of victimhood, as a helpless observer or as a biological essentialist feminine construct.

This homogeneous one-dimensional representation of women in Holocaust resistance history films have been challenged by films like *Nina's Journey* (2005), *The Birch Tree Meadow* (2003), *Remembrance* (2011), and *The Zookeeper's Wife* (2017). *Remembrance* is an attempt to reclaim and reconfigure women's space in the process of memorialising the Holocaust.

Katz and Justice construct the diverse and unique women's experiences during and after the Holocaust through three characters: Hannah, Tomasz's mother, Stefania and his sister-in-law, Magdalena. The film gives multiple roles to the three characters as: victims, survivors, resisters and perpetrators.

When Hannah's character is analysed, the audience witnesses a transition from a vulnerable and helpless concentration camp captive to a bold woman who is ready to face multiple challenges. This transition is shown in the movie by juxtaposing a few scenes oscillating between past and present beginning from a peak point where she takes two crucial decisions: to escape with Tomasz from the concentration camp in 1944 and to go in search of Tomasz in 1976. The party scene in the film cuts to the past where Tomasz had stolen a uniform of SS officer and is dressed up as one, he calls out Hannah's number and furiously pushes her away from her workplace, commands her to follow him and heads to the exit. The tension and anxiety of being caught by the officers is followed by anxiety and confusion of Hannah whether to reopen the missing case. The back-and-forth movement of the scenes in time and space between Poland and New York is used to metaphorically imply Hannah's entanglement with the past and her inability to set her free from it.

The characters Daniel and Old Tomasz unfolded through Hannah's perspective. Daniel is seen as a person who might not understand Hannah's

overwhelming feelings. She does not wish his presence while returning to her past though he requests to fill him in. Tomasz's character is seen as a person who risked his life for love and resistance against the regime. Old Tomasz appears only thrice in the film, the only appearance beyond Hannah's mediation. The first appearance is while Hannah and Tomasz converse over the phone after thirty years: the camera captures Hannah's facial expressions through a close up shot showing her face when she first reveals that she was pregnant, whereas Tomasz's expression is not revealed through a closeup shot since it is a side view. Later he is seen conversing with his daughter, where his reactions to his daughter show that his courage as a youngster resisting the injustices has worn out with the passage of time. In the closing sequence, he hurriedly dresses up well and goes to meet Hannah while she reaches Poland.

Stefania, Tomasz's mother is the second character who is extremely complex. Hannah thought that escaping from the clutches of Nazis would be the end to her and Tomasz's suffering, later they realise that Tomasz's mother is the next threat that Hannah had to overcome. Tomasz's mother has the role of a perpetrator who is also a victim to the indoctrination of Nazism and fear of threat to her life and her family. When Tomasz hopefully goes back to his home, his mother refuses to protect Hannah as she is a German and Jew. Hannah is emotionally shaken and becomes weak hearing Stefania's outburst which leads to miscarriage, but finally Tomasz is forced to leave Hannah back with his mother at Ciężkowice to take the negatives of photographs from the concentration camp to Warsaw. He tells Janusz, his riding instructor to take Hannah to Magdalena. Stefania can be understood as a woman struck with a psychic numbness after she lost her husband and sons who had

been fighting for the injustice against the Jewish community and Polish people. She becomes possessive about her family's life by being indifferent to the suffering of a larger group of people. During the short period at Tomasz's home, while Hannah is recovering, she comes to experience Stefania's antipathy when she invites a German officer for coffee to the room where Hannah was lying, so that he could discover her. Hannah suspects her motives and hides in the cupboard. Disgusted at this betrayal, Hannah leaves immediately, taking a photo of Tomasz. This incident shows how the ordinary people were convinced that they were justified in inflicting pain on Jews, as seen even in *The Pianist*.

Stefania is portrayed as an ordinary woman whose toxic possessiveness towards her family and the internalised fear of threat to life transforms her into a perpetrator. Her character leaves the audience in a dilemma whether to sympathise or despise. She is unwilling to see the larger catastrophe. The scene after the Nazi officer leaves from the room where Hannah is hiding is crucial. A middle shot is seen focusing on Stefania with a mixed expression of revenge, guilt and fear. In the earlier Holocaust films, inhabitants of Nazi occupied areas were portrayed as either innocent or ignorant. One among the characteristics of post millennium Holocaust films is that they interrogate the psyche of ordinary people who gradually became perpetrators through Nazi indoctrination. Anna Justice brings out the complexity in the nature of the mother, Stefania, who might not be fundamentally evil but became so, due to circumstances. This evokes dangerous sympathy towards the perpetrators and justifies their ethnic prejudice as brainwashing by the regime.

Another important character that needs to be discussed is Tomasz's sister-in-law Magdalena. After Hannah left Tomasz's home, she stayed with Magdalena whose

husband / Tomasz's brother is also in Warsaw as a member of *Armia Krajowa* (Home Army).

Magdalena is portrayed as a valiant and caring woman. Hannah learns Polish language and remains optimistic; with Magdalena she experiences the love of a sister. Magdalena is herself a protestor who aids the members of Home Army (the political protestors who were considered terrorists against the nation by the Nazi regime) with weapons hidden in her farm. Everything changes with Stefania's arrival after she is forced out of her home by the Germans. She is aggressive to both of her daughters-in-law. There is scene in which Stefania begins an argumentative dialogue with Magdalena who is outspoken when compared to young Hannah. It begins when Stefania is distressed with the assumption that Tomasz has become a martyr.

Stefania: Tomasz died for no reason at all.

Magdalena: No for Poland.

Stefania: Your Poland took away my second son.

Magdalena: My Poland?

Stefania: Czeslav joined the homeland army to impress you.

Magdalena: We met afterwards.

Stefania: Tomasz was in prison for so many years because of your stupid ideas.

Magdalena: Tomasz has his own ideas.

Stefania: Your homeland army exploited a boy who didn't know what he was doing.

One mistake and he was imprisoned for years. What great goals?

Magdalena: Don't you care for Poland? You watch while Germans and then the Russians take everything. Don't you care about anything?

Stefania: My family. You destroyed my family. (01:17:11- 01:17:55)

This scene, dense with political and humanitarian arguments, forms the core of this movie when looked at as a social space to openly express the realities of Polish nationalism during the Holocaust to the masses. The reference to the Home Army, Polish nationalism, Nazi occupation and Russian invasion makes the film a space to expose untold stories, or the not much discussed perspective of history. Poland was a fully occupied land during the Holocaust, or Second World War when looked from a larger perspective. Half of Poland was occupied and controlled by the Nazi Germans and the other half by the Soviet Russia.

The Nazis built concentration camps for ethnic cleansing. Both the occupying powers were hostile towards the Polish people, they tried to destroy them by subjugating their living and cultural spaces. There were Polish people who helped and showed loyalty to either Germans or Russians, those who remained neutral without joining any group and the resisters like the home army whose allegiance was to the Polish government-in-exile in London, and it constituted the armed wing of what came to be known as the Polish Underground State. They were the Polish nationalists, ideological opponents of both the regimes, who wished for an independent Polish nation. Therefore, this Holocaust film focuses on the fact that Jews were not the only victims of the Holocaust but so were many other communities too belonging to different Nazi occupied nations. Stefania's interventions within the story, throw light on these crucial sub-histories within the Holocaust. The audience faces a dilemma whether to sympathise with the mother of

two nationalist sons or feel contempt for her selfishness and hostility towards others.

The next scene shows Hannah's optimistic belief in stating that Tomasz is alive. She angrily leaves the house. In the scene that follows, Russians capture Magdalena and Czeslav, take them to labour camp, and leave Stefania and Hannah who were hiding nearby the house. Soon Hannah grabs her courage to leave to Berlin as Stefania is always a threat to her life. She leaves a note to Tomasz which is never discovered by him. Later when he reaches home, he sees Stefania alone and assumes that Hannah is dead from the words of his mother. Hannah who falls for the bitter winter is saved by a White Bus (a kind of ambulance to rescue the concentration camp inmates in 1945, initiated by the Swedish Red Cross).

The scene again shifts to the present in which Daniel discovers the reason for Hannah's indifferent behaviour and is revealed to their daughter too. He is distressed of her not allowing him to help her resolve her past. Finally, she finishes a note to her beloved husband Daniel, the one which the audience sees old Hannah writing while she is presented for the first time in the film. Hence the film is edited in such a way that Hannah's memories of more than three decades are recollected while she is writing a letter to her husband Daniel. She states, "I am haunted by memories that refuse to be forgotten, I try to hide, but they always try to find me" (01:36:57-01:37:08). Then she tears that page off and continues writing on the next page, "Thought I was finished with the past done but the fact was that I had to forget as I had to move on" (01:37:00-01:37:40). She regrets for her misassumption that Tomasz was dead and calls it a "monumental mistake" which she tries to overcome by visiting him in Poland, where the film ends (01:37:42-50).

Though Hannah is a memory carrier who tries to overcome her trauma,

Hannah's memory traps the viewers in a posttraumatic consciousness that problematises human nature and ethical dilemmas by placing an unresolvable conflict within her life story. She uses time as a mnemonic device to lead the eyes of the viewers to evoke memory and at the same time eternalise the love of Tomasz and her. The audience witnesses a scene in which Hannah while at Magdalena's home, tries to learn Polish and she starts reciting the units of time, ending with eternity. She stresses on 'eternity' by repeating it and looks at Tomasz's photo which she preserves even at her old age. This becomes a significant scene used as a temporal mnemonic device representing the depth of their everlasting love.

When the Holocaust became a "global icon", as Aleida Assman terms in her essay "The Holocaust- a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community", the possibility of reimagining and fictionalising the fragmented memory of the events increased (93). *Remembrance* is one such film with lots of imaginative investments by Pamela Katz to bring coherence to Hannah's and Tomasz's memory. Pamela Katz's interview with Susana Styron is important in this regard where they discuss the way she imaginatively reconstructed certain instances in the life story which were either absent or murky and unclear. The genesis of the film is from a documentary telling the story of reunion of a couple who survived the Holocaust. The film was written after Hannah's death, and the film was constructed in such a way that the story line unfolds through the memory of Hannah. Though the producers wanted to show mostly the past (the atrocious Holocaust events as in twentieth century films which were event centred) and a few moments of the present at the end, Katz decided to equally divide the time between the past and the present by merging them in such a way that the events oscillate between the past and the

present. She admits that though their past events were quite clearly known, their present as old Hannah and Tomasz was not known except that they met sixteen times in Poland, hence Katz had to imaginatively reconstruct it.

Katz talks about three significant reconstructions that she made in this film. Firstly, Tomasz was a Polish resistor and a political prisoner in real life but did not smuggle the negatives of Auschwitz concentration camp to Warsaw or London, his only intention was to escape with his lover for the camp. It was Pamela's investment to make her character Tomasz, more heroic and idealistic. This was an attempt to graft the true story of smuggling negatives by prisoners like Francisco Boix into the love story of Tomasz to create an impact in the minds of the audience. Secondly, life of Hannah after reaching the Tomasz family was murky and unclear in her original narratives which had to be reconstructed by Katz for an overall coherence. Tomasz's mother did exist, who did not welcome Tomasz and Hannah who were in the camp for four years and refused to protect Hannah as she was a Jew. The rest of the events were not clear to Katz so she imaginatively constructed the reactions of the character Stefania and Magdalena. Thirdly, when Tomasz and Hannah reunited after many years, Hannah's husband had been dead, which meant that the character Daniel is Katz's construction. Daniel's presence in the movie makes the film more dramatic and helps to evoke Hannah's memory with an overwhelming power. Therefore, *Remembrance* is a fictional version of their real-life.

The film *Remembrance* can be read as a heterotopia as it merges many distinct spaces like physical space, memory space, imaginative or creative space, gender space and socio-political space through the reproduction of Hannah's memory. Writing the script for this movie was a process of re-embodiment of the fragmented traumatic post

memory of Hannah to make it accessible to the present generation, leading to form intergenerational memory. Filming her Holocaust experience which had faded with the passage of time was painful. It is a process to reify her memory in a coherent manner into a 'cultural memory'. It can be internalised and reinterpreted by multiple generations. The concept of cultural memory is initiated by memory theorists Jan and Aleida Assmann in which memory is formed by embodying multiple historical events, mnemonics, documents, monuments, celebrations, objects, sacred scriptures and others. It can be stored, transferred or reincorporated into the present or later generations. It can be transmitted across generations to trigger the collective memory and reinterpret the events to merge into the present socio-political circumstances. That is, it either helps to learn and understand the past or influences the present and the future.

Remembrance is the product of Katz's crystallisation of collective memory by extracting the most relevant incidents from the life of concentration camp escapees and adding certain other selected incidents from the vast pool of collective memory to graft a new narrative which is institutionalised through the medium film, by presenting it through internet, television and theatre screens around the world, making it a part of cultural memory of the present generation. Hence, *Remembrance* is also an artistic chronotope that can encapsulate multiple spaces within cultural memory. Holocaust chronotopes revert to the past events of the bygone era through representation and turn towards the present and future simultaneously to recall, recognise and reinterpret with respect to current circumstances. Hence, post millennium films address multiple spaces or sub histories within the present established grand narratives of Holocaust history.

The following section of this chapter attempts to analyse the role that film heterotopias play in a systemically ongoing genocide that started in 1948 with the Nakba. The study intends to analyse the spaces that are depicted and engaged within the films *Lemon Tree* (2008) and *The Time that Remains* (2009) in order to comprehend the different functions of Nakba memory representations through filmic heterotopia. The Nakba and its aftermath are mainly discussed in films by directors from Israel and Palestine; the expatriates and refugees living in the neighbouring countries; or the diaspora. The Israeli and Palestinian film industries have different versions of histories as elaborated in the introduction. They use their shared memories and individual narratives to create stories about the actual circumstances in Israel and Palestine. They see the histories of Israel, Palestine and the ongoing Nakba as a continuous event. They depict multiple cultures with unique characteristics and experiment with multiple film techniques. They are subject to scrutiny and censorship under different laws and with varying amounts of freedom of expression.

In 1948, when the Jewish immigrants of Mandatory Palestine marked their triumph, and declared themselves an independent nation-state, it is a fact that it was a catastrophe for Palestinians who were subjugated by the newly formed nation by erasing their history, geographical area, culture and customs. Though the initial intention was to resettle the Holocaust survivors and escapees in a land, it led to the continuous occupation of the Palestinian land until present leading to spatiocide. In the present, Palestine exists as a *de facto* state, though 139 nations of the UN recognise Palestine as a state and though they are assumed to have a governing body and land, they are geopolitically divided and partially or completely under the

control of the Israeli military or government. The Gaza Strip and West Bank are disputed areas under Palestinian territory with no proper judiciary or military force, and they have very limited self-rule. The rest of the areas that are claimed to be part of Palestine have been illegally occupied and is now under the *de facto* control of Israel.

The Israeli filmmaker Eran Riklis directed the film, *Lemon Tree*. He co-wrote the film script with Suha Arraf, weaving together two parallel lives to symbolically depict the current state of Palestine and Israel, both of which are burdened by their inevitable pasts. The film was an international success for scripting a thematically dense and deeply intertwined narrative with complexity in its characterisation. Despite the film's widespread critical acclaim, it was not received well in Riklis's homeland, modern Israel, as any acceptance of Palestinian struggles against Israel by the Israeli civilians were regarded a threat to national security ("Why fellow Israelis Hated my Hit Film").

Lemon Tree presented an account of the realities of the personal struggles of Palestinians for their homeland or property and ordinary citizens of Israel facing the dilemma of whether to obey their nation/military force in the name of their security or listen to their humanitarian conscience. The film is set in an area where Israel and Palestine meet, divided by Green Line where the Separation Wall is yet to be erected. Riklis finds women to be the apt choice for his central characters as they embody the complexity of the Israel/ Palestine conflict while understanding them from different layers of identity that they represent in a patriarchal society. He introduces the parallel lives of two women, Salma Zidane (Hiam Abbass, Palestinian Israeli actress) and Mira Navon (Rona Lipaz-Michael, an Israeli actress) apart from

many other notable characters. Riklis's other films like *The Syrian Bride* (2004) and *Shelter* (2017) also consist of strong female characters who are placed at the centre of the narratives. In an article by Prof. Rachel S. Harris, she mentions that in an interview Riklis stated that women characters highlight the complexity of the conflict:

I felt that in the Middle East the women are the underdogs, the under-privileged, and I thought, in both cases, that they should be the centre of the story to show support [for] women in the region and perhaps worldwide. But beyond that I also thought the women will bring more complexity and emotion to a story where men tend to hide behind pre-conceptions. ("Parallel Lives" 83)

The Israeli film critic Nurith Gertz in her article, "Space and Gender in the New Israeli and Palestinian Cinema" opines that early Israeli and Palestinian films were deeply masculine: Israeli films dominated by central Zionist male protagonists and Palestinian films dominated by nationalist males. By highlighting the female characters that embody dialogic nature in the process of identity construction, Riklis's female characters have the ability to dismantle these inflexible, compartmentalised patriarchal identities. Apart from the engagement with gender space in *Lemon Tree* which is to be discussed in detail, the film's key factor that distinguishes it from many other Israeli films is the presence of multiple liminal spaces which could also be understood as heterotopic spaces. The film depicts three layers of liminal spaces: physical, emotional and metaphorical, which exist beyond the restrictions and boundaries.

Lemon Tree begins with a middle shot to a close-up shot focusing on a lemon

in the grove and then shifting to Salma's kitchen where the focus is on her fingers cutting lemons and preparing pickle. This scene is accompanied by a traditional Arabic music with English lyrics. These images set the background to the film showing the significance of lemon in the life of Salma in particular and the Palestinian community in general. The lemon grove is taken care by Salma not only because it is her source of income but it is inherited from her father who had planted those trees fifty years back. The trees accompanied her in her loneliness; it manifested her emotions and became part of her life. The lemons are also a part of the Jewish culture.

The next scene shows two people driving to Zur Ha Sharon, the neighbourhood of Salma on the Israeli side followed by a shot in which Mira Navon, the new Defence Minister's wife giving instructions to unload the furniture. The security guards are vigilant about the neighbouring Arabs. The following scene shows Salma watching the news in her television, and the newly elected Defence Minister Israel Navon (Doron Tavory) states, "My late father used to say that goals are achieved only if you draw boundaries. I promise all Israelis to do just that, to continue the successful policy of my predecessors: hunting and eliminating terror wherever it is" (00:03:45- 00:04:05). This scene that shows Navon for the first time represents Zionist patriarchal characters under whose gaze and power the land of Israel expanded. His name 'Israel' literally denotes his embodiment of the military ideologies of Israel.

The film interweaves political turbulence with the personal lives of Salma and Mira. Salma is a widow with three children: her son Nassar is in London and two daughters, Soha in Gaza and Laila in the West Bank. She and Abu Hussam, her father's friend who helps her to maintain the grove and provides her mental support

like a father, are shocked to see the Israeli military and security officers encroaching Salma's grove, where they implant a surveillance point which is a few meters above the ground level as a security measure to protect Israel Navon from attacks by the trespassers, Palestinian resisters or terrorists. The ethnophobia of the Israeli security guards is evident when a guard points gun at Salma and Hussam (who were nourishing their grove) thinking to be trespassers.

Salma receives a letter from the Central Region Commander in Hebrew stating that her trees are going to be uprooted as a safety measure. As she did not know Hebrew, she went to Abu Camal who translated and told her that it was a notice to cut down her trees. The film shows Abu Camal reading out the letter while in a restaurant or club. The club filled with men gaze at her coming alone with this letter to which they listen reading, and have a mixed reaction. Though they have an aversion towards military control and land grab, with the passage of time, they had normalised this act. As tears roll down Salma's face, Camal sarcastically states: "Do you know how much land they confiscated to build prisons for us?"

And how many houses they demolished? It says here you are eligible for compensation. The Israelis are so generous. . ." (00:13:14- 00:13:30). She decides to struggle for her rights for her land. She seeks help from her children. Though the children have very brief appearances, those shots show the youngsters' current attitude towards the conflict. Salma's son Nasser, instead of finding a solution to fight back for their inherited property, tells her to leave Palestine and join him in London to lead a better life. Laila in the West Bank with her husband tries to find peace in their present day to day life and Soha is already in trouble as a person living in the ghettoised place Gaza. These responses show that most of the Nakba's second

generation tries to endure the pain and come to terms with the new normal by only hoping to have a peaceful life in the current circumstances. Nasser's character represents a nihilistic solution to the conflict as he neither cares nor takes up the responsibility of protecting his own land/ Palestine. Later with the help of Laila's husband, Salma finds a young attorney, Ziad Daud living in Jelazoon Refugee Camp.

Meanwhile on the other side, Mira is busy preparing for the housewarming party. She reveals her thoughts about her life as a military officer's wife while in a light conversation with her friend and journalist Tamar Gira. She says that though they seem to be desperate housewives, they are an active part of the political and social scene; it foreshadows the disagreements between Navon and Mira. Though Mira and Salma belong to entirely different social, political and ethnic backgrounds, the audience can draw a similarity between them through their boldness and courage with which they tackle their lives driven by a constant state of tension. Mira, despite having her own opinions, is suppressed by the patriarchal and military powers or decisions. She is forced to be confined within the walls of her home. Like Salma, her daughter too is abroad, in Washington DC leaving her alone at home most of the time. Her daughter also refuses to think beyond her comfort zone as she tells her to obey the decisions of her father. While Salma decides to break through the shackles of conventions from the beginning of the film itself, Mira's decision to shatter her confinements is only towards the end.

Salma's courage leads her forward to fight alone to retain her lemon grove. Daud accompanies her throughout the journey and her bold decisions had always astonished him to move forward. She first goes to the Israeli Civil Administration in the West Bank, that rejects her request by trivialising her case when compared to

many others, as they had offered compensation. Then she goes to the Israeli court that rejects her appeal but she decides to move to the Supreme Court to seek justice. This scene is interspersed with the scenes showing Mira and Navon conversing about preparation of their party into which Salma's case too comes up for discussion. Through the conversations and many other instances in the film, it could be understood that most of the Israeli officers are puppets of the Government. In their conversation, Navon wishes to call an Arab to cater food for the party and play Arab music in a patronising manner, but while discussing Salma's case he cunningly states that though he does not have hatred towards Arabs or Salma, the Secret Service does have opposing opinions and he trusts their judgement, he can do nothing though being the defence minister. When surprised to see Salma moving her case to the Supreme Court, he justifies Israel's occupation as a part of the history to which Mira disapproves by saying that this time it is because of them.

It is to be noted that Salma and Daud left no stone unturned in the course of protecting her lemon grove. They tried to meet the President of the Palestinian Authority in Ramallah who was busy and had no time to intervene in this case as Salma was moving against all odds. This hints at the helplessness of PLO in the West Bank as it has made many compromising temporary agreements with Israel for a 'peaceful' exchange of workforce and resources. Hence, they do not want this single case to come in the way of the mutual agreements.

The next scene shows the lemon grove surrounded by barbed wires, prohibiting Salma from entering the grove. This is the physical liminal space that Riklis creates between Palestine and Israel where though the grove is fenced. It is the only place where both Salma and Mira get into defying the restrictions of society

and nation. The lemon grove has the potential to transform Salma and Mira as they move through it.

A few days after Salma is restricted from entering her grove, she gets frustrated of not being able to take care or water her trees. She gets into the grove and starts watering them and collecting lemons. Seeing this the security guard Itamar watching from the surveillance point comes down to warn her to leave the grove, but gradually he becomes compassionate and they manage to speak to each other in Arabic and Hebrew that they know. This is obstructed by a bodyguard who scolds Itamar for coming down and tells her to go back, but she continues collecting lemons as part of her silent resistance. She then looks at Mira who too was observing her through her window. Their gaze marks the beginning of an emotional bond. Towards the end of the film, Mira too sheds her social identities off to meet Salma, to connect to her feelings, talk to her and console her. She tries to cross the liminal space (grove) and reach Salma but Mira is not allowed to knock on Salma's door, she is driven away by her Israeli bodyguard before a physical meeting. Though they could not meet, the lemon grove could gradually dissolve the conventional societal limits that constructed the identities of Mira and Salma as Israeli and Palestinian respectively. The surveillance point and Itamar also play the role of physical liminal zone. Itamar's ineffectual guarding, his attempts to negotiate with Salma and exchanging friendly conversations with Mira, features him as a humane and helpless character when compared to many other male characters who internalise the rigidity of Israeli identity.

The emotional liminal zone that Salma and Mira share is gradually developed when their eyes meet while Salma is in the grove for the first time after

fencing and Mira watching her through the window. The second time they see each other is when the caterers and soldiers collect lemons from the grove for the upcoming housewarming party without Salma's permission. She enters the grove and accuses them of theft and throws lemons across the fence as she protests when Navon, Mira and other officers stand watching the incident.

Mira intervenes and they gaze at each other followed by Mira's apology which helps Salma momentarily to regain her dignity as she gets up and removes her apron to cover her head. The initial ambivalence and xenophobia within them are dissipated leading to mutual respect and empathy. An emotional bond is created between them. The third time that they connect to each other is before entering into the Supreme Court, where Navon had restricted Mira from going. Their gaze support and empower each other, to fight against the trap of patriarchal hegemony in which women have no agency.

Riklis addresses women's subjectivity. Salma's late husband's photo on the wall and his staring eyes remind of a surveilling patriarchal eye inspecting Salma's deed. Stoicism and independence are looked down upon by the conventional society who discourage her for dealing with the case alone, for moving out of home several times and for mingling with young Daud, seen as behaviours that bring disgrace to their family. On the other hand, Mira is also accused of being outspoken. Her opinions about the illegal destruction of land that their nation has no limits, puts Navon in trouble when newspapers call it the 'Lemon War'. Mira is forced to change her word. These allegations on Salma and Mira are countered in the film by showing their subjective nature. Salma's stern decision to move ahead with the case even when many demotivated her, choices of wearing makeup or scarf at different

instances and her final decision to get rid of the clothes and memories of her husband which she had been burdened with for many years and her decision to throw the newspaper showing picture of Daud's marriage as a symbol of severing the emotional bond with him are all depictions of her individuality. Mira, though had to live in the confinement of her home, symbolically representing patriarchal hegemony, decides to move ahead with her thoughts towards the end of the film. In spite of Navon and their daughter warning her not to attend the Supreme Court, she goes with her bodyguard to listen to the court's order (against her husband and the state). Finally, Mira's decision to leave her husband is her way of expressing her individuality.

Therefore, Riklis portrays Salma and Mira as the key agencies in the progression of the film. They are finally successful in crossing their emotional liminal zone to attain peace of mind by acting according to their consciousness. It can be understood that the emotional liminal space helped to dissolve the conventional boundaries, providing a space for self-discovery.

Finally, through the above explanations it could be understood that the lemon grove acts as the metaphorical liminal space that microcosmically represents the crisis of Israel/ Palestine. The film depicts the Israeli government's illegal occupation of land and destruction of resources in the name of security. Spatiocide and memoricide are discussed in the film through the image of lemon grove, as the security guards decide to cut down trees. The lemon grove is intrinsically connected to Salma and Abu Hussam's life and memory as it was inherited from her father and cutting them down would be like deliberate destruction of all traces and physical reminders of her father and their tradition of making lemon pickle which is the

source of their income. The trees are a part of Salma's life that helps to get rid of her loneliness. Abu Hussam states in an instance while speaking in the court, that trees are like humans, they have souls and emotions, which need proper care. The lemon from the Salma's grove metaphorically symbolises the merging of two cultures. In a shot in the film, while in the Supreme Court, a lawyer compares Salma to a lemon tree and states, "Lemon tree, Defence Minister is a lethal combination" (00:56:12-14). The Supreme Court's final compromising judgement after negotiations that the trees have to be pruned but not uprooted metaphorically depicts the ironical xenophobia of the governing Israelites towards the subjugated Palestinians. The grove is destroyed to an extent that it changes beyond recognition. Salma's lemon grove kaleidoscopically depicts the current state of Palestine, where attacks have reached a point where civilians struggle to find hope of returning to a normal life. Ironically, the Israeli government discriminate Palestinians and destroys their land in the name of protecting Israeli civilians.

The second metaphorical liminal space is the psyche of Israel Navon, whose name itself suggests him to be the personification of the State of Israel, all his statements are asserted based on his father's words. The father figure that he admires and reveres is metaphorically his nation that commands him to set boundaries to attain success. Mira while in a conversation with Tamar Gira also states, "My mother always said, Israel needs to sort out his problems with his father before he becomes one himself. She wasn't much of a psychologist, but perhaps she was right" (01:09:40-01:09:56). This is an apt statement to describe Navon's inner crisis or the state of confusion between his humanitarian concern and his duty to the State.

The voice-over of the psychometric test that Itamar attends, which is heard as

soon as someone enters the lemon grove functions as a liminal space at the auditory level. The course begins when he is stationed in the surveillance point and the audience hears the final assignment for the program, marking the climax of the film. It is a recorded soundtrack accompanying his duty that helps to qualify the entrance exam of a university, but it indirectly describes the atmosphere and anxieties of the two communities on both the sides of the grove. In the final scene, the erected Separation Wall depicts the elimination of the liminal space that on one hand refers to Salma and Mira who courageously broke through the established boundaries built by the society and on the other hand depicts Navon's inability to cross the boundaries of the political policies.

This heterotopic film *Lemon Tree* mirrors and merges two contested spaces and represents the complexity of the world's most enduring conflict due to ethnic genocide and land occupation happening as part of expansion of a nation. Riklis indirectly challenges the process of nation building. The film suggests the need to unlearn and relearn many ethnic discriminatory misconceptions, the futility of communal hostilities and the need to coexist. It allegorically mirrors the situation in all warzones where questions of land, ethnicity and culture come into conflict. Moreover, the study of Riklis's *Lemon Tree* sets a best example among the post millennium Israeli films that function as a heterotopic space in trying to encompass ethnic multiplicities.

In the present, the geographical space of Palestine is continuously reduced in such a way that the term 'Palestinian' has become literally an adjective without a physical or concrete existence. Palestine experienced the State of Israel's land expropriation beginning from 1948 to the present leading to the gradual erasure of

Palestine from the globe. Though ghettoised Gaza and West Bank are said to be the part of Palestine, they too are controlled by Israel. This has been a premise for many of the Israeli and Palestinian movies addressing the geopolitical and social conditions of people within Israel, Gaza and the West Bank. The Palestinian Israeli film director and actor Elia Suleiman stands distinct from many other artists for his courage to take up the challenge to represent a 'Palestine' that still exists within Israel. His three films *Chronicle of a Disappearance* (1996), *Divine Intervention* (2002) and the film to be discussed in this study, *The Time That Remains* (2009) are largely set in Nazareth, the largest city in the Northern District of Israel. Nazareth is known as the 'Arab Capital of Israel' as it is the place where the descendants of pre 1948 Palestinians reside.

They are called the Arab citizens of Israel who mostly consist of Muslims and Christians, and are not considered as a part of present Palestine. Suleiman who was born in Nazareth in 1960, visually chronicles the different decades from 1948 till the present by narrating the story of the Suleiman family. It is divided into four episodes, chronologically arranged within the frame of Elia Suleiman's (called as ES) return to Nazareth in the present after the years of forced exile. The film depicts Nazareth, which was initially a part of Mandatory Palestine and a territory allotted to the Arab state under the 1947 UN Partition Plan, fighting Israel's land occupation but ultimately surrendering to the military superiority of Israel. Though the film is set particularly in Nazareth, it primarily examines the formation and expansion of the State of Israel. The narrative traces the journey of native Palestinians whose identities were reduced to internally displaced refugees after the 1948 Nakba.

The film begins with a shot set in the present Nazareth to which ES is

returning. It starts with a taxi driver closing the boot of his car after keeping the luggage of the passenger. The next shot shows Elia sitting in the back seat, though the two people are sitting in the car, both do not communicate to each other. The driver gets confused between the roads as the State is continuously realigning its terrain. Elia's silence to the driver's monologue gradually turns to become a haunting one, and the shot suddenly cuts to a back screen. The next scene shows the first episode set in the 1948 Nazareth, before Elia is born. It begins with the life of Elia's father Fuad Suleiman (Saleh Bakri) who is a gun maker for the resisters against the Nazareth occupation in 1948. The episodes in the film are a cluster of disconnected scenes which are merged together in the form of a visual collage.

The first shot in the episode shows a soldier from Iraq, of the Arab Liberation Army (ALA) heading to save Tiberias and Haifa without knowing where the places existed. Fuad brings him to the resisters of Nazareth who were sitting idle at a café listening to the announcement calling out to stop resistance against Israel as it is the time of liberation and any resistance would be stopped by the Israeli army. This scene sarcastically shows how the people of Nazareth lost faith in the ALA by assuming themselves to be weaker than the newly formed Israel. The episode merges humour and sobriety in the scene of the surrender of Nazareth, whereby the town's leaders including the Mayor agreed to cease hostilities in return for promises from the Israeli officers which was formalised in a written agreement stating, "Nazareth unconditionally surrenders to the Israeli Army. However, the army is the only jurisdiction to determine what is civil or military. Israel recognises the civil and equal rights of Nazarenes, regardless of race, language or religion" (00:09:20-00:10:30). The director Suleiman mocks at the flaws of this historical decision

through a photography session in which the audience sees the photographer's back facing the leaders of Nazareth, and camera flashlight falling on their faces rather than on the Israeli military officials and the mayor.

The next shot shows strategies adopted by the Israeli military to imprison the resistors who were called the criminal gangs. They disguised as Palestinian resistors and marched through the city and a woman shouted Palestinian slogans and is shot dead. Then it shows a poet entering a space where the imprisoned resistors are kept in captivity. He kills himself after delivering a few lines looking upwards without showing the listener, suggesting his martyrdom to be futile. He states,

An honourable man has two aims:

To die fighting or achieve victory.

I want no life, if we're not respected in our land. If our words are not heard, echoing in the world.

I shall carry my soul in my palm, tossing it into the cavern of death! Either a life to gladden, the hearts of friends

Or a death to torture the hearts of foes. (00:13:35- 00:14:05)

This scene is followed by another showing the Suleiman family for the first time, who are preparing to leave their home for the time being.

The film then shifts to Fuad's gun making space. Fuad keeps alive the spark of resistance in him while many of the Palestinians accepted their fate and fled to other neighbouring places or countries. Then the camera shifts again to Fuad's home followed by the sound of a gunshot and Fuad runs to rescue the injured person who has been fleeing from place to place in a hope to escape from the Israelis to finally realise that he is within an inescapable loop like region taken over by Israel. The

episode ends with Fuad in the Israel military's custody for being a gun maker and political prisoner whose eyes are blinded by tying a cloth around his head. A long shot shows many more captives in the field. In this desperate condition, the sight of a nun carrying water and giving it to the captives symbolises a ray of hope in humanity. Fuad is questioned and his refusal to answer annoys and provokes them who leave him to die by throwing him across the compound wall. The episode ends with this shocking sight. In this episode, Suleiman recreates the sights of civil disorder, brutality, plunder of houses and cunning strategies of Israel and the resilience of Palestinian citizens through Fuad's life which microcosmically shows the struggle, protest and nationalism of Palestinians of 1948 without showing much of bloodshed. He adopts inspiration for these scenes from his father's diary.

The next episode begins in the period of Elia's childhood, in the 1960s or 70s when Nazareth is no more a part of Palestine but belonging to Israel and the native Arabs are considered a minority group within the State of Israel. The subtitle of the film, *The Chronicle of a Present Absentee* a notoriously oxymoronic Israeli legal designation, has multiple connotations in the film. It actually refers to the identity of Palestinians who are called as Arab minorities within Israel. This episode shows the frustration of Palestinians living under this identity.

The Present Absentees are those who fled or were expelled from their homes in Mandatory Palestine to the nearby places for a short period during Nakba or the Israel- Palestine war between 1947 and 1949. They remained within the area that became the state of Israel. Their legal status as internally displaced while being in their own homeland is ironic.

The Israeli new historian Tom Segev in his book *1949: The First Israelis*,

discusses the darker side of the Zionist vision (the creation of the State of Israel) and the friction between the natives and the immigrants. The history of tremendous looting, plundering and occupying the properties of native Palestinians (who were exiled) by the newly arrived immigrants and government officials during Nakba from 1947 to 1949 is vividly discussed by Segev,

By the end of the year some 600 shops in Ramallah had been distributed to immigrants. . . In Jerusalem the situation was the same. In April it was decided to allocate 400 apartments to government officials who would move to Jerusalem. . . . The decision to centralise and formalise the procedures for handling the property came as a result of the growing amount of property and the increased incidence of looting. . . . More than half a million acres were thus expropriated from their owners. (78- 80)

He says in his work that during and after the formation of Israel, the native Palestinians/ the Arab Israelis/ the present absentees were not permitted to live in the homes they formerly lived in, even if they were in the same area, the property still existed, and they could prove that they owned it. They are regarded as absent by the Israeli government because they were absent from their homes on a particular day as a safety precaution during the period of curfew. Even if they did not intend to leave for more than a few days, and even if they left involuntarily. Segev states,

Under British rule there had also been a Custodian. . . At first the Custodian was seen as a temporary trustee of property left behind by the refugees, which would have to be maintained until their return. Sometime after, the Custodian was authorised to sell the abandoned property to the development authority. A few thousands of these owners (Palestinians) were actually

living in Israel, yet the law defined them as absentees. Later they came to be referred to as "present absentees." The majority of them were not allowed to return to their homes. Those refugees who were permitted to return to Israel after the war were also formally absentees and their property was not restored to them. (80)

The second episode begins with a middle shot showing Elia's mother writing a letter to Fuad's sister Nadia, through which it is understood that Fuad escapes with injuries after he was thrown to die. In this episode, the director experiments with multiple camera techniques and distinct form of narration to depict the stagnancy experienced by the Palestinians. The mother's letters convey the socio-political and economic condition of Nazareth to Nadia and the audience. Child Elia appears on the screen for the first time in this episode. The film seems to be a personalised account; the script is woven around the life of ES as a child, a teenager and an adult. *The Time that Remains* juxtaposes ES's coming of age with Israel's history after Nakba in 1948 making the film personal and political at the same time. Though the film is a chronological representation of Nakba and its after effects, the director intends it to be an artistic expression of memory, unlike most of the genocide themed films which are propagandistic. Sulaiman deftly interweaves the contentious political subject of Israelis and Palestinians by fusing comedy and absurdism into poignantly emotional scenes. The audience is drawn into the life of uncertainty experienced by Palestinian internal refugees or present absentees through the witty exaggerations and repetitions of events. The ridiculousness of military surveillance is addressed through a number of comic collage sequences. The movie uses temporal and spatial filmmaking techniques to reveal the theme, relying on minimal dialogues

or silence at various points.

The audience is caught in the web of an artistic chronotope representing the past and present of Palestinian Israelites. The second episode which is set in the 1970s and 80s presents Fuad as a Palestinian who had lost his idealism and believes Palestine is destined to live in Israel's shadow, while his son Elia (acted by Zuhair Abu Hanna) who studies in an Israeli school, belongs to the so called 'Arab minority' and propagates among his schoolmates that America is colonialist. He is punished by his teacher, gradually developing a reputation as a political dissident. It can be seen that Olga, one among Fuad's sisters is struck by a kind of national amnesia and has assimilated into the Israeli culture. This would have been the case of many Palestinians who lost their historical connections due to Israeli propaganda, not knowing where they had been or where they are heading to. This can be seen in the form of collective national amnesia in the scene where the students belonging to the Arab minority community win the prize for singing the Israeli national song.

Suleiman's cinematic deliberation merges history, memory and art into the contemporary. He can be compared to the Palestinian national poet, Mahmoud Darwish for his style of manifesting hope while in despair. While Darwish uses poetic images, Suleiman uses black comedy and prolonged silences while in chaos. The second episode uses black comedy that prompts the audience to laugh and then regret for their laughter. Suleiman introduces a nameless neighbour into the narrative who acts like a foil to Olga. He is trapped in the memory of Nakba and is unable to progress in his life. Initially the audience laughs at the repeated failure of the nameless neighbour to self-immolate, an act which is always stopped by Fuad. He repeatedly comes to meet Fuad to start a conversation and delivers many

disconnected and illogical sentences interspersed with the absurd logic for the Arab defeat in 1948. This repetition is a characteristic of absurd theatre. This Beckettian style becomes more grotesque when in the final circle of the repeated scenes the old man is accompanied by his son in the same condition, indicating the adverse effects of intergenerational trauma.

Suleiman depicts the extent of Israeli surveillance through a scene in which Elia and his friend goes for fishing regularly (almost like a ritual to escape from the daily oppression), and the soldiers visit them regularly to ask for their identity cards, which reminds them of their precarious identity even during moments of leisure. Little Elia too is caught in the repeating cycle as in the scenes where he brings food from Olga every day and throws it into the bin. He is a silent observer of the time that passes by him. The episode ends with Fuad getting down the stairs of his home along with the Israeli officers on suspicion of smuggling arms from Lebanon by sea.

The third episode again begins with the mother's letter to Nadia, set in the 1980 and 90s, she discusses of Fuad's health condition and then switches to the socio-economic crisis and lack of urban development.

Elia (starred by Ayman Espanioli), now a teenager spends time with friends with a fire of resistance in him, like that of his father's youth. The audience witnesses many scenes and settings getting repeated as in the times of young Fuad with a few alterations, depicting a trap in the confined space of Ramallah where time passes by without progress in space or change in activities. Among these repeated actions Suleiman introduces voice-overs as a means to identify the decades. News is read as voice-over in the background while Fuad is watering plants. It mentions that this episode is happening during the fourth anniversary of commemorating the 1976

event, Land Day, a protest by Arab Israelites/ Palestinian Israelites and the Palestinians against the land annexation policy of Israel. In the earlier episode, voice-over of reading news was used to inform the death of President Gamal Abdel Nassar of Egypt.

Young Elia is expelled from the state for tearing an Israeli flag and later a long shot from Elia's balcony shows conflict between the young Israeli Arabs and Israeli soldiers. The episode ends with Fuad's hospitalisation. In a long shot from his window, shows a balcony through which an injured person is pulled to both the sides, on one side seems to be the Palestinians and doctors and on the other side are the Israeli soldiers who finally take the injured. Later the film ends where Elia witnesses Fuad falling asleep or dying when he returns from a pharmacy, accompanied by a long silence with background music.

The final episode begins at the same staircase, which the adult Elia climbs after returning from exile to look after his old mother. Elia and the audience discovers that nothing much has changed except that his mother is accompanied by a policeman and an imported Thai caretaker, hinting the replacement of Gazan and the West Bank workers during the second intifada. He realises that nothing has changed in the lives of his friends, and the same scene in front of the cafe gets repeated where the three of them sit. The mother's craving for ice cream and shooting up of her diabetics is Suleiman's usual style of adding pathos to the existing density of the narrative.

Nazareth acts as a liminal space for the Present Absentees. Though the people of Nazareth are in one sense a metonym of the sufferings of Palestinians, they cannot fully represent the actual atrocious physical, emotional and psychic torture the Palestinians of West Bank, Gaza or the refugee's experience. But the

liminal conditions of the internally displaced citizens need to be discussed as they too take part in the struggle for the liberation of Palestine and the ceasing of land annexation. Suleiman presents them as a community that experiences alienation from land occupation as they seem to lead a comparatively comfortable life, while at the same time experiences the consequences of land and psychological occupations they are still discriminated as an Arab minority within the state of Israel despite being the natives of Nazareth which was earlier under Palestine. Suleiman presents the characters in the film and the audience in the liminal space where the frames get repeated leaving many gaps between for the audience to fill and interpret.

Elia digresses from Nazareth's space by travelling to Ramallah of West Bank. Scenes in Ramallah are relatively vibrant, with energetic characters and dynamic spaces. The Ramallah scenes begin when Suleiman checks into a luxurious hotel in front of which a traffic policeman regulates traffic like directing an orchestra or performing a robotic dance. As Tom Hill states in his article titled "Staging the Sublimation of Cliché," "a ballet of magic-realist sociability unfolds between a traffic policeman and each passing car" (83). The next scene shot from the hotel window shows the confrontation between the Israeli soldiers heading towards the Palestinian area and the young Palestinians, a usual sight scene in the media. The fight is stopped for a moment when a mother walks across the street with a pram, and when a soldier shouts and tells her to go back to her home, she reacts by telling them to return to their home. Suleiman depicts the courage of the Palestinians in front of the military superiority of Israel.

The above scene cuts to another satirical one in which a military tank blocks a street and keenly tracks the movements of a young man who comes out of his

apartment to throw garbage. He is careless and unconcerned about the tank in front of him and enthusiastically discusses music and partying through his mobile phone with his friend. ES stands behind a wall and watches the whole scene and finally he disappears when the military tank points at him. This exposes the extremity of illegal surveillance by the Israeli military that the people of Palestine face. The next scene shows a club party where many young Palestinians dance to an Arabic avant-garde music and enjoy while a jeep stops outside, repeatedly announcing a curfew through the megaphone. The soldiers in the jeep gradually begin to move to the beats of the music as youngsters inside the club begin to disregard the warnings. The military restrictions placed on the Palestinian civilians are satirised in this scene. The scene is open ended leaving the viewer to decide whether the soldiers are sympathetic to the Palestinians and chooses to overlook the incident, or if they are pitied for the hardships they will have to endure. The young people's responses in these scenes can be interpreted as a new generation being acclimatised to military control, or as their bravery to defy colonial regime and occupation.

The most gripping and brilliantly shot scene is the one in which Suleiman uses magic realism as the technique to transgress the boundary between Israel and Palestine. In this scene Elia stands in front of the West Bank's side of the Separation Wall which is also called as the apartheid wall, holding a pole vault, and suddenly runs towards the wall and leaps the wall like an experienced high jumper to reach the other side. This hyperbolic scene offers a glimmer of hope to transcend human made barriers between the Israeli and Palestinian communities. Apart from this scene all others are more realistic representing the actual conditions.

The next scene switches to the first scene in the taxi, where the taxi driver

had fallen asleep on the steering after his monologue. Now the audience probably understands the meaning of Elia's silence or the contemplative nature after seeing the life in Nazareth and Ramallah. The scene switches to a hospital where his mother is hospitalised. She holds Fuad's photo sitting on the same chair in the balcony where she usually sits, he too is photographed from the same frame. When she removes her spectacles, he puts it on St Mary's statue on the window sill which is quite ironic. The film finally ends at the hospital veranda where Elia sits on a bench and watches the casual things happening in the daily life of the youngsters moving in front of him. The final shot shows a young man, probably a resistor handcuffed by a policeman who moves around with him like his puppet.

The Time that Remains can be read as a heterotopic text of the post millennium with the artistic equilibrium achieved in the representation of the stark realities of the condition of particularly the Palestinians in Israel who are called the present absentees, and the pathetic living conditions of Palestinians in general. The phrase 'present absentee' also represents the character ES who is present in the narrative as an observer, but does not involve much in the narrative to make major changes in the society. It also refers to the diasporic condition of the director. Suleiman uses art as a means to combine incompatible spaces becoming heterotopia. It is evident that Nazareth's socio-political conditions have not changed much over the course of many generations, apart from the continued implementation of physical barriers and more communal restrictions. However, it is also evident that time is constantly building up above this stagnant space, leading to resistance movements and protests against the oppressors, which offer some hope for "the time that remains," which is when attitudes toward the present absentees will eventually

change, albeit slowly.

The title has mainly two implications. Firstly, it points to the stagnancy of Nazareth's condition and its people who might nihilistically choose to go with the flow of the State of Israel; and secondly it suggests treasuring the time that remains and finding a solution by courageously living in the present, with the futuristic vision and hope of freedom from the present absentee identity rather than regressing to the weaknesses of the past. The director Elia Suleiman too made the film with the expectation of hope in the time that remains as he had told in many interviews. Being of Palestinian lineage, he discusses the Palestinian condition which is also pertinent to and reflects any region in the world suffering, under occupation. In the interview titled "A Different Kind of Occupation" in *The Electronic Intifada* he states,

The Time That Remains is not at all a metaphor of Palestine. . . I'm not saying anything about the Arab-Israeli conflict. In fact, the phrase 'the Arab-Israeli conflict' does not even belong to my dictionary – at all. I only reflect and sponge experience, and that happens to be as a Palestinian Diasporic – or everyday reality. An occupation of some sorts. A different kind of an occupation. An occupation of the geography of Palestine, and an occupation of the souls of those who live there. . . This is a reality that is being experienced everywhere in the world, and not necessarily just Palestinians.

The film set in the contemporary, spans over many years, and focuses on the attitudes of the post Oslo generation in which the youngsters do not wish to return back to the past rather seek justice, gain human rights and attain freedom from the present Palestinian condition of living under occupation.

Unlike the other films in his oeuvre, in this movie he departs from his usual style of montage and arranges the events in this film narrative chronologically. He employs his masterpiece style, mode of silence, in this movie too. In the situation where every word becomes a political utterance, he resorts to silence which gives space for the audience to fill in their lived experiences or create multiple interpretations which ultimately leads to the formation of a collective feeling which is intrinsically individualistic and unique for everyone who experiences it directly or vicariously. Elia's silence can be interpreted in multiple ways. The silent protagonist Elia Suleiman metaphorically represents the voicelessness and helplessness of the Israeli Palestinian community. It can be viewed from another perspective that the sublimity of the prolonged silence disturbs and haunts the suppressors who fear bursting out. Suleiman, in an interview for *Al Jazeera English*, described the space occupied by silence as follows:

. . . silence itself actually has a site that is so undefined in our life, in our spiritual life, and it has a very political territory. If you're silent so many times it's so destabilising to power structures. They would beat you in order to talk. And silence also does not have a centre. Silence is something that the spectator can participate in. You can fill in the space if you want. I take pleasure from the spectator participating in the making of the film.

(00:10:05 – 00:10:45)

Suleiman represents the Palestinians. He adopts a silent observer persona similar to that of Handhala, a character created by the Palestinian cartoonist Naji al Ali, which is now a national symbol and embodiment of the Palestinian people. Handhala, which appears as graffiti on numerous walls and buildings, travels

symbolically through the various situations in the West Bank, Gaza, and other Palestinian refugee camps exposing the realities of oppression in the form of wall art, much like the character Elia Suleiman does in the artistic space of cinema. He who moves through various situations in Nazareth and Ramallah, exposes the Palestinian struggle for self-determination.

Unlike the history of the formation of many other nation-states, the formation of Israel/ Palestine is a simultaneous process of de/re-territorialisation. Through the above discussed two films *Lemon Tree* (2008) and *The Time that Remains* (2009), the study looks at these two films as heterotopic spaces which function as a means to retrieve or uncover the history of indigenous people of the Palestinian region, present Israel, settler colonialism, and historicide or memoricide through spatiocide. Both the films portray dehumanisation of the Palestinian community within the areas of Palestine under Israeli control, in Israel or the diaspora community. They depict the disturbingly increasing disappearance of Palestinian people through spatiocide, and silencing of their voices and that of the external communities too that support their struggle.

Artistic chronotopes created by filmmakers have helped in interweaving the space and time of these atrocious events to form narratives which could be comprehended by the present global and regional communities across the world. In the case of the Holocaust, the filmmakers evoke the traumatising experiences using flashbacks, fragmented timelines, non-linear narrations, and by adding lingering images, surrealistic characters and locations where extermination was executed (as seen in *The Pianist*, *Remembrance* and in the films to be discussed in the following chapters). These narratives blur the spatiotemporality that differentiates the past

from the present, hence creating a third space for the viewers to confront history and become vicarious witnesses of the sufferings of the Holocaust victims.

Similarly, Nakba films, which are also artistic chronotopes, provide vivid explanations of the sense of loss, trauma, and excruciating impermanence that the Palestinian community continuously experiences. The current generation confronts the past by using multiple liminal spaces; blurred timelines; surrealistic images; and fragmented memory, nationhood, and home land to visually represent their trauma. They also challenge the oppressors and the mainstream media by exposing the unspeakable while they are still in their shackles, as demonstrated in the films *Lemon Tree*, *The Time That Remains*, and other movies that are yet to be discussed in this thesis. These artistic chronotopes aid in addressing the complex history of Palestine/Israel and its never-ending ramifications.

Filming Holocaust in the post millennium is an attempt to reiterate the dominant history, and filming Nakba is an attempt to uncover or reclaim the subjugated history. What broadly distinguishes postmillennial Holocaust and Nakba films is that most of the Holocaust movies are even now set within the atrocious events of Holocaust depicting bloodshed, concentration camps and gas chambers, which the characters of the past witnessed or experienced. Whereas Nakba is represented by events of the present (socio-political issues) or by evoking the past memory through characters who are living in the present, either as victims or somehow managing to survive each day.

When historical events are portrayed in the Holocaust films, horrific images of mass murder, torture, concentration camps, labour camps, crematoriums, and bomb blasts are used to incite fear and anxiety. However, despite the fact that both Israeli and Palestinian films mention the Nakba in passing, the stories focus on

people's day-to-day lives in the present, which naturally implies the consequences of the Nakba even without a lot of artificial settings or comparatively few depictions of the oppressor torturing or killing large numbers of people.

Narrativisation of trauma has been taken up by the Holocaust survivors like Szpilman and Polanski, and the filmmakers like Anna Justice, Agnieszka Holland, Roberto Benigni, Tim Blake Nelson and others to bring together the shattering experience and weave wholeness from fragments. By functioning as heterotopias, Holocaust films challenge viewers to grapple with the enormity of the Holocaust. These films sometimes juxtapose the normalcy of life with the horrifying reality of the camps as seen in the films like *Remembrance*, *The Devil's Arithmetic*, *Life is Beautiful* and many others. This disrupts the viewers' sense of order and safety. Concentration camps, crematoriums, labour camps, and youth cadet's training camps work as specially constructed spaces of exception designed to suspend normal societal rules and inflict systematic brutality and unimaginable suffering. Films depict these spaces as sites of extreme control, dehumanisation, and the breakdown of social norms.

Nakba as of present, always has a fragmented nature which cannot be reduced to a complete whole. The film directors of post 1948 Nakba films like Elia Suleiman, Eran Riklis, Mai Masri, Annemarie Jacir, Hany Abu Assad and others involve in a process to expose the silenced voices by addressing the fragmented nature of memory. Nakba films, which function as heterotopias, illustrate the contesting histories of Israel- Palestine and the conflicts caused by them. In addition to portraying the experiences of dispossession, displacement, and identity crisis among the diverse Palestinian society, they depict the varying temperaments of the

diverse Israeli community. These films offer alternative viewpoints that are often excluded from established narratives and mainstream media. These films work as spaces of exception where dominant social orders are suspended through artistic expressions that reveal challenging viewpoints or alternative realities. These films portray life in Palestinian refugee camps, divided cities like Jerusalem, life on the two sides of the Separation Wall or Green Line, checkpoints, lost villages and other liminal spaces. By functioning as heterotopias, Nakba films opens a space for critical reflection and understand the ongoing struggle for self-determination.

The post millennium Holocaust movies intend to sustain the memory of past which is prone to wither with the passage of time whereas the Nakba movies intent to escape from memoricide and at the same time opens up a range of different paths to alternative future.

Both the deliberations of memory in this century are self-reflexive and challenge the genre from within to project narratives that are future oriented, multi-layered and can represent multiple identities at a universal level. Therefore, this study addresses the way post millennium films become correlating moral narratives, that try to project the possibility for transnational resonance of cosmopolitan moralities and at the same time reflect the distinctions and uniqueness of each experience of different communities which is often left out of consideration or subjugated by other grand narratives of genocide memory.

It can be observed that filming has become a mode of thought and interpretation rather than merely representing the history which has been already written. Genocide films of the present try to communicate the incommunicable spaces which are either prone to contestation or spatiocide. Holocaust and Nakba

films create a space outside the realm of everyday experience, forcing to confront the darkness of genocide and open the eyes of the audience to ensure that it is never repeated. Furthermore, these are spaces where the Holocaust memory bearers and Nakba victims, who have multifaceted identities, transmit their past memory to the present generation, grappling with the pursuit of self-determination, which will also be explored in the following chapters.

Chapter 2

Mediated Memory Constructing Identity:

An Unabating Event

Conceptualising or defining the term “identity” has become a difficult task due to its ubiquitous nature that cuts across multiple disciplines like sociology, psychology, philosophy, ontology, political science, history and cultural anthropology. Identity is a multifaceted concept. It transcends a fixed label that is inherited or given at birth (like ethnicity and sex). It is a dynamic process, constantly evolving through human’s experiences and interactions with the world. It can be understood as a process in which an interaction happens between an individual and his/her present society. The individuals are either shaped by or absorb certain aspects of collective memory and preconceived notions or norms related to biological traits like genetic differences and inheritance patterns. Memory plays a crucial role in construction of individual or collective identity. Genocide films offer a powerful lens to examine the complex relationship between memory, identity, and the aftermath of these horrific events which will be discussed in this chapter. These films revive memories of genocide and at the same time challenges the unjust ways in which intricacies of identity crisis and memory of the two events are communicated.

Many theorists and philosophers had tried to define identity mainly from two viewpoints. Firstly, theorists like George Herbert Mead, Henri Tajfel and John Turner (American, Polish and British social psychologists respectively) connected external social structure and internal self. They conceptualised identity as a

reflection of a social category or a collectivity which consists of distinct groups with varying culture, ethnicity, gender or political affiliations that drive an individual's perception and social behaviour. This theory is recently extended by Alexander Haslam (Australian social and organisational psychologist) who explained that the shared social identity defined by Turner can become the basis for mutual social influence. He put forward the idea that the mutual social influence motivates individuals within a group to want to "co-ordinate their behaviour in ways that are relevant to that identity" ("Identity, Influence, and Change" 206). Thus, these social psychologists defined identity as a social product.

Secondly, theorists like Sigmund Freud (Austrian psychoanalyst) and Erik Erikson (German American developmental psychologist and psychoanalyst) turned towards the Self, that is, identity is cultivated from within an individual's mind. It can be explained as the meanings that an individual contrives from the multiple roles that he/she plays in the contemporary diverse society. They both conceived identity in terms of the ego of an individual. Later, French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan expanded on Freud's idea of identity. Freud defined psyche as the ego which mediates between human desires and internalized morality. Lacan argued that identity is not an internal entity but rather is constructed by society, placing identity in the domain of imagination and external social factors (defining the self in terms of the 'Other').

Though the two strands of identity theory (social identity and individual identity), developed as two distinct branches, it can be understood that they were deeply interconnected to each other. Social identity, as Sheldon Stryker and his colleagues opined, focused on the linkages of social structures with the social

behaviour of an individual or a group (“The Past, Present, and Future” 284).

Whereas, recently, theorist Peter J Burke described identity to be an internal process: a ‘self-verification’ that produces and sustains social structure (“Identities and Self-Verification” 61).

Despite the fact that numerous theorists from around the world have attempted to define identity variously over time, there has always been a gap between individual and social identity theories because the theorists tried to place identity within either of the frameworks. Defining identity was quite impossible, as identity formation is a dynamic process that happens within an individual or group. It uses past events (recent or distant) as the ingredients, which are reproduced within the contexts of the present and used to mould the future. Past events are usually in the form of recorded history (recorded and stored in an authentic manner), experience and memory. History might have influenced many of the theorists discussed earlier as selectively preserved history was the foundation in the formation of social structure. Whereas memory, though being the most vital factor in identity formation, was either neglected or overlooked by the traditional identity theorists, for its fragmented nature or lack of authenticity.

John Locke was one among the early philosophers to acknowledge memory's vital role in the development of identity. According to his observation, a person's memory only reaches as far as his/her memory extends into the past. Though Locke could identify a sense of continuity through memory in the formation of identity, his tendency to rely only on the consciousness, neglecting the subconscious mind and the body became a limitation to his philosophy.

The idea of a historical sense of continuity in the formation of an individual

or a group identity dates back to the times of the Greeks and later in all major civilisations. This was not limited to the timespan of consciousness of an individual. They employed different means of memorialising to transfer the sense of belongingness to the later generations. They preserved the past in the form of written history, monuments, inscriptions, religious texts, rituals and practices. This dependence on memory to define identity was later neglected by the modern theoreticians and psychologists as discussed above.

While turning back to the history of sociology, it can be observed that retrieval of memory and past became a discipline in its own right in the twentieth century. French sociologist Emile Durkheim's idea of historical continuity and collective consciousness was later developed by his disciples, and the most prominent among them being Maurice Halbwachs' concept of 'collective memory'. The question of memory established as a methodology of study, has opened up possibilities to generate multiple discussions that link the past and present in myriad ways.

It is to be noted that Halbwachs developed his career as a sociologist and advanced his ideas during the interwar period (1918 to 1939), and the term 'collective memory' was coined in 1925. As discussed in the last chapter, collective memory refers to a pool of memories which can include past events, testimonies, narratives, religious ideologies, memories of a nation's past, racial and ethnic identities, class consciousness, values, morals, gender orientation and cultural or ritualistic backgrounds, shared by the individuals of a social group which helps to form a collective identity. With the increase in migration of people caused by colonisation and globalisation, this idea of shared identity became a universal

phenomenon in which memory could be shared by any individual who perceives he/she belongs to a group, even if they are not present within the geographical space or might not come into contact with the vast majority of the group's other members.

Though Halbwachs was influenced by Durkheim, he never slavishly depended on his thoughts; instead, expanded it. Lewis A. Coser, the translator of *On Collective Memory* states in the Introduction of the book, "For Halbwachs, the past is a social construction mainly, if not wholly, it is shaped by the concerns of the present . . . He argues that the beliefs, interests, and aspirations of the present shape the various views of the past as they are manifested respectively in every historical epoch (25)". This became a pathbreaking concept in the field of sociology to analyse history, memory and identity. His ideas were recognised and hailed during the interwar period, but later towards the end of the World War II and during the post war period he was highly criticised for his presentist perspectives.

This chapter brings to light Halbwachs' notion of collective memory to understand the connection between cultural memory and identity formation. Though Halbwachs believed in historical continuity, he also questioned it, as he tried to prove that history or memory cannot be entirely transmitted to the present or future. He recognises the possibility of gaps while translating an event and finds that the past which is perceived in the present is a social construction, which can include selection, elimination or fabrication during this process. He exemplifies this using the example of changes that had occurred while transferring the history of the Holy Land through different periods. This study has relevance in this research as it can be applied to understand how history and memory were constructed by the Nazi regime and how the refugee European Jews or the modern Israelites and Palestinians

remember their Holy Land or nation which precipitated an irretrievable political crisis leading to the formation of multiple contested identities in this century.

Halbwachs tried to show how past or history described in the present is constructed through an individual's or a group's selective perceptions and memory which is largely affected by current experiences and contemporary social, political, communal, ethnic, religious or cultural contexts. Moreover, this construction also depends on the "existential security" of the present generation and the demands of nation building (34).

Therefore, it can be said that when an individual or group forms an identity, they move forward and simultaneously turn back in order to establish connections between the past and the present. At the same time, subgroups within a community might have a perceived collective identity, whereas an individual's identity is a complex amalgam of multiple traits from different collectivities.

In the light of the above observations, this chapter explores the ways in which genocide memories of the two events Holocaust and Nakba have influenced the multi-layered identities of the Holocaust victims and survivors, Palestinian/Israeli victims and survivors, their offsprings and the vicarious victims living in the present bearing the memory of the past. The four films which will be discussed in this chapter are *The Grey Zone* (2001), and *The Zookeeper's Wife* (2017) set in the background of Holocaust, focusing on the multi-layered Holocaust victimhood; and *Omar* (2013), and *3000 Nights* (2015) set in the present Israel/Palestine focusing on the manifold identities that were produced during and after Nakba. The late twentieth and twenty first century cinematic expressions of genocide memories led to questioning the homogeneity in the victim and perpetrator representations, and

highlighting the selective erasure and projection of certain memories. They tried to depict the multi-layeredness of ethnic identities and its multidirectionality leading to national, social, racial, religious, political, gender or any other marginalised identities. These films pointed to the limitations of the homogenised collective memory and identity developed during the early twentieth century to address the pre- and post-World War generation. The most adverse criticisms on Halbwachs' collective memory are about the dangers of the presentist approach to collective memory and identity formation. Halbwachs' definition clearly depicted how collective identity and memory were created through manipulated history by the then current totalitarian Nazi regime. In a sense, Halbwachs' notion of memory being selectively created by the present, with reference to the purpose of remembering, is practised as a method of commemoration even in the present by many totalitarian governments to fabricate memory.

Though Halbwachs' was praised for his ideas, he too was a victim of extermination. Halbwachs was arrested for his involvement in French resistance and his opposition to Nazi regime. He was targeted for his Jewish lineage and political activism. He was deported to Buchenwald concentration camp in 1944 and tragically died in 1945, only a few months before liberation of the camps by Allied forces.

Many critics criticised the limitations of his term, as it selectively chose some traits and left others to be forgotten during the process of collective memorialisation which leads to homogenisation. It leads to the superiorisation of certain collective identities and erasure of the others or as Coser stated in her article "The Revival of the Sociology of Culture: The Case of Collective Memory" that in certain regions "people had been forced in the last few years to shed their own

collective memory like a skin, and to reconstruct a largely different set of collective memory” which becomes a deliberate attempt to erase the past (366). The rigorous presentist approach of Halbwachs has been extended and contradicted by many later theorists like Aleida Assman, Michael Rothberg, Hannah Arendt, Dori Laub, Barry Schwartz, Jeffrey K Olick and many others. However, it cannot be denied that Halbwachs is the pioneer to stress the fact that “collective memory is essentially a reconstruction of the past in the light of the present” (Coser 372).

Thus, it can be understood that identities formed, whether individual or collective (both being interdependent), are in a continuous process of encounter and exchange with respect to the memory and past. Identity formation becomes a continuous process that is prone to change during the different stages of life. This chapter throws light at how mediated genocide memory, especially films become a part of discourse making through the depiction of multiple identities.

The Holocaust films *The Grey Zone* and *The Zookeeper's Wife* are two key evocations of the Holocaust in the post millennium to address the past. Both the films delve into the already constructed collective memory of Holocaust victimhood, to dissect it by looking at it from the perspective of different individuals as characters psychologically bearing the burden of collective victimhood and at the same time belonging to different social strata under the Nazi regime. *The Grey Zone* recalls the experience of prisoners within the walls of concentration camp and *The Zookeeper's Wife* looks back on the civilians, equally experiencing imprisonment and traumatising even while being outside the concentration camp under Nazi rule.

The American Holocaust movie, *The Grey Zone* directed by Tim Blake Nelson is an iconoclastic movie remarkable for its distinctive approach towards the

representation of the Holocaust, for its thematic density and depth in recognising the identity crisis. The film is primarily based on *Amidst a Nightmare of Crime: Manuscripts of Prisoners in Crematorium Squads Found at Auschwitz* and an eyewitness account of Dr Miklós Nyiszli published in 1946 under the title *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*. Nyiszli was a Hungarian- Jewish doctor, who worked for Josef Mengele, a German *Schutzstaffel* / SS officer and a doctor who was also known as the Angel of Death. The film is set in Auschwitz concentration camp of the 1940s.

The Zookeeper's Wife is set in Warsaw of 1939, directed by the New Zealand film director Niki Caro and script written by Angela Workman. The film is the remake of the real- life story of Jan and Antonina Żabiński who hid and rescued hundreds of Polish Jews during the volatile circumstances of Poland invasion by Nazis and World War II. It initially appeared as a non-fictional account of the Warsaw Zoo director Jan and his wife Antonina, written by Diane Ackerman who came across the diary of Antonina and later rediscovered the whole story of tactic rescue of victims while under surveillance. Though the book was published in 1968 in Polish, it remained unpublished in English till 2007. The two films intend to dismantle the notion of collectiveness in describing genocide victimhood and address plurality inherent within the collective identities which were initially formed by selective homogenised memories.

The two Israeli/ Palestinian movies *Omar* and *3000 Nights* of the post millennium discuss the current instability and identity crisis of Israelites and Palestinians, that stems from Nakba. These films also address the grey zones or contested identities living within Israel/Palestine and refugees of the 'Holy Land'

across the world. The Palestinian Dutch filmmaker and Israeli citizen Hany Abu Assad's Academy Award nominated film *Omar* throws light at the transgenerational trauma experienced by the youngsters who live under continuous surveillance. It narrates the life of people living on both sides of the Separation Wall and their ways of resistance. The film is set in Nazareth (in Israel), Nablus (in Palestine) and the Far'a refugee camp (near Jordan in the West Bank of Palestine). The narrative revolves around the life of Omar (a young Palestinian baker), his friends Tarek and Amjad, and his lover Nadia (who are on the other side of the West Bank wall).

The first Palestinian woman filmmaker and activist Mai Masri's film *3000 Nights* is an internationally acclaimed feature fiction film that tells the story of motherhood behind the prison bars. This film which was an entry for the Oscars unrolls the incidents in the life of a wrongly imprisoned Palestinian woman Noor Layal who was fated to give birth and bring up her son in an Israeli jail. As mentioned by Mai Masri in one of her interviews, it narrates the life of a woman whom the director had met in Nablus. In the film, Noor Layal who lives in the occupied West Bank town in Nablus is accused of being a teenage boy's accomplice who is charged of trying to attack an Israeli checkpoint. It simultaneously portrays the terrifying living conditions of Palestinian political prisoners of 1980s and the Israeli criminal inmates who are forced to coexist in a well surveilled Israeli prison.

This chapter explores the role of Holocaust and Nakba genocide memory films that initially reiterated already defined notions of identities, later moving on to reclaiming the suppressed ones and gradually bringing forth and revivifying rhizomatic identities submerged by the grand narratives of collective memory within the film industry. Here rhizomatic identities can be defined as the multiple and

heterogeneous sub-identities that exist within the envelop of an established and seemingly unified identity. These rhizomatic identities are constructed at two levels: individual and social. That is an individual's body encounters with racial, ethnic and sex orientation distinctions; his/her mind forms relations with collective phenomena like national, political, social, religious, cultural and gender identities and also grasps the pedagogically translated thoughts which together form an individual. At the same time, these individuals encounter and engage with other individuals within the collective definitions of nation, ethnic identity, religious identity, and cultural milieu, forming collective memories. The so formed collective memories are dispersed in nature and hierarchical in some cases. Hence the so formed social rhizomatic identity is a cluster of collected memories rather than a unified collective memory.

The distinction between collective and collected memory was first addressed by Jeffrey K Olick and the multidirectionality inherent within collective memory was initially discussed by Michael Rothberg in his book *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (2009). Through the four films to be discussed in this chapter, the research tries to analyse how films become mediums to show and construct rhizomatic identities and the ways in which contesting memories confront each other in the present public sphere.

The Holocaust films of the twentieth century had a relentless tendency to define victim and perpetrator in a binary sense and consecrate the victims of the Nazi regime to an extent that collective Holocaust victimhood became an industry, the concentration camps have become memory sites and well-known victims have become a commodity or a pop culture icon. The popular assumptions about unified

Holocaust victimhood were revised with the publication of writings of survivors like Primo Levi, Zalmen Gradowski, Shlomo Venezia, Filip Muller, Kazimierz Smoler and a few other testimonies discovered from the death camp sites. 'Grey zone' is a term coined by Levi in his essay collection *The Drowned and the Saved* to describe the pathetic realities of concentration camps and the complexity of human nature. Primo Levi states,

The network of human relationships inside the concentration camps was not simple: it could not be reduced to two blocs, victims and persecutors. People who read (or write) the history of the camps nowadays have a tendency, indeed a need, to separate evil from good, to take sides . . . over here go the righteous, over there the wicked. (2277)

Tim Blake Nelson's film *The Grey Zone* initially appeared in the form of a book named, *The Grey Zone: The Director's Notes and Screenplay* in 1998. The script was inspired from doctor Miklos Nyiszli's memoir *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*. Nyiszli was a Hungarian Jewish prisoner who was professionally a doctor and was spared from death by the Nazis, by compromising his moral conscience by favouring Nazis. As a forensic pathologist, he was assigned to dissect and conduct autopsy on the bodies of twin Jewish children. Though initially he was not aware of his duties (as he thought he was volunteering for a hospital), he could not stop conducting the assigned research as the alternative was the death of himself and his family.

The Grey Zone describes the horrifying and disturbing lives that the *Sonderkommandos* had to endure. In Nelson's book *The Grey Zone*, he defines them as

. . . those unluckiest of death camp inmates offered the most impossible bargains humanity could propose to itself. These Jewish men were told simply that they would either help out in the extermination of their fellows or be shot. They cleaned the gas chambers, burned the corpses of those murdered and ushered fellow Jews to slaughter. They did so in twelve-to-fifteen-hour shifts for periods of upto four months before being exterminated themselves and replenished with a new group. (9)

The film recreates the death camp experience to expose the tyrannical policy of the Nazis who psychologically tortured and forced many imprisoned people to collaborate with the perpetrators. Many of them even willingly chose to join the *Sonderkommandos* due to their pressures of instincts to live. Though the films like *Son of Saul* (2015), *The Counterfeiters* (2007) and *The Photographer of Mauthausen* (2018) also problematise the identity of the victims who are complicit with the oppressors, *The Grey Zone* stands distinct for its horrifying portrayal of human nature at its barest and crudest form, when the civilisation is in crisis. With this as the major theme Nelson also discusses the tensions within the victims by merging contesting networks of identities like national, class, ethnic, gender, and other minority consciousnesses ingrained in human nature that works even while at such a crisis. These networks of identities intersect and diverge under different contexts, showing individuals with multiple or rhizomatic identities within their self while simultaneously being under the rubrics of a certain collective memory of victimhood identity (as here it is the Holocaust memory).

The film addresses the true events surrounding the twelfth group of *Sonderkommandos* out of the thirteen groups assigned: the inexplicable pain that

they had to undergo and their attempts of resistance. The twelfth group which mostly included Hungarians functioned in Auschwitz II- Birkenau (there were many more *Sonderkommandos* who worked in Belzec, Sobibor, Chelmno, Majdanek and Treblinka).

The film begins with a brief expository note about Doctor Miklos Nyiszli and *Sonderkommandos*, and directly moves to the grim and bleak settings of the Number One crematorium of Auschwitz in Poland of 1944. The first scene starts abruptly with a close up shot showing a *Sonderkommando* Hoffman (Hungarian Jewish Prisoner starred by David Arquette) who seems to be numbed with shock, fear and grief. His silence is broken by a Nazi officer who asks, “You have anything to drink?” (00:02:19). Nelson, by framing this question at the very outset of the film breaks the typical gulf between the Holocaust victims and the oppressors by showing the ambiguous relationship between Hoffman and the Nazi officer which is gross and confusing. This first moment is an act of “implied complicity” (The Holocaust is Not a Metaphor 00:26:03- 04). The first scene informs and prepares the audience to see a dystopic world different from their expectations about what went on in the Nazi concentration camps.

Then the camera follows Hoffman who swiftly walks through the hall of a bunker in the crematorium and the lens shifts away from him to show other prisoners who are mechanically engaged in different tasks in the different rooms. The first word that Hoffman speaks is when he calls for the doctor. Hoffman gets into a room where the audience gets to see a few other characters: Rosenthal and Schlermer (Hungarian Jewish prisoners starred by David Chandler and Daniel Benzali respectively) discussing whether to resuscitate the life of an old man or kill

him (the audience is not aware of the context for this discussion). Hoffman appears with Doctor Nyiszli (starred by Allan Corduner) to help the old man but the men say that the old man is dead. Nyiszli tries to revive him but is obstructed by Schlermer and finally, Rosenthal smothers the old man with a pillow and immediately they push Hoffman to carry the old man to the crematorium furnace and make sure he gets his number. Hoffman gets down the stairs with the body and the haunting hum of the machineries in the furnace increases. The next scene opens with Hoffman in a furnace, where audience sees many prisoners burning bodies of fellow victims. This creates a moral dilemma in the audience of whom to be recognised as good or evil. Hoffman later narrates the story of that old man who had to burn the dead bodies of his wife, daughter and two grandchildren as a death camp worker. In twenty minutes, the whole family was exterminated. Out of guilt, he took pills to kill himself, which was the only choice for of him.

The next scene opens showing the Number Three Crematorium. It begins with a conversation between Hoffman and Abramovics (Hungarian Jewish prisoner who lives with Polish inmates in Number 3, acted by Steve Buscemi). They speak secretly about the plans for an uprising and the potential of survival.

Hoffman: Can I?

Abramovics: Take the pack. They're Hungarian. Hoffman: I like our cigarettes.

Abramovics: It's shit tobacco. Hoffman: I like ours.

Abramovics: What they need to do is invade Turkey and then you'll taste a cigarette. Get going.

Hoffman: You trust the Poles?

Abramovics: What do I care? The Poles.

Hoffman: They don't trust the Poles. They don't trust anyone in Number 3.

Abramovics: Me?

Hoffman: I can't say. Abramovics: I'm Hungarian. Hoffman: But you're here

Abramovics: So, because I'm with the Poles?

Hoffman: Rosenthal's worried. He's gonna say that we don't have the time.

Abramovics: I know, we don't have time. They wait for lulls.

Hoffman: If the front...

Abramovics: That's not gonna happen for us. Hoffman: No one really knows that...

Abramovics: Never.

Hoffman: There are planes almost every day now.

Abramovics: Not for us. The Russians get 10km from here we're the first to go right out to the pyres.

Hoffman: Everyone keeps saying that.

Abramovics: Believe it. You're dead already, either way. It's just a matter of deciding how. (00:05:45-00:06:45)

Through the above intense conversation Nelson tries to bring out the tensions within the ethnic community who had different national consciousness (Hungarian and Polish as seen in this movie). Many of their attitudes towards each other varied with the national identities they embrace, neglecting the fact that they all were just numbered sub-humans in front of Nazis. Nelson throws light at the diverse opinions and mistrust within the victim community to show the existential crisis. This was not the only way the victims belonging to different nations reacted. There are evidences

of imprisoned communities showing unity, courage and bravery in the accounts of the survivors.

Olga Lengyel, a Hungarian Jewish prisoner who worked as an internee in infirmary of concentration camps and survived the Holocaust, wrote in her account *Five Chimneys: A Woman Survivor's True Story of Auschwitz*,

At least 400 Greeks from the Corfu and Athens transport were ordered in the Sonderkommando. Now, something truly unusual happened. These 400 demonstrated that in spite of the barbed wire and the lash, they were not slaves but human beings. With rare dignity, the Greeks refused to kill the Hungarians! They declared that they preferred to die themselves first. Sadly enough, they did. The Germans saw to that. But what a demonstration of courage and character these Greek peasants had given. A pity the world does not know more about them! (113)

Thus, the *Sonderkommandos* could not be defined in a straitjacket manner, but came with different levels of endurance, who were considered to be privileged prisoners with dense moral ambiguities. Abramovics' hopelessness in attacks against the Nazis by other nations and affirmation that they would be the first ones to be killed if the Russians attacked the Nazi regime clearly stated the vulnerability of their existence. The Nazis who turned victims into accomplices harping on the weakness of every human's will to live, made sure that they died after intervals so that the secret of mass slaughter is never let out to the world.

The term *Sonderkommando* meant Special Forces. Nelson, through his film exhibits the duties that they carried out through a number of scenes in a blunt and unemotional style. Many criticisms have been raised, across decades, regarding the

morality of the special squads and the nature of their job. Several scenes in the film show the different duties *Sonderkommandos* carried out. They assisted the Nazis to herd the imprisoned people into the rooms where they are numbered and told to undress; they are pushed into the gas chambers and later carried to the crematoriums to be burned. Before burning, they collected valuables from the dead bodies. The captives in the concentration camps were assigned different duties. Many barbers were assigned to shave off the hair of the dead. Many doctors were assigned to collect teeth from the dead bodies, work in the infirmary and conduct research on twin children who were dissected for autopsy. The Nazis did not want to lose anything valuable from the captive's body. In *Five Chimneys* Lengyel states:

The Nordic Supermen knew how to profit from everything. Immense casks were used to gather the human grease which had melted down at high temperatures. It was not surprising that the camp soap had such a peculiar odor. Nor was it astonishing that the internees became suspicious at the sight of certain pieces of fat sausage! (69)

The *Sonderkommandos* were sometimes given the duty to drag the captives to the SS officers so that they could be killed and pushed into the ditches to be burned. As seen in the film, the imprisoned workforce was also assigned to clean and whitewash the gas chambers after every gassing.

There are several gripping scenes in the film that show both individual and collective trauma of the *Sonderkommandos*. Nelson weaves in multiple lives and stories with the help of Russell Lee Fine's camera techniques (the cinematographer of the film) to bring out the depths of the crisis. There are many pan camera movements that show the collective trauma of the prisoners who with a haunting

indifference did their tasks as mentioned earlier. Lee also uses handheld camera to shoot many scenes, as per director's notes, in his book Nelson states that the audience must feel dizzyingly that we are entirely inside the experience of the characters in the film (163).

Nelson and Lee also use still shots, zoom in shots or dolly shots to evince individual trauma of the *Sonderkommandos*. The first still shot of Hoffman discussed earlier is one such depiction. Lee's another gripping frame is in which he uses a dolly shot after a scene in which two SS officers with masks casually open the top of a gas chamber to empty a tin of Zyklon B. In the dolly shot that follows, the camera slowly moves towards Schlermer (a relatively old Hungarian *Sonderkommando*) who seems to be emotionally paralysed by pain, and continuously drinks alcohol (the *Sonderkommandos* had a steady supply of alcohol and cigarettes, which made them addictive and willing to do the job for Nazis) until Rosenthal comes with a mask to open the door of the chamber where many dresses are hanged on numbered hooks into the chamber after gassing. During this shot, the audience is terrified to see the character's numbness and is engrossed by the sounds of the victims and the chamber fans. Another example is the close-up and zoom in shots of the girl who survived gassing, whom Hoffman and other inmates try to protect. Her uncanny looks of incomprehension and silence are stark expressions of individual trauma and identity crisis.

Nelson uses the technique of juxtaposing two oxymoronic shots to exhibit the unsettling racist ideologies of Nazism. The camera pans across a well-watered lawn in which many Special Squad members are scattered, sitting in luxurious couches and chairs. They wear tattered uniforms and are emotionless. The camera

shows the lush green lawns being watered, symbolising growth and fertility.

Suddenly the lens switches to show a truck filled with ash of humans from the furnace setting out from the crematorium to be disposed. The truck is escorted by three death camp members who sit above the ashes of their fellow inmates. In another sequence, we see a grand dinner scene following a terrible sight of the burning of bodies in the gas chambers. In yet another scene, a line of new arrivals is walked into the gas chambers while the Auschwitz orchestra band plays the music of Jewish composer Johann Strauss. Strauss was a Jew. The Nazis hid the fact that Strauss was of Jewish lineage, and was hailed by the Third Reich as the greatest German composer. This scene ends with an aerial shot that captures the fate of the victims. The newly arrived detainees are seen approaching the gas chamber, and near them are the tall chimneys of the crematorium which spew thick black smoke.

In another sequence, we see Hoffman and other *Sonderkommandos* wheedle the newly arrived group of victims to undress themselves and shower themselves before entering into the gas chamber, which is called as a place to 'reunite with your other family members'. In between this scene, Hoffman meets with a man who resists obeying the *Sonderkommandos*. To the shock of the audience, Hoffman beats down and kills the man for his expensive watch which is handed over by a Nazi officer with an eerie smile to the dumbstruck Hoffman after his commission of murder.

The ontological crisis was so dystopic that the Nazis who considered them to be the superior race made sure that they never involved directly in the process of ushering, gassing, slaughtering, dissecting or burning the bodies, but made the victims (who were largely Jews) do it to reduce themselves to subhumans who prey

on their own kind. Though many representations interpreted the role of *Sonderkommandos* as those who lied to their inmates and abetted the slaughter of their own people for better living conditions, many accounts of the survivors stated that they were driven by their willingness to live: some feared to face the immediate death and some were desperate for better circumstances after many days of starving and sickness. But they were horrified when they came across the work that they had to do. Nelson recreated the individual and collective trauma of the *Sonderkommandos* through the film characters constructed by reading and analysing the memory of the victims who wrote and hid (within the camp) the writings of their experiences inside the camp, or by listening to the narrations of the survivors.

Nelson explains the essence of the predicament faced by the prisoners through the individual and collective resistances that they make in the film. It can be seen that under such vulnerable circumstances, victims' identity becomes a phenomenon under construction and an unabating process. The audience gets to watch different perspectives of victimhood and victimisation through different characters. In the film, the identity of every character becomes a self-construct that changes depending on the different circumstances they have to go through, but has a basic element that always remains the same: consciousness of understanding oneself to be a victim within collective victimisation. Below are some examples of how Nelson wove the complexity and dynamism into the identities of his characters, against the background of the planning and execution of Auschwitz- Birkenau prisoner revolt of October 7th 1944, which resulted in the destruction of two of the four crematoriums.

The ideas and intentions of the death camp inmates Hoffman, Abramovics,

Rosenthal and Schlermers differed, though their combined effort was to revolt against the oppressors. They are shown as ambiguous and self-denying while living in the midst of in the absurd world of the Holocaust. Hoffman who is initially depicted as a soft-hearted person trying to save an old man about to die, suddenly changes his personality while carrying the dead man's body into the crematorium. In another scene, he ashamedly punches a newly arrived inmate to death for a watch. Later the audience witnesses the same character Hoffman along with others help save the life of a girl who is unconscious and alive in the gas chamber. As a *Sonderkommando*, he perceives the act of bringing the girl back to life as both an expression of resistance and a gesture of repentance. He can be understood as the most vulnerable character among the commandos who often breaks down under the pressures of his filthy work.

Abramovics who initially states that they as death camp workers “are dead already, either way, it is just the matter of deciding how” (00:06:43-47), later tells “It's my fucking life. I hope I live till I'm ninety” (01:06:24-26). These contrasting attitudes of Abramovics reminds of the life experience of Shlomo Venezia, a *Sonderkommando* who survived Holocaust. Venezia in his book *Inside the Gas Chambers* describes the impact of his work (while in the death camp) as “a disease that gnaws away at (me) from within and destroys any feeling of joy. I have been dragging it about with me ever since I spent that time suffering in the camp. This disease never leaves me a moment of joy or carefree happiness; it's a mood that forever erodes my strength” (154). Venezia ends this book (which is in the form of an interview) by simply stating “nobody ever really gets out of the Crematorium” (155). This statement clearly states the moral degeneration of the survivors even after the war. While Venezia is a survivor, the character Abramovics in the film was

shot down moments after his dialogue about his wish to live. Survival was not by heroism but mere luck.

Max Rosenthal is portrayed as an angry, quite practical man who is one among the leaders of the revolt. He wishes the revolt to happen as soon as possible as he realises that every day extended leads to thousands of victims into the crematorium. Nelson tries to bring out the complex ethnic – national background mainly through Rosenthal's and Abramovics' conversations. In an instance, Rosenthal states, "If we were burning Polish Jews we wouldn't be waiting. What's another week to these guys? Another ten thousand Hungarians" (00:26:51-54). Rosenthal gets infuriated to know that the Polish inmates' delay to begin the revolt is a tactic to plan their escape from the camps. This delay would kill many more Hungarian inmates including the Sonderkommandos, who were about to be exterminated and replaced by new inmates. He doesn't want to die without an act of resistance against the Nazis.

Similarly, Schlermer, comparatively older among the inmates is well aware of their fate and strongly wishes to conduct the revolt. He is stoic, pragmatic and solves the disputes among the inmates like a leader to whom everyone listens. He does not want to survive the Holocaust and readily accepts death during the revolt like a martyr, trying to get solace from his terrible work. The mental crisis of the victims is most poignantly described through one of the most gripping conversations in the film between Schlermer and Nyiszli,

Schlermer: You volunteered.

Nyiszli: They wanted doctors for a hospital.

Schlermer: You knew the sort of work you'd be doing, and you continue to

do it. Nyiszli: I don't kill.

Schlermer: And we do? Nyiszli: I didn't say that.

Schlermer: You give killing purpose.

Nyiszli: We're all just trying to make it to the next day. That's all any of us is doing. Schlermer: You have no idea, do you?

Nyiszli: I don't know what you're talking about.

Schlermer: I do not wish to be alive when all of this is over. (01:02:55-1:03:28)

Inmates in the crematoriums were forced to compromise with their oppressors, who provided them varying degrees of freedom of choice and mobility. Nyiszli was a 'privileged' prisoner who had permission to meet his wife and daughter in another compartment. He was a complex character to be acquainted with the Nazi officer. He tries to revive the inmates (the old man and the girl) from death if he gets a chance. But on the other side, he obeys the orders of his superiors and dissect victims to do research. He is proved to be excellent at it too.

Nelson throws light on two important Nazi officers through their close association with Nyiszli: Josef Mengele and Erich Muhsfeldt. History says Mengele was one of the evil officer; he appears only once in the film to appreciate Nyiszli's research work and increase the number of samples which further shocks Nyiszli. Nelson uses a close-up shot to capture Nyiszli's expression of shock and horror, who is shaken to the core and remains silent for a few seconds, finally he states that he will do it in exchange to protect his family. Nelson constructs the character Muhfeldt (starred by Harvey Keitel) with reference to the account of Nyiszli. Nelson tried to portray the complexity of a pathetic mundane man who had to work as an oppressor

and obey his superiors through the character Muhfeldt. His conversations and meetings with the doctor and *Sonderkommandos* are important turning points in the film. Muhfeldt has mixed feelings towards the victims. He believes in the Nazi ideology of homogenisation but wishes to save the doctor. He is indignant about the medical report of his physical and mental health due to his job of killing humans, but he tries to make himself believe that what he is doing is right. The doctor intimidates him by talking about his health but Muhfeldt wishes to hide his disabilities and believes himself to be healthy to serve Nazis. His statements too are ironic in different instances. While in a conversation with the doctor, he talks about the *Sonderkommandos* and states, “they think we are going to kill them” (00:20:52). In another instance, while he is requested to protect the revived girl, he muses on what he had seen the inmates do: “I never fully despised the Jews until I experienced how easily they could be persuaded to do the work, to do it so well, and to their own people” (1:27:37-43).

Apart from the *Sonderkommandos* in the crematoriums, Nelson weaves another strand of the story depicting the female characters in the Union Munitions Factory at Brzezinka, who played a vital role in the revolt: Rosa, Dina and Anja (acted by Natasha Lyonne, Mira Sorvino and Lisa Benavides respectively). They smuggled the gunpowder for the commandos.

The character Rosa is inspired from the life story of Union Factory inmate Roza Robota, a Polish political prisoner. She seems to be mentally strong and determined. She organizes the smuggling of powder and ensures that her fellow prisoners never lose motivation to carry out their mission. Dina is portrayed as a Jewish lesbian inmate who too is part of the revolt. She wears a uniform with a pink

triangle on her shirt indicating her to be a lesbian. Through the character Dina, he addresses a group of victims (who are regarded as minors) who are not much discussed in mainstream Holocaust films. Nazis persecuted gays, lesbians, cisgender women and transmen as they were thought to show antisocial behaviour. Anja is portrayed as a fragile and emotional character. She is afraid of the tortures that she will have to face.

Though they appear only for a few minutes, their characters are so strong that it leaves an in-depth impact on the audience, for their courage to face the Nazis. There are three horrific and disturbing scenes in the film showing their role in resistance. Firstly, in the instance where the three of them secretly converse about the chances of them being caught by the officers, and their next day's plan to transport gunpowder by hiding in the dresses of corpses, Rosa bluntly asks about the number of corpses to be sent and she states, "You see, that's good. The more bodies the better" (00:15:57-60). Their self-control and will power be displayed at the instance where the three of them are tortured by the Nazi officers to disclose the truth. The close-up shots of these women and the bleak haunting backgrounds clearly explain the sufferings that they had gone through.

The last wide angle lens scene showing Dina, Rosa and all other inmates lined up in front of the officers, to be killed one by one for not disclosing the truths of smuggling is the most distressing and powerful scene in the film. In this scene, severely tortured Dina and Rosa choose to suicide without revealing the truth. One of them chose to run to the electrified barbed wires and the other provoked the officer to shoot her to death. This incident in the film reminds of Lengyel's recollection in *Five Chimneys*:

The barbed wire was the very symbol of our captivity. But it also had the power to liberate. Each morning the workers found deformed bodies on the high-tension wires. That was how many chose to put an end to their torments. A special detail detached the corpses with hooked sticks. The sight of the misshapen dead filled us with mixed sentiments. We were sorry for them, for such deaths were really horrible; yet we envied them, too. They had found the courage to reject a life which no longer merited the name. (97)

Another important female character in the film is the young girl, played by Kamelia Grigorova, who is neither identified by a name nor has a number. The second half of the film revolves around the revival of this girl's life and the discussions on the potential threats of protecting her. Her silence represents all the victimised children who were tortured by the Nazis. In the final scene after the revolt when Hoffman and Rosenthal lie down on the ground to be shot, they die happily believing that they had saved a life, but the audience finally witnesses the young girl's death too. She starts hauntingly speaking only after her death, giving life to the traces or the grey ashes of all the victims who have been burned in the crematorium. After she is shot, she is resurrected by Nelson to say (as voiceover to the visuals of new *Sonderkommandos* at work in the crematorium):

After the revolt, half of the ovens remain, and we are carried to them together. I catch fire quickly. The first part of me rises in dense smoke that mingles with the smoke of others. Then, there are the bones, which settle in ash. And these are swept up to be carried to the river. And last, bits of our dust simply float there, in air, around the working of the new group. These bits of dust are grey. We settle on their shoes and on their faces and in their

lungs. And they become so used to us, that's on they don't cough and they don't brush us away. At this point, they're just moving, breathing and moving. Like anyone else, still alive in that place. And this is how the work continues. (*The Grey Zone* 01:38:32- 01:40:15)

Though most of the inmates died in the revolt and a few escaped, this desperate act of defiance against the Nazi extermination machinery was partially a success. It disrupted the killing operation and caused a temporary halt to the cremation process. The uprising brought attention to the horrors of the extermination camps, both within the imprisoned communities and the world outside. This increased the pressure of Nazi regime to conceal their crimes.

Nelson wove many life stories to address multiple identities and the nature of human beings, though there are slight deviations in his narration and portrayal of characters when compared to the real-life survivors. *The Grey Zone* is the most powerful and multidirectional film that has been made on the theme of the Holocaust, especially describing the life of death camp inmates. The title of the film itself has multi layered implications. Firstly, it refers to the pervasive grey colour of the bleak death camps and its apathetic inmates who are covered with the ash dust of those whom they have burned (which might include their own spouse, parents, relatives or children as narrated by Hoffman to the girl, about a man who had to do so on the first day of his duty and he ate death pills). It refers to the grey coloured atmosphere and surroundings where people are dehumanised and exterminated. Secondly, the title refers to the grey zones within the consciousness of the death camp inmates. It represents their psychological trauma and their inability to situate themselves in their own opinions. Thirdly, it refers to the grey zone between the

ambiguous human nature of victim and victimiser identities. The phrase indicates a space where choice, discipline, morality, ethics and resistance uneasily coexisted. The audience of *The Grey Zone* gets trapped within the ambiguity of human nature in the turbulent world.

Under the totalitarian Nazi regime, the crimes against humanity committed by Holocaust survivors, collaborators, and common German citizens who participated either actively or passively in the extermination process were normalised. After covering the 1961 trial of Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem, one of the main architects of the Holocaust, political philosopher and Holocaust survivor Hannah Arendt elucidated her concept through her groundbreaking book *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (1963) wherein she explains the psychology of normalising the evil. She noted that Eichmann seemed surprisingly normal, thoughtless, and banal. He was driven by careerism. He could not logically interpret that his deeds were crimes against humanity and showed no remorse for his actions. Instead, he portrayed himself as a disciplined veteran who simply obeyed the orders of the regime. This was the case with numerous brainwashed German citizens and officers. Stephen Daldry's film *The Reader* (2008), also exemplifies this nature of the Nazi supporters and officers under them through the character Hanna Schmitz. Arendt's concept of 'banality of evil' has drawn criticism for downplaying the influence of Nazi ideology, anti-Semitism, prejudice, ethnic hatred, and the desire for power, of those who carried out and supported the Holocaust. Her approach did not consider the nuanced nature of human motivation to do crimes like mass extermination, and hence has drawn much criticism.

The cinematography techniques and the sound effects literally push the

audience too into the grey zone of the Holocaust victims, making the film a chronotope in which new meanings are produced to the diverse experiences within the collectiveness of Holocaust memory. The participation of audience in the meaning production process makes the film a chronotope.

Nelson decides not to add any dramatic musical notes except for a few, like the music played by the Auschwitz orchestra band and the solo violin soundtrack at the end of the film. The rest of the scenes are mostly accompanied by the sound from the crematorium the haunting humming sounds of the machineries and fans in the barracks and sounds from the gas chambers. Through *The Grey Zone*, Nelson tried to represent and recreate the harsh experiences of the *Sonderkommandos* in a raw, unadorned, unheroic and undramatised manner. Despite being one among the most gripping and realistic engagements with the Holocaust (which was praised by Steven Spielberg, the director of *The Schindler's List*), *The Grey Zone* could not hit the box office as expected, as it was scheduled to release on the day when 9/11 attack happened. The premiere show had to be cancelled. Though it was screened later, it did not get proper attention from the audience.

While most of the Holocaust films have conveyed the trauma of the victims dramatically by recreating concentration camps, gas chambers and crematoriums, *The Zookeeper's Wife* is one of the movies (*The Pianist* discussed in the second chapter is another example) that has tried to display traumatic experiences of Holocaust victims without the portrayal of the above-mentioned genocide sites. *The Zookeeper's Wife* directed by Niki Caro and written by Angela Workman is an attempt to visually remake the real-life legacy of the couple Jan and Antonina Zabinski which is adapted from Diane Ackerman's bestseller book *The Zookeeper's Wife* (2007). Ackerman's book was an attempt to re-narrativise Antonina's story

after reading her diary which was published earlier in 1968, in the name *People and Animals*.

New Zealand film director Niki Caro's Hollywoodised version of Zabinski family's story is set in Prague, where a zoo and Zabinski's home were recreated to resemble the actual one in Warsaw. Caro spins a compelling narrative, inspired from Zabinski family's daring and inspirational act of rescuing around three hundred Polish Holocaust victims and at the same time protecting the animals in the zoo. The film focuses on Hitler's policy of cultural homogenisation (especially Aryanization), through pseudo biological racism, eugenics in humans and back breeding of animals.

The opening scene of the film begins with an over the shoulder shot that sets the audience to watch the movie from the perspective of Antonina Zabinski starred by American actress Jessica Chastain (she is also the co-producer). The scene shows Zabinski's son Ryszard (acted by Val Maloku) sleeping on the bed with lion cubs to whom Antonina moves casually and holds her son's foot and kisses the cub. This scene that shows how the animals and Zabinski family coexisted sets the context for the film.

The beginning scenes of this chronologically arranged film are set in 1939; the film portrays Antonina who runs the Warsaw Zoo along with her husband Jan Zabinski, the director of the zoo (starred by Flemish actor Johan Heldenbergh). The cinematographer Andrij Parekh and Caro have wove a harmonious relation between the zookeepers and the animals in the film. The film begins with Antonina's daily routines in the zoo where she dresses up and gets ready to graciously welcome the visitors. Though the film is set in the context of Holocaust, the introduction of Antonina and the animals in the zoo are picturised in the form of a fairy tale from

Disney movies with Antonina as the central character. The camera moves along with Antonina who rides a cycle through the zoo to visit all the cages with wild animals. She takes along with her a calf of a camel in the zoo for daily rounds, greets all the other animals in the zoo and finally reaches her husband to help him. The camera moves to show an aerial shot depicting pre-World War II Poland.

Then the scene switches to a dinner party held at Zabinski's home. This scene introduces some of the key characters in the movie and the different attitudes of people towards the arrival of Hitler and Nazism. The scene focuses on the real-life character Lutz Heck (starred by Daniel Bruhl) who was a zoologist and the director of Berlin Zoological Garden. He worked for Nazis on the project to back breed animals to achieve the qualities of and extinct ancestor. He aimed to prove it by trying to produce aurochs through cross-breeding of various modern breeds which he thought had parts of the original genetic heritage. A few other characters that are introduced in this scene are Magda and Maurysy (Polish Jews performed by two Israeli actors), and the Nazi supporters Stefan and his wife. This scene is created to establish a relation between Lutz and Antonina and to show Stefan's ready acceptance of the invasion of Hitler, and Jan's attitude of disagreeing to Nazism. The party is interrupted by Rysz's call for Antonina to rush to the yard where elephants inhabit, to help a suffocating baby elephant which is thought to be dead. Antonina calms down the panicked mother elephant and simultaneously removes the obstruction from the calf's trunk. This act of compassion and care for the animals proves what Magda states in the earlier scene of Antonina, that as a zookeeper, "sweetness is the least of it, Antonina is a magician" (00:06:32-34). Jan compares her to "Eve in her garden" (00:11:11-12).

The next scene sets the background for the forthcoming catastrophe of humanity. Antonina and her son witness the Jews carrying loads on their back resembling mules (as Rysz states). Overnight Antonina decides not to leave their zoo out of fear but chooses to face the war. The next day is shown as 1st September 1939. It opens showing animals in the cage. The silences in the shots are broken by the sound of the aircrafts and sudden aerial bombardment of the city and the zoo, resembling the *Blitzkrieg* or 'lightning war' (a surprise attack) by the Nazi army as part of the invasion of Poland. Finally, Poland had to capitulate to the Nazi army after air attacks and artillery shelling.

The tension of the human world is metaphorically shown by Andrij and Caro through the depiction of the panicked animals like monkeys within the cages and leopards, camels, tigers, lions and kangaroos outside their spaces, walking wildly through the ruined zoo and on the roads in the city. There are certain painful scenes of the Nazi army shooting animals at the sight. In fact, Ackerman and Caro, through the story of Antonina tried to tell the world that it was not only humans but also the fauna and flora that had to suffer during the Holocaust. Ackerman stated in her book, "Germany's crime is the greatest crime the world has ever known, because it is not on the scale of History: it is on the scale of evolution" (58).

The film then recreates the incidents after Poland's surrender. Zabinskis, though they wished to stay back in the zoo and face any situation, Antonina and her children attempt to flee out of panic, but are not able to escape as there were no train services and they return home. The rest of the movie focuses on their bravery in rescuing the Holocaust victims. Caro portrays two parallel worlds: the Poland that surrendered in front of Nazism and the Poland that resisted Nazism. Zabinskis could not be blind about the Jews who had coexisted with them until then, they joined the

Home Army taking up the mission to rescue the victims and resist the oppressors.

Lutz Heck has a role in the film as a puppet that embodies all the characteristics of a Nazi. He is initially characterised as an innocent zoologist and an animal lover who later flips to become Hitler's chief zoologist, Jan's professional rival and an evil preying on Zabinski's hope. In the film, he manipulates Antonina by offering to protect exotic and prized animals by exporting to Berlin Zoo until the war ends; it was his way of pilfering animals with the owner's permission. Later, he came back with soldiers to shoot the others, revealing his covert brutality. Though the film extends his role to the climax, in reality Antonina mentions him only a few times in her book. He was a confusing character, though an animal lover, he hunted animals to do experiments and for pleasure. He and his brother aimed to back breed animals to recreate the extinct ones. The frightening Nazi ideology of genetic purity extended even to the non-human species, as seen through Heck's experiments. The anti-Semitism and ethnic purity extended to aspirations about reviving a pristine environment with all the species in their primitive form. In the film, Lutz Heck gets the duty to operate the zoo and do his experiments on bison to revive aurochs.

Though many animals tragically perished in the zoo liquidation process as a consequence of occupation during the war, Zabinskis decide to keep the zoo in operation and save it from closing down. They plan to continue the functioning, with the inner motive to protect the victims. This risky plan to shelter the Jews while being right under Nazi surveillance, threatening their own life and that of their children to protect humanity by confronting the Nazi menace of ethnic cleansing, made their life story eternal. It was a difficult time when anyone would be shot for helping a Jew even by giving a glass of water, as stated by Jan in a scene.

Caro plots Lutz's infatuation towards Antonina to fill the gaps in the real story of Zabinski family. They convert the zoo to a pig farm with the permission of Lutz, and cleverly receive a pass to the ghetto in the name of collecting garbage of the Jews as the feed for pigs, ironically to be slaughtered to feed the Nazi soldiers. The rest of the film is set in multiple spaces: the eclectic villa of Zabinskis within the zoo, its basement with many cages and wild animals becomes refuge for many victims, the tunnels that acted as passages to escape the Nazi predators, the zoo itself that turned to become a pig farm to hide the victims in plain sight until safe houses were found, the Warsaw ghetto and Lutz's office.

Initially, Antonina and Jan planned to protect their friend Magda and later helped the Underground Army by sneaking out many Jews from the ghetto. The zoo became a station of refuge until they were transported to a safer place. The victims hid in the basement of their villa, tunnels and abandoned cages in the zoo. Antonina metaphorically calls it a "Human Zoo" in the film (00:35:17).

The film shows Jan and Rysz entering the Warsaw Ghetto to collect the food waste for the pigs in the farm. His act of secretly passing over the pig meat to his friends in the ghetto, who gladly accept it for their survival, though it is forbidden in their religion, is a shocking fact. He hides people in the pig feed and smuggles them out. One among the distressing scenes is the circumstances of Jan meeting a teenage girl Ursula and the way she is taken out from the camp. Antonina empathises with Ursula who is mentally shattered and traumatised. She nurtures her, gifts a rabbit, and brings her back to normal life. Ursula's initial resistance to speak out of fear ends when she is accompanied by many more children and elders who too were victims of the Nazis.

Antonina worked together with Jan while being in the zoo with a house full of distressed Jewish victims by risking her life. She made sure that her guests felt comfortable while at her home (another confined space, more comfortable than the caged existence in the Warsaw ghetto). She requested them to sleep, train themselves to be silent and not wriggle or move around in the mornings until they hear Antonina play a melody on her piano at midnight when the army patrol leaves and they are safe to come out. Antonina used her talent of playing piano to even signal the victims of danger and remind them to hide. She even played an important role in transporting the Jews to safer places. In a scene, before transporting two women, Antonina bleached the women's black hair blond to fake their identities and reduce risk. Racist ideologies of Nazis and other Hitler supporters believed that those with blond hair and blue eyes were the superior race. Such homogenised notions of identity, culture and racial purity were successfully perpetuated among the non-Jewish population. Ackerman in her book states,

. . . many Germans and Poles, too, assumed all blonds came from Scandinavian stock and all Jews had dark hair. This fallacy endured, even when jokes circulated about Hitler's non-Aryan mustache and dark hair. From photographs and a comment of Jan's, one learns that, at some point, Antonina had bleached her own brown hair, but that only meant lightening it several shades, not transforming it from shadow-black to citrine, and so she consulted a barber friend who gave her bottles of pure peroxide and a recipe. She needed a recipe because, as Emanuel Ringelblum emphasised, in practice, it turned out that platinum blondes gave rise to more suspicion than brunettes. (184)

After a few scenes, it is seen that in April 1943 the two women whom Antonina and Jan had helped to escape are discovered and executed. In reality too, two Jews, Rosa Anzelowna and her mother were killed among the Jews and Partisans who were transported by Antonina and Jan.

Another disturbing scene is from 5th August 1942 when the Germans begin transporting Jews to the death camps. Parekh brings out the tension in the scene through a montage of close-up shots in which the audience sees the hands of the imprisoned people handing over their suitcases, boot steps of the Nazi officers, baggage and suitcases piled up, children getting into the containers, police dogs walking and officers pushing and ushering people through the station. The close-up shots are followed by an instance in the station in which Jan runs to Janusz Korczak, head of the Jewish children's orphanage, telling him to escape with Jan. But he refuses and wishes not to leave his children. The most heart-rending scene is the one in which the innocent orphan children readily raise their hands to Jan who has no choice but load them into the boxcar of the train leading to the death camp. Back in the zoo, the information about the liquidation of the ghetto is heard from the radio around which Antonina, Rys, Ursula and other refugees sat. The burning of the ghetto is sensed by Antonina and Rys when they see the floating ashes scattered in the air. The inmates offer a Seder for those who are going to be dead. This scene is a montage of shots portraying burning of Jewish families' luggage that were left at the station, the setting on fire of Jewish ghettos, the prayer song of the refugees in Antonina's Zoo, and the cries of the dying.

Meanwhile, Lutz Heck who is infatuated with Antonina works like a dramatic foil character to Jan in the movie. Caro spends many scenes to complicate

their relationship, create a rift between Jan and Antonina and finally resolve it. Towards the end of the movie, Lutz Heck becomes suspicious about Rys's behaviour. Heck finds Rys with his father near the bakery where the Underground Army worked to stamp papers and passes for the prisoners who were rescued from the ghetto to send them safely. Heck burns down the bakery and goes to question Rys and forces him to wear the Hitler's badge. Rys reacts to it shouting "*Hitler ist Kaput*" (01:34:41-43), to which the soldiers raise their guns, but Heck commands them to leave. Heck is portrayed by Caro as a complex character who is both a terrorizing homicidal maniac as well as a softspoken affectionate person. He nurtures favourable breeds of animals while also killing different creatures at random. Although he has special feelings towards Antonina, he once tried to rape her, revealing his cruel side. Towards the end of the film, he spares Rys from his bullets after mentally torturing him and his mother. Caro merges multiple characters into Lutz Heck, making him an embodiment of Hitler's Nazi officers.

During this period of crisis, Antonina gives birth to their daughter and at the same time Jan joins the Warsaw Uprising and he is shot and captured, assumed to be dead. The next time period shown in the film is January 1945 when the Soviet troops forced the Germans to retreat. As the evacuation of Warsaw begins in the background, Antonina dresses herself to impress Heck as she knows that he would know about her husband. Heck, recognising her deceit, tries to rape her, but finally she confesses that she finds him disgusting. Heck rushes to the zoo out of fury, from where the refugees had already been shifted. He discovers the artworks on the wall, stars of David in the basement, drawings of families in the form of animals, and Antonina is drawn as a mouse playing the piano. Out of rage, Heck locks Antonina

and terrorises her by dragging Rys out of her sight, blows a bullet pretending to kill Rys and leaves the zoo. Rys returns to Antonina who is paralysed with grief. They join the people who are marching out of Warsaw taking with them a rabbit and the bison that Heck had produced through his experiments. They set free the bison in a forest. The next scene opens showing the long expanse of ruined Warsaw and the camera zooms out to show people working hard to remove the debris and rebuild their place. The camera switches to the location of the zoo where Antonina and her children return to their home, to repair and restore it with their loyal zookeeper Jerzyk who plays the role of a father like figure (supportive and emotionally balanced) throughout the movie. The climax shows their life back to normal. Jan, who was assumed to be dead, reunites with his family after surviving a prison camp.

The film ends with a scene where the Zabinski family members along with their friends Magda and Maurcy paint stars of David on all the walls and cages of the zoo. The final choker shot of Antonina drawing a star end showing the postscript that all the refugees except two survived. Hence the film ends with a ray of hope for humanity. Two decades later, Antonina and Jan Zabinski were recognised as 'Righteous Among the Nations' by Yad Vashem (The World Holocaust Remembrance Centre) in Israel as an honour for their bravery and compassion in the time of crisis.

This incredible true story of Jan and Antonina Zabinski's bravery has been carried over to the present generation through their memoir, a novel, documentaries, and the mainstream film industry. Each form of representation had its own focus and function in the society. Niki Caro's re-narrativisation of the book *The Zookeeper's Wife* has played a key role in memorialising Warsaw Zoo which was a hiding place

for around three hundred Jews in Poland. The film focuses on Antonina's character, which begins by portraying her as a vulnerable being, turning to become a strong character, implacably determined to save the desperate group of people. The film throws light on the dangers of cultural homogenisation.

Antonina's character and Warsaw Zoo are examples of 'site of memory'. They are reinvested through different genre and time period. The space created at different times, through repetitive engagement makes apparent the performativity of the Holocaust memories. These performative memories are the last remembered version of the actuality. The Hollywoodised version of *The Zookeeper's Wife* is one among the recently remembered re-narrativisations of Zabinski couple's heroism, which is exploited and fictionalised to fit into the frame of a conventional triangle love drama for mass consumption and to meet the logics of capital accumulation.

In this imaginative reproduction, Antonina is characterised as a vulnerable person throughout the film except for the act of courage and resistance in the climax. Caro could not highlight the fact that Antonina was an epitome of courage, who never submitted herself to the Nazis (as seen in the film in which Lutz meets her often and she, having no choice, accepts his abuse and satisfies his pleasure) or fell for any kind of persuasions. In fact, Ackerman had stated in her book that both Antonina and Jan kept "a small dose of cyanide with them at all times, so that they will never confess their secret mission in front of the Nazis" (219). The second fictional element is the characterisation of Lutz Heck who is portrayed as an ambivalent character, as a zoophilist and a homicidal maniac. He is a typical Nazi officer who readily does his job though struck by his moral consciousness at different instances. His intelligence simultaneously supports breeding to bring back

extinct species, and genocide to exterminate existing species; both of these were done to achieve ethnic cleansing and racial purity. In many newspaper reviews, the film was criticised for the characterisation of Lutz Heck and the major role that Daniel Bruhl had performed, which diverted the focus of the audience from a film addressing the Holocaust to one foregrounding an unnecessary infatuation making the film a love drama (in which Antonina flirts with him to earn his trust) for the young audience, rather than a serious deliberation on the bravery and courage during the period of crises. The film is further charged with intense conversations between Jan and Antonina criticising her for her behaviour to Lutz and comparing their roles in the act of rescue of victims. In reality, though Lutz Heck and Zabinski family had a friendship and hoped Lutz to help them, according to Ackerman's version of the events, Lutz stole the exotic animals to the Berlin Zoo and later he fled when the zoo became a pig farm. This means that unlike the movie, there was no role for Lutz to decide the Zabinski family's fate during the Holocaust.

One of the most interesting fictional elements in the film is the drawings that the refugees had done on the walls of the basement of Zabinski's villa. Caro and Chastine had told in many interviews that this was absolutely a product of imagination. Through those drawings Caro tried to compartmentalise the victim and perpetrator identities as good and evil respectively, leaving unaddressed grey zones or the complexities in human nature. The wall art reminds of the Pulitzer Prize winning graphic novel (also called as a memoir) by the cartoonist Art Spiegelman named *Maus*, which was initially serialised from 1980 to 1991 and later published as a book. It narrates the story of Spiegelman's father who was a Polish Jew and a survivor of the Holocaust. The non-fiction designed in the form of an interview, uses

the postmodern narrative technique of confronting the unspeakable through art. Spiegelman represented humans through animals: Jews as mice, Germans as cats, Poles as pigs, Americans as dogs, the British as fish, the French as frogs and so on. In the similar manner, the wall art done by Ursula and other refugees in the basement of Antonina's villa, depicted humans in the form of mice, foxes, horses, giraffes, dogs and so on.

One of the most striking images is that of a mouse sitting and playing piano, which resembles Antonina, denoting that she belonged to the good category or the mice family that represented the refugees. This image carries the potential to expose multilayered meanings. Firstly, it directly alludes to the term Antonina uses in the film, 'the human zoo', in which the rescued Jews had to live in the cages from which many animals were cleared. In the basement, the humans had to coexist with a few more animals which were protected by Antonina. Secondly, it reminds of how Nazis dehumanised and demonised the imprisoned by calling them disease spreading rats or parasitic vermins. The Nazi propagandists were aware that it would be difficult to persuade the gentiles to support the racial fanaticism unless the Jews were portrayed as subhumans. Thirdly, the depiction of Antonina as a mouse implies either herself to be a moral captive struggling to escape the madness of Nazism or as a symbol of goodness in the minds of the refugees who are also portrayed as mice. The picture, ironically and unwittingly depicts the way in which the character Antonina is represented in the film when compared to the brave woman Antonina who can be found in her memoir and Ackerman's book. Though the film consisted of a crew with many women and *The New Republic* announced the film as the first feminist Holocaust film, it presents Antonina with feminine features and her shyness. She is

portrayed as inferior and confused with her motives when compared to Jan. Jessica Chastine's attempt to gradually mould Antonina's character from a soft and meek woman to a headstrong rescuer is interesting. In reality, Ackerman's writing does not infer her to be shy, but as a radically compassionate wilful woman whose support was inevitable for Jan in a period when humanity or respect for lives could be a punishable crime leading to the death of them and their children. Another noticeable gender question in both Ackerman's and Caro's version of Antonina's memoir is regarding the social label. Though both the non-fiction book and film centre on Antonina's character, these are titled as *The Zookeeper's Wife* (as if she is a minor character) instead of focusing on the name Antonina (as in the Brazilian film *Olga* or the American movie *The Courageous Heart of Irena Sendler*). The life of Antonina is an example of compassionate heroism. In a discussion organised by United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Jessica Chastain stated, "I don't think we celebrate enough in cinema or history, where she used compassion as her weapon against hate and violence" (00:18:20 -33).

Caro's attempt to bring the audience into the chronotope of the Holocaust through her film's setting and music is noteworthy. The movie oscillates between dark and light locations, a usual camera technique to emphasise deeper emotions and meanings. Unlike the usual symbolisations of darkness to convey negativity (evil, death or hopelessness), the dark space in the movie, the basement of Zabinski's villa provides a sense of hope, human perseverance, indomitable spirit and resilience. As in many other films like *The Book Thief* and *Jojo Rabbit*, the basement in *The Zookeeper's Wife* too propagates the value of humanity beyond power and politics. On the other hand, the well-lit scenes and spaces in the movie represent terror and

fear for all haunted identities including Jews. These scenes oscillate between the zoo and the ghetto, both creating disquiets in the viewers. One example, among the many already discussed, is the scene in which a woman stands in front of the ghetto—overpopulated with distressed victims—and poses for a picture, distinguishing herself as a gentile in contrast to the victims behind the barbed fence. This showed the extent to which the minds of the common people were negatively influenced by ethnic or racial discrimination during the Holocaust.

The subtle musical scores that run throughout the movie, by the composer Harry Gregson Williams enhanced the smooth movement of the storyline and had a powerful impact on the psyche of the audience. Every bit of human emotion expressed in the film is accompanied by a score of music, for example the scores played when Yan and Antonina plan to rescue the captured, the moment of Heck's realisation, signals given by Antonina to the people in the basement by playing piano, the seder song while the ghetto is being burned and so on. The background score or music conveyed the emotional dilemma of the actors, and aided the transition from one scene to another.

Though the film does not take a nuanced understanding of the complexity of the identity crisis that many other films like Agnieszka Holland's *In Darkness*(2011) and John Kent's biopic *The Courageous Heart of Irena Sendler* (2009) addressed, it is relevant for discussing Hitler's racial fanaticism or the identity hunt that did not restrict to humans but to all the species, dangerously close to an evolution, through eugenics and selective back breeding which have not been explored by Holocaust films. Zabinskis' radical acts of compassion helped them to face the challenges with enthusiasm and grace, even during the time when the dominating power tried to

change the course of humanity. The film received larger acclaim when compared to *The Grey Zone* discussed earlier. It was awarded the “Truly Moving Picture Award” in 2016 at Heartland Film Festival held in Indiana and in 2017 it received an award in the Human Rights category from the Political Film Society, USA.

The Grey Zone and *The Zookeeper’s Wife* discussed above are two among the best visual expressions of ‘postmemories’, a term coined by Marianne Hirsch. The Nobel Peace Prize winner and Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel stated in her Nobel Prize acceptance speech at the legacy of Holocaust survivors conference, “Whoever listens to a witness, becomes a witness”. Postmemory can be described as a relationship that the present generation bears with the traces of the personal, collective or cultural traumatic experiences of the earlier generation passed over to them. This relation is formed when the younger generation of the contemporary period internalises the anecdotes, pictures, photos, stories or behaviours of their victimised precursors, among whom they grew. This memory of the past fills the social, cultural and emotional milieu of the current generation who have not directly experienced the event, but will leave an indelible impression on their psyche and mould their later perceptions. The term was first used by Hirsch in an article on Art Spiegelman’s *Maus* in the 1990s.

Through the two films discussed above, it can be understood that the postmemory of Holocaust, also helps to bring to light the rhizomatic identities subdued by the grand narratives of the Holocaust memory by working through the already existing memories, which in turn has multiple functions within the present society. In an interview done by *Columbia University Press*, Hirsch opined,

Postmemory synthesises and constitute memories in their own right. As I see

it, the connection to the past that I define as postmemory is mediated not by recall but by imaginative investment, projection, and creation. To grow up with overwhelming inherited memories, to be dominated by narratives that preceded one's birth or one's consciousness, is to risk having one's own life stories displaced, even evacuated, by our ancestors. It is to be shaped, however indirectly, by traumatic fragments of events that still defy narrative reconstruction and exceed comprehension. These events happened in the past, but their effects continue into the present. . . I've been trying to define and refine it, on the basis of personal experience and my reading and viewing of the work of writers and artists of what we might think of as the "postgenerations".

Therefore, it can be understood that the Holocaust represented through the postmillennial films (conscious remembering or the last remembered versions of the event which consists of multiple truths) are expressions of postmemories which paradoxically have the strength to shape the future of the past, through the interpretations of these visual mediums like film which is quite uncontrollable and unabating. Therefore, the present generation (who have better social mobility) which also includes the Z generation who are well informed and has access to the plethora of floating information on the internet and other digital technologies, shape their life by interpreting history that they might have not lived in. Hirsch in the interview observes the future to be "comparative and connective, it is dominated by new media and new strategies of memorialisation. . . the Holocaust is one event in a global space of remembrance that looks towards a future that will know the past deeply but that will not be paralysed by its darkneses".

It is pertinent to look at some of the survivor experiences before going on to the next section of this chapter. It would be essential to this thesis to quote a few things that the survivors learned from their experiences during the Holocaust. Primo Levi stated in his book *The Reawakening*, “Monsters exist, but they are too few in number to be truly dangerous. More dangerous are the common men, the functionaries ready to believe and to act without asking questions” (228).

Israeli educational psychologist Haim Ginott, in the epilogue of his book *Teacher and Child* includes an excerpt from a letter written by a Holocaust survivor to the educators,

Dear Teacher,

I am a survivor of a concentration camp. My eyes saw what no man should witness: Gas chambers built by learned engineers. Children poisoned by educated physicians. Infants killed by trained nurses. Women and babies shot and burned by high school and college graduates. So, I am suspicious of education.

My request is: Help your students become human. Your efforts must never produce learned monsters, skilled psychopaths, educated Eichmanns.

Reading, writing, arithmetic is important only if they serve to make our children more humane. (121)

A quote on the role of education which has been retold by many Holocaust survivors like Sol Noyman and many others, “Education is not memorialising that Hitler killed six million Jews. Education is understanding that how millions of Ordinary Germans were convinced that it was required. Education is learning how to spot the signs of history repeating itself”. He repeated it recently in 2021 while

addressing the University of Guelph community, during the Holocaust education week, Nayman added to the above statement, “Rather, it is understanding how one person can start a hate movement with just words, how millions of ordinary German citizens were convinced that hatred was standard, and how countless nations and millions of people were indifferent bystanders” (Kopsaftis, “Holocaust Survivor” 3).

Elie Wiesel, in his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech on Dec. 10, 1986 stated,

We must always take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented. Sometimes we must interfere. When human lives are endangered, when human dignity is in jeopardy, national borders and sensitivities become irrelevant. Wherever men or women are persecuted because of their race, religion, or political views, that place must—at that moment—become the centre of the universe. . . . Action is the only remedy to indifference: the most insidious danger of all.

A Holocaust survivor Marian Turski, in his speech delivered to a gathering to commemorate the anniversary of the camp’s liberation on January 27, 2020 expressed, “Don’t be indifferent when you witness historical lies. . . Don’t be indifferent when the past is manipulated for the sake of current political interests. Don’t be indifferent when any minority is discriminated against” (Berendt, “At Auschwitz”). The given impressions of the Holocaust survivors are the transitional points or outlooks from where the second section of this chapter is to be read. The post millennium Holocaust film industry has been prolifically experimenting with diverse themes which absorb the essences of the multidirectional experiences of the event.

These films are expression of post memories which address multiple ethnic, social, cultural, and political identities by working through the memory of the past event while remaining in the present. Whereas the Post Millennium films addressing Nakba, which could be metaphorically called, the Holocaust in Palestine, highlight the consequences of Nakba in the present generation rather than just nostalgically revisiting the event.

Though there are many Holocaust films set in the present, the young generation who are not the direct victims of the event can approach their ancestral past only through a fancy revisit using magic realistic techniques or a dream like supernatural experience that transports them back to Nazi concentration camps, ghettos or occupied lands in the 1930s and 1940s as in the films like *The Devil's Arithmetic* (1999). Whereas, the post millennium Nakba films expose the day-to-day challenges that the present generation face under occupation. Unlike the Holocaust, Nakba is still an ongoing event, a continuous systemic genocide.

When addressing the identity of Holocaust victims in the post millennium movies, it is a process of disentangling and recognising the multiple repressed identities within the collective memory of the event. It is done by dealing with the memory and perceptions of the Holocaust survivors and the offsprings of the perished (the indirect victims). The present generation become aware and is affected by the exercise of recollecting the nostalgic past.

In the case of Nakba films of the post millennium, they try to communicate the dynamicity of the entangled ethnic, religious, social, cultural, and political identities of Israelites and Palestinians which are also continuously under construction within the multicultural and political context of current Israel and

Palestine. Addressing their identity through films is a process of representation done by living through the memory of an event which is continuing.

This section, looks at the overlapping collective identities of Palestinians and Israelites from three perspectives: ethno-religious, social-political and cultural. A Palestinian's or an Israelite's individual identity is an amalgam of these collective identities. The Palestinians, as discussed earlier are the native Arab population of the Palestine region which includes the present State of Israel and the annexed areas. Israelites are the citizens of the State of Israel which was formed on 14th May 1948. These two overlapping definitions will perhaps be the oversimplified descriptions of who actually the Palestinians and Israelites are. Palestinians and Israelites are basically rooted in Semitic culture whose identities are dynamically constructed and deconstructed to an extent that it is an unsettling and unabating process in the present.

The Holocaust rescuer Antonina Zabinski's observation (noted by Ackerman in the book *The Zookeeper's Wife*) can be applied in the context of Nakba: "Not long ago the world looked on the dark ages with contempt for its brutality, yet here it is again, in full force, a lawless sadism unpolished by all the charms of religion and civilisation" (87). The legalised and illegal occupation of the Palestinian region by the recently formed Israeli government in the name of establishing a Jewish state or reconquering the Promised Land has tattered the identities of many inhabitants of Palestine living within and outside the geographical boundary. As mentioned in the earlier chapter, when looking into the power dynamics of Palestine/Israel, Israel has a fully functioning government and externally funded military program when compared to the Palestinian security force under PLO. Though Palestine is a

recognised state, presently it is under the de facto governance of Israel. When many people interpret the Palestine/ Israel issue as a conflict, there are many people who understand it as systemic ethnic cleansing, apartheid or racial discrimination instilled to swipe away certain identities and homogenise others.

In terms of the ethno-religious aspect of the Palestinian community, (who perceive themselves as the offspring of natives in the Palestinian region before the formation of Israel) consists of Palestinian Arab Muslims (mostly Sunnis and Salafis), Palestinian Arab Jews (presently called as the Oriental Jews), Palestinian Arab Christians (who are called Nazerene, as they are from Nazareth), Palestinian Druze (a branch developed out of Shia Islam) and the Samaritans (an Abrahamic ethno-religious group who originate from the ancient Jews but differ in certain beliefs, presently they reside on their sacred mountains between Palestine's West Bank and State of Israel, and their national identity is ambiguous).

The formation of Israel led to the arrival and recognition of many more ethno-religious communities like the Israeli Jews (those who reside in the modern State of Israel), who themselves are divided into Ashkenazi (the descendants of Jews from France, Germany and Eastern Europe, who migrated to the State of Israel after its formation), Mizrahi (the descendants of Middle Eastern Jewish communities from West Asia and North Africa, who remained in the Land of Israel since the ancient times) and Sephardim (the descendants of Jews from Spain and Portugal). Apart from the Jewish community, the Israeli population also include Israeli Druze and Arab Muslims who are legally citizens of Israel (they are the people who did not flee Palestine during Nakba; they remained in their homeland). The Muslims in Israel belong to two minority groups: Ahmadiyya and Bedouin (they even serve and participate in the Israeli army).

The Palestinians and Israelites are further numerously divided in terms of their socio-political identities. Politically, the people within different communities label each other as supporters, resisters, collaborators and traitors with respect to their political affiliation. Socially they are stigmatised as victims, perpetrators, exiles, migrants, immigrants, refugees, internally displaced, illegal or legal settlers and the diaspora.

In terms of the cultural aspect, the Pew Research Centre that published a report in March 2016 titled *Israel's Religiously Divided Society* found in their survey that the Israeli Jews self-identify them as one among the four subgroups: Haredi (ultra-Orthodox), Dati (religious), Masorti (traditional) and Hiloni (secular). This difference in religious conventionality is applicable to other religious communities too in present Palestine. Within the Jewish State some people identify Jewishness as a part of religion and another group believes it to be ethnic and cultural. There are people in all the communities of Palestine and Israel who believe that government should promote religious values and law alongside the government policies: enshrine Halakah for the Jewish state, Sharia as official law for Muslims and Laws in the Bible for the Christians. A substantial portion of the population believe that religion should be separated from the government policies. According to the report,

Israeli Arabs are highly skeptical about the sincerity of the Israeli government in seeking a peace agreement, while Israeli Jews are equally skeptical about the sincerity of Palestinian leaders. But there is plenty of distrust to go around: Fully 40% of Israeli Jews say their own government is not making a sincere effort toward peace, and an equal share of Israeli Arabs

say the same about Palestinian leaders. Israel's major religious groups also are isolated from one another socially. The vast majority of Jews (98%), Muslims (85%), Christians (86%) and Druze (83%) say all or most of their close friends belong to their own religious community.

Separatism, segregation and seclusion imposed by the authorities and other resistance groups both Israeli and Palestinian, have assimilated into the cultural and social practice of the civilians (due to their limited choices) in the present, unlike the situation of social integration which was there during the pre-Nakba period in the land of Palestine. This overlapping and conflicting process of rhizomatic identity constructions and recognitions of Palestinians and Israelites have made it difficult for the current generation to come to terms with the political instability of the present times. These identity crises of the present merge with collective or individual memory of the past, forming the two parallel national identities of Israel and Palestine.

Memory plays a crucial role in the existence of Palestine and Israel as nation states in two distinct ways. In the present, Palestine relies on the memory of pre-Nakba Palestine and strengthens it and addresses it through the means of art and social media even while the geographical area and their historical traces are being erased by the governing authority Israel as part of their Nation's expansion, which is in a way, occupation and torture for the Palestinians. They embrace memory to resist the erasure of their culture, land and identity from the erroneous argument that Palestine never existed. On the other hand, Israelites embrace and continuously evoke Holocaust memory and the notion of the Promised Land not only for their existence as a nation but also for their expansion. Hence the recently formed State of Israel which is in its phase of expansion, and Land of Palestine which is

continuously facing reduction of land, both exist on the floating foundation-memory, which is continuously prone to reconstruction and fabrication.

The post millennium generation, rather than fixing themselves in the past, tries to address the incommunicable situation of the two entwined 'imagined communities' (Benedict Anderson) that exist within the Nation-State or share the national identity while remaining outside the country either as diaspora or refugee, through the means of media spaces and public spaces. In the post millennium, the cultural practices and protests by the young generation (belonging to both sides), challenge, the already existing identity norms and address the identity crisis of the Israeli and Palestinian people (who either have limited freedom of choice or remain blind to the present condition). Their fearless resistance is either direct or through social networking. They use art forms to convey their present condition to the world.

The advent of digital media has made society uncontrollable even while inflicting physical torture and extending boundaries by the government. Digital media has significantly expanded the scope for the freedom of speech and expression, making it increasingly difficult for authorities to control societal discourse and international solidarity towards the oppressed society. Despite the Israeli government's occupation and physical torture, the civilians are resisting the oppression by opposing manipulated mainstream media contents, unveiling the actual horrors happening in the current war zone and finding ways to circumvent surveillance. In the recent years, social networking media like *Facebook*, *Instagram*, *Twitter* and many others, and digital media like films or documentaries have become crucial platforms for representing the present condition of Israel/ Palestine even after multiple attempts of subjugating and silencing the voice of the residents by the

authorities. Some of the examples are the growing grassroots movements and resistance by the young generation of Palestine and around the world, who reacted against the Gaza, Al Aqsa Mosque, Sheikh Jarrah, Silwan neighbourhood attacks, and strongly stands for Palestine and demands freedom even in the 2023 genocide. The media called them 'Generation Z'. They are the generation reaching their adulthood in the second decade of the twenty first century, who are familiar with social networking since their childhood. The Israeli government was shaken by the fearless faces of Palestine. The social media brimmed with titles like "Generation Z will free Palestine" (*Al Jazeera*), "Gen Z Reclaims the Palestinian Cause" (*Foreign Policy*), and "Palestine's Generation Z nullifying Israeli narratives" (*Arab News*), mostly pro-Palestinian and a few against this generation's deeds.

As discussed in the earlier chapter, film is a space that can merge both media and public space to form a heterotopia. It is a crucial means employed by the Palestinians and Israelites to represent the diverse identities mentioned in this chapter, artistically to the world, by crossing the boundaries of surveillance and subjugation. The Palestinian and Israeli films of the twentieth century played a crucial role in transmitting Palestinian and Israeli identities defined by their past, opposing ideologies and definitions of nationhood to the world. On the other hand, the films of the twenty first century, rather than being stuck in nostalgia of the past, sketch the range of emotions among the Israelites and Palestinians of the present as well. It discusses the complexity of identity and its fragmented nature, broad scepticism, eroding respect for those in power, and the young generation's despairs and hopes. This section of the chapter interprets these entanglements between memory and identity in detail through the two films *Omar* and *3000 Nights*.

Oscar nominated film *Omar* by the Palestinian Dutch film maker born in Israel, Hany Abu Assad traces the tides of conflicting emotions in the life of young Palestinians of the present who live in the midst of occupation. It is set on both sides of the Separation Wall showing the lives of people territorially divided but emotionally alike. The film centres around the life of Omar (starred by Adam Bakri), a baker on the Palestinian side of the Separation Wall, who illegally climbs the wall to meet his lover Nadia (Leem Lubany), and his childhood friends Tarek (as Nadia's brother, acted by Eyad Hourani) and Amjad (Samer Bisharat) on the other side of the wall (Palestine illegally occupied by the Israel government during the process of construction of the Separation Wall). It begins with the close-up shot of Omar's face to set the perspective, then shifts to a long shot of him standing by the side of the wall to climb over it when the street is free. As he is about to get down to the other side, a gunshot is heard, probably by the guards watching from the checkpoints to stop the trespassers. He runs through a lane to meet his friends who were separated from him when the wall was erected in 2002 claiming Israel's security. This initial scene sets the socio-political tone of the film that depicts the present condition of Palestine/Israel after the Nakba or Israeli Independence, through the long shot showing the Separation Wall inscribed with graffiti.

Omar continues to show the resistance movements of the Palestinian civil population as part of their freedom struggle, the act which is recognised by the Israeli governing body as treason. The three youngsters Omar, Tarek and Amjad practise shooting and attacking soldiers. These characters represent Palestine and its freedom fighters who refuse to withdraw despite its weakening army and dwindling resources. On the other hand, the film also shows how the youngsters in the Israeli

army bully the Palestinians thinking themselves to be more powerful and superior than their neighbours. In Laurel Holliday's *Children of Israel, Children of Palestine* she writes in its introduction,

Whether they call it Israel or Palestine, the two ethnically and culturally distinct peoples – both Palestinians and Israeli Jews – lay claim to the very same sand, stone, rivers, vegetation, seacoast and mountains. . . Israeli and Palestinian children grow up feeling that they are destined for conflict with their neighbours. (xv)

Holliday is a versatile writer who has curated numerous stories in her *Children of Conflict* series, which also includes *Children in the Holocaust and World War II* portraying harrowing pictures of genocides and systemic violence.

In *Omar*, the characters' day-to-day life and their entertainment activities show the dreary and tedious plight of the young Palestinians under unending occupation. The plot depicting the multigenerational trauma of the Palestinian community is intertwined with a triangle love between Omar, Nadia and Amjad. The film also depicts the way young military squads beat and harass the Palestinians and place them at the tip of death anxiety, every time they are caught. This can be seen in an instance when Omar is caught by the Israeli patrol while he is returning after meeting Nadia. The abusive soldiers punch his nose and force to obey them. As a result of this humiliation, Omar decides to expedite their mission to attack the Israeli soldiers. In the later scene, the three shoot a soldier at a checkpoint after informing the brigade to which they belong. Tarek plans the attack; Omar steals a car for their mission and Amjad acts as the sniper. Their life moves on and Omar decides to speak to Tarek of his wish to marry Nadia. Later he crosses the wall to meet Nadia.

The conversation between Omar and Nadia that follows epitomises the real-life conditions and the multidirectional aspirations of the present youngsters of Palestine.

Omar: I decided I'll talk to Tarek today.

Nadia: Where will you take me on honeymoon? Omar: Mozambique?

Nadia: Why not Bangladesh?

Omar: They have enough disasters; they don't need a new one. Nadia: Be serious!

Omar: Now you want me to be serious? I thought school meant no honeymoon. Nadia: What's school got to do with it?

Omar: OK, how about Paris, then? Nadia: I've never been to Paris.

Omar: Have you ever been outside this hole? Nadia: To Hebron...

Omar: well, that's like Paris.

Nadia: Have you ever been outside this hole? Omar: I don't need to, I have you.

Nadia: Are you making fun of me? Omar: Never. (00:19:00-42)

In this scene, Omar and Nadia refer to Palestine/ Israel as a “hole”. It is the geographical region to which they are stuck for years psychologically, weighed down by the memory of genocide and land occupation. Their identities are constructed with respect to the social, political and ethnic confinements created by present Israel/ Palestine. Though the new generation endure the traumatic memory of the past, their aspirations are different. The Palestinian Israeli author Emile Habibi calls this psycho-philosophical concept as ‘pessoptimism’, an amalgam of despair and hope. In the above conversation, Nadia wishes to get out of the “hole”

Palestine for their honeymoon whereas Omar is contented to remain in his native land Palestine, with his beloved, even after multiple tortures by the ruling government. Their optimism is their never weakening aspirations and hope for a better future even while going through the traumatic present conditions. One similar conversation on Nadia's wish to migrate and Omar's wish to remain in Palestine is depicted in a scene when Omar shows Nadia their new house. In the instance when Nadia stamps an insect deliberately to kill it,

Omar: Poor guy, you could've let him live and just sent an eviction notice.

What do you think? (of their new home)

Nadia: I dream of leaving this place. Haven't you thought about that? Omar:

Nadia, I'm doing my best.

Nadia: I know, I know, I just. . . I'm ready to live with you anywhere. Even on Mars.

Omar: Mars is too far. Let's stay here.

Nadia: It doesn't matter where. I just want to be with you.

(00:45:29- 00:46:07)

This scene, which discusses the Israeli government granting permission to live while simultaneously threatening to evict residents, laughs at the Israeli government's policy of eviction of Palestinians.

Freedom is defined in multiple ways by the youngsters in this film representing the new generation of Palestinians who are living through the event Nakba, as the after effects of the event are not yet over. To live in freedom is to remove the shackles of identity of a person from the contested land Palestine/ Israel and move to a foreign land for Nadia. For Omar and Tarek, freedom means

embracing their identity as Palestinians and reclaiming their land and culture. For Amjad freedom in his present condition is to enjoy the momentary pleasures and go to any extent of fabrication and treachery to attain happiness. Many youngsters define themselves as freedom fighters who plan ambushes, mass strikes, attacks and secret missions; some of them wish to merely end each day peacefully without experiencing the tortures of the authorities; some of them willingly or forcefully collaborate with the persecutors; some of them support and involve in civil disobedience and boycotting products and some of them wish to coexist.

The next part of the film shows another side of the Palestinian freedom fighters who get caught in the trap of authorities. The frustrated Israeli authorities chase the three friends involved in the killing of the Israeli soldier, and Omar gets caught while Tarek and Amjad escape. Even after continuous torture for several days, he does not confess the identity of the shooter. Finally, Omar is tricked by an Israeli agent named Rami (starred by Waleed Zuaiter), yet another vital character of this film, disguised as Hassan Ismael from Al Aqsa brigade.

When the disguised Israeli officer Rami tries to extract the truth from Omar through treachery, Omar utters after a long silence, "I will never confess" (00:31:20-21). With this statement he falls into the trap of authorities as it becomes a confession to the Israeli judges. The character Rami disguised as Ismael clearly explains the life of a collaborator through his dialogue, "If you do confess, they will break your will, make you dependent, and turn you into a collaborator. So watch it. Never become a collaborator. There's no turning back, no way out, and no end to it" (00:31:00-06). This is a paradoxical instance in which Rami uses this explanation to prompt Omar to speak, worsening his condition by forcing him to become an

informant of Israel government, who will be defined as a collaborator or traitor by the Palestinians. Omar is forced to choose between his life and his friends. Rami suspects Tarek though Amjad was the one who shot the soldier. Omar is released from the jail in exchange for admitting to help Rami trace Tarek. Hence Omar is doomed and is tricked into incriminating himself; his right to self-determination is shattered.

Omar's release spreads the rumour of him to be a collaborator and the freedom fighter Omar is stigmatised as a traitor by the Palestinian community. He meets Tarek and Amjad. Tarek states that there is a traitor among them who ruined the plan. In between, Omar talks to Tarek of his wish to marry Nadia, which Tarek happily accepts. They plan an ambush which fails and Omar is rearrested and tortured. A scene shows the other prisoners in the jail calling him a traitor and attacking him. This is the situation that shows the existential crisis of a Palestinian who is forced to become a collaborator but struggles with the dilemma of his national consciousness and personal well-being. At this point, Omar is expelled from both the identities: from being a determined freedom fighter and from being an informant as he is called a liar by Rami for planning an ambush against the government.

The director includes a scene in which Omar engages in a light conversation with Rami. When Omar hears the telephone conversation between Rami, his wife and mom, Rami states, "I'm at work, in the middle of the West Bank" (01:01:30-33). Many films discussing Israel/ Palestinian issue, include characters like Rami who are stuck with their duties in the Palestinian areas, and highlight that they are not willingly doing their job. Through such scenes, the directors try to show the personal

dissatisfaction and disgust of Israeli characters who are forced to do the duties entrusted on them by the government.

In the next part of the film, Omar is given a second chance by Rami. This time an electronic surveillance machine is attached to Omar's leg, doubting if he would dodge the duty of an informant. The informants or collaborators are the suspects who are forcefully or willingly flipped to the Israeli government's side, who have to exchange information of other suspects or their secret missions, for their considerations in terms of charges or threat of sentencing to death.

Omar later confronts Amjad, who admits that he had betrayed Omar and Tarek. and hesitantly tells that Nadia is pregnant with his child, dishonouring both of them, and the Israeli officers blackmailed him with this secret that they found. After a long silence, Omar forces Amjad to confess to Tarek, who angrily tries to kill him. In their struggle, Tarek is shot dead, making Omar and Amjad guilty. They decide to hand over his body to Rami and they clear their identity.

The triangular story of love that runs parallel reaches its climax when Omar meets Nadia's family to propose Nadia's and Amjad's marriage. Confused Nadia tries to speak to Omar who refuses to take her letter. Unfortunately, Nadia gets married to Amjad and Omar tries to forget Nadia by symbolically throwing away all her letters and her photo that Tarek had given him into the burning oven. After two months, Tarek's corpse is released and his community receives it with a huge funeral procession and protest against the government.

The director uses this scene to highlight the desperate condition of Omar and the cunningness of Amjad. While moving with the procession Amjad pretends to cry to which Omar ironically asks, "Why are you crying?" and Amjad replies, "Because you are not" (01:22:22 - 26).

Assad shows the time lapse of two years through a conversation between Omar and Muhsen Ali Taha, the new field leader of the Jerusalem Brigade after Tarek, who questions him of Amjad's whereabouts and the secret behind Tarek's death. The next scene shows Rami at Omar's bakery, who begins to play the second round of being protector and destroyer in the life of Omar. He plans to catch Muhsen using Omar as the bait. Rami blackmails Omar saying that he would disclose the truth about Tarek's death to Nadia if Omar disobeys. This part of the film shows how a Palestinian's life struggles with the layers of his identity. Omar, who was part of the Palestinian freedom struggle is suspected for his early release by the Israeli police and is accused in the case of Tarek's death, on the other side the Israeli police though proclaimed that he is free to live his will, still surveils him and uses him as a bait to catch the next prey, Muhsen.

The film then shows a close-up shot of Omar as in the first scene of the film standing near the Separation Wall. This scene is highly emblematic. This time Omar does not have the strength and is unable to climb the wall. He falls down multiple times. This shot symbolically indicates how he is weighed down by the burdens of his present personal trauma and multigenerational collective crisis, caused due to Israeli and Palestinian conflict. When he breaks down into tears thinking of his hopeless condition, an old man comes to help him climb over the wall, lending Omar his shoulders to climb over and take the first few steps. It clearly shows how history, the ancestral traces or the presently living old generation (who had undergone Nakba and have been encountering its consequences for many years) join with the present generation to strengthen and give mental power to face their world.

The film then moves to the moment of realisation when Omar gets to know

that Amjad was cheating him (and was a traitor), Nadia and Tarek to marry Nadia, he realises the consequences of not picking Nadia's letter from the tea tray when they met the last time two years back. Though Nadia does not understand the truth, they apologise to each other, and Omar finally states "We all believed the unbelievable" (01:31:20-22). Omar experienced a wave of emotions avalanched with such an intensity that he could not negotiate them, and realises his vulnerabilities.

Assad weaves the climax illustrating his mastery in the art of storytelling. Omar writes a letter to Nadia to reveal the truth and calls Rami to tell him that it was not Tarek who shot the soldier and tells him to give Omar a gun without mentioning the purpose. Omar also meets Muhsen to tell him that he will handle Amjad. A series of dolly shots and wide shots are shown, enlarging and narrowing the worlds around the subjects of the film and the audience. Finally, Omar meets Rami who is accompanied by his guards, to take the gun.

Rami teaches Omar to shoot and while it is the chance of Omar to shoot, rather than aiming at the cactus, he shoots Rami after his final retort and witty dialogue, a riddle to which Omar had been a prey for a long time, "Do you know how they catch monkeys in Africa?" (01:35:52-55). The film ends with this daring act of Omar while in front of the other Israeli guards. Omar the young Palestinian realises that the only way to escape from the trap of Israel is to destroy Rami. Rami is the personification of the continuously occupying Israel and its expansionist tactics. Omar's body metaphorically represents the fragmented Palestine and the pessoptimistic Palestinians. Omar and his friends represent the continuously suppressed Palestinians and the vanishing parts of Palestinian land. The film offers a

kaleidoscopic view of the irreconcilable Palestine and Israel issue of more than six decades long identity crises. The final dialogue spoken by Omar, repeating what Amjad had told earlier in the film, showcases the mastery of Assad in storytelling, and is an act of self-realisation. This scene resonates with the earlier dialogue of Omar, “All traitors fall at last” (00:54:03-05). The climax has the potential to drive the young Palestinians to action.

Omar is a kind of synthesis or a way of resolving an incomplete question proposed by him in his earlier Golden Globe winning movie *Paradise Now*. *Paradise Now* is a film narrating the life of two youngsters who decide to become suicide bombers, a kind of self-sacrifice of an individual’s identity for their nation. In *Omar*, the three friends are given the task to attack the Israeli military. Both the films blur the boundaries between the identities of martyr and collaborator; traitor and patriot; foe and friend to depict the complexities of identity construction in the present Palestinian generation.

It can be observed that film making by the Palestinians include current Palestinian citizens, diasporas, refugees or the Israeli Palestinians, set in the background of Palestine is more than an artistic rendering. It is a social responsibility and a political act. It is to be noted that the films by Palestinian directors were rejected by the Academy Award Community (or the Oscar Award Panel). They were a challenge to the committee as Palestine was not politically recognised as a nation. Later Palestine got its first Oscar nomination with Abu Assad’s film *Paradise Now*, an instance recognising Palestine’s political existence. Nana Asfour, a writer in *The Guardian* in the report titled “Omar: The Palestinian Oscar Nominee Made Amid Panic and Paranoia” wrote,

In 2006, when *Paradise Now* was nominated, it was first filed under “Palestinian Authority”, creating much controversy. Abu-Assad, who like Suleiman, is an Israeli citizen, protested, resulting in a change to “Palestinian Territories”. This time around, without the director’s intervention, the committee took a bold step by naming Omar’s country of origin simply as “Palestine”. Yet, Abu-Assad, while grateful that Palestine is being recognised as an independent entity, doesn’t think it actually has much significance. “To be honest, it’s not a big deal because Palestinians are still under occupation. As long as that’s happening, it does not matter what you call it,” he said recently, when he was back in New York to promote the release of *Omar* in the US.

Omar was nominated for the Best Foreign Language Film at the 86th Academy Awards and bagged many more acclaims and awards including the Special Jury Prize in Cannes Film Festival. In 2014, the film was also screened at the United Nations.

This post millennium film brilliantly expresses the complexity of the Palestinian cause. A Middle East history professor Serpil Atamaz’s words were quoted by writer Kandace Redd in the article, “The Complex History of Israel-Palestine Conflict” in *ABC10* with respect to the current Israeli/ Palestinian condition,

One side has a state, the other one does not. . . It's not just about land, but it's about having the right to self-determination. This is not a conflict between Jews and Muslims or Jews or Arabs. It doesn't go back to the biblical times or the Old Testament at all. This is relatively a modern conflict.

Omar became an example of how violence of the occupation has crept into all the levels of Palestinian life including social, political, cultural and personal. Identity has become an inevitable element in every Israeli or Palestinian films. Patriotism gets multiple definitions in contested spaces like Israel/ Palestine. The film shows the performative nature of the multi-layered identities of Palestinians and Israelites which is always in a state of flux. When Rami's personal identity is defined while being in the state of crisis, Omar's and his friends' identities remain in the state of exception. This state of exception is enhanced by many governance measures executed by Israeli military force and Palestinian political organisations, both psychological as in the case of brainwashing or surveillance, and physical by military checkpoints, roadblocks and the Separation Wall. The movie serves as a universal metaphor for the part colonial governments play in brainwashing and victim incrimination.

Omar reflects upon the idea of the sovereignty of a nation-state in the present Israel/ Palestine. It can be understood that the present generation represented in twenty first century Palestinian films, wishes to regain peace and the right to political existence in their current condition. They struggle dynamically to attain social and political freedom, rather than being fixated on nostalgia for the pre-Nakba Palestine, mainly from the realisation that it is impossible to retrieve the past, as the land is inextricably diverse- socially, politically, ethnically and culturally in the contemporary period. Though the early Palestinian movies thematically were trapped in the angst of questions related to the ontological existence of Palestinians after Nakba or the identity crises of the Israeli/ Palestinian community just after Nakba as in the films like Kasim Hawal's *Return to Haifa* (1982) and Michel

Kleifi's *Wedding in Galilee* (1987), recent films gradually try to accept the multigenerational memory and the current political conditions. They resist their identity crisis through film techniques like absurd humour or magic realism (as in *Omar* and Sulaiman's *Divine Intervention*), with a strong hope of freedom. The act of filmmaking itself becomes a form of resistance. Palestine has become a 'portable absence' (a term by Sherif Almusa) for the current young recipients of the multigenerational memory (those who live in Israel/ Palestine) and transgenerational memory (for refugees, diasporas and exiles). This portable absence gains existence in films.

When *Omar* paints the multiple shades of political identities of Palestinians and Israelites, *3000 Nights* portrays the multiple ethnic identities of Israelites and Palestinians, and their conflicting and conflating perspectives of belongingness to their homeland. Palestinian filmmaker Mai Masri (who also shares Jordanian and American nationality), the director of *3000 Nights*, has drawn inspiration from the experience of a Palestinian woman who was falsely accused and jailed. Masri is renowned for her films that delve into the lives of women and children. She is one among the Palestinian filmmakers to address women's experience in prison, that has been rarely dealt within the prison genre. The film is set in Nablus, 1980 Occupied West Bank.

The film begins with a few barely lit and blurry close-up shots of a few blinded prisoners in a van. It can be seen that a woman is trying to remove her handcuffs, which seems to be in vain. In the midst of the pouring rainy night, she is forced to get out of the van and is pulled through the corridor of a jail by a policeman. The next close-up shot shows the central character Layal's hands and

then the camera moves backward to show her handcuffed and tied in a darkroom. This docudrama movie centers on the life of Layal (starred by Maisa Abd Elhadi), a young schoolteacher who lives in Nablus (a West Bank town in present Palestine, illegally occupied by the Israeli government) with her husband Farid. Layal helped a teenage boy who was wounded, when he asked for a ride without knowing that he was a suspect of attacking a military checkpoint. She is arrested and is falsely accused of helping a culprit. Her act of compassion towards a stranger culminated in her incarceration in an Israeli prison. This incident happened in her life when she and Farid were preparing to go abroad, to Canada in search of new opportunities and fortune.

Layal is shifted to the Israeli prison in which both Israeli criminals and Palestinian political prisoners are in custody. Mai Masri realistically portrays the anxieties, trauma and sufferings of victims in the state of incarceration by setting the film in real prison. The film is set in an abandoned Jordanian military prison. In an interview by *Women and Hollywood*, Mai Masri states, "The oppressive atmosphere of the prison, with its thick, dilapidated walls and rusty bars, gave a huge authenticity to the set and provided an important psychological framework for the actors" ("TIFF 2015 Women Directors"). Masri portrays Israel's Ramla prison of the 1980s which consisted of both male and female inmates in two different prison wings. The Israeli and Palestinian female inmates were sometimes kept in the same cell as seen in the film. The storyline triggered in Masri's mind, when she met a woman while she was making a documentary in Nablus. She had a conversation with the woman who had to give birth in a prison. Masri gathers several true accounts of many women who had to live in prisons for years to create the

characters of *3000 Nights*.

In the film, Layal is taken through the bleak corridors of the jail and is put into the cell of Israeli women criminals who were violent, abusive, terrorising and drug addicts. They included Ze'eva (played by Khitam Edelbi), Shulamith (acted by Raida Adon) and a few others. She is abused for being an Arab. Layal asks permission to the officers several times to speak to her husband which is refused. Later, she is called to the office and is given permission to speak to her husband in exchange for her willingness to pass information about the communication channel of the Palestinian inmates- how these resistors communicate to the outer world even while being under strict surveillance. Layal speaks to Farid who is disappointed for not sharing the incident of helping the stranger until she was caught. He tells the only solution is to say that the boy threatened her. When she returns to her cell, she engages in a fight with the inmates who accuse her for smuggling messages to Palestinian inmates. After this fight she is locked in a darkroom where she falls unconscious and later realises that she is pregnant.

The next scene shows Layal being pushed into the cell of Palestinian inmates. Sana (Nadira Omran), a Palestinian resistance fighter from Lebanon is sceptical about Layal's arrival as she is doubted to be an informant working for the Israeli police, whereas the other inmates are more friendly and hospitable. Though the film does not reveal the stories of every cellmate of Layal, through this scene an inmate Rihan introduces all other members' political backgrounds which include Im Ali (who has a grandson in the men's prison), Fida and Jamila (two schoolgirls arrested while in their classroom).

During the trial though Layal's lawyer, Rachel Steiner, tries her best to have

Layal released, Layal's integrity and her disagreement to tell a lie that the boy had threatened her, though he was a stranger, results in the Israeli military court's verdict that she is sentenced to life imprisonment for eight years. It is followed by a brief conversation with Farid who is planning to move to Canada to establish a new life. Though the prison warden and Farid pressurise her to abort the baby, she decides to protect her baby in her womb. These conversations are followed by a middle shot of Layal taking a bath as a symbol of shedding down the burdens of the mind. It is juxtaposed with the scenes of haunting jail walls and the moving shadows of jail grills and barbed wire fences indicating her double imprisonment (gender and ethnic) as a pregnant woman and a Palestinian in Israeli jail.

Through this film, Mai Masri powerfully recollects and recreates the experiences of several women in Ramla prison. Though most of the actors were amateurs, they acted realistically as they either had experience in prisons or had relatives who survived prison tortures. Masri create dynamics between the two heterogeneous groups of Israeli and Palestinian women.

The film *3000 Nights* is a pathbreaking movie in the genre of prison films. There are many male oriented international and Israeli/ Palestinian prison films (*The Eyes of a Thief*, *Ghost Hunting* being the recent Israeli/ Palestinian movies) but female oriented international films set within the premises of prisons are very few and *3000 Nights* is the first Israeli/ Palestinian movie in this genre. It exclusively discusses the social, psychological and bodily experiences of women under incarceration. It also discusses the ethnic and political diversity of Israel/ Palestine and the moments of interethnic tensions and solidarity. In an interview with Mai Masri, published on the *Institute of Palestine Studies* website, she states that,

The Israeli women convicted of criminal charges were predominantly of Mizrahi origin who suffered from discrimination in their own society. In the early years of their incarceration, the Palestinian women had to fight for everything; including the right to books, pencils and paper. They organised themselves and utilised their time for education and political discussion. They gave each other English and Hebrew courses as well as literacy classes for the elderly women and math and physics lessons for the high school girls. They called themselves the “Free Republic of Women.” The prison administration (mostly Ashkenazi) pitted the Israeli and Palestinian prisoners against each other and tried to keep them segregated and in a constant state of hostility.

Masri has used this information found from her research to mould her diverse range of characters.

Several scenes in the film discuss the methods of resistance that women practiced, their creative ways of coping with emotions, and their commitment to persist by strengthening themselves while under Israeli subjugation. Masri’s characters Sanaa and Jamila write messages on small bits of paper and are passed over to the male cell through a small hole made on the wall. They get caught by the Israeli guard and Jamila is dragged into another cell where she is shackled and tortured. Some of the cellmates isolate Layal as they suspect her to be the informant who gets to see her husband in exchange. In a few other scenes it can be seen that while the Israeli jail was fully equipped with surveillance cameras, the Palestinian inmates used pieces of broken mirrors to spy on the Israeli guards watching them. Layal’s lawyer brought books for her and other inmates to read while in the jail; the very act of reading and gaining knowledge or awareness itself was a way of

resistance against the imprisonment.

In another instance, where the Palestinian women are assigned to sew the uniforms of Israeli police officers, each woman expresses their attitude towards their duty. Sana whose one arm had been amputated states that the military had favoured her by removing one of her hands as she need not stitch their uniforms against her will. Jamila expresses her resistance by sewing 'Palestine' in Arabic on Israeli police uniforms' collar. They organised hunger strikes for days and they even protested by not cooking food for the guards and inmates or sewing uniforms.

The film also portrays the moments of tension between the Israeli and Palestinian prisoners who attacked each other based on prejudices. It also shows how the two groups of inmates were treated differently. The guards favoured the Israeli prisoners, blamed the Palestinians for no fault of theirs, and often fuelled each other's animosity. The Israeli prisoners abused the Palestinians by hurling insulting remarks. The most disgusting scene is the one in which Ze'eva begins a fight with Sanaa and barbarously throws food at each other, creating a chaos and messing up the dining hall. It can also be noted that the Israeli officers bend the rules for Israeli criminals to favour them with better living conditions. They were not required to wear prison uniforms, or do domestic jobs like cooking, sewing and cleaning. They had the privilege of having a continuous supply of drugs and could easily pass messages to the other inmates without being caught or abused by the Israeli jail officers.

The heated rivalry between the two groups melts with the arrival of Layal's baby Nour. The most grim and disturbing scene in this movie is the giving birth to Nour. Layal undergoing birth pangs while being shackled to the iron rods of a prison

cot is the most distressing scene in the movie that makes Masri's work a poignant expression of feminine experience. Layal (who represents every Palestinian woman who had to undergo delivery while shackled) giving birth in captivity is a powerful testament of women's resilience while in adverse conditions. The baby boy is named Nour, which means light. As the name suggests, he becomes the ray of light in the place of darkness, by changing the attitude of most of the characters in the film. His birth is a sign of love and hope. Nour's arrival is celebrated by the jail mates with ululation- an Arab cultural practise to express joy and strong emotions. When an Israeli prisoner calls the baby "Little terrorist", the guard tells her to stop calling so (00:48:30).

Layal was already different from the other prison inmates as she was not affiliated to any particular political resistance groups, but a common school teacher who was imprisoned because of her refusal to go against her moral principle of refusing to tell a lie. After becoming a mother, she and her son overcome the dreary and gloomy atmosphere of the prison by bringing a feeling of intimacy and togetherness in the prison community. Nour is loved and cared by the cellmates by becoming grandmother, aunt, sisters and other relatives for the kid. One of the most heart soothing scenes is the one in which the cellmates celebrate Nour's birthday and they make toys for him with the things available around them. The inmates of the Palestinian cell sing an Arabic song wishing Nour, which is sung even by Shulamit of the Israeli cell and Ze'eva gets irritated hearing her singing Arabic.

The film also portrays the sprouting of a relationship and understanding between Ayman (a Palestinian prisoner doctor, acted by Karem Saleh) and Layal. He gives Nour a wooden bird to play, symbolising freedom. In a magic realistic

manner, the wooden bird turns into a real one indicating the freedom to fly beyond the barbed wires of the prison. Layal tries hard to create good memories and happiness for Nour by transforming the dull bare prison walls into fascinating storytelling boards by drawing pictures with stone on the wall. Everyone tries to engage Nour by telling him tales of hope either through drawings or using puppets made by the inmates and the wooden bird's shadow on the wall.

There are a few notable scenes by Masri mainly to show the moments of solidarity between the Mizrahi Israeli women prisoners and Palestinian political women prisoners by bringing into discussion their political, ethnic and territorial disputes. As discussed earlier the Jewish community after the formation of Israel was divided into multiple groups based on their geo-ethnic identities. Miri Talmon and Yaron Peleg (Media culture and Israeli Studies scholars) in their book *Israeli Cinema: Identities in Motion* state:

Israel was established as a result of the efforts of the Zionist movement, a European Jewish national movement, much in the spirit of other European National movements of the nineteenth century. . . In effect it positioned all Middle Easterners as internal Others (if Jewish) and external Others (if Palestinian) in relation to the Zionist project. (259-260)

The Mizrahi Jews or the 'internal other' (according to many of the Zionists who migrated to the Middle East) were regarded as inferior compared to the Ashkenazi Jews who migrated and occupied Israel/ Palestine during and after Nakba. In *3000 Nights*, as Masri had stated in her interviews, the Israeli prisoners mostly belonged to the Mizrahi community who too had experienced displacement. The Mizrahim could connect to the political struggle of Palestinians, as they too had experienced ethnic discrimination while being within their community and society, formed after

the formation of the new State of Israel.

It can be seen that the film's character Shulamit, initially is against Layal but later starts helping her after gradually realising the humaneness of Layal and recognising the illegal acts of her own state Israel. In an instance, Layal helps Shulamit when she saw her injected with drugs and collapsed on the floor seeking help. Shulamit aids the Palestinian inmates by smuggling letters and newspapers to them. The friendship between Shulamit and Layal symbolically represent the common line between the Palestinians and Mizrahi Jews or the Oriental Jews who both are discriminated and displaced by the Ashkenazis. Masri in the interview by *Institute for Palestine Studies* further states,

“there were often fierce confrontations between both sides, but also rare moments of human interaction that cut through the conflict and animosity. This was particularly true in the eighties after the invasion of Lebanon and the massacres of Sabra and Shatila that shook world public opinion, including some sectors of Israeli society”.

In the film, it can be seen that the Palestinian prisoners begin a hunger strike after hearing the news broadcast announcing the 1982 Israeli war in Lebanon. The Israeli inmates boast of their strength and fight with the Palestinian inmates in which Shulamit does not participate. She gradually realises the inhumanity and illegal occupation that Israel is carrying out. She plays the role of an informant by giving the Palestinians the newspaper. Frustrated and disappointed Sanaa (who had spent fifteen years in the Israeli jail for being a Lebanese Palestinian resistor) and other Palestinian inmates decide to protest against the injustice and gain attention. Another important character to be discussed in the moments of solidarity and empathy of

Israeli commoners for the Palestinian political prisoners is Layal's Israeli lawyer,

Rachel Steiner, who tries to protect Layal from imprisonment but it goes in vain. She hands over many books to Layal for reading while in prison. She questions the ways in which the Israeli police bend the rules to favour Israeli criminals. In a scene when Layal's rights are denied, she asks the jail warden, "Haven't you learned anything from history?" (00:40:55-57). Rachel herself is a mother who had lost her eighteen-year-old son who fought during the war. She is one among the Israelites who had recognised the futility of war and ethnic cleansing.

Masri combines many such stories and experiences to the main plot of the film to problematise the complexity of the Israel/ Palestine issue, by entering into the multiple layers of the present society and their experiences rather than reducing it to major assumptions within the power politics. On the other hand, Masri also portrays characters like Rihan who willingly collaborates with the Israeli officers for her wellbeing and her early release from imprisonment. Layal who is initially threatened by the warden and other guards, of separating Nour from her in case if she doesn't withdraw from the strike, she decides to take the risk. Even while being torn between her wish to support the resistance and protect Nour, she decides to rejoin the strike as an affirmation of her integrity to stand with the righteous. Her child is taken away by the guards depressing Layal.

The climax of the movie shows a series of protests, resistance and resilience by the women inmates with whom the male prisoners on the other side also join. This piece of information is passed through Shulamit by Aiman to Layal. A dispute occurs between Rihan and other Palestinian inmates when they realised that she had betrayed her fellow inmates.

The young girl Jamila is killed by a guard during the dispute and the resistance reaches its peak. The women inmates lock the guards out of their prison and they start hitting their metal cups on the grills of the jail creating loud clanging sounds in protest. The intractable nature of the struggle irritates the officers who take a day-long planning and execute their methods to silence the prisoners. The determination of the prisoners and the rhythmic and continuous clatter of the metals, absorb the audience of the film too into the movie, to become psychologically a part of the resistance.

The resistance of the women prisoners is silenced by the armed soldiers wearing gas masks who spray tear gas into the compartments. The sounds gradually faint and on the next day when the guards enter the jail, slight movements wake the resistors who had been physically controlled and subdued but mentally strengthened by the rebellion. The hand-held camera shots make the film more realistic, perspectival and documentary like. The prisoners' resistance becomes news, and the rebels outside the prison capture six soldiers asking for the release of Palestinian political prisoners in exchange. Hence the women's resistance succeeds and many prisoners are released but Layal is doomed to serve her full prison term battling with her feeling of isolation, teaching other young inmates and making stories on the wall. The film ends with a scene showing the release of Layal and finally the reunion with Nour. Masri adds footages from documentaries showing the actual Israeli prisons resembling concentration camps and showing the release of a few Palestinian political prisoners and their family members. The film ends with a note, "Since January 1948, the Israelis have imprisoned more than 700,000 Palestinians. In November 1983, the PLO reached the release of 4,765 Palestinian and Lebanese

prisoners in exchange for six Israeli soldiers captured in south Lebanon. There are now more than 6000 Palestinians in Israel prisons. That was the story of one of them” (1:35:52-1:36:57).

The prison in the film *3000 Nights* metaphorically represents the land of Palestine occupied and ruled by Israel after its formation in 1948. In the earlier mentioned interview, Mai Masri said, “Prison is profoundly felt by Palestinians not only on a physical level, but also on a psychological level. Confinement, boundaries, and walls are part of their everyday lives” (“3000 Nights: Interview with Masri”).

The film also presents the multi-layered society and pluralistic identities in the contemporary Israel/Palestine. Through its characters it portrays the multi-directionality and multidimensionality of the Israel- Palestine situation and the perplexing human condition. By juxtaposing the individual memory of Layal’s motherhood and the collective memory of struggles, perseverance, hope and pessimism of Palestinian and Israeli discriminated communities, Masri tries to urge the viewers to realise that a peaceful Israel/ Palestine can be envisaged only through a major political reformation in the Israeli mindset to end the ethno-political discriminations and to establish an inclusive community which will recognise and provide equal space and rights to Palestinians in every aspect.

The film promotes mutual support and solidarity between the Israelites and Palestinians. Moreover, the friendship between the Palestinian Layal and the Mizrahi Jew Shulamit allegorically shows that the geo-ethnic identity of the native Palestinians who belonged to the Palestinian region before the formation of Israel or Nakba cannot be erased. The term Oriental Jews or Mizrahi was used to distinguish them from the European Jews or the Ashkenazis. Their indigenous ethnic identity

was considered inferior and they were re- educated and transformed to assimilate with the culture of the Ashkenazi, but they had to face suppression and discrimination from the migrated Jews who came into power. Hence the traces of their ancestry and the culture of their earlier Palestinian homeland still run through their blood. Israeli cultural theorist Ella Shohat, in her seminal book titled *Israeli Cinema: East/ West and the Politics of Representation*, writes:

In a roundabout way, the Mizrahim as “imagined community” (Benedict Anderson) constitute, at least in part, a Zionist invention. Mizrahi identity is, then, on one level, one of Zionism’s unintended consequences, one that marks a certain departure from previous Jewish cultural geographies. Yet, the delegitimation of Middle Eastern culture has also resulted in a new identity formation, shaped out of the shards of a non-European past, which brought together a massive encounter among Arab, Iranian, Turkish, Kurdish, Berber, Indian, Georgian, and Ethiopian cultures. From Jews of such diverse regions as the Maghreb and Yemen has emerged a new overarching umbrella identity, what began to be called in the late 1980s “the Mizrahim.” The term “Mizrahim,” I have suggested elsewhere, condenses a number of connotations: it celebrates the Jewish past in the Eastern world; it affirms the pan- Oriental communities developed in Israel itself; and it invokes a future of revived cohabitation with the Arab Muslim East. (303)

Through this film, Mai Masri fosters the indigenous culture of Arabs to show their existence and its potential to unite people. One of the best examples is the ululation by the prison inmates celebrating the arrival of Nour. It can be seen that in a shot, Layal’s fellow cell mates melodiously sing an Arabic poem written by

Mahmoud Darwish (regarded as Palestine's national poet) like an anthem of political prisoners. This poem was translated into English as "No Walls to the Cell" by Denys Johnson Davies.

As usual

My cell saved me from death,

From the rust of intellect and being outwitted by a spent idea.

On its ceiling I found the face of my freedom, The orange grove

And the names of those who yesterday lost their names on the soil of
battlefields. (lines 1-8)

The prison inmates sing this Palestinian poem to strengthen their hope even while in imprisonment.

Another moment of revival of the Palestinian culture is when Ayman makes reference to the olive oil that his mother uses to cure fever. Olive oil and olive trees have high significance in Palestinian society. In an article titled "Fact Sheet: Olive Trees- More Than Just a Tree in Palestine" published by *Reliefweb* of the United Nation's Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs stated,

. . . they are symbolic of Palestinians' attachment to their land. Because the trees are drought-resistant and grow under poor soil conditions, they represent Palestinian resistance and resilience. The fact that olive trees live and bear fruit for thousands of years is parallel to Palestinian history and continuity on the land. . . .Some families have trees that have been passed down to them for generations and the olive harvest season in October bears a socio-cultural meaning where families come together to harvest olive trees bearing in mind that their forefathers and mothers had tended to the same trees several years ago.

These cultural implications incorporated into the film by Masri have the ability to transcend space and time. *3000 Nights*, a coproduced film, distributed by Cinema Politica of Canada, aimed at a universal audience and achieved global acclaim for its thematic density and uniqueness in rendering a prison narrative from the female perspective. Masri's debut feature film *3000 Nights* was first screened at the Toronto International Film Festival in 2015 and has won many awards. It was selected to represent Jordan at the Oscars for the Best Foreign Language Film. It was also selected to represent Palestine at the Golden Globes.

Hany Abu Assad's *Omar* and Mai Masri's *3000 Nights* are powerful universal allegories of the normal human experience, temptations and resistances under abnormal conditions. Both the films paint complex pictures of morality beyond the binary representations of good and evil. Both the films are representations of the multidimensional, highly complex and intractably intertwined present situation of Palestine and Israel.

The background and the settings of the film express the liminality of the Palestinian and Israeli experience. In the film *Omar*, the Separation Wall (more than six meters high) which is also called as the Apartheid Wall built by the Israeli government bears a plethora of graffiti artwork visualising historical events and interpretations. Graffiti drawings started to appear on the walls of the buildings in Israel/ Palestine since the first Intifada. During that period, when Israelites did graffiti to erase the memories of war by painting on bomb shelters, Palestinians used art as a means of political resistance and awareness of the catastrophe. In the twenty first century, the Israelites and Palestinians faced the second stage of tearing them apart, by concentrating on the places like West Bank, Jerusalem and Bethlehem. The

Israeli government decided to erect the Separation Wall between the two states in 2002 as a latest strategy in their neo-colonial governmentality and encourage urbanisation of Israel by eliminating any traces of Palestinian indigeneity. Ostensibly, it was constructed as a security for the Israeli settlers from the native Palestinians who are called as the trespassers. The Wall illegally encroached large areas of the existing Palestine. It also displaced Israelite settlers and Palestinians equally. Hany Abu Assad portrays this situation of the present young generation through the families of characters Omar, Tarek and Amjad.

This huge Wall can be understood as the most visible epitome or horrific manifestation of Giorgio Agamben's State of Exception or state of exclusion/inclusion practiced by the Israeli Government. It curbed the freedom of Palestinian existence by placing them under the surveillance of the Israeli government even while living in the state of Palestine. This mobility regulation is a part of the government's 'biopolitics', in other sense, a divide and rule policy by creating a shared consciousness related to the fear of the 'Other' through segregation. The wall controls multitudes of humans including that of Palestinians (Omar and his friends as scene in the film) and Israelites (Rami unwillingly working in the West Bank as an example from the film).

With the passage of time, the huge concrete wall's surface facing the Palestinian side turned to become a canvas for the Palestinian and the International artists, to accumulate and represent the multidimensional histories, create a sense of collective identity and depict the present political conflicts, interpretations and opinions. Thus, the performative nature of the Separation Wall enabled through the graffiti art ironically makes this structure a symbol of unabating resistance and the

collective strength of the Palestinians and the expression of solidarity by the international community.

Abu Assad incorporates the Separation Wall into the background of his film to set the context and address the complexity of the Israel/ Palestine issue. The wall in reality deprives collective community and individuals of their identity, as all the laws and rights are suspended, and morality and ethics are complex and confusing. In the film, Omar climbs the wall several times like a sportsman practising and performing his event. This practice is a fantasy portrayed by Abu Assad in a realistic tone, as it is almost impossible to clamber along the wall and cross it, since it is always under surveillance. Through his filmmaking techniques, Abu Assad makes the wall a transient structure which is easily penetrable. He states in an interview titled “Cheers for Palestinian film of love and betrayal” conducted by Agence France-Presse, published in *Al Arabia News*, “We managed to get permission for all of the places, even the wall. For the wall, we had permission to climb up to a certain height and then, for the moments at the top, we used a fake wall on a set in Nazareth”. In the second part of the movie, after the death of Tarek, Omar once again tries to climb the wall which he fails in, but symbolically an old man (representing Palestinian memory and identity) helps him to advance to his future by climbing over the occupation wall.

Assad integrates graffiti on the Separation Wall (which has performative characteristics in representing past, present and future) and the film *Omar*, to transcend space and time and in a way psychologically demolish the wall of imprisonment to attain freedom of speech, expression and political existence in the land of Israel/Palestine. Hence, *Omar* as a cultural space and the Separation Wall

within it are the liminal spaces that become agencies of resistance in the present, which has an access to both local and global communities. Apart from the Separation Wall, Assad brings out the irony in the government policies by combining paradoxical backgrounds and foregrounds in the set. For example, the billboards behind the telephone booth (through which Omar communicates with either Rami or Tarek) show captions like “Planting hope: social responsibility” contrasts with the hopeless condition to which Rami has pushed Omar into (00:40:30).

The liminal experiences of the Israelite and Palestinian communities are also depicted in Mai Masri’s *3000 Nights*, which is set in a prison where people are subjected to varying degrees of discrimination and where the assumptions surrounding ethnic identities and prejudices are problematic. The two cells, one of the Israeli and the other of the Palestinian inmates resemble the two states. The prison corridors, courtyards, workspaces and dining areas become the physical liminal spaces where all the inmates of the different cells get to meet each other and interact. Though the prison guards create tensions to separate the inmates of the two communities, at certain moments it can be seen that feelings of empathy and emotional solidarity arise. Like in *Omar*, Masri’s film also suggests the condition of any Palestinian, whether within the prison or in the Palestinian territories (which is now an open prison) without walls but completely under surveillance and restrictions. Moreover, it can be understood that every film representing Palestine/ Israel is deeply imbibed in collective and individual memory of suffering, occupation and loss from which a pessoptimistic young generation emerges.

The identity crises of the Palestinians/ Israelites also reflect in the lives and

works of the film makers, a few among them being Hany Abu Assad (born to a Palestinian Muslim family in Nazerath of Israel and immigrated to the Netherlands); Mai Masri (Palestinian American born in Jordan); Rashid Masharawi (a refugee Palestinian); Sameh Zoabi, Elia Sulaiman, Michel Khleifi, Mohammed Bakri (Palestinians of Israeli citizenship); Annemarie Jacir, Suha Arraf, Mohammed Abu Nassar (Palestinian filmmaker); Najwa Najjar (Palestinian writer grew up in Saudi Arabia and educated in the US); and Israeli born film makers like Amos Gitai and Eran Riklis (who had keenly observed the consequences of Israel/ Palestine issue).

Though pluralism usually means inclusiveness, in the contesting region like Israel/ Palestine it has always suggested multidirectionality, incompatible diversity and conflict. Films become spaces for empathising and mutual understanding, beyond the social, political and ethnic barriers. The film makers of the twenty first century Holocaust films foreground victim identity to affirm their identity and thereby gain global acceptance. While the earlier Holocaust films attempted to project Jewish victim identity and become a major configuration in the building of Israeli history, contemporary films focus on the multi- directionality, the savagely cruel side of victimhood and victimisation, and its universality in themes too.

For the Palestinian filmmakers, film space is a medium for reassertion of their identity and resistance. Nation is a portable absence that these film directors carry over through every film, for their complex identity not to be forgotten. The post millennium Israeli filmmakers discussing the issue subtly attack the colonial governmentality and deprivation of humanitarian rights.

Through the four films *The Grey Zone*, *The Zookeeper's Wife*, *Omar*, and *3000 Nights*, the role of film space in the formation of identity has been analysed. It throws light at the transnationality of the mediated memory in the form of films. The four films discussed in this chapter have transgressed the geographical and identity boundaries mentioned in the storyline through multiple strategies. The filmmakers shoot their movies in artificially created sets; as in *The Grey Zone* which was shot in Bulgaria, in a reconstructed version of the Auschwitz death camp; *The Zookeeper's Wife* shot in a zoo created in Prague of Czech Republic; *Omar* shot in Nazareth and Nablus depicting the Separation Wall; and *3000 Nights* shot in an abandoned prison in Jordan resembling the Ramla prison of Israel. Talmon and Peleg state in *Israeli Cinema: Identities in Motion* that the film directors also use techniques like passing, “in which casting decisions allow a member of one ethnic/national group to play another” (263). This is a carnivalesque technique to transgress the identity of the actor to prove that ethnicity is not biological. It can be seen in the above discussed films, and a few examples being, the character of the German officer Eric Muhsfeldt in *The Grey Zone* played by the child of Jewish immigrants of America Harvey Keitel and Arab American actor Waleed Zuaiter as Agent Rami in *Omar*.

The other transnational features are co-productions, distribution and release by multiple countries around the world, using many languages within the film, subtitling in different languages, giving new soundtracks, publishing through websites and by participating in a number of film festivals around the world with diverse audience.

It can be observed that the film space works as a chronotope that configures or merges time and space to produce multiple interpretations and meanings. While

postmillennial Holocaust movies work through the collective memory of the event to reassert multi-layered victimhood identity and resonate their need to reinvigorate and establish it for the sake of Israel's existence and power, Palestinian cinema is a powerful artistic expression to culturally conquer the continuously vanishing parts of Palestine, by strengthening a sense of Palestinian history shaped by displacement, dispossession and victimhood. Both these memories converge in front of diverse mass audience around the world forming new 'imagined communities' beyond the geographical boundaries. Benedict Anderson discusses the notion of 'Nation' in his book *Imagined Communities*. He states that a nation should be understood not with consciously prepared political ideologies but with large cultural systems (12). The twenty first century Holocaust and Israel/ Palestinian films are cultural products that create space for communication, interpretation and meaning production to build a mutually cooperating Israel/ Palestine for the present generation. The four films discussed in this chapter are transnational movies which had found space in international film festivals. They are simultaneously local and global.

Film festivals are clusters of space and time that mingle to give a chance for the present generation to perceive, mould and recognise the rhizomatic nature of memory and identity which is a ceaseless process of becoming. Such spaces that combine the local and the global facilitate a non-hierarchical network for memories and identities to mingle with each other and facilitate the audience to unlearn, observe, learn, evolve or progress. The functions and features of the glocalised memory, an entity produced when the local memories become global and the global memories become local simultaneously while being within chronotopic spaces like transnational films, are to be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Glocalised Memories: Reimagining

Genocide Memories in the Post Millennium

Patterns of construction and transmission of genocide memory are continuously expanding with the developments in the field of visual media, which have impacted both online and offline digital media platforms. Genocide memories transmitted through the digital media have tremendously influenced the existence and identity formation of the present generation worldwide. They are dialectical in nature as they are acquired from the society and at the same time, they influence and are influenced by national narratives. Genocide memories recollected by digital media also have the power to challenge the currently existing unjust or repressed expressions of memories of any event.

The recent cultural memory studies scholars like Jeffrey K Olick, Michael Rothberg, Aleida Assmann and Astrid Erll have initiated the question of the “collectiveness” of genocide memories in the age of mediated memory and screen society. Olick initiated this interrogation through his books like *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility* (2007) and *The Sins of the Fathers: Germany, Memory and Method* (2016). These works suggest that collective memory is not a static cultural property or a monolithic entity, rather it is a dynamic process that comes into existence while coded in a language or represented through different mnemonic devices within certain social contexts and as a response to the social cues. He defines collective memory as an interactive process where the interconnection between the individual and society is a continuum

and the practice of remembering is an unabating process.

Aleida and Jan Assmann expanded the idea of collective memory further through the concept of 'cultural memory'. They too defined memory in terms of mnemonics. In a short video clip posted by the *Network in Transnational Studies*, Aleida Assmann states that cultural memory is a kind of equipment that they (people) grow into and they are not fully aware of until they know other cultures. They use it as a kind of suitcase that they take along on their journey which is repacked at various stations when the realities change and when they have interactions with other cultures and so forth (00:01:15-40). She calls this space where memories interact as a "space of resonance" (00:02:00) in which human beings live.

Michael Rothberg developed a novel approach to memory studies through his observations on collective memory in his book *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (2009), which sparked public debates. Instead of viewing the collective memories of different genocides as existing in a competitive relationship, Rothberg understood the relationship between the collective memories of various events as multidirectional. The realisation that multidirectionality is a key feature of collective memory revolutionised the existing perspectives on competing histories and memories. Drawing on the productivity of memory, Rothberg opined that memory develops through dialogue and exchange, and different groups come to existence through the articulation of memory. He acknowledges the uniqueness of the Holocaust, and at the same time, he looks at the possibility of comparing it with (or juxtaposing it with) other genocides around the world as a social responsibility to make the present generation explore the dynamics

in memory formation and victimhood identity, which is multidirectional. Concerning the moving nature of memory, Asrid Erll conceptualised the idea of ‘travelling memory’. She suggested that memory travels through five dimensions: people, media, forms, contents and practices (“Travelling Memory” 00:02:10 -25).

This chapter introduces the concept of memory glocalization that occurs in international Holocaust and Nakba films, and explores its features, functions, and ways in which it influences the contemporary society. The concept of glocalisation was initially introduced by the Japanese. The term glocal originates from the Japanese word *dochakuka*, meaning global localisation, to refer to how global farming techniques were adapted to regional methods of cultivation. Cultural Sociologist Roland Robertson stated in the 1997 conference Globalisation and Indigenous Culture that “glocalisation” means “the simultaneity . . . the co- presence . . . of both universalising and particularising tendencies” (“Comments on the “Global Triad” and “Glocalisation”). Anna Reading, in her article “Memory and Digital Media: Six Dynamics of the Global Memory Field,” approaches memory from the position of its digitalisation and hints at the glocalisation of memory through her concept of the ‘global memory field’ and its extensity (241-251).

Glocalised memory emerges in the spaces where global and local media memories related to an event intersect, dialogise, contest, and coexist. It opens an unbounded space to engage with the processes of remembering, forgetting, constructing, breaking silences or silencing counter narratives. This means that every mediated collective memory of different communities, including the Holocaust and Nakba memories is continuously being recollected and reconstructed while undergoing the process of transmission through the four stages: local-global-

local-glocal.

This chapter throws light on the ways in which the Holocaust and Nakba memories initially borne by a few communities that faced the event, became a national memory; later crossed the territorial boundaries to reach every corner of the world as memories of the victims' offspring, refugees, migrants and diasporas who had either escaped or still endure the consequences of the two events; later as a universal allegory for every genocide happening around the world; and now as events that define the identities or livelihood of multiple communities of the present belonging to Europe, America, Germany, Middle Eastern Nations and all the places where many refugees or diasporas reside. The reinvesting, representation and transmission of Holocaust memory through media has influenced the transnational and transgenerational communities as it has become a 'prosthetic memory' (a term coined by Alison Landsberg) that is acquired and problematised by the young generation.

Glocalisation of memory can be exemplified with the post millennium filmic representation of Holocaust and Nakba. This chapter intends to discuss four films, which powerfully depicts the characteristics. The chapter looks at cross cultural perceptions of the Holocaust and Nakba memory through the postmillennial films *In Darkness* (2011), *Jojo Rabbit* (2019), *The Salt of This Sea* (2008) and *Tel Aviv on Fire* (2018). These glocalised memory representations address the Holocaust and Nakba in the present, viewing the event from different perspectives, leading to the recognition or construction of different identities.

The two Holocaust films, *In Darkness* and *Jojo Rabbit* are multi-perspectival voices of the bygone event. They are adaptations of books. The process of

adaptation from a printed text which is for the purpose of reading, to the medium of film intended to be watched is by itself transformative. *In Darkness* is a riveting Polish-German-Canadian coproduced film written by Canadian screenwriter David F Shamoon based on the British author Robert Marshall's book *In the Sewers of Lvov* (1991). The script underwent many changes under Polish director Agnieszka Holland's direction. This was one among her well recognised projects based on the Holocaust after her Hollywood film *Europa, Europa* (1990). The film got international acclaim and was nominated for the Best Foreign Language Film at the eighty-fourth Academy Awards. Holland insisted that *In Darkness* to be in the Polish or Ukrainian language as the narrative was rooted in the space of sewers in Lvov (earlier a part of Nazi occupied Poland and presently known as Lviv, in western Ukraine). The film is inspired by the life of Leopold Socha, a sewage inspector in Lvov during the period of the Holocaust (recognised as Righteous Among the Nations in 1978), who rescued a group of Jews from ghetto liquidation by helping them find refuge in sewers. The film is dedicated to Polish political and social activist Marek Edelman (the last surviving leader of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising who passed away in 2009) who wrote extensively about human nature during the period of the Holocaust and the futility of war.

Jojo Rabbit is a comic Holocaust fiction film written and directed by the New Zealand film director and actor Taika Waititi. The film is adapted from the novel *Caging Skies* (2008) authored by New Zealand Belgian author Christine Leunens. The film is set during the declining period of Nazi Germany. It is set in a fictional German city of Falkenheim, shot by artificially recreating the settings of wartime Germany and its atmosphere in the Czech Republic. Waititi conceptualised

this film in 2010 after listening to the story of *Caging Skies* from his mother. It took around eight years to get produced. Though the characters and storyline in the novel are similar to those in the film, Waititi's version of the story is entirely different. His take on the character sketch and thematic perspective made *Jojo Rabbit* remarkable in the Holocaust film genre of dark comedy. The film was coproduced in 2018 between the United States, New Zealand and the Czech Republic. This historic fiction portrays the main character, Johannes Betzler, a ten-year-old Hitler Youth member who finds out that his mother is hiding a Jewish girl in their home. He is accompanied by an imaginary friend, buffoonish Hitler. The characters speak English with a perfectly clipped high German accent. The film focuses on the psychological and moral growth of Johannes who is nicknamed Jojo. The whole crew won fourteen film awards, and Waititi won the Oscar for the best adapted screenplay at the ninety-second Academy Awards. Belonging to Maori community and his Jewish descent, became the first indigenous person to win this honour in the screenwriting category.

The two post-Nakba films are set in the present, showing the consequences of the systemic ethnic cleansing and exile of the Palestinians in 1948 and 1967, the futile Oslo Accord, and the ongoing displacement and ethno-political dispute. *The Salt of This Sea* is a film by Palestinian film director Annemarie Jacir, born in the West Bank, grew up in Saudi Arabia and now lives in the United States. She is the cofounder of the Dreams of a Nation project, along with Professor Hamid Dabashi, to archive Palestinian films and help researchers to access them. Jacir stated in an interview with Lisa Mullenneaux titled "A Bitter Sea" that the storyline of *The Salt of This Sea* is inspired by two real incidents that Jacir came across: a bank robbery in

Bethlehem that happened during a military curfew by two men and a woman, and the second one being the experience of Jacir's friend's father whose savings were frozen (and he never got them back) after he was exiled in 1948 and remained a refugee throughout his life. The characters in the film speak Arabic, Hebrew, and English, and the film is subtitled in French and English. The film is centred around a Brooklyn-born young woman, Soraya, of Palestinian descent. She fulfils her dream to return to her homeland, Palestine, but realises that her ancestral traces and their history have been erased from the present Israel/ Palestine. The film had to face many obstacles in the pre-production and post-production phases: Jacir found difficulty in finding producers, had to face restrictions while shooting, was not allowed to distribute the film in many countries, including the United States, and was not readily accessible in the first couple of years. The film was bestowed with many awards, including the official selection for the 2008 Cannes Film Festival.

Tel Aviv on Fire, is a satirical comedy film set in Israel/ Palestine, coproduced by companies from Israel, Belgium, France, and Luxembourg. It is directed by Sameh Zoabi, an Israeli-Palestinian. Zoabi is born in Iksal, an occupied Palestinian region currently known as the Arab Local Council in Israel. The script was cowritten by Zoabi and Dan Kleiman. The film is originally in Arabic and Hebrew, and subtitled in English. This fiction is set in two temporal spaces: in 1967 and the present. The past is narrated through a soap opera produced and directed within the film with the same title as of the film. The key character in the film is Salam, a Palestinian from East Jerusalem striving for a job who is suddenly burdened with the role of a scriptwriter for the soap opera. Zoabi weaves the film in connection with the different incidents that happen when Salam meets an Israeli

military officer Assi, whose ambiguous power relation later becomes a decisive factor and an obstacle to overcome in Salam's life. Through the means of comedy, the film vividly portrays the current condition of the Palestinians and subtly mocks the Israeli governance over them. Unlike *Salt of This Sea*, *Tel Aviv on Fire* did not have to face much opposition inside and outside Israel or Palestine because of the cautious and subtle representation of both Israelites and Palestinians without directly criticising any side. The film premiered internationally at the seventy fifth Venice International Film Festival, where Kais Nashef, playing Salam, won the Best Actor award. The Israeli premier was at the Haifa International Film Festival, where it won the Best Film and Best Screenplay awards. Zoabi and Kleinman won the Best Screenplay award at the Israeli Academy Awards and the Asian Pacific Screen Awards too.

This chapter will discuss in detail the ways in which these contemporary films recall these two genocide memories. It looks into the current reverberations and repercussions of the two events. The discussion on multilayered human nature in these films (both at individual and collective levels) has a simultaneous particularising and universalising tendency, facilitating the development of transgenerational memories that have the ability to surpass all the spatial, temporal, social, cultural, geographical, and political boundaries.

In Darkness narrates the life of a Polish sewage inspector Leopold Socha and a group of Holocaust victims who survived the ghetto liquidation with his help. It begins with a toy train moving fast, resembling the trains to the concentration camps, introducing the characters: two petty thieves, Socha (starred by Robert Więckiewicz) and Szczepiek (performed by Krzysztof Skonieczny). They confront

two teenage couples: a Polish girl and a German boy. Socha plays the lead role in this film and drives the plot and action. His thoughts, feelings, behaviours, and character undergo change and acquire depth over the course of the film. Apart from depicting the experiences of the Holocaust victims, this film also throws light on the plight of Leopold Socha (a Catholic Christian, nicknamed Poldek) from a petty thief and opportunist, to a person who dared to make a choice that helped a group of Jewish Holocaust sufferers survive extermination.

The disturbing second scene in *In Darkness* shows Socha and Szczepek, who are running through the forest trying to escape with their loot, suddenly listening to the cries of imprisoned women running closer to their side. The camera shifts from the faces of Socha and his companion to show a wider angle of the foggy forest, through which a group of naked women are frantically running, followed by a group of Nazi officers. The scene ends by showing a large pit in which the corpses of those women are dumped. This scene sets the Holocaust horror as the background of *In Darkness*.

The following scene shows the ignorant nature of Socha and Szczepek, who lead their daily lives, looting the war victims, disregarding the Holocaust condition. While hiding their loots in the sewage, they listen to some sounds in the sewage, and Socha recognises them as being from the ghetto. They encounter a group of Jews struggling to enter the sewer, trying to escape from the upcoming ghetto liquidation. This scene marks the beginning of the unfolding of the not much discussed plight of a group of people during the Holocaust.

The audience is taken into a dark, suffocating and claustrophobic underground space along with Socha and the Holocaust victims. Socha is

characterised as an ambiguous and rounded person. He is a thief, a crook and an immoral opportunist with selfish motives, but at the same time, he is seemingly a good family man, religious, kind and helpful. Holland perhaps portrays him as an ordinary lower-middle-class Catholic man living during the Holocaust, making crucial choices that lead to unexpected paths in life. The destiny of the group of people whom Socha meets in sewage partially depended on his choices.

Rather than idealising Holocaust victims by portraying them as righteous, helpless people, Holland brings to the audience a diverse group of people belonging to different classes and who are morally imperfect. The terrible circumstances through which they had to undergo and the fear they endured make them complex, sometimes selfish, disloyal to fellow beings, unmanageable and unbearable humans with a crude nature. When Socha found these people, the group consisted of twenty people.

Initially, the group distrusted Socha and Szczepek, but they did not have any option but to trust them. In the same manner, Socha thought of turning them over later to the officials. The situations changed later. Socha's and the others' natures transform gradually over the course of the film. The group included Ignacy and Paulina Chiger and their children Krystyna and Pawel (they belonged to the educated upper class and led a luxurious life); Mundek Margulies (a tough and quick-witted man); Janek Weiss (a faithless husband); and Chaja (mistress of Janek); Clara and her sister Mania; a priest and many more victims whose names are not mentioned in the film.

Apart from the scenes shot in the sewage which vividly addresses the internal turmoil within the Christians and Jews belonging to the Polish community,

the film also consists of many scenes showing the political turbulence and tortures perpetrated by Nazi regime on the victimized community living on the ruined Polish land.

After a shot in which Socha and Szczepek are terrified to hear the sounds of bomb blast, the scene shifts to the surface where the horrors of war are shot: the debris-filled ruined towns, an atmosphere filled with smoke, grounds greasy with gore and sludge, army hitting and firing humans, people screaming out of fear and screeching with pain, corpses scattered all around, people running for help, and young Hitler Youth members laughing at the sight of torturing the people. The scene suddenly shifts focus to Paulina, who runs through the street to check for her children's safety. Though the Nazi officers had broken into her home, her children had hidden safely in their wardrobe.

Then the focus abruptly shifts to Mundek, who is running to the apartment where they dug a hole in the sewage. The room is filled with desperate people pushing each other to get into the sewage. The camera shows Yanek forcing his wife and child to enter the sewage, which they refuse because Yanek is faithless, and he is also taking his mistress Chaja into the sewage. The Chiger family, Clara, Mania and a few others also enter the dark, damp, hauntingly spacious sewage where Socha was waiting.

The film is shot in such a way that the audience too is made to experience the victims' journey sensually (chronotope- aids the audience to identify with the victim's journey) with the help of different camera techniques and lighting. The audience too enters this refuge cum death trap along with the Jews, forcing them to witness the horrifying plight. Though the atmosphere is suffocating for all the people

in the beginning, they all get adjusted to their circumstances except Mania, who cries and fights with Clara to return to the surface. Socha leads them to a chamber. It was darkness all around except for the flickering torchlight of some of the members. The accounts in the book *In the Sewers of Lvov* state that there was an underground river named Peltwa that flowed through the sewage, into which all the untreated waste was dumped.

The scenes oscillate between the underground and the surface. A scene shows Socha shocked to see many corpses floating in the river, and it suddenly shifts to a scene on the surface in which he is startled to see a truck filled with many more dead bodies. He is caught by Nazi officers, who threaten him with death. Socha, in turn, mentions the name of his Ukrainian friend Antoni Bortnik (acted by Michal Zurawski) and escapes. Bortnik is now a Nazi officer, killing the Jews on sight as a duty. He is a trustworthy friend of Socha, but brainwashed by Nazi ideology, desiring to join the ranks. Apart from Bortnik, the other major characters that the audience meets above the surface are Socha's wife, Wanda, and his daughter, Stefcia. Wanda stays with Socha in his ups and downs. When he is in a dilemma whether to expose the Jews or not, the conversation with Wanda while she bathes him strengthens him:

Wanda: I doubt if there's anything left of the ghetto. Did you see anything?

Those poor people.

Socha: They're offering rewards for turning in Jews.

Some people are making a pile.

Wanda: God will punish the greedy.

Socha: The Jews crucified Jesus. It's written in the Bible: "His blood be upon

them and their children." The priest said so.

Wanda: That's just church politics. Just think about it. Jews are just the same as us. Our Lady and the apostles, they're all Jews! Even Jesus.

Socha: Jesus? (*In Darkness* 00:29:56 – 00:31:23)

In the film, Wanda is a deeply religious woman; she sympathised with Jews but feared death by being targeted by the Nazi officers for protecting Jews. Later in the film, it can be seen that when Wanda comes to know the secret of Socha hiding the Jews, she is completely disturbed. A few Polish people living nearby, like the vegetable vendor, started being suspicious about Socha's sudden growth. She doubted the reason for Socha buying a large quantity of food. One purchase could kill him and his family if discovered. This was the moment when Socha exposed himself to the risks that he would have to face for protecting Jews.

Back in the sewage, the group of refugees started whiling away time doing things of their interest with what was available for them. Holland brings out the crudest nature of humans in times of crisis: they push and pull each other to grab the food that Socha had brought for them; at times they turn wild and angrily hurl abusive words at each other; at some moments they become selfish; and some characters have open sex, making other members of the group uncomfortable. Socha feels it difficult and risky to feed so many Jews; he decides to only protect eleven of them. A dispute arises between the people in the group, questioning and countering each chosen person's eligibility. Even while in this awful place, choices are made according to the survival mechanism of the fittest and richest. This dreadful decision shatters the hope of many refugees. This is shown by using the technique of dimming the yellow light from one face to the next one of those who are left behind.

Socha shifts the 'chosen' eleven to another chamber surrounded by shit, filth, and mice but comparatively safer.

Above the sewers, the town is completely destroyed. When Socha returns home, he sees Bortnik questioning Wanda about her knowledge of any Jews in the sewers. Bortnik starts suspecting Socha as no one in the town knows better about the sewer and its chambers, he mentions the rewards for catching a Jew. The next breathtaking scene is when the protected Jews narrowly escape from Bortnik's search with the help of Socha. Meanwhile, Szczepk reveals the secret of protecting Jews to Wanda. Though she sympathises with the victims, she disagrees with protecting them, as it will cost Socha and his family their lives. Though she is shocked to hear it and refuses to accept Socha's deeds, she gradually accepts them without letting out the secret.

As mentioned earlier, the movie progresses by intercutting the two parallel worlds where the characters reside: in the sewage and on the war-struck Lvov's surface. After the liquidation of the ghettos when the search becomes more intensive, the two worlds of the characters become equally dangerous for living, where they all must work together to survive. The Nazi government not only hunted down the Jews but also those who illegally sheltered them or helped them to hide and survive. For Socha, his financial demands would have forced him to take all the money from the refugees and then turn them in, to gain more rewards from the Nazis and brush off the risks. He was different from those who looted the refugees' valuables and exposed them. In an instance, when he unearthed the ornaments that Chiger had hidden earlier, on a whim, he thought of exposing the Jews to the Gestapo and asked Wanda's opinion, to which she disagrees in silence. From

Socha's viewpoint, the group never thanked him for his service; they only demanded, suspected, accused, complained and betrayed him. His journey was never easy or sentimental. From the refugees' viewpoint, their suspicion and accusation of Socha were out of fear. The film shows Socha's moral development. Though Chiger stopped giving funds for their food, when the money ran out, Poldek's consciousness did not allow him to leave them back and die starving. He took it up as his duty to protect them, even by risking his family's life.

The next half of the film consists of a series of daring scenes - a combination of spine-chilling events and momentary numbness. Janek, Frankline and Landsberg rob the leftover money from the co-refugees and leave them. Later, they are found dead, as they too would have been caught by the Gestapo and killed like many others who had entered the sewage. Another imprudent decision is taken by Mundek (portrayed as strong and wise), who falls in love with Klara and decides to go to the Janowska concentration camp to search for her sister Mania. In one instance, he luckily escapes from a Gestapo with the help of Socha, who both knocks the officer down and kills him. Later, a scene shows ten Polish people hanged for suspecting they were the killers of a soldier. Socha stood stunned beside the bodies, among which one was his partner, Szczepek. Mundek never gives up; he goes to the camp by getting out of the sewers for the second time. Holland shows glimpses of the victims' condition in the concentration camp through Mundek's experiences above the ground.

In another instance, the children Krystyna and Pawel get lost in the sewers and Socha luckily meets them and returns them to their parents. In a scene, a Polish man discovers the refugees hiding place, escapes to the surface, and shouts out that

he has found Jews which Socha luckily hears. He hurriedly shifts them to another chamber, to which they need to move through a narrow tunnel, which becomes an arduous task.

The most disturbing scene while in the sewers is Chaja giving birth to a child- the worst condition in which a child can be born. Chaja has turned quite insane due to her circumstances; she feels no connection with her child or with anyone who has been with her throughout her struggles. The child's father, Yanek, who left his wife and child to face liquidation, had cheated Chaja and tried to flee but was later discovered killed. Socha is shocked to hear the news and fears that the cries of the child would attract attention of the people above the ground. Socha and Wanda decide to adopt the child, but emotionally isolated and numb Chaja smothers her child before Socha reaches them. This happens beneath a Roman Catholic church in which Easter was being celebrated on that day (as he had shifted them earlier to this chamber and they had to remain silent). The following scene of the burial of the newborn is equally anguishing for the characters in the film and the audience too. When things get back to normal, a sudden heavy rain floods the sewers which leads to the filling of all the chambers, including the one in which Socha's Jews hid. It was the day of Socha's daughter's holy communion and he had to leave in between to protect the Jews.

Though the Russians have taken control of Lvov and the Nazis are about to leave, they plan death traps in sewage, which Socha stops. An officer sends Bortnik to inspect the sewers with Socha. When Bortnick is about to shoot Socha out of suspicion, he misleads Bortnick out of his determination to protect the refugees. The next shot shows Bortnick dead, drowning in the sewage. The refugees miraculously

escaped this incident as one of the manhole lids moved due to an overflow of water.

Holland's balanced and unsentimental weaving of the film *In Darkness*, in turn, pushes the audience into an inescapable web where they witness the characters making difficult choices and showing the best and worst of human nature in the catastrophic period. They remained in the sewers for fourteen months. The final scene shows the mastery in direction and camera techniques. The Russians take over Lvov and the refugees are safe to climb back up to the surface. The scene is shot in such a way that the audience is also pulled out of the dark underground to the surface. The characters faint when the bright light blinds their eyes; they feel difficulty in making sense of the reality; they gasp for fresh air; and are finally relieved from the fear of death. Socha proudly calls them "my Jews" (02:11:32).

The end note stated that Socha was killed in May 1945, while saving his daughter from an out-of-control Russian truck. At his funeral, someone said that his untimely death was God's punishment for saving Jews. This describes the dangers of Nazi indoctrination, which has given rise to the conviction among the gentiles that it is morally right for them to murder Jews. This further demonstrates the banality of the civilians in committing evilness towards the victims even long after the Holocaust was over. The final coda adds the statement, "as if humans need God to punish each other" (02:11:57- 02:12:00). Socha and Wanda are recognised as the Righteous Among the Nations by Israel. The survivors migrated to Israel, Europe and the United States. Chiger's daughter Krystyna, the last surviving member of this group, wrote her memoir *The Girl in the Green Sweater*, published in 2008, which Holland came to know only after *In Darkness* was released.

Working through the theme of Holocaust again, after directing two

Holocaust movies in German, *Angry Harvest* (1985) and *Europa Europa* (1990), was a challenging task for Holland. She had to show what was not yet discussed in this genre. She took three steps to bring novelty to *In Darkness* from her other Holocaust movies and many other Hollywoodised versions too. Firstly, she regionalised the already universalised theme of Holocaust genocide by filming it with characters who spoke six different languages, from the various social classes in Lvov, a place that has evolved into a multicultural area over time. People belonging to the different strata of the Lvov's society converged in this story. The languages included Yiddish, German, Hebrew, Ukrainian, Russian, and mainly Polish as well as a sociolect called Bawak (a variant of Polish) that the commoners spoke during that period. All the languages synced seamlessly with the storyline, highlighting situations of strangeness or suspicion and togetherness or unity among the characters.

Secondly, Holland addressed the multilayeredness and nuances within the compartmentalised definitions of victim, perpetrator and bystander. Holland portrayed a diverse group of Holocaust victims with different social statuses and natures, some of whom were innocent and helpful, while others being cunning and selfish, each one having their flaws. The flawless matured behaviour and character that the two children, Krystina and Pawel, acquire through the period of war contrasts with the nature of adults portrayed in the film. Children get adapted to the atmosphere. They do their daily activities that entertain them and keep them hopeful, along with their parents. For example, though children were scared of the mice and the suffocating atmosphere, they learned to live in it and overcome their fear.

Several times the audience sees Krystina taking the mouse that is obstructing her work and calmly keeping it down. One of the most heartbreaking scenes is at the end of the film when the victims are pulled out of the sewers. Pawel wishes to go back, as he feels the underground is safer than the outside world. Socha too conveys the real temperament of Polish gentiles during the *Third Reich*. His dilemma of whether to protect the victims or become a bystander is vividly portrayed in the film. Socha is an impulsive decision-maker who betrays his friend Bortnek and protects the Jews who are strangers to him. Socha's dilemma becomes more complex when he confronts the religious dilemmas related to the connection between Christianity and Judaism. Wanda, in an instance, states that Christ was a Jew. In another instance, when Chiger requests Socha to protect twelve of them like the twelve apostles, Socha replies that the twelfth was Judas, who betrayed Christ, to which the priest replies that there were always twelve apostles and Judas was replaced by Mattias. In another instance the audience sees Socha imitating a Vulcan salute and providing books and a menorah to the refugees, showing respect to their religion. These religious dilemmas are addressed at different crucial points in the film, making the relationships between the characters more complex. This shows the character Socha's and the director's struggle with identity and anti-Semitism.

The film shows Poles as having flaws in their characters too. Apart from a few Poles who sheltered and aided Holocaust victims, there were many who supported the Nazis by being bystanders, either out of fear or for rewards. It was a dark period in the history of humanity, where the ethical codes were subverted to an extent that to kill a person was considered moral and to protect was immoral. Some of them even remained blind to the atrocities that Nazis carried out claiming that

they too were psychological victims of the genocide. The Germans who presently feel guilty of their dark past, are portrayed in the film as either fanatic, armed to kill any Jew in their sight, or as those who are forced to execute their duties despite guilt. Holland made sure that this horrifying narrative did not cast any well-known actors, as she was dubious that the story would not be conveyed to the audience with the proper depth of the theme.

Thirdly, the film is realistic and avoids overdramatisation in any instance. The refugees' behaviours are crisp and emotionless, with no signs of grace or over expression. Most of them seem to be at their breaking point of sanity, feeling fatigued, unmotivated and irritated. Ms Krystyna Chiger, the last survivor among the escaped group of refugees, said after watching *In Darkness* at the Toronto International Film Festival that Holland "was so realistic that I felt I am back in the sewer and am smelling it" (Rohter, "To Tell a Dark Tale"). She said in the interview for the *New York Times*, "I was very happy and said to Agnieszka that this is not like some Hollywood version. . . I think she did a very good job, showing the positive and the negative and how they meld together. She showed the selfishness, the goodness. It was what really happened" (Rohter, "To Tell a Dark Tale").

The different symbols used in the film enhance the storyline in an apt manner. Money is the key symbol in the film that drives the narrative. It helps to assess the changing behaviours of the characters. It became an important factor in deciding human destiny, during the time of crisis. Even while facing an existential crisis, people were still greedy for wealth. Secondly, darkness symbolised possibilities for a positive future in this film rather than the usual representation of negativity, evilness or hopelessness. The dark subterranean space is used as a

symbol to show intense relationships, a sense of hope, human perseverance, indomitable spirit and resilience. The sewage also symbolised a huge, tempting rattrap for some characters and, at the same time, a shelter for many others.

The film stands distinct from the plethora of Holocaust representations for its distinct settings, depiction of complexity in human nature during the period of crisis, and ability to enter into the dark recesses of the human soul. One of the key intentions of contemporary Holocaust film scriptwriters and directors is to search for what is yet to be represented. It can be observed, as discussed in the earlier chapters, that Holocaust films have opted to make a shift from an event-centred to human nature centred approach. Narrating human nature has an inevitable characteristic: it is extremely subjective. Robert Marshall, in the introduction to his book *In the Sewers of Lvov* writes:

When I saw the Chiger's manuscript, I realised that it was not a complete account, but a record of Chiger's own personal recollection. . . It was written in isolation, without reference to any of the other survivors' recollections. . . Though they have always remained close to one another, they never discussed their common wartime experiences. . . So, with five separate, highly subjective surviving versions, I set about trying to see if it would be possible to produce an account that would be faithful to all. (2)

The film *In Darkness* is also an adaptation of multiple complex life stories, narrated from the perspectives of Shamoan and Holland, based on Robert Marshall's version of the incident with respect to the Holocaust survivors' accounts. Hence, the film contains notable deviations from the book to fit into the film genre and its market.

Holland and Shamoan reduced in number the actual number of people mentioned in the actual narrative of Marshall. Firstly, in reality, Socha had two

companions, Wroblewski and Kowalow, who supported and helped him throughout the journey, though initially he had to persuade them. Szczepiek is a fictional character, and his murder is also a false story. Secondly, initially Socha saved twenty-one people though he insisted on twelve, but later, one drowned, another fell sick and died and nine were killed when they tried to escape from the sewers. Thirdly, Janek's mistress was not named Chaja but Halina. She was not the one who gave birth in the sewers ending up smothering the child; it was another woman Genia, a character and her family not mentioned in the film. Fourthly, many incidents in the film have been trimmed, and many other fictional elements have been added. Though filmed realistically with less dramatisation, the film extensively portrays many sexual intercourse scenes that are neither mentioned in the book nor are necessary to drive the plot of the film. These include lovemaking between Socha and Wanda, uncomfortable sex between Janek and Chaja before all other hiding members, including children, and later between Mundek and Klara after he returns from the concentration camp. Although one could argue that these dramatic scenes, which might evoke voyeuristic pleasures, could have been avoided, they are integral to the storyline in order to give a more realistic effect in conveying human nature, instincts and emotions. The audience feels uneasy and suffocated by these love scenes set against the backdrop of the catastrophe.

Furthermore, by looking at these inclusions of fictional elements as in many other film adaptations of survivors' biographies, this study points at the possibilities where the audience might consciously or unknowingly have a tendency to conflate misleading information or imaginative recreations of the Holocaust with the realities of the events, which American psychologist Daniel L Schacter referred to as

'misattribution' and 'suggestibility'. He regards these as two key sins among the seven sins of memory that cause inaccuracy in recollection. He elucidated that the personal memories of individuals who experienced a past event can be influenced and changed by external sources such as other members of the society, written materials, pictures, visuals, or media (156). Regarding the Holocaust, this can apply to both the survivors of the Holocaust and the generation after.

Transgenerational Holocaust memory paved the way for many fictions that experimented with the theme of life during the second World War. Among them, the most remarkable attempts are the films that explore children as protagonists. Children grappling with the realities of the Holocaust is the most stressful and guilt-inducing visual representation of the genocide. The history of children's Holocaust movies can be traced back to the 1959 film adaptation of Anne Frank's autobiography. *Anne Frank's Diary* was adapted multiple times later, the most recent being *No Asylum: The Untold Chapter in Anne Frank's Story*, a documentary produced in 2015. The traces of history were carried through decades by reinvesting the Holocaust victim Anne Frank's character many times, making her a memory site that embodies the spirit of Holocaust victimhood.

An array of children's movies were produced in late twentieth and twenty-first centuries, like *Snow Treasure* (1968), *The Lucky Star* (1980), *Hope and Glory* (1987), *A Friendship in Vienna* (1988), *Alan and Naomi* (1992), *Swing Kids* (1993), *The Island on Bird Street* (1997), *Life is Beautiful* (1997), *Miracle at Midnight* (1998), *The Boy in Striped Pyjamas* (2008), *The Book Thief* (2013), *Run Boy Run* (2014), *Fanny's Journey* (2016) and *Jojo Rabbit* (2019). All the visual and verbal cues in these movies promoted universal themes like friendship between different

racism, blending of class distinctions, good versus evil, morality and ethics in the dark age, family bonds, gentile families rescuing friends, reincarnation from the debris of war, hope of restoring humanity, innocence of children and the way they are caught between personal and social dilemmas. Films portraying child protagonists who had to witness Holocaust, have found way into the textbooks, novels and big screen to instill Holocaust memory and the question of identity into the minds of younger generation.

Hence, unlike the Holocaust movies depicting the victimisation of adults, which mostly had a serious, bleak, distressing and disheartening effect on the audience, the films for children had to be a mixture of innocent dreams, thought stimulating, fear evoking and hope giving. The main motifs of these films were to create awareness about the Holocaust and the dehumanising nature of genocide; provide strength to resist any critical situation; help build psychological resilience; and give a ray of hope to survive any atrocities.

Taika Waititi's *Jojo Rabbit* is an Oscar-winning film for the best adapted screenplay. For Waititi, as an actor and director with a flair for comedy, blending humour within the Holocaust was a challenge. The trend of parodying Hitler on-screen dates back to the 1940s when this tyrannical leader and his regime were still a global threat. The famous comedian, scriptwriter, director, and actor, Charlie Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* (1940) can be regarded as the first movie in this tradition. This revolutionary film was initially banned in many countries, like Germany and its occupied countries, Japan, Peru, Spain and US cities. Hitler was mocked later in films like *To Be or Not to Be* (1942) by Ernst Lubitsch and *The Producers* (1967) by Mel Brooks. Waititi's *Jojo Rabbit* is another successful attempt

at comically filming Hitler and the Holocaust, especially from the children's perspective, by skillfully juxtaposing innocence and hope with terror and trauma.

Waititi establishes the mood of the film right away. He adds a background score with polka music and a German choir to accompany the film credits as they appear on the screen. The first scene in the movie begins with extreme close-up shots detailing the uniform that the key character Jojo Betzler (starred by Roman Griffin Davis) wears. In the next middle shot, the enthusiastic ten-year-old boy Jojo pledges to himself that from that day onwards he will join the ranks of the Jungvolk (children aged between ten to fourteen) to be intensively trained in the path of Hitler. As he pledges, the next character is introduced: Hitler (starred by Taika Waititi). Jojo fetishizes Adolf Hitler to the extent that he is often visited by an apparition like friend Hitler, providing him courage, consoling him while humiliated and giving him emotional investments at the moments of dilemma and confusions in his life. Hitler's character, caricatured as buffoonish, strengthens Jojo's beliefs in Nazism and the supremacy of Aryan blood. The slogan "*Heil Hitler*" is repeated continuously to turn the terrorising phrase into a funny one. With the energy and excitement that he received from his imaginary friend Hitler, he rushes out of his home, running along the streets, dancing, and waving *Heil Hitler*. These outdoor shots are mixed with footages showing how the Nazis indoctrinated the German youth, making them political fanatics who saw Hitler as a superhuman.

The film is set in the fictional city of Falkenheim during the collapse of Nazi Germany. Waititi unrolls the whole movie from the viewpoint of Jojo. He interlocks Jojo's conscious and subconscious mental processes with socio-political tensions, tyrannical Nazism, propagation of hatred, and the madness of war. Waititi subverts

the ideologies of an extremely atrocious period in the history of mankind through the means of black comedy deeply imbued with sarcasm, fluctuating between despair and hope. The innocence of a child's viewpoint helps him to blend humour into chaos, creating a carnivalesque atmosphere throughout the film without losing the thematic seriousness.

Initially, *Jojo Rabbit* looks like a pro-Nazi film, glorifying Hitler's ideologies. The following scene shows Jojo and his friend Yorki (played by Archie Yates) sitting with a large group of children dressed in Hitler Youth uniforms in a sprawling field in the *Hitlerjugend* Camp. The crowd is addressed by Captain Klenzendorf (called Captain K, acted by Sam Rockwell), who lost his one eye in the war. He looks disillusioned and free from anxiety and responsibility. He plays an important role throughout the film as a funny, dramatic, and humanistic Nazi officer. He is the main trainer of the kids, accompanied by two more instructors: sub officer Finkel (doing a minor role and being the gay partner of Captain K) and Fraulein Rahm (an awkwardly funny girls' trainer). The motives of the training are absurd, and the enthusiasm of the children to wear the uniform, get trained and to be treated as special or acceptable by the German society is shocking. This shows the extent to which Nazism was indoctrinated in children. Captain K said while addressing the children:

This is your first step towards being men. Today you boys will be involved in such activities as marching, bayonet drills, grenade throwing, trench digging, map reading, gas defence, camouflage, trap setting, ambush techniques, war games, firing guns and blowing stuff up. . . The girls will practice important womanly duties such as dressing wounds, making beds,

and learning how to get pregnant. (00:06:05 – 00:06:32)

In his speech Captain K even mentions the fact that the Nazis are losing the war, hence conveying the period in which the film is set. The film is set between a few days before the fall of Nazi Germany to a few days after Hitler's suicide.

Though a blind fanatic fiercely dedicated to Hitler, Jojo is nicknamed "Jojo Rabbit" due to an incident that happened in the training camp. The senior cadets found Jojo to be double-minded: he wished to be a merciless Nazi youth, trained to kill Jews and use explosives, but he also feared hurting others. Once, a senior cadet orders Jojo to snap a rabbit's neck without any regret. As he fails to obey the orders, he is called Jojo Rabbit by all the children. The goofy version of Hitler reappears to console the humiliated Jojo and says that being called rabbit is good, as the humble bunny faces the world bravely and outwits their enemies. Jojo, accompanied by his imaginary friend Hitler, throws a grenade to prove himself but explodes at his feet. He is taken to the hospital, and he is deeply wounded, leaving scars on his face. This scene is shown as a part of a training session that teaches children to kill for Hitler.

In the camp, Captain K and his team's duty was to misrepresent Jews as strange creatures, inject hatred towards them, and teach children to use knives, rifles and grenades. Another ritual that they practiced is burning books, which is also seen in many other films like *The Book Thief*. Works written by prominent Jewish, communist or liberal authors and books with important historical records were burnt. This is apparent evidence of surveillance and intolerance during the Nazi period.

Another important character, Jojo's mother Rosie (starred by Scarlett Johansson) is introduced in the hospital scene. Jojo lives with his mother and his father is assumed to be on the warfront. Rosie is characterised as a strong-minded,

ambitious and independent woman who is jovial and extrovert. She is the source of hope and happiness for Jojo. At every moment when Jojo feels embarrassed, either about his appearance or his inability to be like other children, she pumps him with full of confidence through her funny nature, acting like a child to entertain her son. There are many conversations between Jojo and Rosie revealing her concern about her son, whose childhood has been tainted during the catastrophic period of the Holocaust. She advises him to be a kid again and enjoy life when everything comes back to normal. In an instance, while they were merrily walking across a river bank, they discuss love:

Rosie: Love is the strongest thing in the world.

Jojo: I think you'll find that metal is the strongest thing in the world, followed closely by dynamite and then muscles. Besides, I wouldn't even know it if I saw it.

Rosie: Surprise, surprise, your shoelaces are undone. Again.

(She ties the laces of his two shoes together making him trip while he gets up, to make her son enjoy childish plays) You'll know it when it happens.

You'll feel it. A pain.

(later)

Rosie: You're growing up too fast. A ten-year-old shouldn't be celebrating war or talking politics. You should be having fun, climbing trees, and then falling out of those trees.

Jojo: But the Führer says that when we win, it is us young boys who will rule the world.

Rosie: Pah! The Reich is dying. We're going to lose this war and then what will you do? All I'm saying is that life is a gift and therefore we must celebrate it, hold on to it. We have to dance to show God we are grateful to be alive. (00:50:28 – 00:52:04)

This conversation clearly shows how Nazism took away the innocence of childhood and instead instilled animosity towards Jews and greed for power.

After Jojo is wounded while in the camp, he is assigned minor duties, letting him spend more time at home accompanied by the apparition of Hitler. One day he hears a noise from his late sister Inga's room and finds a person hiding behind the walls of her room. This is when he finds out that his mother is secretly resisting Nazism and is hiding Elsa Korr, his late sister's Jewish friend (acted by Thomasin McKenzie) in the attic. Jojo's initial reaction was fear and aversion. Elsa playfully follows Jojo as he rushes down the stairs. He is caught by her and is told to not share the secret of her hiding to anyone.

Then a series of shots are taken from Jojo's room where he is in a dilemma whether to accept Elsa or expose her. His internal dilemma is explicitly brought out in the film by Waititi with the help of the surrealistic Hitler, who is actually the second side of his consciousness that doubts and questions his deeds.

The storyline advances through the shock and realisations of Jojo that his mother Rosie aided the Jews, and they are not as odd or disgusting as he is taught. He also realises that his parents, though Germans, secretly fought against Nazism. Jojo decides to negotiate with Elsa in exchange for helping him to write a book on

Jews (a task that was earlier mentioned by Captain K as a passing comment). The conversations between Jojo and Elsa reveal how racial and religious prejudices were indoctrinated into the minds of German children to make themselves feel superior and treat others as ridiculous creatures.

He saw her as a specimen to study and make a picture book named *Yohoo Jew* to write and draw the distinct features to recognise her “kind”. She says that she is a human like him, but her kind is chosen by mighty God while Jojo and his kind by “a weak little man who cannot even grow a full moustache” (00:39:00-10). Elsa’s amusement about Jojo’s misconceptions of Jews helps him to fill his book with even more surreal anti-Semitic canards. Eventually friendship sprouts between them. They even deceive the Gestapo, who come home suspecting Rosie. Elsa pretends to be Inga and shows her identity card, she escapes with the timely help of Captain K (who is already hopeless and disillusioned by the war).

By giving voice to the children, Waititi helped the audience to understand the Holocaust from multiple perspectives beyond the adult world. Waititi tried to deconstruct the notion of children’s stereotypical movement from innocence to experience (as seen in films like *The Boy in Striped Pyjamas* and *Hope and Glory* in which Bruno and Billy Rowan are the protagonists respectively), to a more realistic movement from misconception to recognition. Jojo recognises that the indoctrination is false and understands the inhumanity of the Nazi regime. In an instance in the film, Jojo meets his friend Yorki who is now a soldier despite being a kid. They share their experience of meeting Jews, and Yorki too states that the group of Jews whom he met were also normal humans like them. This is a scene in which Jojo and many other kids are assigned to pick up scrap metals. Many reports stated

that scrap metals were collected from the citizens for the war efforts, which were recycled and used to make bombs, tanks, guns and others. Jojo even realises that his mother is silently spreading anti-Nazi messages throughout the town, to free their country, Germany.

Though set as a dark comedy, the most heart-rending scene in the film is when Jojo discovers that his mother is dead. The scene shows Jojo collecting his ration, and while walking back home, he sees a butterfly dancing and follows it to reach his mother's feet with her beautiful shoes (which are focused in many shots in her dance sequences). He sees her hanging in the town square. He hugs her legs, cries and tries to tie her lace (which Rosie usually does for him) but fails. The camera moves from this close-up shot to a wide angle, conveying the stillness of the atmosphere and the numbness of Jojo. The next scene shows Jojo back home, trying to kill Elsa, but finally realising that his mother was not hanged for a wrong deed. He realises that she is the only companion left for him, and they share their grief when they hear the sounds of bomb blasts and war in the background.

The film then shows the political condition after Hitler's suicide through morbid humour. The weak civilian population and even the young cadets are armed to fight back. This is a carnivalesque scene combining humour, pathos and chaos. Jojo meets Yorki again, and in that excitement, Yorki waves back, but one side of the rocket launcher in his hand hits the ground and fires, sending a missile into a shop and blasting. Waititi uses many such slapstick techniques in the film to exaggerate emotions, express absurdity in different situations and show vigorous and violent actions. Many bombs explode, and Yorki discusses his uncertain feelings and says that he thinks they are on the wrong side. He states about their current political

condition: Russia, America, England, China, Africa and India are attacking their country and the only support is from Japan. Jojo is shocked to hear that Hitler committed suicide and the Nazi army is left to sort out the problem. He even gets to know that Hitler was evil.

The following shots are a series of intense attacks: children and elders are armed to fire back, machine guns and enemy tanks are continuously firing, soldiers and civilians fall like rain. It is smoky, dusty and foggy everywhere. Jojo meets his insane and ridiculous trainers again. The most horrifying scene is Rahm shoving the young cadets to war. She sticks a grenade into the back pocket of a clone, and pulls the pin and sends to the battlefield to hug an enemy; she calls Yorki and gives him a gun and shoves him too to the battlefield; she calls Jojo and makes him wear the uniform coat taken from a dead child for 'protection' and finally she grabs a huge machine gun and moves to the field where suddenly an explosion shatter all. Jojo even meets Captain K and his Finkel, wearing a sparkly smooth cape and firing. Jojo sees many soldiers turned insane, crazy and frenzy. Shocked and afraid, he hides in an underground hole in the debris of a building. Jojo hides himself until the war ends and the Allies win. When things are silent Jojo comes out but is caught by another soldier. He meets imprisoned Captain K in his tattered altered uniform and runs to him. Their conversation is like concluding a carnival. K says that Jojo's mother was a good person and tells him to protect his sister. When Captain K listens to a Russian soldier's footsteps, he rips off Jojo's Nazi jacket and pushes him away calling him a Jew. Startled Jojo runs and escapes, bumping into Yorki who is also alive. He then runs to Elsa who both decide to escape as they are free.

As Jojo, now a courageous, mature child, gets ready, the buffoonish intimidating Hitler with a bullet on one side of his forehead reappears again in front of Jojo, now ironically helping to realise the comic stance on the politics of war and ethnic cleansing. He complains about Jojo's deteriorating patriotism and scolds him for protecting Elsa and not wearing the swastika emblem. This surrealistic image is kicked off by Jojo through his window, symbolising himself as free from being a worshipper of Hitler. Elsa and Jojo start dancing outside their door on the street out of happiness. They survived the Holocaust, giving a ray of hope to the audience. The film ends with a final note from the German poet Rainer Maria Rilke: "Let everything happen to you/ Beauty and terror/ Just keep going/ No feeling is final" (01:43:03- 10).

Though Jojo Rabbit is said to be adapted from the novel *Caging Skies*, the cruxes of the two works are different. The novel evokes a sense of disgust and despair as the character Johannes is not able to completely escape from the indoctrination of Nazi ideology. He remained an obsessive narcissist even after the war. He is nineteen then and does not free Elsa out of the fear of loneliness and believes that she owes to requite love and pleasure as he had protected her. He frees her only after three years. Waititi takes a more satirical stance in his representation of Nazi ideology and expresses contempt and disdain for Hitler, showing him as buffoonish. In Waititi's version, Jojo is just ten and a half years old and his love towards Elsa is like that towards his sister Inga. Though he lies that the war is not over, in the next moment he changes his word and tells her to be free from the crawlspace where she had lived for months. Their identities are no more superior or inferior to one another, instead, Waititi's portrayal of children promotes love, hope and inclusivity.

Waititi's balanced characterisation, in which for every character he created an equal and opposite foil, brought out the humour and seriousness in the film. Jojo is portrayed as enthusiastic and creative, but a passive and weak child when compared to his daring mother, due to which she is hanged. When Jojo is characterised as the central character who falls into all the troubles, his friend Yorki is characterised as the one who luckily escapes every trouble and finally even death in the war. Jojo and Elsa, too, have contrasting natures. Jojo is portrayed as a weak, timid and emotionally impulsive character in the beginning, whereas Elsa is portrayed as intelligent, courageous and emotionally balanced character. Their attachment conveyed that person relationship and coexistence with people from other ethnic groups helps to concede the humanness of deprived minorities. Waititi skilfully created his child characters to manifest the pluralistic psyche of civilians under any dictatorship by merging misconceptions, fears, resistance, heroism, fetishism and the nature of blind extremists armed to fight. The audience witnesses how children are indoctrinated in such a way that they forget the happiness, fun and innocence of childhood. They are haunted by the fear of being discovered and are forced to take up huge responsibilities. The vibrant and extrovert Rosie, filled with energy and hope in life, can be seen as a foil to Captain K, who is worn out with no hope of a recovery from his disillusioned condition.

Early mainstream narratives after the Holocaust usually overlooked the persecution of LGBTQ+ community by the Nazis. In the recent years, the abundance of holocaust movies compelled the filmmakers to explore unsaid themes and strive for a more complete picture of the Holocaust. The stories of the sexual minorities began to gain prominence, demonstrating the multidirectionality in representing the

Holocaust. The inclusion of gay officers, Captain K and Finkel, in the movie *Jojo Rabbit* signified a departure from the stereotypical portrayals of Nazi officers. While a few films (including the 1997 film *Bent*, the 2005 film *A Love to Hide*, and a brief reference in *The Grey Zone*) have featured sexual minorities in the oppressed group, the oppressors or the officers who represent them are rarely shown. *Jojo Rabbit* is a film that both mocks the myth of Aryan purity (by incorporating gay officers) and presents a unique portrayal.

The key feature that enhanced the plot of this film is the music composition by Michael Giacchino (famous for composing many television series, video games, animation movies and thriller films). Waititi suggested his Oscar winning composition for the animation movie *Up* as model for *Jojo Rabbit*. Music played a vital role in expressing the thematic depth and seriousness of this Holocaust story. The emotions underneath every hilarious and poignant scene are brought out through the choice of music by Giacchino. He mixed German and English classic songs, pop music, and band beats in the film. The music and brightly lit scenes make the movie more like a fictional fairy tale rather than a realistic one.

There are many symbols in the movie that enhance the narrative, and the most obvious being Jojo's uniform, which he wears most of the time while at home or outside. It is a sign of his excessive admiration for Nazism. Jojo's book on Jews is an expression of his misconceptions about the Jewish ethnicity and his prejudice towards them. Being able to tie his shoelace is attached to Jojo's growth, gradually increasing his confidence and independence. The rabbit image in the movie is the timid and frightened version of Jojo within himself, who is caged by the end of the narrative as shown in the last picture of his book *Yohoo Jew*, and Jojo is let free from his internal dilemmas.

Though *Jojo Rabbit* seems to be a typical anti-Nazi spectacle, it marked an epoch in the history of Holocaust films as it allegorically exposed the irrationality in executing genocide and the despotism of some of the tyrannical rulers currently in power worldwide. As a powerful children's movie, didactically it has many functions: it evokes the memory of the Holocaust, exposes the ruthless rule of Hitler, portrays how hatred was manifested, and illustrates the conditions of some of the civilians who pretended to follow Nazism but actually resisted it. It mocks those who blindly follow the brutal dictators and see them as cult figures to be worshiped for their own livelihood. Through Jojo's perspective, the film grapples with the moral conundrum of whether to destroy or protect the 'other'. He struggles between his loyalty to his imaginary friend Hitler and his sympathy for Elsa. Living under the Nazi system, Jojo initially identifies all Jews including Elsa as the 'other'. His perception of the 'other' shifts as he grows. Towards the end of the film, he realises that Hitler is the 'other' that should be alienated and destroyed from his life.

Though the movie bagged many awards, the critics criticised it for its levity in dealing with themes like the Holocaust. Critics brought out the pun in describing the film as an anti-hate satire. Being a historical fiction, a few critics said that it promoted the idea that, towards the end of the war, many people who supported Nazism turned humane and helped the victims. The American film critic Richard Brody stated in his article published in the *New York Times*,

The present-day didacticism of *Jojo Rabbit*, encourages viewers to look with benign empathy at Nazis. . . The actual target of *Jojo Rabbit* isn't really the haters, it's those who would presume to hate the haters. The movie doesn't so much satirise Nazis, let alone expose the fraudulence of contemporary

hatemongers (such as neo-Nazis or alt-rightists) . . . rather, the movie ultimately cautions against the easy contempt and dismissal of them by liberals and progressives: there are a lot of very fine people on both sides. (“Springtime for Nazis”)

Therefore, *Jojo Rabbit* was a highly political, thematically complex, and controversial movie. As decades passed, it can be understood that the function of child protagonists in Holocaust movies too dynamically changed with respect to the emergence of new generation of storytellers who had experienced the transgenerational trauma. The memory holders of different periods themselves became the creators, fabricators and drivers generating new meanings, making the Holocaust a travelling memory.

While working through the representations of Holocaust memory in post millennium films, it is understood that the directors tried to localise the experiences of the Holocaust victims and simultaneously universalise the bygone event showing the consequences of any genocide happening around the world. The films discussed imply that Holocaust memory is a collection of diverse experiences, perceptions and perspectives of people from different territories within the Nazi occupied regions and of those people who bear the transgenerational memory even while living outside these territories. These filmic interventions, which represented transgenerational memory, have helped to glocalise Holocaust memory by not limiting it to a single region or community. Hence after decades, the memory of the bygone event Holocaust has extended beyond territories and has become entangled in diverse national histories and identities through the process of glocalisation of memory. This has made the Holocaust a postnational discourse across the world.

The dynamics of two genocide memories (the Holocaust and the Nakba) work in an entirely different manner in Israel/ Palestine. In Israel, the Holocaust memory is in congruence with the geopolitical territory and national history. The history of the State of Israel (formed in 1948), is constructed with the sympathy of Holocaust victimisation memory and the myth of returning to the 'Promised Land' as its foundation. Majority of the present Israelites are the Jewish settlers who migrated from the Nazi-occupied nations, and the others being the residents of the old Palestine before the formation of the State of Israel.

The ideologies of political Israel were colonial and ethnonationalist, as they aimed to build a state of monolithic society exclusively for Jews, where the European Jews who migrated during the Holocaust considered themselves racially superior to the native Jews of old Palestine. This issue is reflected in Israeli political scientist Oded Haklai's work, *Palestinian Ethnonationalism in Israel*, in which his arguments are grounded in majority-minority dynamics in Israel. He discusses the history of the formation of Israel and identifies it to be ethnonationalist, and then discusses the emerging ethnonationalism in Israeli Palestinians after the 1980s to attain the identity of "an indigenous and national minority" demanding equal rights in Israel (1). He argues the Arab struggle in Israel to be the result of emergence of Communist Party and discusses the identity of Israeli Palestinians as being excluded from other Palestinian activist movements (13). He does not focus much on the old Palestinian land and people before the establishment of the State of Israel, as addressed earlier in Edward Said's *The Question of Palestine* or Ilan Pappé's *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*.

To realise the dream of Israeli nationhood, the newly formed state occupied and vandalised Palestine, forming a new territory. This territory is continuously under expansion by encroaching on the remaining Palestinian land and usurping their power. Israeli political geographer Oren Yiftachel, in his critical study *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/ Palestine*, counters sociologist Sammy Smooha's claim that Israel is an archetype of a resilient 'ethnic democracy'. Yiftachel argues that Israel is an 'ethnocracy' rather than a democracy, as the State of Israel is bureaucratically ruled by Jewish ethnos, and not by a democratic government with defined territory. He criticises the Israeli governing system that controls both Israeli and Palestinian territories, and states,

'Israel proper'. . . simply does not exist, since it is impossible to define 'Israel' as a spatial unit, and it is difficult to define the boundaries of its body-politics. . . Israel operates as a polity without borders. This undermines a basic requirement of democracy - the existence of a 'demos'. (96-97)

The idea of Palestinian nationhood traces its origin in the history of the existence of old Palestinian region and Palestinian nationalism before the Israeli occupation, and the memory of ethnic cleansing of Palestinians by the political Zionists. There are several critical studies tracing the origin of Palestinian identity, nationalism and nationhood. Many Western scholars, like Bernard Lewis (British American historian specialised in oriental studies) and Daniel Pipes (American commentator), argued that Palestinians did not recognise a distinct nation for them until the interwar period. Another historian, James L Gelvin, stated in his book *The Israel–Palestine Conflict: One Hundred Years of War* that “Palestinian nationalism emerged during the interwar period in response to Zionist immigration and

settlement” (92- 93). Gelvin emphasised that though Palestinian nationalism emerged after Zionism, it does not mean that it is inferior, invalid or less legitimate than Zionism, as it is a fact that every nationalism arises as a reaction to another. Whereas, Palestinian American historian Rashid Khalidi traced the history of Palestine and the existence of Palestinian identity centuries back in Biblical times. Khalidi’s book *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness* which was published before Gelvin’s study has already mentioned that “it is a serious mistake to suggest that Palestinian identity emerged mainly as a response to Zionism” as this would be a negligence of the past socio-political struggles and the already existing Palestinian identity (19). David Seddon writes in his work, *A Political and Economic Dictionary of the Middle East*, “the existence of a population with a recognisably similar name ('the Philistines') in Biblical times suggests a degree of continuity over a long historical period (much as 'the Israelites' of the Bible suggest a long historical continuity in the same region)” (532).

It can be said that the modern Palestinian nationalist movement against the British and political Zionist occupiers was launched in 1936 with the Arab Revolt. This movement was crushed. Later, many protests came up, both marginal and major, leading to the formation of the PLO. As time passed by, PLO too became ineffective and was forced to serve as the Zionist government’s puppets in order to gain political advantages, they were unable to address the issues faced by Palestinians. As a result, numerous new protests arose. The Palestinians were oppressed by the Zionist government, but the protests gained momentum and recognition on a global scale, enabling them to reclaim their identity. Ethnonationalist movements such as Hamas emerged in Gaza of Palestine to reclaim

their history and land, when continuous efforts are taken by Israel and its allies to exile, marginalise or eliminate Palestinians; manipulate history; bomb civilians in a systematic manner; leave many children orphaned; and target children and women to end future generations. The Palestinian refugees longed to return to their native land. This ongoing Israeli-Palestinian power struggle has led to the emergence of national memory narratives. This power structure where one tries to erase another and the other tries to reassert itself has never ended the identity struggle of Palestinians and Israelites. Many of the contemporary Nakba films from Israel and Palestine try to challenge the ethnonationalism of these two regions, and move beyond boundaries to expose the realities to both Israelite and Palestinian people by depicting their collective, individual, fabricated, and erased memories.

Through creative deliberations, many of the contemporary films try to question the territorialisation or concretisation of Holocaust memory in Israel, and deterritorialisation or erasure of Nakba memory in Palestine through mainstream narratives and media, even in the present. *The Salt of This Sea* and *Tel Aviv on Fire* expose the difficulties that the residents of Israel/ Palestine experience due to Nakba, the ongoing event of expulsion and victimisation. Glocalisation of the Nakba memory challenges the congruence between memory and political history developed by the government. This process brings to light the consequences of Nakba faced by the transgenerational trauma bearers, the new generation of Israelites who are either residing in Israel or Palestine, and the refugees outside the nation-state. These films, through glocalisation, universalise the experiences of the Nakba, accept the uniqueness of both cultures, address the current problems and identity struggle faced by the young generation of Palestinians and Israelites as the intergenerational

memory bearers, bring repressed cultures to the forefront, critically revisit the narratives of Israel/ Palestine, and protest against the ongoing erasure and construction of a new history by the ruling government.

The two movies also address the ways in which the cultures of Israel and Palestine are gradually adapting, blending, and integrating; this leads to the eventual loss of the distinct collective identities, culture or memory, or the subversion of the weaker group's origins and attainment of autonomy over it. They portray the cultural elements unique to each group as a means to propagate a sense of belongingness and the collective identity of each community.

Annemarie Jacir is regarded as the first Palestinian woman to make a full-length feature film. Her film *Salt of This Sea* gains significance in this research as it voices against many stereotypes in representation of Palestinians, and courageously exposes dimensions of Palestinian history that are not much shown in the mainstream media. The film begins with black and white footages showing the demolition of buildings and the war during the period of Nakba. The audience sees bunkers and jets destroying the regions where Palestinians resided, and people migrating by boat through the heavy tides. These footages work as visual evidence of the existence of indigenous people in the pre-Nakba Palestine. The scene shifts to the present by switching to the coloured version of the rough sea, accompanied by traditional Palestinian music.

The first scene begins with a closeup shot of the title character, Soraya Tahani (starred by the Palestinian American poet Suheir Hammad) who is going through immigration and security checks. Since she wishes to visit Palestine, she is rigorously interrogated several times in a quite insulting manner, and her baggage

and body are thoroughly checked before leaving the airport. The audience gets to know the complexity of Soraya's identity, and gets a glimpse of the geopolitics and identity crisis of the Palestinians, Israelites and the expatriates. It also gradually reveals the xenophobia of the ruling government. Soraya's individuality, surname, nativity, lineage, religion and geographical identities are questioned by the airport officers. Despite being from New York, she is questioned because her grandfather was born in Jaffa, a significant pre-Nakba cultural hub of Palestine, and her parents were refugees in Lebanon. She is questioned about the reason for her visit and, ironically, responds that it is for her personal security. She is perceived as a possible rebel or threat to the State of Israel. This airport scene sets the premise of the film.

Jaffa, Soraya's grandfather's homeland, was the largest coastal city in Palestine during the pre-Nakba period. Jaffa was the most important commercial hub of that period and was called the 'bride of the seas'. In the introduction to the book titled *Nakba: Palestine, 1948 and The Claims of Memory*, Ahmadh Sa'di and Lila-abu-Lughod states,

Jaffa, the port city that was a place of intense fighting, and from which almost the whole population fled in 1948, fully expecting to return once things quieted down. Instead, the city was annexed to Tel Aviv. The tension in the present was sparked by the stream of diasporic Jaffans, or their children and grandchildren, recollecting Jaffa and returning—if they had the proper passports—just to have a look at what was once theirs. (20)

Soraya feels burdened by the tragic history of the Palestinian extermination, despite being born in Brooklyn and belonging to the second-generation of 1948 Nakba memory bearers.

Later scenes show Soraya heading to Ramallah to stay with her friend Koryn. Through Soraya's eyes while travelling, the camera shows the outskirts and the busy underdeveloped towns of present-day Palestine, the Separation Wall, the difference between the infrastructures of current Israel and Palestine, and the unemployed youngsters whiling away their time.

By returning to Palestine, Soraya intends to trace her lineage and live in Palestine, where her family was exiled in 1948 (when Israel occupied their land). She tries to retrieve the savings left by her grandfather in the British Palestine Bank. She receives a refusal from the bank as the account is not valid since it was taken before 1948. All the accounts were frozen after the Nakba, and the Israeli government declared that her grandfather was not a Jaffan native, though he had a UN issued identity card. The bank manager states that presently, Jaffa of Palestine and the bank's branch do not exist. Soraya demands justice.

In the book *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*, Pappé writes that fifty eight out of the sixty-four villages were wiped out in the coastal areas between Haifa and Tel-Aviv (137). The poorly equipped and not well coordinated Arab protestors were easily defeated by the political Zionists. Later in 1950, Jaffa was formally merged with Tel Aviv and a unified city was established and named Tel Aviv Yafo. It progressed to become Israel's cultural and economic centre.

The determined heroine Soraya tries hard to reclaim her Palestinian identity, and through this, attain a spiritual repatriation of her family to their homeland. Throughout the movie, the Palestinian and Israeli people whom she meets conceive of her as a Brooklyn born, well off crazy lady coming over to ruined Palestine,

fancifully wishing to live in her grandfather's home and cherish the ruins of her ancestors. Her inner trauma and loneliness are never understood by her native Palestinian friends or Israelites. The film vividly shows the perspective of the natives about a foreigner in different instances. Soraya experiences mental turmoil as she is seen as a foreigner in her homeland. In an instance, Soraya is taken to a luxurious house by a renter, and the next shot shows Soraya sitting in a barely furnished room, showing her financial condition, unlike the assumptions of the Palestinians whom she meets.

On the path to overcoming her mental struggle of not being able to prove her Palestinian identity, she meets Emad (acted by Saleh Bakri). Emad is a youngster, originally from Dawayima, raised in Al Am'ari refugee camp and living in Ramallah. He works as a waiter in a restaurant, from where Soraya met him for the first time. She too seeks a job in the restaurant. Unlike Soraya, Emad dreams of escaping from the constraints of the Palestinian condition and going abroad to Canada for higher studies. Soraya's romanticised version of Palestine, which her grandfather had narrated, starkly differs from Emad's daily experiences while living in the present war-torn Palestine. Emad believes life outside is better than life inside Palestine.

Soraya: All my life, I have dreamt of coming here. There is no going back.

Emad: That's a problem. How do you feel now? you are here.

Soraya: I feel like I don't know what to do. I am finally here. And all I get is a two-week visa.

Emad: You should have said that you are here to meet your Jewish friends.

Soraya: Why should I lie?

Emad: Why should you tell the truth? It only makes their job easier.

Soraya: I have nothing to hide. They'd search until they find the secret that I am a Palestinian . . . They can deny my entry, turn me back or

Emad: Or give you a measly two-week visa when you deserve the same as anyone else. No, you deserve more. You come from here. Your family comes from here. But they'll never let you live here. You'll only ever be a tourist. So, give them what they want. Confess it all if you think it will help.
(sarcastically)

Soraya: All we have is the truth. I am not giving that up.

Emad: Think the truth helped anyone here? Wake up. Look around. They won. You are wasting your time giving them the truth. They don't deserve it. What matters is you hold your head up. You think Palestine is just oranges? Jaffa oranges? What a fantasy.

Soraya: Finished? I am not some foreign chick who will kiss your ass and say you are special because you are Palestinian. You don't know me. I don't need a lecture on Palestine! Don't tell me what Palestine is! I know what it is! (00:31:50 – 00:34:20)

Soraya's and Emad's state of mental disturbance and uncertainty in identity, being an insider-outsider, are well depicted in this conversation.

Another character in this movie struggling due to their Palestinian identity is Emad's friend Marwan (performed by Riyad Ideis). He desperately wants to become a filmmaker. Being in Palestine, he is unable to follow his dream. He, too, wishes to follow Emad to Canada and build his career. The characters Emad and Marwan represent a section of the Palestinian youth who are disillusioned by the present state

of their existence. This reminds of the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics and Sharek Youth Forum report stated in the case study by Interpeace in 2017 titled “Palestinian Youth Challenges and Aspirations” stated, Youth comprise one third of Palestinian society, representing 30% of the 4.95 million population. Youth live under harsh conditions, with around 40% unemployed, of whom 50% are among graduates. One person out of 25 young people is with disability. Polls indicate that over one third of youth wish to migrate abroad (37% in Gaza and 15% in the West Bank). There are differences in unemployment between men and women, as the rate is 21% among males and 43% among females. Also, the rate is higher in the Gaza Strip (40%) than the West Bank (16.9%).

Emad and Marwan belong to those who wish to escape from the current sociopolitical context of Palestine and the confinements enforced on them by the Israeli government. Their responses towards history suggest their detachment from and disinterest in the history and the present of their de facto fragmented nation. They are the epitomes of Palestinian youths facing transgenerational trauma and everyday humiliations. They are frustrated of not being able to cross Israel’s constructed boundaries. The authorities refused Emad’s student visa for the fourth time and did not give him a chance to leave the place in which he had been confined for the past seventeen years. Another Israeli government attempt to degrade Palestinian youth is expressed in the conversation between Marwan and Soraya about the availability of guns in Palestine. Marwan stated that earlier Palestinians were not allowed to use guns. Now they are flooding into Palestine to kill each other, American-made and Israeli- approved.

Emad, Marwan, and Soraya decide to take matters into their own hands, even if it means breaking the law, in order to escape from the Palestinian condition and gain freedom from what they are facing due to government's oppressive policies like denial to travel. Their quest for justice allegorically represents Palestine's quest for justice and their struggle to reclaim their statehood. The second half of the movie begins with a scene in the bank where Soraya and Emad disguise themselves as a Muslim woman wearing niqab (a head scarf covering face) and a man wearing keffiyeh (a scarf used by Palestinian men), respectively. They grab the money from the bank (from Ramallah branch in the West Bank) by blackmailing the accountant and escape with the help of Marwan. This act, though criminal, is understood by these youngsters to be the only means to get back the right to their property and to emancipate themselves from the shackles of geopolitical oppression and ethnoreligious segregation.

In the next scene, the three friends disguise themselves as Jews and cross the barricades and military checkpoints to reach Jerusalem without permits. They wander through the Israeli area, hiding their identity. Later the film shows long shots of the Separation Wall dividing Palestine/Israel, along which the three friends travel for a long distance. They divide their money and decide not to return to the West Bank again. The next scene shows them traveling through the Israeli cities. Emad drives to see the deeply yearned-for sea. The sea is a symbol used throughout the film to show multiple human emotions like longing, freedom, the flow of life and so on. The sea symbolises an ongoing pursuit of home for Soraya, whereas it reminds Emad and Marwan of the injustices, surveillance, restrictions that the young native Palestinians must endure to build a prosperous life.

The later scene shows the three friends in Jaffa, the city where Soraya's grandparents lived. They reach her ancestral home which is presently occupied by another Israeli family. The hospitality of the young woman Irit (acted by Shelly Goral) living in Soraya's home makes Marwan and Emad comfortable, except for Soraya, who feels suffocated. Jacir vividly and realistically portrays the tension between Soraya and Irit in this part of the film. Their time together is dense with emotions and recollections. Every gesture or conversation with the woman irritates her. In this instance, the woman tries to converse with the guests and permits them to live in 'her' home as long as they wish to. She expresses her sympathy for Soraya's parents, who had to leave their home. She states that the young Israelites like her too wish to live in peace and blame the politicians for the current Israeli-Palestinian situation.

Contrary to the earlier scene, in the following scene the next day, the audience witnesses a harsh argument between Soraya and Irit, when Soraya proposes to buy her grandfather's home back. Irit brushed off her idea by stating that she cannot accept her proposal, as the house belongs to the Jews after the Jewish nation was found. Soraya then says that she is ready to convert, to which Irit says that it is pointless. The conversation between them deepens and becomes intractable:

Soraya: This is my home. It was stolen from my family. So, it's for me to decide if you can stay. And you can.

Irit: Are you serious?

Soraya: My father should have been raised in this house, not in a fucking camp.

Irit: You want to speak about history, the past. Let's forget it.

Soraya: Your past is my every day, my right now. This is not your home. Irit:
It is now.

Soraya: You can stay if you admit all of this is stolen.

Irit: I can stay? This was your grandfather's home. They left.

Soraya: They were forced to. (Marwan tells Soraya to calm down) They
didn't want to leave. My grandfather laid down this floor. What does that
mean to you?

Irit: She's crazy. I am extending a hand to you. I invited you to stay. I'm
being friendly. Soraya: Our windows, our doors, our fucking house. Admit it.

Irit: Get out of my house. (Soraya breaks a vase)

Soraya: Recognise it. (01:16:20 - 01:17:57)

This heated discussion is the core of this movie. Soraya reclaims her ancestral land and her Palestinian identity by reaffirming that her grandfather laid down the floor of the house in which Irit is currently staying. This is an act of confirming that her family had been living there for generations until they were forcefully expelled. The phrases used by Irit and Soraya for the circumstances in which Soraya's grandparents had to leave the country are noteworthy as they clearly show how history gets revised. Irit states that Soraya's grandparents 'left' which indicates that they left willingly and not forcefully, which Soraya refutes. This shows the attempts of the Israelites to erase the history of Palestinians.

The scene also throws light on the double standards of the Jewish migrants like Irit, who blame the government for torturing Palestinians and at the same time refuses to accept the fact that they occupied someone's land. It is interpreted as the helplessness of the second-generation Israelites in changing the current

circumstances of Israelites and Palestinians (though Irit is sympathetic, when her existence is questioned, she too is not able to accept). It brought together hostility and hospitality in the character of Irit. Another scene that affirms the traces of Palestinians in the land is the one in which Soraya sees many stores with piles of furniture and traditional artworks kept for selling in stores, which actually belonged to the Palestinians in the past. This scene is accompanied by Arab music in the background, together documenting Palestinian's historical presence.

Emad calms down the furious Soraya and asks her why she should act crazy as though she is under occupation. Emad finds it difficult to understand Soraya's mental trauma when he is literally living and experiencing it in the midst of occupied territory. Emad and Soraya continue their road trip to their next destination, Emad's village, Al Dawayima, and Marwan decides to stay back. Emad states that they can cross any checkpoints with his looks resembling those of an Israelite and her English accent.

Their trip to Al Dawayima is another attempt by Jacir to recollect the history of Palestine by working against memoricide or erasure of the traces of pre-1948 Palestine. The film shows that the present generation is not familiar of a place with a place with the name Dawayima, as it has been changed to Amatzya. Emad and Soraya walk through the ruins of the place, through which Jacir subtly refers to the 1948 Dawayima massacre. The film acts as a counter history, as it internally maps the names of the old Palestinian regions, which are absent in the current history or geography. Their symbolic act of lighting a candle over the ruins of Dawayima is an act of commemoration for the victims of 1948. This is a response against the attempts to erase the history and, at the same time, seeks to weave a counter history

that exposes the present history as fabricated. Emad and Soraya decide to stay in the ruins of a house, unaware that it is now an archaeological centre. During their stay together, they discuss their vulnerabilities as Palestinians. Emad perceives Soraya's and her future offspring's diaspora identity as a privilege that provides hope and freedom to travel the world, something he is restricted from. Though she empathises with and experiences the transgenerational trauma, she is not physically confined in an inescapable trap like Emad or Marwan.

The next day they are woken up by a history teacher who has brought his students, ironically to learn about their roots and teach them how Jews turned alive the ruins of the biblical land. Emad and Soraya narrowly escape, faking them to be Jews from Brooklyn. They pack their belongings from Dawayima and move on.

Soraya realises that though her dream of returning to her homeland is finally fulfilled, she is exposed to the threats and daily realities of living under occupation. The audience is made to follow her through the history of lost Palestine. This journey is a revelation to Soraya. She embraces her ancestral history even more tightly, but now from a new perspective after travelling through the annexed Jaffa and other erased Palestinian regions presently belonging to Israel. Along the journey, she realises her privileges as an American citizen originally from Palestine when compared to Emad and Marwan who are stuck in the stillness of life because they are Palestinians living within the Palestinian region of Ramallah.

Soraya and Emad continue their journey to Haifa but are caught by the Israeli police for not having identity cards. Soraya tries to protect him as usual but fails this time. Emad is caught with his pronunciation of 'Jerusalem'. She is sent back to Brooklyn and Emad's destiny is not revealed.

This thought-provoking movie, with its audaciously bold representation, shakes the stereotypical images and notions of the Israel/ Palestine condition and the people bearing it. An article by the Arab Film and Media Institute, stated that Annemarie Jacir was banned from returning to Palestine for several years after the completion of production. The film received global acceptance and won fifteen international awards. Her other films include *When I Saw You*, *Wajib* and many other documentaries and short films.

Unlike most of the usual representations of Arab women as passive and docile, Jacir's female protagonist, Soraya, around whose decisions the whole plot revolves, is a dynamic and valiant working-class woman who is determined to reclaim her identity. Jacir's protagonist, Soraya, is an uncompromising lady, who questions back the Israeli officials about their belongingness to the land of Palestine, which was occupied. Jacir characterises Emad and Marwan as patient and supportive, unlike many of the depictions of Palestinians as uncultured and violent attackers. Soraya's desire to recuperate her grandfather's frozen money and taken-away property is the central theme of the movie, which boldly redefines criminality and morality. Soraya believes her act of threatening and taking money from the bank to be her right, which is a crime in front of the law. Through this, Jacir questions the law, different for every person in the occupied territories, where the basic right to movement itself is denied. Another courageous move by Jacir through art is her recalling and rewriting Palestinian history. Soraya's reminiscences about Jaffa and Emad's memory of Al Dawayima before 1948 bring back the actual history that has been erased from the current history of the land to the present generation.

There are many symbols used to give poignancy to the plight of the

characters through the history of Israel/ Palestine. Sea is a significant motif in the movie. The title, *Salt of This Sea*, alludes to the yearning of the natives to return to Palestine and the injustices perpetrated on Palestinian refugees around the world by not allowing them to return to their land and sea. They desired for the salt of 'this' sea of the pre-Nakba Jaffa, which was a prosperous coastal city at that time. Water is used as a symbol to convey the film's messages in several instances. In Emad's case, he has not seen the sea for the past seventeen years, indicating how he is trapped and stuck under Israeli control, without a possibility to enter into the flow of life to seek a bright future. The shots that show Soraya drowning in the still water in the tub indicates the loss of control of life and control over her life in the present Israel/ Palestine. Her bathing in the vast wavy sea symbolises her mental turbulence of being an insider-outsider and a present absentee. The trios' trip to Tel Aviv Yafo to see the coast and sea shows their determination to fulfil their dreams.

Another key symbol used in the film to convey multiple meanings is the orange, which is an important element in Soraya's memory of Palestine transmitted through her grandfather's narrations of the land. As a woman who cherishes the oranges of old Jaffa, Emad sends her a box of oranges to say sorry after a dispute between them. Emad, Soraya and Marwan pluck oranges and eat them, symbolising hope in establishing a new life free from restrictions. Jacir also tries to look at the Israeli occupation of land, culture, wealth and vegetation of Palestine through the discussion and presence of oranges throughout the film.

Jacir uses Arab music to bring back the memories of Palestine. She deliberately incorporates the names of the Palestinian regions, which are erased from contemporary history and are renamed. The confusions related to the old names of

the places are purposefully created to evoke the past and bring it to the light for the young audience to recognise the political attempts of the government to hide and rewrite history. It exposes the dangers of collective amnesia among the young Israeli Palestinians and the threat of forgetfulness leading to the erasure of Palestinian history.

Palestinian historian Elias Sanbar begins his essay, "Out of Place, Out of Time," with the statement:

The contemporary history of the Palestinians turns on a key date: 1948. That year, a country and its people disappeared from maps and dictionaries "The Palestinian people doesnot exist," said the new masters, and henceforth the Palestinians would be referred to by general, conveniently vague terms, as either "refugees," or in the case of a small minority that had managed to escape the generalised expulsion, "Israeli Arabs." A long absence was beginning. (87)

The post millennium films representing Nakba oppose this forcefully imposed 'long absence' of a group of indigenous people by bringing to light the growing cultural, social and political amnesia in the young generation due to the fabrication and erasure of the history of the land of Israel/ Palestine by the political powers.

Sameh Zoabi's fictional film *Tel Aviv on Fire* vividly portrays the difficulty that the people living in Palestine/ Israel face, due to the discriminatory restrictions in the rights to travel and reside. The film exhibits the life of a Palestinian youngster Salam (played by the Palestinian actor Kais Nashif) living in East Jerusalem (under the control of Israel). He works in the film industry and recently is employed as a trainee and a consultant to help with language on the set of a Palestinian soap opera

“Tel Aviv on Fire”. This drama serial within the film is produced in Ramallah (a Palestinian city), and Salam needs to cross the Israeli checkpoint every day to reach the television studio.

Zoabi’s *Tel Aviv on Fire* reminds of a quote attributed to Charlie Chaplin, “To truly laugh, you must be able to take your pain, and play with it!” (“Charlie Chaplin Quotes”). Finding humour in an ongoing volatile subject like the current Israel/ Palestine condition is a challenging task. This film is the best example of Zoabi’s mastery in filmmaking and his balanced approach to the complex and multilayered issues. The film is set in two parallel political periods: the soap opera set in 1967 shows the political turbulence during that period, and the film that includes the soap opera showing the present reality of the Palestinian struggle, Israeli restrictions and surveillance.

The film begins with a scene from the soap opera focusing on the character Tala (acted by Belgian actress Lubna Azabal), an actress, who takes the role of a Palestinian spy named Manal, daughter of a refugee family from Jaffa. The shot consists of a caption introducing the context of the soap opera as “three months before the 1967 six-day war” (00:01:29). The scene introduces another character, Marvan, a Palestinian protestor, who tells his girlfriend Manal to work as a spy, pushing her into the midst of an Israeli city. She is assigned the duty of luring General Yehuda Edelman and finding the Israeli government’s secrets. The scene suddenly shifts to show the *mise en scene* and the studio settings (where the camera and the lights are arranged) of the soap opera, in which the characters Manal and Marvan are doing their roles, and then the film lens gets back into the soap opera. This show is popular amongst both Israelis and Palestinians.

The following scene shows the first meeting of General Yehuda (played by Karim, the co-actor of Tala doing the role of General), and Manal (now pseudo-named as Rachel, a Jewish immigrant from France and owner of a French restaurant in Tel Aviv), and there ends the episode. The next scene shows the present, where Tala is learning her dialogues. The film and soap opera are distinguished by using visual effects. The soap opera is picturised by using vibrant colours for the settings and costumes, highlighting the background and characters, and overdoing dramatic acting and camera movements, which makes the show look quite deliberate and artificial. Most of the scenes in the show are shot in the studio. It represents the glamorous television industry. Whereas the film narrative that runs parallel to the soap opera, depicts the Palestinian condition that the present generation endure in a more realistic manner, with naturally available lighting, and minimal camera techniques. The outdoors is mostly shot in real locations (except for the checkpoint) and with neither much artistic effect nor over- dramatisation.

The following scenes introduce the other characters behind the camera, the production crew of the soap opera. It includes Salam (the main character in the movie who is working as an assistant in direction), the director and scriptwriter Wafa, the producers Atef, Nabil and Bassam (Salam's uncle), the costume designer, cameramen, lighting technicians and other bit characters.

The film then focuses on Salam's life. He needs to cross the checkpoint twice a day to reach and return from the studio. Once, he is caught by the military officers at the checkpoint for clearing his doubt on what is meant by the expression "she is a bomb" (a phrase on which there was a quarrel within the crew in the studio) (00:10:54- 55). He is taken to the chief officer Assi (acted by the Israeli actor Yaniv

Biton). This meeting is a life-changing moment for Salam. Assi is impressed and happy to meet Salam who tells Assi that he is the writer of the soap opera *Tel Aviv on Fire*. Assi's wife and mother are fans of this television serial, and he is determined to control the role-plays so that the Israeli General should appear as a romantic gentleman. He forces Salam to reveal the end, and when he refuses, he blackmails him saying that he will not cross the checkpoints smoothly unless his suggestions are included. Assi is portrayed as a strict, arrogant, and occasionally humorous high-ranking officer. He tries to be romantic to impress his wife, but never succeeds. He makes a challenge to his wife that the climax will be as he wishes it to be. This family matter of Assi will turn out to be a conflict in Salam's life that is difficult to resolve.

Salam, who is later promoted as the scriptwriter, when Wafa disagrees to bring in the theme of Holocaust victimhood into the serial with an intention to make the characterisation of Manal and the General more complex. Wafa opines that if the Holocaust theme and the Israeli army are portrayed together in the soap opera, these will change the motives of the soap opera, to become a Zionist propaganda. The actors, co-directors and producers disagree with her opinion. They believe it would make the characters rounded and interesting. Wafa, had earlier complained about casting Tala, a French actress (for not easily picking up the language), instead of many talented Palestinian actresses. She disagrees to work with her if the serial has to move according to Tala's decisions. But the producers disagree with changing Tala, as she is a renowned actress and the investors want her in the episodes. The challenge in front of the producers, director and scriptwriter is that the soap opera should neither be pro Zionist (or pro Israelite) nor be antisemitic, as their audience is

from both Palestine and Israel. In either way, Israelis or Palestinians would criticise them.

When viewed from a broader viewpoint, the two stories run parallel, representing two generations of Israel and Palestine: firstly, the soap opera based on the historical period of 1967 is produced by the Palestinian Arabs like Bassam and others, who belong to the older generation of Palestinians. They were the freedom fighters in the 1967 war and resisted the occupation of Palestine, but they also had to finally sign the Oslo Peace Accord- a failed dream of self-rule for the Palestinians. The second narrative is a continuation of the history, representing the present. The daily routine of crossing checkpoints and turnstiles to reach the workplace is a harsh reality that the present generation face as a consequence of Nakba.

The two realities merge in the life of Salam. The storyline, though written in a comic manner, subtly discusses the major issues faced by young Palestinians and Israelites and the transgenerational trauma that suffocates them in the path of their progress. Salam's struggles with the two realities intensify after he is promoted to the post of scriptwriter. The key ingredient that drives the whole film is the dynamics between Salam and Assi, who becomes a secret writing partner for Salam. When seen from a larger perspective, Assi plays the role of an occupier who tries to impose his ideas and dictate a romantic narrative (for the soap opera) that hides the realities, favours his nation, and most importantly, glorifies the Israeli military officers. Whereas Salam representing the occupied, is trapped between the Arab investors and the Israeli military force. The film follows Salam's tactics to resolve these issues as a young Palestinian in the midst of Israel and Palestine.

While being a political satire, it is also a romantic drama where three love relationships run simultaneously. Firstly, Salam's broken love with Mariam, and his active efforts to reconcile and restore their love. The film introduces the character Mariam (played by Palestinian Arab actress Maisa Abd Elhadi) randomly while she and Salam meet in a restaurant, just after he starts working for the soap opera. She is currently a doctor in Jerusalem. She blamed him for being unreliable and his inability to find a proper job independently. They broke up a few years ago when once Salam said that with Mariam, he felt like being in the Dead Sea, instead he wanted to explore the Mediterranean. This expression indicates Salam's dream to escape from Palestine, where he feels mentally barren and hence does not wish to be involved in any close relationships that would hinder his wish to escape Palestine/Israel.

The film depicts the two different attitudes prevailing amongst the youngsters of Palestine facing political restrictions through the two characters Emad and Mariam. Emad wishes to go abroad for a prosperous future, whereas Mariam prefers to stay back with her family in their homeland. As Emad grows up, he is stuck in the same place and has to resolve his dreams and career by not escaping from his native place but instead courageously reworking it by remaining in Palestine. The second love story that runs parallel is between Assi and his wife. Assi struggles hard to impress his wife who believes that her husband has no emotional or romantic side in his nature. He is looked at as an arrogant military officer executing Israeli rules. The third one is the triangular love story between Manal, Marvan, and General Yehuda in the soap opera. All the three relationships revolve around the choices and decisions that Salam makes.

Eventually, the soap opera and the realities outside it (the film's narrative showing the present) begin to connect and merge. A series of comic events occur, connecting one another. Bassam assigns Nabil and Salam to write the scripts for the next scenes. Salam's duty is to write the scenes between Yehuda and Rachel. Being not a man of letters or romance, he seeks help from his mother, friends and people around him and finally reaches Assi. Assi helps him out in return for a bowl of Arab hummus, which indeed becomes a remarkable scene in the soap opera. This routine continues, and Assi insists that the climax should be the marriage of Rachel and Yehuda. The casting combination of Salam as the protagonist and Assi as the antagonist is interesting. Salam's simple nature is contrasted in the movie with Assi, who is energetic and creative.

Salam's writing has to satisfy many characters like Tala, Karim, Assi, Bassam and other Arab investors. These negotiations in his writing process are humorous, and at the same time, a strategy used by Zoabi to discuss many conflicting issues in the past and present of Israel/ Palestine. Bassam's suggestions about the ending, which he had partially adapted from an old Hollywood film, are condemned by Salam for being copied from Hollywood. At the same time, Salam finds it difficult to convince Bassam about the ending of the soap opera with a wedding of General Yehuda and Rachel as promised to Assi, as Bassam states, "It would be like new agreements of Oslo. The great illusion that changed nothing" (00:42:45- 54). Bassam wishes to end the serial with a bomb blast, whereas Assi demands for a marriage.

Karim who plays the role of General Yehuda, is dissatisfied with his character sketch as a tender and sympathetic person. He, who had been in Israeli jail

for seven years, had only seen harsh and rude officers, and Salam agrees to work on the ‘naughty part’ of the character. Assi demands a new favour every day for his ideas. In an instance in which Assi and Salam discuss the character Marvan, Assi states him to be a terrorist, whereas Salam says that he is their freedom fighter; this clearly shows the two conflicting perspectives that Salam has to deal with. Tala has her demands as an acclaimed actress. Her beauty, consciousness and capricious nature make demands on the whole crew.

Salam’s growing skill in writing script and sensitivity in dealing with people around him are the most crucial elements in the film, as they have the potential to change the mindset of every character and finally make them accept his viewpoint. Zoabi’s mastery in direction is at its best in the second half of the film when Salam patiently uncoils every loop tangled around him in the form of relations and responsibilities.

The audience witnesses a combination of comedy and menace in a scene where a squad takes Salam into custody, covers his head, blinds him, and takes him to a remote place where Assi is waiting. Assi points a gun at him and threatens him to death for not planning the wedding of the two characters Rachel and Yehuda in the soap opera. Assi snatches Salam’s wallet and takes away his identity card. Though it appears to be a comic strip, this scene is highly threatening and depicts the madness and surveillance executed by those in power.

Assi: Do you think you can write what you want? . . . Will there be a wedding?

Salam: Yes.

Assi: It’s good. Take your wallet. But I keep it. You see your ID? This is my

guarantee. A marriage against your ID.

Salam: but this is my card. Indeed.

Assi: Salam Abbas, you are under my control. You will do as I say. You may not enter Jerusalem in my absence. Understood?

Salam: Yes, I understood.

Assi: You shall have the wedding day. Now, you do what you got to do. And do show my photo on TV. It is an order. (00:59:50- 01:01:28)

This seemingly insignificant scene exemplifies the condition of an aspiring artist in Palestine. In one instance, Salam is even restricted from going home as his identity card is no more with him. Assi's bossy nature and threatening commands are purely the voice of a coloniser who tries to suppress and hinder creativity as well as the freedom of speech and expression of the natives.

This frustrating scene is followed by another one in which Salam needs to convince the fussy natured Tala, who is about to leave the place due to her lack of interest in the role she has to play in the remaining scenes of the soap opera. She demands Salam to write the whole script overnight in favour of her wishes. He is again caught in a dilemma whether to go and meet Mariam, who has started showing interest in him, or write the script for Tala. Unfortunately, he has no other option other than to finish the script for the smooth shooting of the soap opera and keep himself employed in the studio.

Even while being annoyed and distressed for being trapped between the opinions of Assi and Bassam, metaphorically representing Israel and Palestine respectively, he smoothly resolves the issue through his writings. He convinces Bassam that the soap opera could have a sequel which could depict the political and

social struggle of the Palestinians after the war and the Oslo Accords, and their fight to reclaim their land. The continuation of this show in several series will help in evoking Palestinian nationalism. This could keep Palestinian nationhood alive in the minds of the old and new generations of audience, which includes both Israelites and Palestinians. Secondly in a practical sense, it could keep them all employed too.

Nabil, in a conversation with Salam opined:

Salam: Nabil, do you think I am right? The bomb is a cliché and a wedding is better?

Nabil: You want practical or artistic response? The practical answer is that I want to pay my . . . and that marriage would allow a second season. The artistic response is that I don't want the story to end in 1967. It was a tragic year. I want to introduce new characters. The story continues again and again, as in the American series. Forever as Palestine.

Salam: Nabil, you are a poet. (01:17:09 – 01:17:55)

Then, Salam convinces Assi that a soap opera set in 1967 cannot have a happy ending, as the war has already happened, and the marriage of the two characters for good would only be unrealistic and a fantasy illusion. Salam instead satisfies the investors' wish to set off a bomb, but not to be blasted and kill Rachel, General Yehuda and his comrades as they demanded. Salam gets himself out of these multiple problems with a single creative line of thought applied in the soap opera. He introduces Assi as a new character, an investigator disguised as a rabbi. He stops the wedding before the bomb detonates. Rachel and Yehuda are arrested, and the sequel begins. This enables the soap opera *Tel Aviv on Fire* to have a second season, introducing many more new characters, and Salam to remain employed,

hence satisfying both Israelite and Palestinian audiences equally. Through this he could also get back Mariam's love and her father's approval for their relationship. On the other hand, Assi could impress and entertain his wife by showing his talents. In a broader sense, the film *Tel Aviv on Fire* suggests that Israel- Palestine peace can become a reality beyond the treaties and written agreements only if both the nations are treated equally.

Though the title *Tel Aviv on Fire* suggests a conflict, on the contrary, it stirs up a comedy of the grim and intractable Israeli Palestinian condition. This theme is developed by the pessoptimist character Salam, who is entangled by an inseparable hope and despair under untenable historical and political conditions. The film is thematically chaotic, representing the chaotic social, political, cultural and religious condition of Israel/ Palestine. Zoabi uses this chaos as a method in the arrangement of incidents and scenes too. At various instances, the protagonist confronts with multiple problems from different spaces in his life (personal and professional), pulling him apart, but he eventually solves them. Zoabi employs farce and satire to depict the absurdity of war, or, to be specific, the Israeli occupation of and control over Palestine. Assi is pictured as an embodiment of political Israel.

Zoabi incorporates many cultural elements into the narrative, the most important one being the dish, hummus. Hummus, which originally means chickpeas in Arabic, is a spread or dip made with chickpeas, tahini, lemon and spices added in different proportions eaten in different regions of the Middle East and Mediterranean. This is a staple food of Arabs, and a part of their long tradition, uniting them. But the case is different in Israel/ Palestine. The food culture contributes to the national and ethnic identity of Palestinians and Israelites.

Hummus is a common dish consumed by both Palestinians and Israelites of the present. This is originally the dish of Palestinian Arabs- healthy, cheap and easily available. After the formation of Israel, this dish became a part of Israeli cuisine. Later they adopted and appropriated it, claiming hummus as a symbol of Israeli identity and calling it the favourite food of Sabra community (Jewish people born in Israel). Zoabi brings to light this contested notion of hummus in *Tel Aviv on Fire*.

Assi who is very fond of 'Arab hummus', demands Salam to bring it for him in return for helping to write the script. Whereas, Salam hates hummus and has not tasted it for many years, as it is a part of his traumatic childhood memory. When Assi, a Sabra yearns to have hummus to activate his creative skills and control his temper, in an instance while they are beginning to have hummus together, Salam states, "At the beginning of the first Intifada, the army took control of Shuafat. We could not leave the house for a month. We had nothing to eat apart from hummus box. I was six. A month was an eternity" (01:27:52- 01:28:14). Salam's recollection is clear evidence of the role of hummus in Palestinian history. At the same time, the notion that hummus is an Israeli dish becomes complicated when Assi asks for Arab hummus, as it acknowledges the existence of Palestinian nationhood, which his political nation is trying to erase.

Sociologist Liora Gvion, in the introduction to her study, *Beyond Hummus and Falafel: Social and Political Aspects of Palestinian Food in Israel*, stated, "Food is one of the means through which distinct national and ethnic identities are formed and practiced". She illuminated "the social processes through which food contributes to the national and ethnic identities of groups that share a single territory

but perceive themselves as distant and different from one another politically, culturally, and economically.” (1) The discussion on hummus is in a sense cultural restitution to affirm Palestine’s existence, and at the same time, it becomes a means to unite the two cultures and in turn the states by understanding the distinct culture, history and tradition of one another, by accepting and valuing both. Other cultural elements included in the film are the Arab kiss in a scene in the soap opera, which becomes a point of comic dispute in the film.

Another key feature to be analysed is how the psychology of waiting and continuity is addressed in the film. Waiting for a better future and continuity in the flow of life is perceived and experienced differently by each generation of Palestinians and Israelites, and their response to it also varied across time. The films like *The Time That Remains* and *Paradise Now* depicted the conditions of humans struggling with disillusionment and hopelessness of Palestinians waiting in limbo, uncertain about their future. They expressed their boredom, frustration and anger towards the system through films. In recent films like *Tel Aviv on Fire*, it can be observed that the politics of waiting has transformed, stimulating active socio-political action by the youngsters among both Palestinians and Israelites for establishment of peace in the nation- state. *Tel Aviv on Fire* takes a creative turn, where the continuation of the representation of Palestinian condition through the series of the soap opera, will help the Palestinian identity and nationhood to continue to prevail in the minds of both the Israeli and Palestinian audiences, even when there is a continuous attempt to erase the history by Israeli government. Here, the Palestinians’ decades of waiting is seen as an inextinguishable protest to reclaim their identity, and used as an act of resistance to change the future by the present generation.

This chapter has discussed how the four post-millennium films (used as examples) contribute to the glocalisation of Holocaust and Nakba memories by revising and redefining the dynamics between space and identity, producing multilayered meanings. This process creates a reflexive memory discourse that aids in the mutual growth of Holocaust and Nakba memory bearers. Glocalisation of memory is a process in which universalisation and particularisation happen simultaneously, as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Through the films discussed in this chapter, it can be understood that this process overcomes the limitations of both globalisation and regionalisation of memory. Cultural globalisation enhanced the transmission of genocide memories (especially Holocaust memories as seen in the present) beyond the territorial boundaries making it a universal experience. It promotes deterritorialisation, integration and interconnectedness of memories. It sometimes leads to simplification or trivialisation of genocide memory. This process gradually leads to erosion of many local cultures, communities, identities and authentic experiences exclusive to certain regions where the genocide happened. According to the critics of globalisation, this dislocation from space will make the world view the genocide through a monochromatic lens, leading to widespread neglect of distinct regional memories due to cultural homogenisation. This in turn leads to supremacy and dominance of a single dimension of genocide memory over the others by marginalising, fabricating or erasing them. Regionalisation of genocide memories helps to address the multilayered and diverse victimhood experiences particular to a region. On the other hand, irrational and excessive commitment to regional or territorial memory will lead to the emergence of dangerous extremist ethnonationalism.

The glocalisation of memory is a phenomenon in which the features of both globalisation and regionalisation coexist in a balanced manner, establishing a discursive space for productive deliberations rather than a competing one. The simultaneous existence of post-millennium Holocaust and Nakba films are the best examples of the glocalisation of genocide memory happening through the media space. As discussed in the earlier chapters, Holocaust memory and collective victimhood came into public discussion only in the 1960s, after the trial of Adolf Eichmann (one of the chief executors of the Holocaust) in Jerusalem, after a long silence on the consequences of the Final Solution. Global transmission of this collective memory led to widespread sympathy for Holocaust victims, especially Jews. A prolific number of testimonies, documentaries, narratives and films emerged representing the traumatic victimhood experiences. The Holocaust was later conceived by the proponents of this collective memory as the only genocide or systemic crime that has no parallel in human history. This political stand led to many controversies about the homogenisation of victimhood, the universalisation of experiences, and even the commercialisation or industrialisation of this collective memory through visual representations like films. For example, criticisms were raised about the Americanisation of the European Holocaust experience through films.

The Holocaust representations took a different turn in Israel / Palestine (where many Holocaust survivors migrated). The universal themes of the Holocaust were amalgamated into the themes that propound uniqueness of Jewish identity, the need for a Jewish State, the reason for returning to the Promised Land, and the justification for the occupation of the Palestinian land. Renewing the Holocaust

memory with new significance was one of the strategies used by the political Zionists to cover up the systemic genocide executed by them through Nakba as part of establishing the new state of Israel. The international guilt consciousness of not helping the Holocaust victims while they were exterminated by Nazis became one of the reasons for the silence of the international community when another genocide was executed in Palestine by the political Zionists, providing space for the Jews and expelling the Palestinians.

Glocalisation of memory through the post millennium films, narrated by the Holocaust victims and transgenerational memory bearers, specifically from places like Germany, Hungary, Poland, Ukraine and other Nazi-occupied regions, were a reaction to the idealisation of Jewish Holocaust victims and the domination and universalisation of the Holocaust over other genocides. The recent Holocaust movies try to regionalise the event and expose the multiple layers of victimhood. These film expressions neither deny the magnitude of the event nor the depth of the traumatic experiences of the victims belonging to the different ethnic, social and political communities, which largely consisted of Jews. They rather universalise and bring to the global public consciousness the suppressed histories of basic human nature and multilayered experiences while living in the period of ethnic cleansing like the Holocaust; wishing never to be repeated again, as seen in the film *In Darkness*. The universalising strategy is also used to mock any tyrannical regime currently in power and expose the politics of hatred and futility of war, as seen in *Jojo Rabbit*.

Glocalisation of Nakba memories too work in a similar manner, bringing to light the suppressed histories and ongoing experiences of Palestinians and Israelites, to public consciousness. Unlike the Holocaust memory bearers, the present

generation of Palestinians cannot dwell only on the past, when they are victims of ongoing Nakba and its consequences are still continuing. The contemporary Nakba films are embroiled in the current geopolitical contestation in Israel and Palestine as it is a living reality. The memory bearers produce counter histories against the dominant hegemonic political history created by the Israeli government. The continuous effort to erase the traces of Palestinian nationhood is resisted through creative means, especially through graffiti and films. Moreover, unlike the Holocaust films, depicting the harsh realities of the systemic, prolonged genocide and exile happening in the transitory and truncated Palestine in its full wavelength is impossible, as Nakba is an ongoing event. The films will have to face multiple surveillance before reaching the big screen. The post 1948 Nakba films *Salt of This Sea* and *Tel Aviv on Fire* discussed in this chapter vividly bring together the two genocide histories, the Holocaust and Nakba, existing as two competing nationalist narratives in Israel and Palestine, respectively. The films bring out the dynamics between the two genocides. Holocaust and Nakba, which are considered mutually exclusive political histories, in reality, can actually be reinscribed as mutually related. In Israel/ Palestine the two genocide memories are institutionalised after the formation of Israeli territory in the Palestinian land. Though the Holocaust and Nakba are regarded as two incongruent events, the human suffering and victimhood trauma experienced are the same when they are removed from the frames of the competing national ideologies, and can be universalised to represent the human condition in any other genocides.

This leads to the understanding of the second feature of glocalisation of memory, that is, it is basically polylogic. The different groups of people belonging

to various ethnic, political, social, class or geographical areas conceptualise and reason the two genocides fundamentally in different ways. This polylogic nature breaks down any dominant narrative by trying to suppress another. This process acknowledges multiculturalism by recognising overlapping identities. It represents multilayered victimhood and multidirectionality within ethnic identities. The film *In Darkness* shows the experiences during the Holocaust, mainly from the perspective of Polish Jews belonging to different social classes, and Catholic lower-class Polish people. *Jojo Rabbit* looks at the experience of German Jews and gentiles who fought against Nazism. In *Salt of This Sea*, Soraya represents the inner turmoil of a Palestinian diaspora, while Emad and Marwan represent the experience of the refugees and the internally displaced person living inside their own nation. Irit represents the condition of the Jewish migrants living in Palestinians' residential areas when they became the citizens of newly formed Israel. *Tel Aviv on Fire* portrayed the life of Palestinians and Israelites of different generations and attitudes living in the occupied regions of Palestine through the key characters, Salam, Mariam, Bassam, Nabeel, Assi and his wife.

Thirdly, the glocalisation of the two memories addresses the unsettling condition of the transgenerational and intergenerational memory bearers who are forced to depend on the two genocide histories to define their identities. Many Palestinian critics like Ghassan Abdallah have questioned why Palestinians are made to pay for the crimes of Nazis against Jews. The moral dilemma that the current Israeli and Palestinian young generation experience, even if they understand the mutual relation between the two genocides, is explained in the article by Dan Bar-On and Saliba Sarsar titled "Bridging the Unbridgeable: The Holocaust and Al

Nakba,”. They opine “for the Palestinians, accepting the Jewish pain around the Holocaust means accepting the moral ground for the creation of the State of Israel. For the Israeli Jews, accepting the pain of the 1948 Palestinian refugees means sharing responsibility for their plight and their right of return”. The films *Salt of This Sea* and *Tel Avi on Fire* depict this moral dilemma faced by the younger generation. The conversation between Irit, a second-generation Israelite, and Soraya, a young Palestinian diaspora, in *Salt of This Sea* highlights the moral conundrum that members of the two communities face. The dynamics between Israeli officer Assi and Palestinian youth Salam in *Tel Avi on Fire* illustrates the uncomfortable environment in which they are compelled to live. Assi at times believes Salam to be good at heart though ambiguously, but he, being an Israeli soldier instilled with the hate stories about Palestinians, is always suspicious of Salam and controls him.

The fourth feature of the process of memory glocalisation is that it confronts with historical negation, fabrication and revisionism. Holocaust denial had been a political move during and just after the Second World War to hide the guilt of extermination. Later the Holocaust memory was invested with added significance to the extent that there emerged a prolific number of filmic representations. This repetition in representation led to the search for new means to commercialise Holocaust memory. Some of the recent films are criticised for euphemism and distortions in the message conveyed about victimhood identity. This might not be necessarily intended as an expression of antisemitism. Some fictionalised versions of the Holocaust, like *Jojo Rabbit* and *The Boy in Striped Pajamas*, were criticised for biased representations of Nazis and children. In the case of Nakba, being an ongoing process, historical negations, erasure and revisionism play a key role in exerting

power and authority. The post millennium Nakba films worked as counter narratives protesting against the erasure and intentional forgetting of history as seen in *The Salt of This Sea*, in which Jacir recalls Jaffa and Dawayima of pre-Nakba Palestine. The mainstream Israeli or American productions mostly misrepresented, asymmetrically presented or avoided representation of Palestinians, denying their existence even in this twenty first century. One of the examples is the 2007 film *The Little Traitor* (presented from a child's viewpoint), which showed no trace of Palestinian resistance during the period just before Nakba, when Mandatory Palestine invited Jewish migrants to the land. This film showed the independence of Israel but not the realities of the occupation of Palestine. The Palestinian film *Farha* (2021), also presented from a child's viewpoint, set in the same time period as of *The Little Traitor*, worked as a counter narrative to it, as it represented the harsh realities of the 1948 Nakba that exterminated and dispossessed the well-established Palestinian community.

Many mainstream Israeli films misrepresented Palestinians as primitives and barbarians without a defined culture or history. This 'imperial gaze' (Ann Kaplan) of the Israeli government defining the Palestinians was countered by many films and footages of old Palestine. Even the present generation of Palestinians are portrayed as political extremists, aggressive and uncultured. The history of Israel and Palestine is continuously revised based on the territorial expansion and extremist ethnonationalism practiced by the Zionist government. Power and control are discriminatorily exercised in Palestinians, Israelites, refugees and diasporas dealing with the same competing history. Glocalisation of Nakba memory countered social, cultural and historical amnesia, as seen in the discussed films. Many films protested

the denial of Nakba and the Palestinian existence as seen in the films by Elia Sulaiman, Mai Masri, Eran Riklis and Hany Abu Assad.

Fifthly, the process of glocalisation of memories through films helped in cultural transmission and cultural restitution simultaneously. The versatility in techniques used for representation and the thematic density of contemporary Holocaust films help in the transmission of the memory of the bygone event, making it a prosthetic memory. These prosthetic memories assimilate as personal experiences into the present generation, who has not directly experienced them. This helps the present generation (regardless of their race, ethnicity, gender or nationality) to empathise with the Holocaust victims and experience the trauma that they had undergone. This transmission was also accompanied by cultural restitution to retain the authenticity of regional memory and define the history of that place. For example, the recent Holocaust films like *In Darkness* and *Olga* were shot in regional languages and were subtitled in other languages for the global audience to accept the regional and universal characteristics of the traumatic experience.

In the case of Israeli Palestinian films, cultural transmission exposes the identities of the two broadly divided communities to the international audience. For the Israelites, cultural transmission is a means to justify their historical belongingness and affirm the political existence of their newly formed territory. For the Palestinians, cultural transmission is the means to reclaim their continuously depleting land and protest against the attempts of historical erasure. It also acts against cultural imperialism, where the Sabra tries to dominate by considering Palestinian culture as inferior either purposefully or due to lack of knowledge and ignorance, but at the same time assimilate many cultural practices into the Israeli

culture. For instance, many Israelites consider hummus as their national dish which critics point out as an appropriation of Arab culture. Native fruits and foods like Jaffa oranges, hummus, and lemon pickles, as well as Arab music and customs, are often incorporated into films as a way to assert Palestinian culture and traditional values. It is a practice of cultural restitution.

Glocalisation in films helped to propagate multiple perspectives of the two genocides through open discussions. All the four films discussed in this chapter are directed by intergenerational genocide memory bearers. Their films mingle with each other in a larger context, in heterotopic spaces like the internet, broadcast media, theatres or film festivals giving a space for independent interpretations and deliberations, providing a ground for glocalisation of genocide memories to happen. This process challenges the exaggerated stereotyping and belligerent hostility that the Western mainstream media perpetuates about the Orientals in general, or Arabs in particular (an issue pointed out by Edward Said in his work, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*). More than being cultural reproductions, the select films problematise cultural imperialism and homogenisation. Additionally, they promote cross-cultural sensitivity by providing grounds for awareness and acceptance of distinct cultures.

The representations of the Holocaust and Nakba memories in films have helped to create a collective consciousness, which is an amalgam of multiple stories of human sufferings that has the power to travel beyond all political, social, cultural or territorial boundaries. These depictions promote the growth of a postnational imagination, not by opposing nationalism or nationalist feeling, but by problematising extremist methods that build territorial nationalism in an irredentist

fashion.

The glocalisation of the Holocaust and Nakba memory explores the concepts of citizenship and belongingness to a defined nation or nationhood, as well as the manner in which these concepts mediate relationships to one another's pasts. This process encourages the Holocaust and Nakba memory bearers to move beyond the traumatic clutches of victimhood experiences and learn to understand each other's pain. This can become the first step to peacebuilding, helping to imagine a common future valuing each other's diversity, and establishing a relationship not defined by the logic of ethnonationalism.

Conclusion

Imagination and Ethics: How Glocalised Memories

Function in the Present Society

The research has examined the wide spectrum of the Holocaust and Nakba multilayered memories, spaces, identities, experiences and emotions, addressed through the film representations that function as heterotopias. These heterotopias play crucial role in forming perspectives and shape how contemporary local or global communities perceive and interpret the two genocides. By discussing the cinematography and the art of thematic crafting of Holocaust and Nakba films, the thesis has attempted to discuss the politics of memory making, which in turn throws light on the ethics and morality in remembering, forgetting, and in turn, reimagining the Holocaust and Nakba genocide memory.

The introductory chapter explores the notion of subjectivity of shared memory and the ethical ramifications involved while perceiving, constructing, representing and disseminating the past and victimhood identity, especially through international films. It analyses the various disputes and debates that have arisen due to combining the ethics of the Holocaust and Nakba genocide memories and its consequences, with religion, myth, and competing national histories of the two events. Along with understanding the immensity of the bygone event Holocaust and its present consequences across the world, the chapter also looks at the contemporary catastrophe and ongoing systemic ethnic cleansing in Palestine/ Israel which has turned out to be a ceaseless genocide even now. This chapter has

attempted to draw information from many religious, sociological, political, cultural, and historical texts and multidirectional arguments by scholars in order to discuss the history and memory of the two genocides, the Holocaust and the Nakba, as well as trace the history of the natives of Palestine/ Israel from the past till date. It provides insights on the process of memorializing history and historicising memory and the politics behind memory making. It also briefly discusses the role that the twentieth century Holocaust and Nakba films had played in disseminating history.

The first chapter looked at the way the two genocide memories and victimhood cultures move across space and time in the post millennium by means of the Holocaust and Nakba films. The main objectives of this chapter are two. Firstly, through the context of the Holocaust and Nakba, the films clearly demonstrate how the physical living spaces are constructed for a dominating group considered superior by tyrannical systemic coercion at the cost of memory-side and spacio-side during genocidal settler colonialism. Secondly, the unrepresentable terrain of memory spaces (which include site and time) in the real world are portrayed through narrative reproductions like films, helping to address its complexity. Hence films become heterotopias to discuss the liminalities (physical, emotional, artistic and metaphorical) and multilayeredness existing within the genocide memory spaces.

The chapter discussed the correlating and contesting narrative spaces of the two events, the possibility of transnational resonances, and the way genocide films work as memory sites, chronotope and heterotopias simultaneously. All the films discussed in this thesis directly or indirectly addressed and problematised these spatial palimpsests and their representations. *The Pianist* addressed the *lebensraum* executed by the Nazis, a German concept of expansion and nationalism that swiped

away or exterminated a group of people dehumanised and stigmatised as vermin, for the Aryans to settle and prosper. The tyrannical government constructed ghettos to force in and dump all the Jews and other discriminated communities, eventually shifting them to highly populated and filthy concentration camps, to suffer a fate worse than death.

These ghettos and concentration camps turned out to be claustrophobic spaces for the Holocaust victims, finally leading to their extermination. The film also looks at how the Holocaust memories prodigiously survived, gained importance and were historicised even in the twenty-first century. Similarly, the strategy of reducing the living space of Palestinians by the settlers is observed to be similar to the practice by the Nazi regime, which executed *lebensraum*. The films like *Lemon Tree*, *The Time that Remains*, *The Little Traitor*, *Salt of This Sea* and *Farha* alludes to the larger picture of Israeli occupation of the Palestinian land, and the Nazi notorious *lebensraum* policy adapted and executed by political Zionist Israeli government (for the last seven decades) for the European Jewish settlers and their offspring, who were initially accepted by the indigenous Palestinians as refugees fleeing from the Holocaust before the formation of the state of Israel. These films show the Israelites in power plundering the Palestinians, occupying and depleting their living space, and expelling or exterminating them for the migrated Jews to settle and flourish. The Palestinians have been dehumanised for years, implementing discriminatory laws and denying their right to self-determination or even existence by the Israeli government, as they regard the native indigenous Palestinians as 'human animals' (as the Israeli Defence Minister stated during October 2023 Nakba) who are to be annihilated from their land. Many provocative measures were

executed by the Israeli government aimed at narrowing the Palestinian region after the establishment of Israel in 1948. They issued new military orders in the later years expelling Palestinian Arabs from Gaza, the West Bank, and Jerusalem in order to expand Israeli territory, and any attempt to retaliate at this forced deportation was brutally suppressed using deadly weapons, bombs and missiles.

Apart from the discussions on the physical living space, the films taken for the study have also discussed the gender struggles in the social spaces. The characters Hannah, Stefania, and Magdalina in *Remembrance*; Antonina in *The Zookeeper's Wife*; Rosa, Dina, and Anja in *The Grey Zone* exemplify different female identities, their multiperspectival viewpoints, and their inevitable roles during and after the Holocaust, unlike many other dominant narratives reinforcing male suffering and their stories of struggles in the war forefront. Similarly, distinct female perspectives and their struggle for justice are also depicted through the earlier discussed characters in Nakba films like Salma and Mira in *Lemon Tree*, the women prisoners in *3000 Nights*, Mariam in *Tel Aviv on Fire* and Soraya and Irit in *The Salt of This Sea*. Their fragmented identity and existence are juxtaposed with the fragmented history of the geopolitical region to which they belong. The films have tried to reclaim and reconfigure subjugated gender spaces in the process of memorialising the Holocaust. Films like *The Grey Zone* and *Jojo Rabbit* subtly looks into the lives of differently abled and gender minorities like homosexuals during the Holocaust period. Film space has also been employed to rewrite the stereotypical role played by male characters, who are typically shown as aggressive, dominating, self-sufficient, or as emotionally less expressive.

The chapter has addressed the spatiotemporal dimensions of the two events and the contesting perspectives and memories through artistic space. The post-millennium Holocaust and Nakba film makers used art as a means to combine incompatible spaces, making them function as heterotopias. The artistic space merges many distinct spaces like physical space, memory space, gender space, social space, political space, and imaginative or creative space to expose multiple incomprehensible realities of the past genocide and concealed truths or unspoken memories and realities of tortures in the present. In the chapter, the two experimental film narratives *Remembrance* and *The Time that Remains* move forward and backward in time and travel through memory, enabled by film techniques. *Remembrance* traced the psychological instability, the emotional gap created by the loss of beloveds, and the self-alienation of the Holocaust survivors after the event. The film dramatically and surrealistically portrayed the survivors and their mental dilemma caused by their memories of the genocide. This identity crisis could not be fully comprehended by the second-generation survivors and people around them as not being the direct victims of the Holocaust. In the film, Hannah's memory is used to recall the bygone genocidal event, the impact of which her child or husband cannot comprehend completely. On the other hand, *The Time that Remains* uses symbolism, surrealism, and irony vividly to expose the helpless condition of native Palestinians living in the newly formed state of Israel, whose civilian identity was reduced to present absentees while living in their land. Even after resistances or protests against the oppressors, the geopolitical condition of Nazareth remains stagnant without much sociopolitical progress through many decades after Nakba and Naksa.

Sulaiman employs film space to convey how both the stagnancy in space and movement of several decades have to be juxtaposed to understand the Palestinian condition of being marginalised from their land and their waiting in limbo for justice or the right to self-determination. The film space is also used to artistically represent the Palestinians decades-long desire to demolish the Separation Wall also called the apartheid wall, that divides the Palestinian and Israeli communities as seen in films like *Omar* and *The Time that Remains*, in which the characters Omar very often climbs up the wall from which a rope is hung to reach the other side where his friends reside and Elia leaps over the wall as a symbol of erasure of all the social, political, and geographical barriers constructed by the ruling government to segregate people and foster prejudice. The Palestinian film directors had also used their artistic space to expose the colonial politics of the Zionist leaders who deliberately propelled spaciocide of Palestinian land and worked to erase the memory and culture of the indigenous Palestinian Arab community before the formation of modern Israel for the migrated European community of Jews. The issue of encroachment on Palestinians' living space has already been discussed in the thesis through films like *Lemon Tree*, *Salt of This Sea*, *The Time that Remains* and *Farha*.

In the first place, this chapter had tried to bring together three categories of contemporary Holocaust filmmakers: first, survivors of the event, who came from different parts of Nazi-occupied European countries like United Kingdom, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, and France; second, their offspring who migrated abroad, including Israel, Brazil, Ukraine, New Zealand and the United States; and third, vicarious witnesses who identified with genocide narratives without having

actually experienced it. By choosing the Holocaust films by multiple directors from different regions, the research has thrown light on the diverse and multilayered Holocaust memories and the heterogeneity in the context, theme, form, and motives of commemorating and reinvesting in the current century. The thesis projected the ways in which many of the contemporary filmmakers challenged the propagandist Holocaust films, which tried to homogenise the Holocaust victim community and institutionalise their experiences, neglecting many other nuances embedded in the memory of people belonging to different regions. The creative narrativisation and delving into multidirectional themes on the Holocaust had helped in reviving genocide memory of the bygone event and not trivialising it as cliché or normalising it. By illustrating the heterogeneity in Holocaust memory, this thesis also serves to counter and highlight the ways in which Holocaust is homogenised, universalised, nationalised and functionalised within some particular cultural contexts that lie outside the boundaries of the actual event—such as the Americanisation or Israelisation of Holocaust memory for nation- building.

Secondly, the chapter had tried to bring together the contemporary Nakba filmmakers from different regions within divided and politically surveilled Palestine and Israel after its partition in 1948; the exiled Palestinians and their children in other parts of the world; and some of the Arab directors in the neighbouring countries of Palestine/Israel who empathised with the Palestinian cause. Filmmaking on the theme of ongoing Nakba, by fortifying a Palestinian history and identity, their victimisation, displacement, and dispossession has turned out to be a phenomenal method of culturally reclaiming the ever-disappearing areas of Palestine, and a means to expose the continuous land occupation and illegal establishment of Israeli

state's expansion. The Nakba film space has been struggling to expose the systemic ethnic cleansing of Palestinians from their land by evading the political surveillance. The films had problematised the spaciocide of Palestinian living space by manipulating the history of land Palestine/ Israel, misrepresentations and falsity in imposing victim and perpetrator identities upon the Palestinians and Israelites, misinformation spread through mainstream media on the right to belong and citizenship policies by the colonial Zionist government.

The second chapter of this thesis works against the homogenisation of identities of the people who experienced or are children of the survivors of the Holocaust, and the people who are still facing Nakba even in this decade. The chapter has examined how film functions as a medium for displaying manifold identities as well as the ways in which competing memories interact in the contemporary public sphere. Firstly, this chapter discussed the ethics and morality in collecting, universalising, globalising, and homogenising the Holocaust victimhood identities through films till the end of the twentieth century, and also addressed the gradual shift that happened since the beginning of twenty first century by perceiving their identity as multilayered and continuously under construction through narrative reproductions, depending on the current socio-political determinants. Secondly, the chapter explained the multilayered identities of Palestinians who directly or indirectly are pressurised to live under the systemic ongoing Nakba or are uprooted from their land, and Israelites who are forced or willingly live under the favours of the systemic subjugation of indigenous racial, ethnic and political identities. In brief, Nakba films trace the alterity in the construction of Palestinian and Israeli ethnic identity and criticise the attempts to homogenise and misrepresent the Palestinian-Israeli tension as a religious struggle for land between Muslims and Jews, rather

than looking at it as a consequence of geopolitical invasion and implementation of apartheid on an indigenous hybrid community that included Jews, Christians, and Muslims.

The chapter has explained in detail the rhizomatic identities of Holocaust and Nakba victims. All the films discussed in this thesis, including those discussed in the chapter, the Holocaust films *The Grey Zone* and *The Zookeeper's Wife*, and *Omar* and *3000 Nights*, showing the consequences of Nakba, exemplified the multifaceted and multilayered victimhood identities; the grimness of human suffering and identity crisis; vicious and sadistic political despotisms; cross-cultural perceptions of the two genocide traumas; and challenged the construction of genocide memory from a universalised angle, neglecting many experiences unique to certain ethnic groups. The chapter also discussed the unabating process of victimhood identity construction, and certain realities about the precarious positions and decisions taken up by the two living generations: those who are bearing the memory of the Holocaust, and those who are living through Nakba since 1948.

Tracing the Holocaust victim's identities, as discussed earlier, the Jews and the few other minority people were dehumanised by the self-identified superior Nazis, and were called derogatory terms like 'vermin,' 'oven dodger,' 'parasite,' 'rats,' 'pigs,' 'plague,' 'subhumans' and so on. Later, those who were alive in Nazi concentration camps after the Second World War were initially called 'liberated prisoners' who largely migrated to the United States, Palestine, a very few to their land of origin, and a small minority to other parts of the world. Most of them who came to the United States and other countries preferred to refer to themselves as 'refugees' and they tried to forget, remain silent or neglect their identity as

‘survivors’ of the catastrophe, because either they wanted to escape from the lingering trauma of being chased and begin a new life (as seen in films like *The Pianist*), or they were burdened by the guilt of ushering their fellow beings as *Sonderkommandos* or Jewish officials who worked in concentration camps for their pressures of instincts to live (as seen in films like *The Grey Zone*). The Jews who migrated to Palestine initially as ‘migrants’ or ‘refugees’ started dreaming of a permanent land in Palestine with the help of political Zionistic agenda, the United Nations, and the British Empire, claiming Palestine to be their holy land and reformulating their identity to be the ‘chosen people of God’ to reside in the newly formed state of Israel by partitioning and occupying Palestine. This prompted a need to establish the identity of European Jews who faced the Holocaust as victims and survivors.

In the United States, many films, documentaries, and television serials emerged narrating the Holocaust victimisation and stories of survival. The survivor identity was given positive value by epitomising it as a sign of strength and persistence, as surviving such a genocide was believed to be possible due to taking appropriate decisions- implying that the ones who perished were impatient, gave up on their life, took wrong decisions or were unlucky. But as seen in many survivors’ accounts and films, their escape from genocide was sheer luck and they too were victimised by the few who had the power. A few survivors admitted that they escaped due to some instinctual decisions to survive (either by witnessing the pain of others without reacting or pushing them to death) of which they are still guilty. Many of them stressed that there should never be another genocide in the history of humanity.

The Holocaust memory bearers, including the children of survivors, their offspring and the community who empathised with them, retrieved the past to re-envision their present and future. When the Holocaust started becoming a part of the national history of countries like the United States and Israel, the status of the survivors elevated to that of a 'hero' and their anecdotes or narratives about them were treated as sacrosanct. This status limited the scope of studying the multidimensionality and multilayeredness in the experiences of Holocaust victims or survivors from different parts of Europe.

Towards the end of the twentieth century and with the dawn of twenty first century, the dominant narratives of the mainstream media that compartmentalised victim-perpetrator and terrorist-terrorised identities were questioned through the post millennium Holocaust films. The Holocaust victim's identity was further elaborately discussed to expose the political tensions that existed within them further dividing them as German, Polish, and, Hungarian inmates or political prisoners (as seen in films discussed earlier like *The Grey Zone*), Spanish civil war veterans (as in *The Photographer of Mauthausen*), Serbian victims (as seen in *Dara of Jasenovac*), Slovakian Jewish victims (as in *Broken Promise*), Austrian and French Jews, people belonging to LGBTQ+ community, Romani people, gentiles who were criminalised for supporting the victims (as seen in *Nicky's Family*, *The Courageous Heart of Irena Sendler*, *The Zookeeper's Wife*, *The Book Thief*, *In Darkness* and *Jojo Rabbit*) and the communists (as in films like *Olga*). The variety in thematic expressions, portrayal of multiple identities and the emotional gamut that the recent Holocaust films covered, make them self-reflexive and question the national histories, agendas and propaganda.

Palestinian and Israeli identities and cultures began to overlap and clash with the arrival of European Jews in Palestine and the subsequent forced displacement and massacre of large numbers of native Palestinians by the government of the newly established Zionist state Israel (as seen in films like *Wedding in Galilee*, *Salt of This Sea*, *Lemon Tree*). The individual identities of a Palestinian or Israelite since the 1948 Nakba became a composite of the ethnic, racial, religious, social, cultural and political collective identities. To trace the unabating process of identity formation of the two internally diverse communities, the thesis brings to foreground the history of Palestine on which the modern Israel was juxtaposed.

Here the term 'modern Israel' refers to the state that was created in 1948 by the United Nations in the land of Palestine to accommodate the European Jewish refugees who migrated since 1880 either to escape the Holocaust or were purposefully recruited. The dehumanisation of the scattered European Jewish community and the establishment of political Zionism in 1897 fuelled the Jewish people's desire for nationalism and unity. The Zionist leaders advocated the return of the diasporic community to their Holy land culminating in the declaration of a new state Israel (the modern Israel in Palestine). Later the Zionist Israel imposed their illegal control over the whole region of old Palestine.

The chapter addressed the multilayered identities existing in Palestine/Israel. The films discussed the internal tensions faced by the present generation, fuelled by the current political narratives with its competing claims for the same land. The thesis discusses the tyrannical political policies that let loose racial discrimination, prejudices, fanatic hatred and phobia towards the 'dehumanised other' or the fellow beings in the present Israel/Palestine through the post millennium films.

In terms of ethno-religious aspect, the present Palestinian community (after the partition in 1948) who are the offspring of the inhabitants of old Palestine or the biblical ancient Israeli region, consisted of Palestinian Arab Muslims, Palestinian Arab Christians, Palestinian Druze, Samaritans and Palestinian Arab Jews or the Oriental Jews. The formation of Israel led to the arrival and recognition of many more ethno-religious communities like the Israeli Jews or the European diasporas, the refugees who fled from the Holocaust, who themselves are divided into Ashkenazi, Mizrahi and Sephardim. Many among the Israeli Jews are those who had openly rejected any ties to their ancestry in ancient Israel and had tried to take citizenship in Europe. Apart from them, the population also include Israeli Druze, American evangelic Christians, Bedouins and Arab Muslims who are legally the citizens of Israel. The tensions between these communities become the premise of films like *3000 Nights* (portraying the clash between Palestinians, Ashkenazi Jews and Mizrahi Jews), *The Syrian Bride* (based on a bride from Druze community will have to permanently shift to Syria and not return), *Wajib* and *The Time That Remains* (showing Palestinian Arabs in Nazerath and the Israeli restrictions they will have to face), *Laila's Birthday*, *Tel Aviv on Fire*, *The Present* and *200 Meters* (the condition of Palestinian Arabs trying to cling on to their employment and family in the midst of Israeli apartheid).

In terms of Israel and Palestine's present religious landscape, Christians, Muslims, and Jews comprise the ultra-orthodox, traditional, religious, and secular population. Within the Jewish State, some regard Jewishness as a religion, while others see it as an ethnic and cultural entity. Discrimination based on race, ethnicity, and ideologies is common among the subgroups as discussed earlier. In every community in Palestine and Israel, there is a group of people who think that the

government should uphold religious laws and values in addition to its own policies. However, a substantial section of the population believes that religion and governmental policy should be kept apart.

The Palestinians and Israelites are further numerously divided in terms of their socio- political identities. As discussed in the third chapter, politically the people within different communities labelled each other based on whom they supported or political affiliations using terms like pro- Palestinians, pro- Israelites. The terms resistors and terrorists were often interchanged based on to which side of the state and history they belonged. For example, in the film *Tel Aviv on Fire*, Assi from Israeli Sabra conceives the character Marvan of the soap opera as a terrorist whereas Salam being a Palestinian considers him as their freedom fighter. This is similar to how many Gazan Palestinians regard Hamas as political resistors who raised voice for the Palestinians who struggle to gain freedom and dignity in their land whereas the Israelites view their retaliations as terrorism. The films like *Paradise Now* and *The Attack* narrated the life of Palestinians who decide to become suicide bombers as an act of their resistance. In brief, Israeli tormentors and executioners in uniforms with highly equipped artilaries and explosives are called commandos, whereas Palestinian resistors or commandos are called terrorists. Many among the subjugated Palestinians or Arab Israelites were cheated and deceived to forcefully become collaborators whereas a very few willingly became so, for the fake promise of better living circumstances. These people were called traitors by the communities to which they belonged. The film *Omar* clearly shows how the Israeli officer Rami cunningly deceive Omar and his friend Amjad to become collaborators, but their society calls them traitors. A similar situation is seen in the narration of Said in *Paradise Now* whose father was forced to become a collaborator and hence

Said became a suicide bomber to erase his father's insulting identity. Collaborators are even portrayed in films like *Farha* and *The Time That Remains* helping the Zionist militia to identify and kill civilians and resisters.

This socio-political identity construction of the two communities' (Israelites and Palestinians) is based on their interaction as two distinct societies, characterised by political polarisation, phobia, and hostility. They swap the identities of the perpetrator and victim in relation to the othered community based on these tensions. The European Jews who migrated to the land of Palestine since 1880 were called the refugees (as seen in films like *The Little Traitor* in which Proffy and the people of his community are migrants who came to Mandatory Palestine under British rule, and in *A Tale of Love and Darkness* in which Amoz and his family are European migrants living in Palestinian land). They were recognised as the survivors or the victims who had faced the Holocaust. The Zionists and many among these refugees claimed themselves to be the 'chosen people' by God to occupy the land of Palestine. With partition of the Palestinian region and the formation of a new state, their identities shifted to that of Israeli citizens. They established a national history enhanced by their Holocaust victimhood identity to defend their siege of land, plundering and murdering of indigenous Palestinians.

The native Palestinians are systematically dehumanised and displaced (as seen in late twentieth century film like *Return to Haifa*, and contemporary films like *Farha*, *Omar* and many more). Their identities were stripped off, history continuously erased, and culture devalued. The young generation of Israelites are brainwashed from their childhood to make them believe that they are the 'chosen people' who have the right to occupy Palestine. Ironically their Zionist belief

prompted them to remove obstacles and establish a permanent state for Israel even through crimes against humanity. Continuous propagation of disinformation and manipulation of history by the Zionist agenda inculcates hatred in the young Israelites (as the Nazis did to dehumanise Jews in Europe). Palestinians the actual victims of occupation and continuing Nakba are dehumanised and called 'uncivilised', 'disease', 'human animals' or 'perpetrators' who have to be annihilated from their land to secure peace for Israelites.

Presently, those who are illegally annexing Palestine, curbing their basic facilities and rights, terrorising civilians and slaughtering them are still called 'victims'. Any attempt at retaliation by the Palestinian community is misrepresented as terrorism and the resisters are stigmatised as criminals, political prisoners or Palestinian terrorists (as the key characters in films like *Salt of This Sea*, *3000 Nights*, *Omar* and *Paradise Now*). That is, the Holocaust victims who came to Palestine as refugees gradually got into the colonisers' position. Thus, the Jewish victims of the Holocaust are divided into two groups: those who acknowledge that they are victims of the Holocaust and condemn or protest against the current Israeli government for occupying Palestine and carrying out genocide by killing Palestinian civilians and internal refugees; and those who consider themselves to be the descendants of Holocaust victims but are given weapons and strength by many countries to eradicate native Palestinians in the name of their victimhood identity.

The Palestinian sociopolitical identity became diverse due to the ongoing Nakba and the denial of Palestinian identity. The forcefully displaced people from Palestine become migrants, immigrants, refugees (as in *Ismail* and *When I Saw You*), internally displaced (thousands of them who live in refugee camps within the

Palestinian region in Gaza and West Bank), illegal or legal settlers and exiles or diasporas (as in *Amreeka, It Must be Heaven* and *Salt of This Sea*). The 1950 Law of Return, grants every Jew around the world the right to settle in Israel with proper citizenship, whereas no Palestinians expelled from their land in 1948 or their offspring are allowed to enter Israeli state or present Palestine. Palestinian Jews who were residents of former Palestine were granted Israeli citizenship when they returned, but claiming the status of citizens by the non-Jewish Palestinian residents were quite impossible as the requirement was that they had to be registered as Israeli residents since 1949 and had not left the country before claiming citizenship. This was impossible as most of the Palestinians were forced out of their land in 1948. At the most they are allowed as tourists for a few days under strict surveillance. This tension related to the law of returning to the homeland is powerfully portrayed in *The Salt of This Sea*.

This thesis does not aim to compare the two genocides as they are incomparable in many respects. Holocaust is a bygone genocide, an ethno-political issue spread across Europe, whereas Nakba is an ongoing genocide- a geopolitical issue, infused with ethnic, racial and religious hatred in the Palestinian region, a massacre that weaponises Holocaust memory. Though the space, time, milieu and magnitude of the two events are different the common ground is the human suffering and mass extermination in both genocides, like many others around the world.

By introducing the concept glocalisation of memory, this thesis has brought out a new dimension to understand the race politics and stigmatisation which has produced and sustained inequality within the human suffering experiences caused by the two genocides- Holocaust and Nakba. Glocalisation of memory, as discussed in

the fourth chapter, occurs when aspects of regionalisation and globalisation coexist, establishing a discursive space for productive deliberations rather than a competing one. This process opens the space to address multiple dimensions of the two genocides and voice out the subjugation of one victim society in the name of another, by overcoming the limitations of both regionalisation and globalisation of memory. The simultaneous existence of post-millennium Holocaust and Nakba films are the best examples of the glocalisation of genocide memory represented in media space. Filming the Holocaust in the post-millennium is an attempt to examine the diversity of the experience by delving into the past; while filming Nakba seeks to reveal, reclaim, and reify the history of Palestinian subjugation that has been manipulated and obscured by the Israeli national narrative.

In the present, international film festivals, film award ceremonies, national or regional film festivals, theatres, film streaming services like *Netflix* and social media have made it possible for people all over the world to watch and engage with the victims' experiences of two genocides at the same time on one platform.

This raises awareness of the genocide being perpetrated again under a different mask and exposes victims who turn into aggressors under the cover of victimhood identities supported by political, economic, and racial discrimination. Many viewers experience vicarious survivor guilt as a result, and they protest injustice, ethnic cleansing, and occupation. Movie streaming services transform into chronotopes, allowing the two memories of the genocide to coexist by challenging hierarchies of suffering. It emphasises the necessity of fostering a fresh dialogue that overlooks political gains and allows for a constructive consideration of both the Holocaust and the Nakba.

The third chapter has discovered the following to be the key features of memory glocalisation: this process is basically polylogic as it propagates multiple perspectives of the two genocides through open discussions; it addresses the unsettling condition of the transgenerational and intergenerational memory bearers who are forced to depend on the two genocide histories to define their identities; it confronts with historical negation, fabrication and revisionism; it helps in cultural transmission and cultural restitution simultaneously; and problematises extremist territorial nationalism or ethnonationalism.

This thesis is limited to feature films to represent a wide range of human experiences of the two genocides, set in multiperspectival contexts within different spaces and times. Documentary films is another area to study the two genocides. It is mostly a collage of a number of shots with free held camera showing life of the deprived. Holocaust documentaries are combination of footages taken during the event, interviews telling the stories of the survivors and victims, and traces or evidences of the past captured by filmmakers who visited the concentration camps after the Holocaust. Some of the prominent documentaries till date are *Night and Fog*, *Genocide*, *Shoah*, *Memory of the Camps* and *The Last Days* from the late twentieth century; and *50 Children: The Rescue Mission of Mr. And Mrs. Kraus*, *There Is Many Like Us* and *Anne Frank Parallel Stories*.

Nakba documentaries are testimonies by the survivors of the 1948 event and the victims of several wars that followed as part of the ongoing genocide. They include testimonials from eyewitnesses of the 1948 Nakba and interviews of the victim who still suffer under occupation and denial of human rights. Some of the prominent Nakba documentaries include *Al-Nakba: The Palestinian Catastrophe*

1948 (the first Nakba documentary filmed in 1996) and the others filmed in the twenty first century like *Occupation 101*, *Five Broken Cameras*, *A World Not Ours*, *Ghost Hunting*, *Five Minutes from Home*, *Skies Above Hebron*, *Jenin, Jenin*, *Born in Gaza*, *Gaza Fights for Freedom* and *Stitching Palestine*.

This thesis focused on feature films because they are powerful tools for fostering empathy and increasing public awareness of genocides and their consequences. Fictional films have the creative freedom and dramatic effect which the documentaries often lack. Unlike documentaries that are expected to adhere to historical accuracy, fiction allows filmmakers to explore deep human emotions by reimagining genocide through fictional characters, narratives, and artificially built settings resembling the real places where the event occurred, especially the spaces which are inaccessible during the period when it happened. Fiction films can delve into the characters' inner struggles, fears, and hopes during a genocide. This creative flexibility can produce a more relatable experience for viewers. This allows viewers to connect with the human element of the tragedy on a deeper level, fostering empathy and understanding. Moreover, the unfathomable inner turmoil of the victims, bystanders and survivors can be symbolically represented through films. Unlike documentaries, feature films have a wider reach and audience globally. They have the ability to surpass the strict surveillance by the authorities through the artistic techniques and creative means of expression used to convey any dense and multidirectional themes.

In the case of Holocaust films, the inconceivable conditions in highly populated ghettos, unhygienic concentration camps, filthy crematoriums, sewages, rubbles and debris of the war and even the hiding or open spaces during the period

of Holocaust from 1940 to 1945 are shown through films by recreating the settings. Nakba films try to expose the more than seventy-five years of occupation and genocide from multiple perspectives. These films portray the conditions of Palestinians under occupation, the draconian and humiliating military rule and the mental crisis faced by both Palestinian and Israeli communities under the pressures of authoritarian regime. The Palestinian/ Israeli filmmakers succeed in showing the physical boundaries imposed by the Israeli government on the Palestinian community, like the high Separation Wall dividing West Bank and Israel, barbed wire fences, strict and discomfiting checkpoints, high-security barricade control systems, high turnstiles and asphyxiating cage like passages before them to cross borders are built in the name of state security. Filmmakers like Elia Sulaiman (as in *The Time That Remains*), Hany Abu Assad (*Omar*) and Annemarie Jacir (*Salt of This Sea*) have tried to cross or transgress the physical barriers imposed on their society surrealistically or symbolically through artistic space. Apart from feature films and documentaries, audio-visual genres like short film, television serial and online series have also contributed to the understanding of the two genocides.

Recently in this year after Israel announced war against Palestine (on 7th October, 2023) for Hamas' retaliation against the siege of Palestinian land and their rights, there have been a proliferation of contents and tremendous increase in the circulation of social media videos (especially through platforms like *Instagram*, *Facebook* and *YouTube*) based on counter history, current politics and conflicting narratives through the voices of civilians, researchers and the governments around the world. These too are playing a key role in the dissemination and glocalisation of the multilayered history of the Holocaust and Nakba. The coexistence of Holocaust

and Nakba films in society is one of the reasons to acknowledge, stimulate curiosity to study and expose the Nakba as a genocide. They spark interest in learning about the extensive history and connection between the two genocides that led to the formation of extremely divided Israel/Palestine communities of the present.

The twelve films discussed in this thesis have brought to light how genocide memories are mediated by the postmillennial movies, producing multilayered meanings redefining space and identity. As part of memory glocalisation, the interaction of Holocaust and Nakba films explore and vividly portray the inexplicable suffering, the xenophobia of various groups of people, and the fluctuation or shifting psychology of victims, victimisers, and bystanders during both crises. This process has the potential to mediate the personal, national and global perspectives about the two genocides discussed, to bring out a paradigmatic shift in the discriminatory history constructed by the colonialists or regimes who perpetuated disparity between the Holocaust and Nakba memory bearers. Hence, it is important to discuss some of the crucial functions that glocalisation of genocide memory carries out in the present society.

First of all, in the era of multiculturalism and multiple histories, the glocalisation of memory serves as a tool for examining the conflicting definitions of truth, morality, and ethics. Currently, the idea of singular conception of truth has been contested, as opposed to the definition of truth as 'affirming reality'. Truth is characterised as complex, nuanced, and relative. In this era of post truth filtering depending on how much of a reality is meant to be communicated. The efforts to combine discussion on the Holocaust and Nakba through the post millennium films have brought out the ethical ramifications in dissemination of genocide collective

victimhood memories and criticises one memory being pulled down by another.

For instance, it can be observed that in the case of the Holocaust, political and corporate propaganda renew interest in memorialising the tragedy in order to prevent it from being forgotten or normalised and gives it new significance. The human suffering and victim identity is clearly defined while commemorating Holocaust. Giving significance to the event preserves the identity of the Israelites as genocide victims and secures or guarantees their continued existence in Palestine. However, the ethnonationalist Zionist government manipulates the history of the Nakba victims (a community that continuously faces conditions similar to those of Holocaust victims or even worse) by disseminating false information in order to oppress them or remove any evidence of their past. Their victim identity is viewed ambiguously or is not acknowledged. The combined discussions on the two genocides criticise discriminations and treat all forms of human suffering equally, without regard to race, ethnicity, religion, or political affiliation.

Films about the Holocaust and Nakba examine how, in times of crisis, people transcend their intrinsic religious, ethnic, or national identities: either positively or negatively. For example, in the films *In Darkness* and *Jojo Rabbit*, respectively, the characters Socha and Jojo prioritise their humanity over national, religious or ethnic identities. On the other hand, films like *The Grey Zone* depicts how even the victimised people normalise the atrocities or are forced to collaborate with their victimisers sacrificing their ethical values in order to survive. It can also be observed through the different films discussed that during the period of crisis, the basic ethical value of not inflicting harm on others is thrown to the winds with oppressors taking any measure to achieve their target as discussed in films like *The Grey Zone*, *The*

Zookeeper's Wife, Omar, and Tel Aviv on Fire. This *carpe diem* mode adopted by the oppressors in the time of catastrophe promotes to do what benefits the moment, without regrets, even if the history needs to be neglected or manipulated.

The Holocaust films like *The Pianist, Jojo Rabbit* and *The Grey Zone* show how both gentiles and victims were brainwashed by the regimes during the time of catastrophe. A similar trope is even seen in many of the Israeli civilians who are brainwashed by the politicians and their education system that manipulated history of the land and made them believe that indigenous Palestinians do not have claim to the land. This nature can be seen in the present Israeli civilians and soldiers who dehumanise and ruthlessly attack or deceive Palestinians as seen in films like *3000 Nights, Tel Aviv on Fire, Omar, Lemon Tree* and *Time That Remains*. The post-millennium self-reflexive Holocaust and Nakba films included in this thesis simultaneously addressed this issue of the existence of these post-truths in genocide memories and they also incorporated characters that epitomised the importance of fidelity in truth, ethics and morality even in the time of crisis. These representations help to expose unbiased claims on victimhood identity, connect and share the experiences and memory, and mobilise the global community to protest against current injustices perpetrated against any racial, ethnic or religious minorities.

Secondly, the globalisation of genocide memories serves to reveal the politics underlying the inclusion and exclusion of competing national Holocaust histories in Israel and other European countries impacted by the genocide, as well as the Nakba history, or the competing histories of the land of Palestine/Israel by Israelites and Palestinians.

Thirdly, glocalisation addresses politics behind the inclusion and exclusion of racial, ethnic, religious, cultural or political groups within the diverse population of Holocaust and Nakba memory bearing people. This has been discussed in detail in the third chapter on memory and identity. The Holocaust films portrayed how discriminatory measures were taken up by the Nazi regime to exterminate Jews, other minorities and political resisters, by portraying them as inferior or traitors. Similarly, Nakba films portrayed discriminatory measures taken by the Zionist regime against the Palestinians and Israeli minorities to inflict excruciating terror and exterminate them. Their human identity itself is stripped off. These victims are tormented for their religious affiliations. Like the Nazi regime brainwashed the civilians to believe Aryans to be the superior race, the Zionist regime indoctrinated the Israeli civilians who migrated from Europe to be the chosen people by God to occupy the Palestinian land. Like many among the gentiles who protested against the brutality in exterminating the Jewish community in the name of their race, there are many European Jews in the present who protest against the brutality and mass killing perpetrated by the political Zionists against the indigenous Palestinians even in this decade. The best example beyond the film narratives is the current war by Israel on Palestinians supported by the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, Poland, Spain and a few other nations for political and economic interests. This is not supported by many Jews inside Palestine/ Israel and a number of global communities. They call for ceasefire and criticise the political Zionist agenda in the shadow of Holocaust victimhood identity.

The narrative reproductions in the post millennium films on both the genocides have traced the alterity in the construction of the Holocaust and Nakba

victimhood identity. This helped the global community to be aware of how hegemonic powers perpetrate racial and ethnic oppression. The Zionist government that indiscriminately bombed the Palestinians several times to annihilate them, also call themselves the victims and their war on Palestine as defence. They infuse hatred within the young Israeli community by misrepresenting political anti-Zionist resistance as antisemitic one. They targeted and killed more than 41000 civilians in one year by dropping missiles and bombs on residential areas, refugee camps, hospitals, mosques, churches, schools and universities. They call it a collateral damage in their way to track down Hamas. Several Israeli officials and civilians openly admitted through social media that their aim is to exterminate and exile Palestinians (whom they call human animals as the Jews were called rats and vermins by the Nazis) and occupy their territory. They used the term 'humanitarian pause' in between the war, granted to the rest of the Palestinians, forcing them to migrate from their homeland. The remaining Palestinian civilians and the wounded are left to die of starvation, with the Israeli government denying them basic necessities like food, water and medical aid. All the Palestinian documents and infrastructures are continuously destroyed to erase their history and culture. The pre-1948 history of the Palestinian region is distorted. In order to fit within the parameters of contemporary Israel's national history—whose citizens are primarily descended from Europeans—the Zionist agenda encouraged the alteration of the history of the native Israeli tribe. Furthermore, Israel's national history incorporated Holocaust victimhood narratives and Jewish ethnic cleansing, while disclaiming any accountability for orchestrating an ethnic cleansing of Palestinians.

This makes evident that the Jewish victims' suffering was used by the

Zionist government to win recognition of the Israeli identity, their right to a state, and justification for the systemic perpetration of violence against the indigenous group whose land they had occupied. They subjugate and silence any attempts of resistance by the oppressed by portraying themselves as the victims who are defending their people so that a Jewish Holocaust happens 'Never Again.' This is also catalysed by Islamophobia and White supremacy. The select films in the thesis clearly show the racist double standards of the Europeans Nazis towards the Jewish ethnicity, and the Israeli political Zionists towards the Palestinian ethnic community which comprises people belonging to different religions. These films questioned the fallacy in the representations of regional history and memory of these genocides. They reacted against blind patriotism and adamant denials of the Other.

Thirdly, glocalisation of the two genocide memories helps to overcome cultural imperialism and cultural homogenisation. It promoted cultural restitution through art. The practice of cultural imperialism can be described as the use of culture by a nation or regime to create and maintain unequal social relationships between people belonging to different communities. For example, the Nazis forced all the Jews to wear the yellow band on their arm with the Jewish symbol, Star of David on it to discriminate them as religious and ethnic inferior. This is shown in many Holocaust films. Later the survivors used it as the symbol of their freedom (as shown in films like *The Zookeeper's Wife*). The Star of David which symbolises Jewish identity is present on the Israeli flag too. Recently, in the context of Hamas-Israel attack, an Israeli ambassador in United Nations Security Council meeting wore the yellow star to reaffirm the Holocaust victimhood identity of Israelites, and used it as a justification to carry out war on Palestinian civilisation. This is a form of

cultural homogenisation in which religious symbols are used for political purposes. Another example is how the rich native Palestinian culture, cuisine and music are adopted by the Israelites in the process of erasure of Palestinian traces. The Nakba films extensively show the Palestinian cultural elements and artifacts as a way of cultural restitution to prove the existence of generations of Palestinians on their land. The graffiti on the Separation Wall of the West Bank showing the evidences of history, which are also presented in the backgrounds of Palestinian and Israeli films become a form of cultural restitution.

Fourthly, glocalisation of the genocide memories encourage the power of learning, unlearning and relearning the history. The post Millenium Holocaust and Nakba films were attempts to decentralise dominant narratives of victimhood identities by addressing the multilayeredness and multidimensionality within the already existing victimhood narratives as discussed in the thesis earlier. The select films resist erasure or suppression of identities. These films proved that any act of forced forgetting of violence or neglect of history and memory led to its poignant remembering and reaffirmation of identity later in time (as seen in films like *Remembrance* and *Salt of This Sea*).

In brief, the study has analysed the strategies and techniques followed by the Holocaust film directors and the Nakba film directors, and how the representations of the genocide memories affect both the conscious and subconscious realms of the spectators. The study has focused on the efforts taken up by the Holocaust film directors to conceptualise, reinvest, institutionalise and even criticize representations of victimhood identity, and their vital role in spreading Holocaust awareness throughout the world. It has also traced the Palestinian identity crisis due to the

ongoing Nakba dealt explicitly in the recent films by Arab directors. By tracing the history and contemporary social scenario of Israelites and Palestinians, the thesis tried to unveil the power dynamics inherent in the representation of Holocaust and Nakba victimhood in their region. Nakba films preserve Palestinian memory and identity, raising awareness about the Palestine/ Israel conflict, and advocating for Palestinian rights, especially in the present time when the Palestinians are being targeted, violently exterminated and driven from their land. The study seeks to make the audience aware of the complicity of the different countries' governments, academic institutions, and mainstream media that either downplay or deny the realities of the ongoing genocide of Palestinians.

The glocalisation of genocides has made it easier to comprehend how conflicting histories shape the identities of those who carry the Holocaust and Nakba memories. It also demonstrates the ways in which dense depictions of Holocaust victimhood in the present has aided commercialisation and capitalist interests. In addition, the thesis examined the perceptions of memory and looked for evidence of historical recurrence. It has also explored how films function as catalysts for social change.

By drawing attention to the process of glocalisation in memory studies, the thesis offers an alternative model for examining the dynamic nature of shared memory, that may be used to examine the various subjugated or competing genocide memories that exist today in different parts of the world. The thesis addressed the Holocaust and Nakba together and placed multiple national perspectives against each other, foreseeing the possibility of accepting multiple histories, and to develop an idea of psychological understanding of human suffering experienced in both the genocides. It aims to help the global audience perceive the range and consequences

of the two genocides by bringing together and analysing international films. It addressed the possibilities of thinking of the Palestinian and Israeli history together, and imagine a possibility of reconciliation and establish peace.

This research urges the genocide survivors to choose to become beacons of resilience and resistance rather than letting their victim status identify them.

Learning from the past is more important for healing than forgetting the past. It is about embracing the human spirit's strength to withstand the deepest wounds. In the light of their experiences, Holocaust survivors and memory bearers can challenge the narratives of prejudice and exclusions perpetrating Nakba, that served as justification for their victimisation too and spread awareness of the consequences of ongoing genocides around the world.

This study contributes to the understanding of multiple spaces and identities embedded in the Holocaust and Nakba history, and the limitations of the dominant mainstream narratives in addressing them. Glocalisation of the Holocaust and Nakba memories have helped the younger generation to perceive the reality. Glocalisation of genocide memories have led to create awareness in the present generation. Many universities, colleges and other public spaces across the world are organising protests and rallies to show solidarity with the victims of genocide, expose the complicity of various authorities, boycott products from countries that support genocide, and call for a ceasefire in Palestine. People empathise with the victims and acknowledge their own responsibility in preserving humanity. The thesis argues to the necessity for decolonisation of Palestine, end weaponising Holocaust victimhood memory and build a healthy relationship between the Holocaust and Nakba memory bearers.

Recommendations

Further Avenues for Inquiry

This study has analysed how feature films that depict and preserve memories of the Holocaust and Nakba genocide have had a profound impact on the space, existence, identity formation and social interactions of the current generation worldwide. It is found that these visual representations serve to empower, commemorate, and educate a society. However, they also have the ability to express the unfair or suppressed memories of victimhood associated with any event, or to challenge the prevailing, excessively dominant narratives.

The study notes that, in the case of contemporary Holocaust films, there has been a shift in focus with respect to the themes and forms of memory representation from event-centred or collective memory to witness-centred or individual memory since the turn of the century. It has been found that this shift has exposed many moral and ethical conundrums in conceptualising collective identity through film representations. This has helped people comprehend the multifaceted and multidirectional victimhood identity of the past event. The Palestinian/ Israeli victims who are living through the memory of the ongoing Nakba also adopt witness-centred approach. They employ this technique to avoid the censorship or political ban that would be imposed by the Israeli government controlling them, and to attain global recognition to the ongoing genocide.

The research employed the phrase ‘glocalisation of memory’ to examine the effects of retrieving, reproducing and disseminating the mediated traveling memories (through the select movies) of the two interconnected genocides, the

Holocaust and Nakba. By analysing the select movies through the lens of this approach with regard to their features and functions, the study has worked through and addressed plurality in the process of framing collective memories. The study has brought attention to the necessity of decentralising the domination of a specific victimhood identity in order to achieve uniqueness, as opposed to viewing the suffering endured by victims of genocides as an equally agonising experience for all.

This research holds relevance in the post-millennial era due to the complex interaction between conflicting depictions of victimhood in the Holocaust and Nakba films exhibited within the same space and time. It is noted that the interplay and intersection of the competing histories and memories of the Holocaust and the Nakba in popular culture have given rise to productive thoughts for global peace among viewers worldwide. The thesis has opened up new avenues for research in the fields such as memory glocalisation, identity politics, cultural studies, trauma studies, genocide studies, spatial studies and neocolonial studies. This chapter intends to suggest recommendations for future studies in the areas related to this thesis. Possible areas for further research or investigation include:

Firstly, even though the research has briefly discussed children's films and movies with kids as the key characters, more research can be done on how children's unique experiences—their worries, fears, and perspectives about the genocides—are portrayed in movies, books, autobiographies, and other works of art. Discussion topics can include visual and verbal cues; the blurring of class, racial, and ethnic boundaries; children's challenges in differentiating between good and evil; morality and ethics in the dark ages; the transition from innocence to experience; the state of change from misperception to recognition; and the way children are caught between social and personal conundrums.

Secondly, there is a need for studies on the psychology of traumatised children bearing the memory of the Holocaust and Nakba. The current generation of Palestinian and Israeli children can be divided into two groups: those who simultaneously learn about, experience, and become traumatised by the ongoing Nakba genocide; and those who are instilled with the memories of the past Holocaust through public narratives and curricula. The theories of western trauma and psychology scholars like the post-traumatic stress disorder defines the condition of children who survived the Holocaust. However, these theories cannot be effectively applied to discuss the trauma experienced by children of ongoing Nakba genocide. For instance, a fifteen- year-old child under Nakba had experienced around five major wars apart from minor attacks and humiliations. Hence, their ways of enduring trauma and coping mechanisms to survive the ongoing genocide are entirely different from the western perception, and there is a need to develop a new paradigm to understand their harrowing condition.

Thirdly, there is an immediate need to study the psychology of the opposing group of civilians who are blinded by mainstream media brainwashing, extremist patriotism and ethno- nationalisms leading to xenophobia, adamant denials and communal hatred even in this present century where social media plays an extensive role in disseminating information. In the case of the recent ongoing genocide in Palestine, perpetrated by the Israeli government, in retaliation for the attack by Hamas on October 7th 2023, more than 11,000 Palestinian civilians were killed by continuous indiscriminate bombing. Though many national leaders and mainstream media tried to coverup the realities of genocide and joined the propaganda supporting Israel in executing genocide in the name of defence, numerous counter

narratives are circulating in social media like *Instagram*, *Facebook* or *Twitter*, and a few other news channels like *Al Jazeera* and *TRT World*. There are mass demonstrations calling for a ceasefire and an abundance of facts about the current state of affairs that outweigh the mainstream media's manipulations. Despite the Israeli governments repressive measures against dissent, there are many Israeli civilians who continue to articulate their resentment towards Israeli government's policy of extermination.

Fourthly, this thesis opens space for deliberations in the fields of sociology, demography and disability studies. Further studies provoke the scholars to look at the dismantled family structures during genocides; the social and psychological condition of amputated people who are twice victimised and traumatised during genocides; and the trauma undergone by frontline workers like rescuers, doctors, journalists, militants and ordinary civilians who continuously see and experience the consequences of genocide.

Fifthly, the thesis has briefly looked into the problems faced by women during the genocide or after it facing the consequences. Even then there is a need to study more on how women are represented in films. Earlier women characters were marginalised by giving them the role of supporting characters for the male protagonists who are working in the frontline of wars. They were shown as fragile and vulnerable, and their main duties were to give birth and nurture children. Their bodies were weaponised (raping women as a way to defeat a community or nation) and objectified (using women characters to arouse voyeuristic pleasures). The recent films analysed in the thesis like *The Grey Zone* and *The Zookeeper's Wife* set in the background of the Holocaust; and *3000 Nights*, *Lemon Tree* and *Salt of This Sea* set

in the background of the Palestinian crisis view women from a more vital perspective, giving them the role of protagonists taking crucial decisions.

Sixthly, there is an emerging scope in studying neocolonialism through social media algorithms in the light of the Holocaust and Nakba memory glocalisation. The social media has the power to connect and control people. On the one hand, it has revolutionised communication, promoted international relationships and given voice to those who are marginalised. People can communicate across borders and build a sense of community by exchanging ideas and experiences. However, these platforms can be used to propagate false information, influence public opinion, and surveil users. Algorithms that curate data have the potential to reinforce preexisting biases and limit exposure to different points of view by establishing echo chambers or shadow banning content. This dual nature draws attention to the complex interaction between society and technology.

Furthermore, studies can be done comparing the documentaries on the Holocaust and Nakba. This genre too helps to study and convey the victims' memory, space, identity and their present realities. The study on the functions of glocalisation can be extended to documentaries too as they have an important role in archiving the genocide events and transmitting it. Filming the genocide or exposing it to the world was banned during the Holocaust and was not encouraged even after the event. These were revived, and the concentration camps became historical museums by the late twentieth century when memorialising history and reinvesting it in school curriculums or public discourses became a part of different nation building. Most of the documentaries are well scripted and include narrations, graphic scenes and reenactments as they are about the bygone event. These documentaries

helped to create genocide awareness to the post Holocaust generation, it kept the memory of the camps alive in the young generation so that the sufferings of the victims are not normalised with the passage of time. Holocaust documentaries mostly narrate survivor's viewpoint.

Documentaries on the ongoing Nakba is even more challenging and has to face many obstacles during production. These were shot in secrecy and had limitations in expressing the actual magnitude. These works have to undergo severe surveillance, sometimes banned and are not easily accessible by the global audience, unlike post Holocaust documentaries. Unlike Holocaust documentaries, there is no need of reenactments or dramatisations in the case of Nakba documentaries, as the people interviewed or portrayed in it are victims who still experience the consequences of genocidal wars perpetrated by political Zionists. They depict the deplorable conditions in refugee camps inside and outside of Palestine; the state of living in Gaza, which is like a perpetual open prison; where basic facilities are denied; and the stark differences between the infrastructure of Israel and Palestine. In addition, the documentaries showed the resilience and coping strategies of children who are vulnerable to repeated wars and attacks; as well as the experiences of Palestinian political prisoners, Israeli soldiers who saw the Nakba; and indigenous people who detailed the spatioicide and memorycide committed by the hegemonic government. The documentaries and testimonies often reassert the incidents in the feature films, and at times they expose the fictionality in reenactment of the genocide theme.

Lastly, this study recommends that the process of glocalising memory through mass media can be used to uncover and analyse other suppressed genocides

committed against various ethnic, religious, and geopolitical communities worldwide, such as the genocides against the Rohingya people in Myanmar, the Uyghur people in China, the Iraqi Turkmen and Yazidis in Iraq, the Rwandan, Colombian, Ukrainian and Bosnian people. The idea that the pain endured by victims of genocides is an equally excruciating experience for all can be emphasised through glocalisation of the narratives on these genocides, despite the fact that the space, time, milieu, culture, and magnitude of the various genocides may differ.

Works Cited

- 200 Meters*. Directed by Ameen Nayfeh, Odeh Films, 2020.
- 3000 Nights*. Directed by Mai Masri, Cinema Politica, 2015.
- A Friendship in Vienna*. Directed by Arthur Allan Seidelman, Walt Disney Television / Finnegan / Pinchuk Productions, 1988.
- A Tale of Love and Darkness*. Directed by Natalie Portman, Voltage Pictures / Black Bicycle Entertainment / Ram Bergman Productions, 2015.
- Abdullah. "Poets from Palestine: No Walls to the Cell." *Poets from Palestine*, 10 Jan. 2010, poetsfrompalestine.blogspot.com/2010/01/no-walls-to-cell.html.
- Abdullah, Md Abu Shahid., editor. *Trauma, Memory and Identity Crisis: Reimagining and Rewriting the Past*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2022.
- Ackerman, Diane. *The Zookeeper's Wife*. W.W. Norton, 2007.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen, Stanford University Press, 1998.
- . *State of Exception*. Translated by Kevin Attell, University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Alan and Naomi*. Directed by Sterling Van Wagenen, Leucadia Film Corporation, 1992.
- Allan, Diana K. "The Politics of Witness: Remembering and Forgetting 1948 in Shatila Camp." *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*, edited by Ahmad H. Saa'd and Lila Abu-Lughod, Columbia University Press, 2007, pp. 253–254.
- Almusa, Sharif. "Portable Absence: My Camp Re-membered." *Seeking Palestine: New Palestinian Writing on Exile and Home*, edited by Raja Shehadeh and Penny Johnson, Spinifex Press, 2012.
- Al-Sharif, Osama. "Palestine's Generation Z nullifying Israeli narrative." *Arab News*, 8 June. 2021, <https://www.arabnews.com/node/1872866>.
- Amayreh, Khaled. "Lebensraum in the West Bank." *MIFTAH*, 19 Apr. 2010, miftah.org/display.cfm?DocId=22012&CategoryId=5.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso Publication, 2006.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Viking Press, 1963.
- . *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Penguin Modern Classics, 2017. Arraf, Suha. "Lemon Tree Movie Script." *Scripts*, 5 Aug. 2018, www.scripts.com/script/lemon_tree_7772.
- Asfour, Nana. "Omar: The Palestinian Oscar Nominee Made Amid Panic and Paranoia."

- The Guardian*, 22 Feb. 2014, <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2014/feb/22/omar-film-palestine-oscar-hany-abu-assad>.
- Ashcroft, Bill, and D. P. S. Ahluwalia. *Edward Said*. Routledge, 2009. "Ashkenazic and Sephardic Jews." *Judaism 101*, https://www.jewfaq.org/ashkenazic_and_sephardic. Accessed 20 Apr. 2022.
- Assmann, Aleida. "The Holocaust — a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community." *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*, edited by Aleida Assmann, Sebastian Conrad, E-book ed., Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Assmann, Jan and John Czaplicka. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique*, no.65, pp. 125-133. JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/488538>. Accessed 5 Oct. 2021.
- Baconi, Tareq. *Hamas Contained: The Rise and Pacification of Palestinian Resistance*. Stanford University Press, 2022.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics." *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, University of Texas Press, year, pp. 84–85.
- Baranova, Olga. "Politics of Memory of the Holocaust in the Soviet Union." *Dimensions of Modernity: The Enlightenment and its Contested Legacies*, edited by P. Marczewski and S. Eich, IWM Junior Visiting Fellows' Conferences, vol. 34, 2015.
- Bar-On, Dan and Saliba Sansar. "Bridging the Unbridgeable: The Holocaust and Al Nakba." *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Economics and Culture*, vol. 11, no.1, 2004, <https://pij.org/articles/17/bridging-the-unbridgeable-the-holocaust-and-almakba>.
- Beatty, Aidan and Dan O'Brien. *Irish Questions and Jewish Questions*. Syracuse University Press, 2018.
- Berendt, Joanna. "At Auschwitz, Holocaust Survivors Plead 'Never Forget'." *The New York Times*, 27 Jan. 2020, www.nytimes.com/2020/01/27/world/europe/auschwitz-memorial-anniversary.html.
- Bezwinska, Jadwiga, and Danuta Czech, editors. *Amidst a Nightmare of Crime: Manuscripts of Prisoners in Crematorium Squads Found at Auschwitz*. Translated by Krystyna Michalik, Reprint edition, Howard Fertig Pub, 2013.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *Nation and Narration*. Routledge Publication, 2008.
- . *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
- Brody, Richard. "Springtime for Nazis: How the Satire of Jojo Rabbit Backfires." *The New York Times*, 2 Oct. 2019 <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/the-front-row/springtime-for-nazis-how-the-satire-of-jojo-rabbit-backfires>.
- Byford, Jovan. "Testimony." *Research Methods for Memory Studies*, edited by Emily Keightly and Micheal Pickering, Edinburg University Press, 2013, pp. 200- 214.

- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Chanes, Jerome A. *Antisemitism*. ABC-CLIO Inc, 2004. "Charlie Chaplin Quotes". *iPerceptive*.
https://iperceptive.com/authors/charlie_chaplin_quotes.html. Accessed 15 May 2023.
 "Cheers for Palestinian Film of Love and Betrayal." *Al Arabia News*, 20. May 2013,
https://english.alarabiya.net/life-style/2013/05/20/Cheers-for-Palestinian-film-of-love-and-betrayal-?cf_chl_tk=9qUDiV65r9udOmjRaAtl.G9xadQO8H7d54.kUJLdyrM-1715236505-0.0.1.1-1770.
- Chiger, Krystyna, and Daniel Paisner. *The Girl in the Green Sweater: A Life in Holocaust's Shadow*. St. Martin's Press, 2008.
- Chomsky, Noam and Ilan Pappé. *On Palestine*. Haymarket Books, 2015.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Peace in the Middle East? Reflections on Justice and Nationhood*. Pantheon Books, 1974.
- Chronicle of a Disappearance*. Directed by Elia Suleiman, International Film Circuit, 1996.
 "Collective Memory." *sciencedirect*, www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/collective-memory. Accessed 17 Jan. 2020.
- Cohen, Maayan. "Sincere Critique in Israeli Filmmaking." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, vol. 31, no. 1, Oct. 2024, pp. 531- 547.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.14231>.
- Collier, Peter and David Horowitz. *The Anti-Chomsky Reader*. Encounter Books, 2004.
- Coser, Lewis A. "The Revival of the Sociology of Culture: The Case of Collective Memory." *Sociological Forum*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1992, pp. 365–73. *JSTOR*,
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/684317>. PDF download.
- Danon, Dina. "What Do You Know? Sephardi vs. Mizrahi." *Herbert D. Katz Centre*, 5 Dec. 2018, <https://katz.sas.upenn.edu/resources/blog/what-do-you-know-sephardi-vs-mizrahi>. What Do You Know Series.
- Dara of Jasenovac [Дара из Јасеновца]*. Directed by Predrag Antonijević, screenplay by Nataša Drakulić Dandelion Production Inc / Film Danas Komuna / Cineplanet, 2021.
- Divine Intervention*. Directed by Elia Suleiman, Avatar Films, 2002.
- "'Double Standards': World Reacts to US Veto on Gaza Truce Resolution at UN." *Al Jazeera*, 9. Dec 2023, www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/12/9/double-standards-world-reacts-to-us-vetoing-uns-c-gaza-resolution.
- Drucker, Jonathan. "Primo Levi's *Survival in Auschwitz* and *The Drowned and the Saved*: From Testimony to Historical Judgement." *An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol. 12, no. 4, Summer 1994, pp. 47-58. *Project Muse*,
<https://doi.org/10.1353/sho.19943.0101>.
- Efron, John, et al. *The Jews: A History*. Routledge Publication, 2016.

- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, edited by Fred Skolnik, 2nd ed., Thomson Gale Publishers, 2007.
- Erll, Astrid, and Ansgar Nunning. *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2008.
- Erll, Astrid. *Memory in Culture*. Translated by Sara B. Young, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- “Ernst’s life story: Rebuilding A Life from The Ashes.” *Holocaust Matters*, <https://www.holocaustmatters.org/ernst/>. Accessed 13 Nov. 2021.
- Europa Europa*. Directed by Agnieszka Holland, Orion Pictures, 1990.
- “Fact Sheet: Olive Trees – More Than Just a Tree in Palestine.” *Reliefweb*, 21 Nov.2012, <https://reliefweb.int/report/occupied-palestinian-territory/olickt-sheet-olive-trees-%E2%80%93-more-just-tree-palestine#>.
- Fanny’s Journey [Le Voyage de Fanny]*. Directed by Lola Doillon, screenplay by Anne Peyregne and Lola Doillon, Origami Films / Bee Films, 2016.
- Farha*. Directed by Darin J. Sallam, TaleBox / Laika Film / Television Chimney, 2021.
- Fernando, Marion. “Calls for Amending UNSC’s Veto Power Grow amid Gaza Carnage.”
- TRT World*, 10 Dec. 2023, www.trtworld.com/europe/calls-for-amending-unscs-veto-power-grow-amid-gaza-carnage-16205883.
- Finkelstein, Norman. *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*. Verso Books, 2000.
- Foucault, Michael. “Of Other Spaces.” *Diacritics*, vol. 16. no. 1, spring 1986, pp. 22-27.
- JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/464648>.
- . *The Order of Things*. Routledge Publication, 2005.
- Frank, Anne. *The Diary of a Young Girl: The Definitive Edition*. Edited by Otto H. Frank and Mirjam Pressler, Translated by Susan Massotty, Bantam Doubleday Publishing Group, 1995.
- Friedman, Isaiah. *British Pan-Arab Policy, 1915-1922*. Transaction Publishers, 2009.
- Gelvin, James L. *The Israeli Palestinian Conflict: One Hundred Years of War*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Gertz, Nurith and George Khleifi. *Palestinian Cinema: Landscape, Trauma and Memory*.Edinburg University Press, 2008.
- Gertz, Nurith. “Space and Gender in the New Israeli and Palestinian Cinema.” *The Cinema of Jewish Experience*, special issue of *Prooftexts*, vol.22, no. 1–2, 2002, pp. 157–85.
- Gilbert, Martin. *The Routledge Atlas of Jewish History*. Routledge, 2010.
- Ginott, Haim. *Teacher and Child; A Book for Parents and Teachers*. Avon Books, 1972.
- Gloomy Sunday [Ein Lied von Liebe und Tod]*. Directed by Rolf Schübel, screenplay by Ruth Toma and Rolf Schübel, Studio Hamburg Filmproduktion / Dom Film GmbH, 1999.

- Greenberg, Judith. "Paths of Resistance: French Women Working from the Inside." *Experience and Expression: Women, the Nazis, and the Holocaust*, edited by, Elizabeth R. Baer and Myrna Goldenberg, Wayne State University Press, 2003, pp. 131–160.
- Guesmi, Haythem. "Generation Z will free Palestine." *Al Jazeera*, 28 May. 2021, <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2021/5/28/generation-z-will-free-palestine>.
- Gutman, Yifat, and Noam Tirosh. "Balancing Atrocities and Forced Forgetting: Memory Laws as a Means of Social Control in Israel." *Law & Social Inquiry*, vol. 46, no. 3, Jan. 2021, pp. 705–30. *Cambridge Core*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/lsi.2020.35>.
- Gvion, Liora. *Beyond Hummus and Falafel: Social and Political Aspects of Palestinian Food in Israel*. Translated by David Wesley and Elana Wesley, University of California Press, 2012.
- Ḥabibi, Emile. *The Secret Life of Saeed the Pessoptimist*. Translated by Salma Khadra Jayyusi and Trevor Legassick, London Arabia Books, 2010.
- Hajje, Abdelhafidh, et al. "The Genetic Heterogeneity of Arab Populations as Inferred from HLA Genes." *PlosOne*, 9 March. 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0192269>.
- Haklai, Oded. *Palestinian Ethnonationalism in Israel*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Edited and translated by Lewis A. Coser, The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Halper, Jeff. "Choices Made: From Zionist Settler Colonialism to Decolonization." *CounterPunch*, 12 Oct. 2018, www.counterpunch.org/2018/10/12/choices-made-from-zionist-settler-colonialism-to-decolonization/.
- Harris, Rachel S. "Parallel Lives: Palestinian, Druze, and Jewish Women in Recent Israeli Cinema on the Conflict: Free Zone, Syrian Shelter, and Lemon Tree." *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2013, pp. 79-102. *ResearchGate*, 10.1353/sho.2013.0119.
- Haslam, S. Alexander, et al. "Identity, Influence, And Change: Rediscovering John Turner's Vision for Social Psychology." *The British Psychological Society*, vol.51, no.2, 2012, pp. 201-218, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02091.x>.
- Hatuqa, Dalia. "Gen Z Reclaims the Palestinian Cause." *Foreign Policy*, 25 May. 2021, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/05/25/israel-palestine-gaza-sheikh-jarrah-abbas-youth-activists-east-jerusalem-occupation/>.
- Hendey, Lisa M. "Of Animals and Men': The True Story of a Righteous Refuge." *Our Sunday Visitor*, 20 June. 2021, <https://www.oursundayvisitor.com/of-animals-and-men-the-true-story-of-a-righteous-refuge/>.
- Hill, Tom. "Staging the Sublimation of Cliché: Elia Suleiman's Silences in The Time That Remains (2009)." *Jerusalem Quarterly*, no. 48, winter 2011, pp. 78-90. *Institute for Palestine Studies*, https://www.palestine-studies.org/sites/default/files/jq-articles/48_Staging_the_Sublimation_1_0.pdf. PDF download.

- Hillauer, Rebecca. *Encyclopaedia of Arab Women Filmmakers*. Translated by Allison Brown et al., Cairo Press, 2005.
- Hirsch, Marriane. "An Interview with Marriane Hirsch." *Columbia University Press*, <https://cup.columbia.edu/author-interviews/hirsch-generation-postmemory>. Accessed 31 March. 2021.
- . *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*. Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Holliday, Laurel. *Children of Israel, Children of Palestine: Our Own True Stories*. Pocket Books, 1998.
- Holmila, Antero. *Reporting Holocaust in the British, Swedish and Finnish Press 1945-1950*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Hope and Glory*. Directed by John Boorman, Goldcrest Films / Nelson Entertainment, 1987.
- In Darkness*. Directed by Agnieszka Holland, Sony Picture Classics, 2011.
- "Invasion of Poland, Fall 1939." *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*, 30 May 2019, encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/invasion-of-poland-fall-1939.
- "Ismail." *YouTube*, uploaded by Bumpy Road Films, 19 Oct. 2020, <https://youtu.be/lePx19UzHb4>.
- Israel's Religiously Divided Society*. Pew Research Centre, 8 March, 2016, <https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2016/03/08/israels-religiously-divided-society/>
- It Must Be Heaven*. Directed by Elia Suleiman, Rectangle Productions / Pallas Film / Nazira Films / Possibles Media / Zeynofilm, 2019.
- Jacir, Annemarie. "A Bitter Sea." Interview by Lisa. Mullenneaux, *Z Magazine*, 2010. <https://znetwork.org/zmagazine/a-bitter-sea-by-lisa-mullenneaux/>.
- Jacobs, Louis. *The Jewish Religion: A Companion*. Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Jacobson, Eric. "Why Did Hannah Arendt Reject the Partition of Palestine?" *Journal for Cultural Research*, vol. 17, no. 4, Dec. 2013, pp. 358–81, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14797585.2013.768472>.
- John Stuart Mill. *Considerations on Representative Government*. new ed., George Routledge & Sons Ltd, 1991.
- "JOJO RABBIT Production Notes FINAL 1 | PDF." *Scribd*, <https://www.scribd.com/document/496821522/JOJO-RABBIT-Production-Notes-FINAL-1>. Accessed 20 Apr. 2024.
- Jojo Rabbit*. Directed by Taika Waititi, Fox Searchlight Picture, 2019.
- "Judaism." *Concise Oxford English Dictionary: Luxury Edition*, edited by Angus Stevenson and Maurice Waite, 12th ed., Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 768.
- Kangisser, Julie. "A Lesson in Camp Hierarchy." *Holocaust Matters*, 19 July 2017, www.holocaustmatters.org/a-lesson-in-camp-hierarchy/.
- Khalidi, Rashid. *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. Columbia University Press, 2009.
- King-Irani, Laurie. "The Arab Capital of Israel." *Journal of Palestine Studies*, vol. 25, no. 3,

- 1996, pp. 103–05, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2538265>.
- Klug Brian. *Offence: The Jewish Case*. Seagull Books, 2009.
- Kopsaftis, Eleni. “Holocaust Survivor Shares his Harrowing Story at U of G Event.” *The Ontario*, 24 Nov. 2021, <https://theontarion.com/2021/11/24/holocaust-survivor-shares-his-harrowing-story-at-u-of-g-event/>.
- Krämer, Gudrun. *A History of Palestine: From the Ottoman Conquest to the Founding of the State of Israel*. Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory*. Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Laub, Dori. “Bearing Witness or the Vicissitudes of Listening.” *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*, Edited by Shoshanna Felman and Dori Laub, Routledge Publications, 1992.
- Lemon Tree*. Riva Film, 2008. *Netflix app*.
- Lengyel, Olga. *Five Chimneys: A Woman Survivor's True Story of Auschwitz*. Chicago Review Press, 1995.
- Leunens, Christine. *Caging Skies*. Vintage Press, 2008.
- Levi, Primo. *Drowned and the Saved*. Translated by Raymond Rosenthal, Summit Books, 1988.
- . *The Complete Works of Primo Levi*. Edited by Ann Goldstein, vol. 1, Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2015.
- . *The Reawakening*. Simon and Schuster, 1995.
- Lewis, Ingrid. *Women in European Holocaust Films: Perpetrators, Victims and Resisters*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Life is Beautiful [La vita è bella]*. Directed by Roberto Benigni, screenplay by Roberto Benigni and Vincenzo Cerami, Melampo Cinematografica, 1997.
- Little, Becky. “5 Ways Christianity Spread through Ancient Rome.” *History*, A&E Television Networks, 23 Nov. 2023, www.history.com/news/5-ways-christianity-spread-through-ancient-rome.
- Lynn, H. “Remembering Auschwitz: 75 Years Later.” *Youngzine*, 4 Feb. 2020, <https://youngzine.org/node/29846/devel/load-by-uuid>
- Marshall, Robert. *In The Sewers of Lvov: The Last Sanctuary from the Holocaust*. Bloomsbury Reader, 1991.
- Masri, Mai. “TIFF 2015 Women Directors: Meet Mai Masri-3000 Nights.” *Women and Hollywood*, 10 Sept. 2015, <https://womenandhollywood.com/tiff-2015-women-directors-meet-mai-masri-3000-nights-7c657f6f47a7/>. Interview.
- . “3000 Nights: Interview with Director Mai Masri.” Interview by Palestine Square. *Institute for Palestine Studies*, 16 Nov. 2015, <https://www.palestine-studies.org/en/node/232341#>.
- Mendes, Ana Cristina. “Walled in/Walled out in the West Bank: Performing Separation Wall in Hany Abu-Assad’s *Omar*.” *Transnational Cinemas*, vol. 6, no. 2, 1, Oct. 2015, pp.123-136, *Taylor and Francis*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/20403526.2015.1084798>.

- Miracle at Midnight*. Directed by Ken Cameron, Davis Entertainment / Walt Disney Pictures and Television, 1998.
- Motti, Golani, and Adel Manna. *Two Sides of the Coin: Independence and Nakba 1948*. Institute for Historical Justice and Reconciliation, 2011.
- Muir, Diana. "Texts Concerning Zionism: A Land Without a People for a People Without Land." *Middle East Quarterly*, vol.15, no.2, Spring 2008, pp. 55-62.
- Nayar, Pramod K. *An Introduction to Cultural Studies*. Viva Books, 2008.
- Neiger, Motti, Oren Meyers and Eyal Zandberg. *On Media Memory: Collective Memory in the New Media Age*. Palgrave, 2001.
- Nelson, Tim Blake. *The Grey Zone: The Director's Notes and Screenplay*. Newmarket Press, 2003.
- Nimni, Ephraim. "Book Review: Israel, Pluralism and Conflict." *Sociology*, vol.15, no. 1, 1981, pp. 136-139. *Sage Journals*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/003803858101500113>.
- Nina's Journey*. Directed by Lena Einhorn, East West Film, 2005.
- "NITMES – Cultural Memory." *YouTube*, uploaded by Humanities UU, 6 Feb. 2017, https://youtu.be/Hjwo7_A--sg?list=PLeBDdx1RvpDQgORu4-0se2X2dgZG7mnjn.
- "NITMES – Travelling Memory." *YouTube*, uploaded by Humanities UU, 8 Feb. 2017, <https://youtu.be/psV9D09Swho?list=PLeBDdx1RvpDQgORu4-0se2X2dgZG7mnjn>.
- "NITMES- Memory Sites." *YouTube*, uploaded by Humanities UU, 6 Feb. 2017, <https://youtu.be/hunUSh3zbbQ>.
- No Asylum: The Untold Chapter in Anne Frank's Story*. Directed by Paula Fouce, Paradise Filmworks, 2015.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations: Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory*, No. 26, Spring, (United States: University of California Press, 1989), pp.7-24.
- Nyiszli, Miklos. *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eye Witness Account*. Translated by Richard Sevear and Tibere Kremer, Penguin Classics, 2012.
- Oleksiak, Wojciech. "The Zookeeper's Wife: Fact vs Fiction." *Culture.pl*, 30 March. 2017, <https://culture.pl/en/article/the-zookeepers-wife-fact-vs-fiction>.
- Olga*. Directed by Jayme Monjardim, Nexus Cinema / Globo Filmes / Lumière, 2004.
- Olick, Jeffrey K. "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures." *Sociological Theory*, vol.17, no.3, 1999, pp.333–348. Sage Publication, <https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00083>
- . *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*. Routledge, 2007.
- . *The Sins of the Fathers: Germany, Memory and Method*. The University of Chicago Press, 2016.
- Omar*. Soda Pictures, 2013. *Netflix* app.
- Oumlil, Kenza. "Re-Writing History on Screen: Annemarie Jacir's Salt of This Sea." *Arab Studies Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 3, summer 2016, pp. 586-600. *JSTOR*,

www.jstor.org/stable/10.13169/arabstudquar.38.3.0586

- “Over 10,000 Infants and Children Killed in Israel’s Gaza Genocide, Hundreds of Whom Are Trapped beneath Debris.” *Euro-Med Human Rights Monitor*, 9 Dec 2023, euromedmonitor.org/en/article/6020/Over-10. Press release.
- Palestinian Youth Challenges and Aspirations: A Study on Youth, Peace and Security Based on UN Resolution 2250*. Interpeace Commissioned by UNFPA and PBSO, 2017, <https://www.interpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/2018-IP-case-study-Palestine-v3.pdf>.
- “Pamela Katz Discusses REMEMBRANCE with Susana Styron.” *YouTube*, uploaded by AGVideowerxs, 4 July. 2012, https://youtu.be/Mwxcy43_egw.
- Pappe, Ilan. *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*. Cambridge University Press, 2004
- . *Ten Myths About Israel*. Verso Books, 2017
- . *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld Publication, 2007.
- Paradise Now*. Directed by Hany Abu-Assad, Augustus Film / Razor Film Produktion GmbH, 2005.
- Peled, Yoav. “Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics by Israel/ Palestine by Oren Yiftachel.” *Middle East Journal*, vol. 61, no. 2, spring 2007, pp.356-357. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4330401>.
- Pinsker, Leo. *Auto-Emancipation*. Translated by D.S. Blondheim, reprint ed., Zionist Publications, 1906.
- Reading, Anna. “Memory and Digital Media: Six Dynamics of the Global Memory Field.” *On Media Memory*, edited by Motti Neiger, Oren Meyers and Eyal Zandberg. Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies, 2011.
- . *The Social Inheritance of the Holocaust: Gender, Culture and Memory*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Redd, Kandace. “The Complex History of the Israel-Palestine Conflict.” *Abs10*, 12 July. 2021, www.abc10.com/article/news/community/race-and-culture/need-to-know-the-israel-and-palestine-conflict/103-79ca68a9-31c4-4adb-9b74-99e26b16cebf.
- Reilly, Katie. “‘Action Is the Only Remedy to Indifference’: Elie Wiesel’s Most Powerful Quotes.” *Time*, 2 July 2016, <https://time.com/4392252/elie-wiesel-dead-best-quotes/>.
- Remembrance [Die verlorene Zeit The Lost Time]*. Directed by Anna Justice, screenplay by Pamela Katz, Cramer Co. / NBC Productions, 2011.
- Return To Haifa [عائد إلى حيفا]*. Directed by Kassem Hawal, screenplay by Ghassan Kanafani, Al Ard Film Production, 1982.
- Ribeiro, Antonio Sousa. “Memory, Identity, and Representation: The Limits of Theory and the Construction of Testimony”. Translated by João Paulo Moreira, *RCCS Annual Review*, no. 3, Oct. 2011, pp. 3-14. *Open Edition Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.4000/rccsar.260>. PDF download.
- Riklis, Eran. “Director Eran Riklis Talks about His Sweet/Tart Flick, Lemon Tree.”

- Flavorwire*, 17, Apr. 2009, www.flavorwire.com/18206/director-eran-rikliis-talks-about-his-sweettart-flick-lemon-tree. Interview.
- Riley, Anna and Peter J. Burke. "Identities and Self-Verification in the Small Group." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, vol. 58, no.2, 1995, pp. 61-73.
- Robertson, Roland. "Comments on the "Global Triad" and "Glocalization." Globalization and Indigenous Culture Conference, 1997, Kokugakuin University, Japan.
- Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture Theory, Culture & Society*. Sage Publications, 1998.
- Rohter, Larry. "To Tell a Dark Tale, Avoid Bright Stars." *The New York Times*, 2 Dec. 2011, <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/04/movies/agnieszka-hollands-holocaust-feature-in-darkness.html>.
- Rosen, Christopher. "Oscar 2020: Taika Waititi Wins Historic Screenwriting Oscar for Jojo Rabbit." *Vanity Fair*, 9 Feb. 2020, <https://www.vanityfair.com/hollywood/2020/02/oscars-2020-adapted-screenplay-taika-waititi>.
- Rosenstein, Marc J. *Turning Points in Jewish History*. The Jewish Publication Society, 2018. Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Run Boy Run [Lauf Junge lauf]*. Directed by Pepe Danquart, screenplay by Heinrich Hadding and Pepe Danquart, B.A. Produktion / Bittersuess pictures / A Company Filmproduktionsgesellschaft / Ciné-Sud Promotion, 2014.
- Sa'di, Ahmadh and Lila-abu-Lughod. *Nakba: Palestine, 1948 and The Claims of Memory*. Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Said, Edward. *The Question of Palestine*. Vintage, 1992.
- Sanbar, Elias. "Out of Place, Out of Time." *Mediterranean Historical Review*, vol. 16, no.1, 8, Sept. 2010, pp.87-94. *Taylor and Francis Online*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/714004568>.
- Schindler's List*. Directed by Steven Spielberg, Amblin Entertainment / Universal Pictures, 1993.
- Schuster, Steve. "Holocaust Survivor Calls Attacks on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Reminiscent Of 1930's Nazi Germany." *Law Journal*, 22 July. 2023, <https://wislawjournal.com/2023/07/25/holocaust-survivor-calls-attacks-on-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-reminiscent-of-1930s-nazi-germany/>.
- Seddon, David. *A Political and Economic Dictionary of the Middle East*. Europa Publications, 2004.
- Segev, Tom. *1949: The First Israelis*. Translated by Arlen N. Weinstein, Picador, 1998. Shahak, Israel. *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years*. Pluto Press, 1994.
- Shavit, Ari. *My Promised Land: The Triumph and Tragedy of Israel*. Spiegel & Grau, 2018.
- Shelter*. Directed by Eran Riklis, Riva Filmproduktion/ Eran Riklis Productions/ MACT Productions/ Heimatfilm, 2017.
- Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. Routledge, 2014.

- Shohat, Ella. *Israeli Cinema: East/West and the Politics of Representation*. Thomson Press, 2010.
- Smith, Al. *Why We War: The Human Investment in Slaughter and the Possibilities of Peace*. Lulu.com, 2006, 978-1-84728-520-1.
- Smootha, Sammy. "Ethnic Democracy: Israel as an Archetype." *Israeli Studies*, vol. 2, no. 2, Fall 1997, pp. 198–241. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30246820>.
- Snow Treasure*. Directed by Irving Jacoby, Sagittarius Productions, 1968.
- Sobchack, Vivian. *The Address of the Eye: A Phenomenology of Film Experience*. Princeton University Press, 2020.
- Soll, Jacob. "The Revelatory Horror of The Zookeeper's Wife." *The New Republic*, 3 April. 2017, <https://newrepublic.com/article/141806/revelatory-horror-zookeepers-wife>.
- Son of Saul [Saul fia]*. Directed by László Nemes, Screenplay by László Nemes and Clara Royer, Laokoon Filmgroup, 2015.
- Spiegelman, Art. *Maus I: A Survivor's Tale: My Father Bleeds History*. Pantheon, 1986.
- Stein, Alexander, "Music and Trauma in Polanski's *The pianist* (2002)." *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, vol. 85, no. 3, 2004, pp. 755 – 765. *Taylor and Francis Online*, <https://doi.org/10.1516/5M8R-60PW-0JA8-VA6F> .
- Stollznow, Karen. *On the Offensive: Prejudice in Language Past & Present*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Stryker, Sheldon, and Peter J. Burke "The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, vol. 63, no. 4, Dec. 2000, pp. 284-297. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2695840>.
- Sulaiman, Elia. "Interview." Conducted by Amanda Palmer, *Al-Jazeera English*, 14 Jan. 2010.
- . "'A Different Kind of Occupation': An Interview with Elia Suleiman." Conducted by Sabah Haider, *The Electronic Intifada*, 1 Feb. 2010, electronicintifada.net/content/different-kind-occupation-interview-elia-suleiman/8654.
- Swing Kids*. Directed by Thomas Carter, Hollywood Pictures / Touchwood Pacific Partners, 1993.
- Tahhan, Zena. "The Naksa: How Israel Occupied the Whole of Palestine in 1967." *AlJazeera*, 4 June. 2018, www.aljazeera.com/features/2018/6/4/the-naksa-how-israel-occupied-the-whole-of-palestine-in-1967.
- Talmon, Miri and Yaron Peleg. *Israeli Cinema: Identities in Motion*. University of Texas Press, 2011.
- Tawil, Yasmina. "The Life and Career of Annemarie Jacir." *Arab Film and Media Institute*. <https://arabfilmstitute.org/the-life-and-career-of-annemarie-jacir/>. Accessed 18 Jan 2020.
- Tel Aviv on Fire*. Directed by Sameh Zoabi, Lama Films/Samsa Films/ TS Production/ Artemis Production, 2018.
- Tharoor, Ishaan. "Analysis | Welcome to the New, 'New' Middle East." *Washington Post*, 16

Oct. 2023, www.washingtonpost.com/world/2023/10/16/new-new-middle-east-israel-region-saudi-relations-future/.

“The 12 Tribes of Ishmael.” *Nabataea.net*, nabataea.net/explore/history/12tribes/. Accessed 20 Apr. 2022.

The Bible. Authorized King James Version, Oxford UP, 1998.

The Birch Tree Meadow. Directed by Marceline Loridan-Ivens, Capi Films/ Ciné Valse/ Heritage Films /Mascaret Films/ P'Artisan Filmproduktion GmbH , 2003.

The Book Thief. Directed by Brian Percival, Fox 2000 Pictures / Sunswept Entertainment / Studio Babelsberg / TSG Entertainment, 2013.

The Boy in Striped Pyjamas. Directed by Mark Herman, Miramax Films / BBC Films / Heyday Films, 2008.

The Counterfeiters. Directed by Stefan Ruzowitzky, Aichholzer Film / Magnolia Filmproduktion / Babelsberg Studio, 2007.

The Courageous Heart of Irena Sendler. Directed by John Kent Harrison, CBS / Lithuanian Film Studio / Hallmark Hall of Fame / BaltMedia / Jeff Most Productions / K&K Selekt / Telekompanija Forma Pro, 2009.

The Devil's Arithmetic. Directed by Donna Deitch, Punch Productions, 1999.

The Great Dictator. Directed by Charlie Chaplin, Charles Chaplin Film Corporation, 1940.

The Grey Zone. Directed by Tim Blake Nelson, Millenium Films, 2001.

“The Holocaust is Not a Metaphor: The Grey Zone (2001).” *YouTube*, uploaded by Ladyknightthebrave, 17 June. 2022, www.youtube.com/watch?v=q86QWx7uACI.

The Island on Bird Street [Øen i Fuglegaden]. Directed by Søren Kragh-Jacobsen, screenplay by John Goldsmith and Tony Grisoni, Moonstone Entertainment / DR / M&M Productions / Connexion Film Productions / April Productions, 1997.

The Little Traitor. Directed by Lynn Roth, Evanstone Films / Panther Prods, 2007.

The Lucky Star. Directed by Max Fischer, Tele-Metropole International, 1980.

The Photographer of Mauthausen [El fotógrafo de Mauthausen]. Directed Mar Targarona, Filmax, 2018.

The Pianist. Directed by Roman Polanski, Canal+ / Studio Babelsberg / Studio Canal, 2002.

The Present. Directed by Farah Nabulsi, Philistine Films, 2020.

The Producers. Directed by Mel Brooks, Embassy Pictures / Columbia Pictures / Crossbow Productions, 1967.

The Holy Quran. Translated by Maulawi Sher ‘Ali, Islam International Publications Limited, 2021.

The Reader. Directed by Stephen Daldry, Mirage Enterprises / Neunte Babelsberg Film GmbH, 2008.

The Salt of This Sea. Directed by Annemarie Jacir, Rotana Studios/ Pyramid Distribution, 2008.

The Syrian Bride. Directed by Eran Riklis, Koch-Lorber Films, 2004.

- “The Time That Remains Movie Script.” *Scripts*, 5 Aug. 2018, www.scripts.com/script/the_time_that_remains_21928.
- The Time That Remains*. Directed by Elia Suleiman, Nazira Films, 2009.
- The Zookeeper's Wife*. Directed by Niki Caro, Scion Films / Electric City Entertainment / Tollin Productions / Rowe/Miller Productions / Czech Anglo Productions, 2017.
- “The Zookeeper's Wife: A Discussion.” *YouTube*, uploaded by United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 31 March. 2017, <https://youtu.be/TeE7-HkvSk4>.
- To Be or Not to Be*. Directed by Ernst Lubitsch, Romaine Film Corp, 1942.
- “U of G and Guelph Hillel Mark Holocaust Education Week with Online Events.” *U of G News*, 26 Jan. 2021, news.uoguelph.ca/2021/01/u-of-g-and-guelph-hillel-mark-holocaust-education-week-with-online-events/.
- Unsok Ro, Johannes. “Memory and History: An Introduction.” *Collective Memory and Collective Identity: Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History in Their Context*, edited by Johannes Unsok Ro and Diana Edelman, De Gruyter, 2021, pp. 1- 18. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110715101>.
- Up*. Directed by Pete Docter, Walt Disney Pictures / Pixar Animation Studios, 2009.
- Venezia, Shlomo and Beatrice Prasquier. *Inside the Gas Chambers: Eight Months in the Sonderkommando of Auschwitz*. Polity Press, 2009.
- Wajib* [واجب]. Direction and screenplay by Annemarie Jacir, Pyramide International, 2017.
- Wedding in Galilee*. Directed by Michel Khleifi, Marisa Films / ZDF / National Centre of Cinematography and Animated Pictures / LPA Film, 1987.
- Wessels, Anton. “Can the Children of Abraham Be Reconciled? Ishmael and Isaac in the Bible and the Qur’an.” *Religion, Conflict and Reconciliation: Multifaith Ideals and Realities*, edited by Jerald D. Gort et al., Rodopi, 2002, pp. 134–144.
- When I Saw You*. Directed by Annemarie Jacir, Philistine Films, 2012. “Why Fellow Israelis Hated My Hit Film.” *The Jewish Chronicle*, <https://www.thejc.com/life-and-culture/film/review-drive-away-dolls-ethan-coen-tricia-cooke-wrong-turn-lesbian-road-trip-movie-u2ewiavl>. Accessed on 18 March, 2023.
- “Widow’s Trees Threaten Israeli Security.” *Al Jazeera*, 16 Feb. 2005, www.aljazeera.com/news/2005/2/16/widows-trees-threaten-israeli-security.
- Wiesel, Elie. “Elie Wiesel Acceptance Speech.” *The Nobel Prize*, 10 Dec. 1986, <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/1986/wiesel/acceptance-speech/>.
- Winter, Jay. “Sites of Memory.” *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*, edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, Fordham University Press, 2010, pp. 312–24.
- Yiftachel, Oren. *Ethnocracy: Land and Identity Politics in Israel/ Palestine*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.