

“The shrug of a policeman’s shoulder has remained more deeply engraved on my memory than the screams of the tortured”-Arthur Koestler, *The Spanish Testament*

Vichy and the Holocaust, a study of the historiography of the Holocaust in France

Adam Yunis

Dr. Hunt

The study of the Vichy regime and in turn French involvement with the murder of 76,000 Jews during the period of 1940-1944 has gone through a transformation since the 1970s due to the work of historians in both France and the U.S. to uncover the truth of Vichy anti-Semitism and collaboration. These advances in our understanding of Vichy and of administrative fascism have had considerable impact on the French public’s understanding of their country’s role in the Holocaust. In public settings, historians have had to challenge myths and prove the validity of their evidence and conclusions, challenging French society to confront the large role of French administration in the deportation and persecution of Jews. The historiography of the Holocaust in France is thus deeply connected to the changing ways French society and government viewed the Vichy regime. Four works will be studied in this analysis of the historiography of Vichy involvement with the Final Solution. Beginning with a brief summary of the development of Vichy myths, Robert Aron’s *Histoire de Vichy*, published in 1955 will be the first work studied, followed by Robert Paxton’s crucial counter narrative *Vichy France and the Jews*, published in 1981. This will be followed by Henry Rousso’s study of the memory of the Vichy regime, *The Vichy Syndrome*, published in 1987, and finally by Renée Poznanski’s social history of Jews during the war, *The Jews in France during World War Two*, published in 2001. Archival power, new methodologies, memory studies and the study of Jewish agency during the war have combined to expose Vichy’s persecution of Jews and have contributed to our greater

understanding of how European regimes contributed to the Holocaust. The story of the historiography of the Holocaust in France is one of a society trying to grapple with dark secrets.

### *Good Vichy and Bad Vichy*

France was a divided and traumatized nation in the immediate post war period. Establishing the criminality of the Vichy regime was not a priority, thus creating an atmosphere of acceptance for accounts of the war years that stressed French patriotism and warped the motives for collaboration. Robert Aron established the myth of Vichy France as a victim in *Histoire de Vichy*, in 1954 in French, and translated to English a year later in 1955. Aron, who was Jewish, belonged to a group of intellectuals in the 1930s called the “nonconformists”, prolific writers that were drawn to certain aspects of fascism<sup>1</sup>. Aron escaped the antisemitic legislation of the Vichy government by fleeing to North Africa, due to the offices of Jean Jardin, director of Pierre Laval’s cabinet. *Histoire de Vichy* relied heavily on eyewitness testimony and to the trial records of Vichy officials taking place between 1944-1949, at that time unavailable to most historians. These trials were Vichy’s attempt at a legal purge of those who collaborated with the Nazis. Well connected to the world of politics and business, Aron makes use of unpublished sources known only to him, and many of Aron’s sources have been difficult to verify, and often are inaccessible<sup>2</sup>.

*Histoire de Vichy* is over 700 pages long and for more than 15 years, served as the standard work of reference for the subject, describing the evolution of *l’Etat Français*. Indebted

---

<sup>1</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 245.

<sup>2</sup> Pearce, *Robert Aron’s History of Vichy*, 5.

to the views of former ministers, Aron push forwarded a “minimalist” interpretation of the regime and its policies. A forgiving interpretation of Vichy flew in the face of the prevalent hostility to the regime in the immediate post war period, but with a large scale policy of amnesty for collaborators being enacted in 1954, Aron’s work gave scholarly authority to downplaying Vichy’s impact on French society. Aron established the “Vichy Shield” myth, that Vichy bureaucrats protected French Jews from the Germans, only begrudgingly accepting German plans for deportations of foreign Jews<sup>3</sup>. Aron pushed forward this view with his argument that there were two Vichy’s, Petain’s and Laval’s. The distinction between the head of state and head of government allowed for sufficient favorable interpretation of Petain’s actions, choosing to view him as a powerless *chef de bureau*, rather than head of a Nazi allied state. Even Pierre Laval is described in a sympathetic fashion, a sincere patriot who felt he was doing the right thing for France by collaborating with the Nazis.

Aron furthers this view of Vichy by his stress of the double game Vichy played, and of secret negotiations with the Allies. Collaboration was thus a result of passive, reluctant acceptance of German demands. Aron was far less cautious in attacking crimes of the resistance, and his authority was cited to justify claims that between “thirty and forty thousand people” had been summarily executed by the Resistance. In truth this was nothing more than striking a middle ground between high estimates of 100,000 and 10,000, the latter number being the best estimate. <sup>4</sup>Charles De Gaulle wrote a letter to Aron praising the work but seeking to correct the

---

<sup>3</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 246.

<sup>4</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 247.

high statistic.<sup>5</sup> By emphasizing crimes of the resistance and minimalizing the effects of collaboration on Jews and the general populace, Aron contributed to quieting the active controversies occurring in France at the time. Rousso argues in the *Vichy Syndrome* that Aron's book work was a part of a larger phenomenon in the 1950s in France of downplaying the civil war that occurred between 1940-1944<sup>6</sup>. A policy of amnesty was announced for most Vichy collaborators in 1954, and Aron's account of Vichy bureaucracy gave scholarly authority to downplaying the division between Right and Left, Resistant and Vichy.

Viewed with knowledge that Aron was himself saved by the Vichy regime, and that most of his sources came from eyewitness testimony of Vichy officials, it is understandable why Aron developed a sympathetic view of Vichy. A Yale review of the work by L. Pearce Williams in 1955 frames his lack of criticism of Vichy in a way of emphasizing the author's impartiality.<sup>7</sup> Viewed more critically, this impartiality or lack of criticism, reflects the lens Aron used to examine his sources. Aron viewed Vichy bureaucrats as having been put in a difficult position, trying to navigate the war with preserving the honor of France, the Holocaust being an inevitable consequence of German design and implementation, not of French policy. This view of the Holocaust in France would continue until the 1970s, where in Rousso's words, "the mirror broke."

---

<sup>5</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 247.

<sup>6</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 247.

<sup>7</sup> Pearce, *Robert Aron's History of Vichy*, 4.

Between *Histoire de Vichy* and Paxton's *Vichy France: Old Guard and the New*, published in 1974 in French, little research was done on collaboration and Vichy. Historians chronicled the resistance using statistical methods of archiving material. Research focused on accounts of the resistance due to archival power. The Comité d'Histoire de la Deuxieme Guerre Mondiale (CHGM), a government institution, dominated the field.<sup>8</sup> Owing its contacts to the government, resistance groups, archives and the army, chronicling the resistance was a priority for historical research and it fit the current needs of French society at the time, placing an emphasis on documenting those who resisted the Nazi occupation, rather than focusing on the victims of Vichy policy.<sup>9</sup> The alliance of government, archives and historians proved fruitful in producing narratives of the Resistance and of Nazi exploitation, but not in actually examining the crimes of Vichy. In this way the historiography of the Holocaust in France was subject to the impact of "dominant memory" of the time, seeking to emphasize resistance and downplay collaboration. Aron's idea of the regime continued to be widely accepted through the 1960s.

---

<sup>8</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 262

<sup>9</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 262

### *An American in Vichy*

The first historian to publish a successful, myth shattering counter narrative to Aron that examined the Vichy regime and its crimes was Robert Paxton in his work *Vichy France: Old Guard and the New*, published in 1971. Now widely taught in French schools, along with the work to be discussed *Vichy France and the Jews*, Paxton's narrative came at a crucial time for French society. The revolutionary generation of '68 was much more skeptical of what they were told about the past. The documentary on French collaboration, *The Sorrow and the Pity* by Marcel Ophuls, was released in 1971 with attempts at censorship by the French government. The film triggered an awakening of curiosity among French society on the truth of the war years, which had been suppressed by a myth of popular resistance. The narrative of a passive Vichy and of popular resistance was beginning to crumble. Paxton's understanding of Vichy profoundly impacted French society and was a part of larger social forces in France that sought to display the truth of Vichy's crimes. Paxton's work gave scholarly authority to the return to what had been repressed.

Robert Paxton was an American who had not lived through the Vichy regime and was thus not subject to the effects of historical memory present in France that emphasized resistance and downplayed collaboration. In *Vichy France: Old Guard and the New*, Paxton used voluminous captured German documents as his sources of new information on the period. His work exploded several myths. Vichy had never engaged in any double game. Collaboration within Hitler's new order was an active French concept pushed persistently and consistently by every major figure at Vichy from 1940-1943, and for some further to 1944. Secondly, Vichy was not a puppet government but one that actively tried to transform French society through a

national revolution of domestic policies. Thirdly, the “Vichy Shield” argument, that Vichy protected France was definitively discredited with comparative models of other western European occupied countries. Finally, Paxton emphasized the specificity of Vichy in the Final Solution, whose policies were only partly dictated by the occupier and mainly a result of its own initiatives. Paxton would devote his next work *Vichy France and the Jews* (1981) to showing the causes of Vichy anti-Semitism and their policies and assistance in the Final Solution. It is worth noting that Paxton was relatively impervious to the internal political considerations of France at the time, and his myth shattering work was in part a product of simple intellectual curiosity.<sup>10</sup> Paxton, who has taught at Columbia University since 1981, was motivated to pursue the subject due to his opposition to the Vietnam War, which sharpened his animosity against nationalist conformism of all kinds. The work caused a scandal, being accepted and praised by Jewish and communist groups and defended mainly by the left, with predictable hostile reactions from the right. Along with Ophul’s film, Paxton’s work drove French scholars to examine collaboration and the dark years in the 1970s.

Archival power has been alluded to but deserves greater examination. French historians were seldom able to refute Paxton’s conclusions with other sources, since French archives were for the most part closed. A law passed on November 19, 1970 stated that all public documents *prior* to July 10, 1940 were to be freely accessible.<sup>11</sup> This barrier was an explicit example of control the French government had over the memory of the dark years. Historian Hervé Villeré

---

<sup>10</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 264.

<sup>11</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 262.

was rejected from viewing Vichy trial records in 1972 and received a refusal by Justice Minister Rene Pleven on the following grounds' "it is indeed quite important to avoid any prejudice to private interests and any reawakening of public passions." (262)<sup>12</sup> A new law passed in 1979 finally opened the majority of archives and marked a sharp departure from the rule of silence. For thirty years after the war, the rule of silence had an opposite effect of its intentions, as it suggested the skeleton in the closet was one of immense proportions. It is after the opening of the archives in 1981 that Paxton produced perhaps still the definitive account of Vichy involvement with the Holocaust, *Vichy France and the Jews*.

The book used Vichy government sources whenever possible and compared them with the surviving records of German occupation. Memos and communication between Vichy bureaucrats provide evidence of the changing way the Vichy administration viewed the Jewish problem. By comparing existing German documents with the newly opened Vichy archives, the separate goals of each administration's anti-Semitism can be studied. Paxton's use of French records is extremely effective, as he produces a chronological study of how France viewed "the Jewish problem" before and during the war years. Reports of foreign observers in France were also used, as well as Jewish sources, but Paxton makes clear that the response of Jews to antisemitic measures was not the primary concern of this study.

In his work, Paxton traces the roots of Vichy antisemitism and explicitly connects the refugee crisis of the 1930s and the Third Republic to the antisemitic measures taken by Vichy from 1940-1942. His argument is that a rival Vichy antisemitism operated separately and

---

<sup>12</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 262.



sometimes in conflict with Nazi measures, and no overt pressure could be found by Nazis on Vichy to implement its own anti-Semitic laws. Vichy's measures were not intended to kill, rather Vichy's urge to expel Jewish immigrants from 1940-1942 dovetailed nicely with Nazi plans for extermination.

The separate way of viewing Jews in France at the time is highlighted, with native French Jews and immigrant Jews being distinguished in the eyes of the Vichy regime, fitting well with Paxton's analysis of the causes of this anti-Semitism being born partly from the refugee crisis of the late 1930s. This refugee crisis consisted mainly of Spanish Civil War refugees and Jewish immigrants fleeing Nazism. Vichy had more qualms about deportation of French-born Jews, but its policies persecuted all Jews, so the "Vichy Shield" argument is revealed as a fiction. With considerable primary source evidence of the Vichy administration, the book argues that the Vichy regime wanted to solve its own Jewish problem and assert its legitimacy to their Nazi masters by implementing its own antisemitic measures to preserve French autonomy. Rather than celebrating the fact that 75% of Jews survived the Holocaust in France, Paxton proves that Germany could not have killed nearly as many Jews without Vichy collaboration in the identification of Jews, widescale use of French police for arrests, and the deportation process.<sup>13</sup>

Paxton is attempting to answer a large question: how did the Holocaust happen in France? He does this by tracing the roots of antisemitism in France, why and how antisemitic measures were applied, who in France supported them, how the French public viewed Jews, and how Vichy policy meshed with German policy. By maintaining this analysis throughout the book chronologically, Paxton is able to counter the fatalism that can develop when dealing with the

---

<sup>13</sup> Paxton, *Vichy France and the Jews*, 372.

Final Solution. Crucially to the study of how fascism and antisemitism operate, the Vichy government did not set out to be a fanatically anti-Semitic regime, rather it created an environment for anti-Semites to flourish in the xenophobic right-wing administration. To quote Paxton, "Government leaders either shared their views (ideological anti-Semites), did not care, or kept silent out of warped motives of personal ambition or a sense of service to the state. Meanwhile, as we shall see, wide segments of opinion and a good part of the bureaucracy went along, covered by deeply ingrained habits of antipathy, by obsessions with private griefs and woes, or by administrative routine."<sup>14</sup> Paxton carries this view on the power of French bureaucracy to the decision to deport 4,000 children to their deaths during the July 1942 roundups. Although there were efforts to free the children, it all became too complicated, "to many officials concerned deporting the children together with their parents probably seemed the easiest solution."<sup>15</sup> How an administrative bureaucracy can function to produce the deaths of thousands is one of the book's most chilling conclusions and continues to be extremely relevant today.

The work is not an indictment of French society, as Paxton notes a major shift occurring in public opinion after the Vel d'hiv roundups in the summer of 1942, a shift in viewing Jews as a problem to viewing Jews as victims. The high percentage of Jews who survived did so however not in any way due to the policies of Vichy, which systematically stripped them of their assets before the Nazi plan for extermination began. The French project of anti-Jewish action has

---

<sup>14</sup> Paxton, *Vichy France and the Jews*, 71.

<sup>15</sup> Paxton, *Vichy France and the Jews* , 268

tended to be obscured by the Nazi plan for extermination. The Vichy policy was one of exclusion of Jews from public life, aryanization of Jewish property, and wanting to rid France of Jewish refugees, all a part of Vichy's greater plans for French society, free of Jewish influence. Paxton places these actions in the context of the Holocaust, and the devastating effects they had on the Jewish community. Additionally, the role of French internment camps in the Holocaust is exposed, using Serge Klarsfeld's recent research. Klarsfeld was a historian and Nazi hunter who also worked to expose Vichy involvement in the Holocaust and to document the identities of Jews murdered. Roughly 3,000 Jews died in French internment camps, with Nazi oversight sometimes even improving conditions of these camps.<sup>16</sup> The conclusion of the book compares the collaboration of Vichy in the context of other European nations, with Paxton emphasizing that Vichy France was the only country besides Bulgaria to deport Jews to their deaths in an area unoccupied by the Nazis, doing so in August of 1942. Put quite plainly, the Germans could never have accomplished the murder of so many Jews without Vichy, the French police and French bureaucracy. The book's conclusion also addresses the question of what was known by Vichy leaders on the fate of Jewish deportees, dismantling the myth that Vichy leaders did not know they were sending Jews to their deaths. Vichy leaders "continued to regard the deportations as merely the next phase of the refugee crisis"<sup>17</sup>(353), in the face of overwhelming evidence that no one was returning or was heard from after being sent East.

---

<sup>16</sup> Paxton, *Vichy France and the Jews* , 363.

<sup>17</sup> Paxton, *Vichy France and the Jews* , 355.

The impact of Paxton's work on the understanding of Vichy's role in the Holocaust cannot be overstated. Paxton's views are now widely accepted by historians and public alike and by the French government. His writings on Vichy are taught widely in French schools, with state textbooks in the 1980s beginning to publish Paxton's account of Vichy over Aron.<sup>18</sup> Robert Aron's work has effectively been made obsolete by Paxton's two books on the subject. It is important to place his 1981 book in the historical context of France. It was the very beginning of discussing Vichy and crimes against humanity. In 1979, Jean Leguay, second in command of the French police was being charged with his role of the deportation of 13,000 Jews in the Vel d'hiv roundup. The drama of Klaus Barbie was becoming a major news story, and he was eventually put on trial for his role in the deportation of a Jewish orphanage, among other crimes. Paxton's works all played major roles in the context of these court cases. Paxton himself testifying at the trial of Maurice Papon, a major post-war French politician that organized deportations of Jews during the war, and Paul Touvier, a Milice policeman who was charged with crimes against humanity. Paxton's two works on the subject have had the rare honor in historiography of contributing to a process of justice for victims of the Holocaust and completely changing how a society views their darkest years. In a roundtable discussion on the book at Columbia university in 2015, Henry Rousso joked that Paxton had "won" and that French students today not only see Paxton's ideas but his name in the index, "there is Obama, Hitler, Stalin and Paxton."<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 270.

<sup>19</sup> Vichy France and Jews, revisited. Youtube.

## *Historical Memory*

Using new methodologies involving the study of the power of memory to shape remembrance, historian Henry Rousso undertook an ambitious project of French historical memory, *The Vichy Syndrome*, published in 1987. The book was based on the belief that the past survives in an active form and the assumption that such survival can be studied historically. A unique work at the time, the study of historical memory of a period was a new approach, as “popular memory” could be hard to define. Rousso’s set out to study why and how the French populace viewed the Vichy years and how this historical memory was expressed in media, in print, in public conscience, in memorials, anything that transmits historical memory. Since historical memory of a traumatic period operates in a similar manner to a psychological study of a patient, Rousso’s work uses scientific and medical terminology to examine what he shows is a systematic difficulty of France reconciling themselves to their history. “Rather like the unconscious in Freudian theory, what is known as collective memory exists first of all in its *manifestations*, in the various ways by which it reveals its presence. The Vichy syndrome consists of a diverse set of symptoms whereby the trauma of the Occupation, and particularly that trauma resulting from internal divisions within France, reveals itself in political, social, and cultural life.”<sup>(10)</sup><sup>20</sup> Rousso’s work is post-modern in that it examines the subjective nature of truth and how the battle over memory reflects not a lack of sources or understanding, but instead the interests of those in power to control the narrative of the Vichy years and not critically examine the traumas that occurred. One can see the influence of Marxist belief on the power of

---

<sup>20</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 10.

contradictions as well in his analysis, as the unresolved contradictions of what occurred during Vichy and what is remembered in French society manifested itself in the series of events Rouso examines in his study.

Rouso lays out his lens of inquiry in the first few pages of the book, the field of memory. The study of memory developed after the Second World War as history ceased to serve the legitimization of the nation, but to the advancement of knowledge, as society replaced “the nation” and private memories became a focus for understanding the past. History had become a social science. The history of memory is “the study of the evolution of various social practices, and, more specifically, of the form and content of social practices whose purpose or effects is the representation of the past and the perpetuation of its memory within a particular group or the society as a whole.”<sup>21</sup> Rouso favors an “event orientated” approach as it allows for the weight of the tensions involved to be examined in any attempt at a collective representation of the past.<sup>22</sup> These events consist of conflicts and displays of memory of the war, such as scandals over the wartime experiences of public officials, that occurred in the 40 years after World War Two. Sometimes, these public tensions were between different group memories and the “dominant memory,” , such as tensions between Jewish memory and French society. These same tensions exist in the writing of history, as the historian is a product of time and place, and in turn is influenced by the dominant memory. Rouso examines French historiography in his work and the dominant memory that persisted from the 1950s until the 1970s that contributed to French

---

<sup>21</sup> Rouso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 3.

<sup>22</sup> Rouso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 4.

historians' lack of critical works examining collaboration and the Holocaust and their choice instead to focus on the Resistance.

The first part of the book attempts to trace the symptoms of the “neurosis.” Rousso begins by classifying the conflict between Vichy and its opponents as a full-scale civil war, as the divisions in French society cannot be understood without understanding the scale of violence and fratricide between these two factions from 1940-43. Between 1944 and 1954, France had to deal with the aftermath of the civil war, knowledge of the Holocaust, post war purges (legal and illegal), and the policy of amnesty. Rousso classifies this as the “unfinished mourning phase”, where the central contradiction and defining elements of the myth took place, stemming from the “Resistance” becoming an ambiguous founding myth, while “résistants” were dismissed as troublesome individuals.<sup>23</sup> This distinction resulted from left-wing resistance movements' lack of power after the war, as the nation rejected their political beliefs but celebrated of their spirit of resistance. From 1954-1971, the French had repressed memories of Vichy with the dominant myth “resistancialism.” Resistancialism meaning first, the process that sought to minimize the importance of Vichy regime and its impact on French society, including the negative aspects, and second, the construction of an object of memory, the “Resistance”, whose significance transcended the sum of its actual activities.<sup>24</sup> Between 1971 and 1974, “the mirror was broken,” in part by Paxton, and the resistance myth was shattered, in a strikingly public manner. This inaugurated the fourth phase of the syndrome, a phase of obsession, characterized by the

---

<sup>23</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 59.

<sup>24</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 10.

reawakening of Jewish memory and the importance that memories of the Occupation assumed in French politics, which at the time Rousso believes was still taking place in 1987<sup>25</sup>. Some of the events studied demonstrating the syndrome include: the Touvier, Leguay, Darquie, Bousquet, Barbie affairs and the trials and media circuses around these men; the negationist controversy surrounding Robert Faurisson; and the releases of films *The Sorrow and the Pity* and *Holocaust*.

The second part of the book is an attempt to investigate how these symptoms are transmitted by the “vectors of the past,” focusing on those carriers of the past that played a decisive role in the history of the syndrome. The collective memory of an event is shaped by all representations of that event, whether explicit or implicit. Rousso identifies three types of carriers of memory: organizational carrier, cultural carrier, and scholarly carriers<sup>26</sup>. Taking an example from each, Rousso focuses on commemorations, films and historiography. Studying the Vichy syndrome in a scientific manner, Rousso’s book contains many graphs and statistics demonstrating his analysis. This analysis will focus on carriers of memory concerning the Holocaust.

The deportations remained a taboo subject for filmmakers in the 1950s, the exception being the 1956 documentary *Nuit et brouillard* (Night and Fog) shot by Alain Resnais in cooperation with the aforementioned Comité d’Histoire de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale. The film focused on the deportation of resistance and political prisoners, rather than those deported

---

<sup>25</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 10.

<sup>26</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 219.



for racial reasons. Useful for this analysis is French censorship of its involvement with concentration camps. Resnais was forced to remove an image of a French gendarme's typical kepi cap that appeared in a shot of the transit camp Pithiviers.<sup>27</sup> The camp was administrated by the French, and the French censors thus obliterated an actual incontestable historical fact, adding to the prevalent downplaying of Vichy's involvement with the deportations.

The "breaking of the mirror" Rousso describes in the early 1970s, the awakening of French public conscious of Vichy's crimes, was inaugurated by the film *The Sorrow and the Pity* (1971), released the same year as Paxton's *Vichy France: Old Guard and the New*. Rousso places great importance on the film as it functioned as a countermyth to the Gaullist myth of resistance. A documentary of daily life in Clermont-Ferrand, a city allegedly typical of France under the Occupation, it used present-day interviews of individuals with a wide range of political beliefs. The film explicitly displayed evidence of French anti-Semitism. This marked a shift for French representations of the Final Solution with prior official and unofficial representations obliterating the existence of a Vichy anti-Semitism that operated separate to the Nazis. The period that followed in the 1970s saw a large increase in films that dealt directly with the negative aspects of Vichy and collaboration, neglected historical realities were put on the big screen, and the resistance myth was shattered. By the 1980s, Rousso states, "films abandoned the militancy, didacticism, and criticism of the 40s revival"<sup>28</sup> (the period in 1970s where the Occupation was a popular subject matter for films). Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah* reflected this

---

<sup>27</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 234

<sup>28</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 239.

transition to a more original and subjective form of film. The genocide is presented not as a historical phenomenon but as an event which survives in the present, the film using only interviews and current day footage to tell the story of the Holocaust. *Shoah* addresses the conflict that may arise between history and memory, “with a scientific reconstruction of the past dismissed for a ‘recreation’ of the past with a moral purpose of remembering the dead, the survivors lending their voices and presence as the distance between past and present is abolished.” (238)<sup>29</sup> The success of the film and its focus on Jewish survivors contributed to the reawakening of Jewish memory in the 1980s. Rousso credits the film with a large role in the development of the obsessional phase of the Vichy Syndrome<sup>30</sup>. Rousso demonstrates the power of films to give a voice to people who had felt excluded from history and the importance of their role in shaping and changing collective memory. *The Sorrow and the Pity* and *Shoah* both showed on film subject matters that had been repressed in French society, representative of the changing way French society viewed the Vichy regime.

Rousso finishes his analysis of vectors of memory by studying the historiography of the Vichy period. Since this is the subject of this paper, I will briefly discuss Rousso’s analysis of the Vichy syndrome and historical work. Works of history evolved alongside the Vichy syndrome, with Rousso demonstrating a clear connection between the social history of France and historical production. The Vichy Syndrome’s resistance myth from the 1950s-1970s affected not only the subject matters of research, but also the acceptance and impact of works that ran

---

<sup>29</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 239

<sup>30</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 239

counter to this narrative. Works produced by the CDJC (Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation), established in secret in 1943, amassed one of the most comprehensive archives for material pertaining to the Final Solution<sup>31</sup>. In 1955, an official of the center, Joseph Billig, produced a comprehensive study of the Vichy government's Commissariat for Jewish Affairs, revealing the scope of French participation in the Holocaust. The book was read by few and there was little reaction<sup>32</sup>. Officials of the CDJC continued to publish studies of the gas chambers, Nazi criminals and concentration camps, their work only eliciting a reaction in the 1970s. Rousso discusses the factors influencing historical scholarship, such as the previously mentioned archival power and changing social expectations on historical production. Historians play the role of "intermediaries in shaping collective memory" in Rousso's words, relying on what sources are available and respond to people's attitudes and expectations of their work<sup>33</sup>. Once written, their works in turn exert influence on people's attitudes. This "chain of transmission" is helpful for studying the historiography of any time and can illuminate why some ideas and subjects are repressed until a specific moment in time.

Studying how a society remembers an event contains many answers on how the event took place. The memory of Vichy, the conflicting representations of the regime, have been shaped by the same antagonistic values that led to the Vichy crisis itself. These factors include

---

<sup>31</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 243.

<sup>32</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 243.

<sup>33</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 260

the cultural tradition of Catholicism, the French political divisions, and finally, anti-Semitism. The importance of individual trials, books and films to confront French society with their involvement with the Holocaust shows the fragility of a false collective memory and enduring antisemitism in France. France was not the only country that found the crimes of the Shoah difficult to comprehend, but it says something that the trials of Vichy officials beginning in 1973 only occurred after a deliberate effort by Jewish individuals to shed light on the regime. Rousso states there is “a never-ending conflict between the desire to forget and the desire to remember, between the need for repression and unpredictable return of the repressed.”(304)<sup>34</sup> By studying what is remembered and what is forgotten of Vichy, Rousso explores the causes of Vichy involvement in the Holocaust and the lasting impact on French society. Studying historical memory was an ambitious task, and Rousso shows the utility of this for lens of analysis for studying how antisemitism operates in French society, giving valuable insight to Vichy’s actions during the Holocaust.

---

<sup>34</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 304

*Jewish Agency and social history*

“I committed the horrible crime of being born in Poland and, with unrivaled cynicism, my father chose the religion of Judaism for me. Yes, Mr. Maréchal, I am a nasty Jew, a dirty kike, a representative of the damned and condemned race, the epitome of sleaze. But I am twenty years old and I want to live.”

—Léon Kecenelenbogen at Douadic, August 27, 1942<sup>35</sup>

Seeing the need for further study of the daily lives of Jews in Vichy, Renée Poznanski published *Jews in France during World War Two*, in 2001. Studying the Holocaust from the perspective of Jewish individuals allows us to see the effects of Vichy and Nazi policy. The impact on human beings is the reason we study the Holocaust, and Jewish voices are key to gaining knowledge on the workings of Vichy policy. This restores agency to the Jews of France, allowing for inquiry into what options were available for Jews and their varying responses to Vichy and Nazi actions. The work is a social history of Jews in France during the Holocaust, their backgrounds and their lives during the war. Poznanski's choice of her field due to previous work stressing the varying strategies adopted by Jews, this approach stresses the political dimensions of German, Vichy and Jewish strategy. While Jews have been treated as objects or victims of history, Poznanski strives to restore their role as subjects. The work contributes to the preservation of memory for the Jews of France, remembering their agency and fight for survival. By recognizing Jewish agency during the war, Poznanski sheds light on their efforts to adapt and survive the Holocaust, combatting a victim narrative that too often prevents us from recognizing

---

<sup>35</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 1.

the efforts of Jews to take matters into their own hands and survive. Poznanski is attempting to answer a simple question, “what was it like being Jewish in France during the Holocaust?”

Four lines of inquiry are used by Poznanski to answer this question. The first is exposing the variety of experiences under the generic name of “the Jews.” The focus on Jews is actually on a whole range of subjects, with enormous differences among Jewish experiences during the war<sup>36</sup>. Poznanski attempts to pinpoint certain types of experiences within this multitude of situations, while at the same time accounting for the Jewish population as a whole. The second line of inquiry analyzes the way in which Jews interpreted events in a chronological fashion. The third line of inquiry concentrates on the links between Jews and the various components of French society, the day to day life of the French people and their interactions with the Jewish community. The fourth line of inquiry is the relationship between the Jewish population and its organizations. The sources Poznanski uses reflects these questions. The extensive CDJQ collection of materials relating to Jews in France during WWII, particularly documents collected by Joseph Billig, provided a “useful first selection” for Poznanski<sup>37</sup>. Three types of sources play a large role in her analysis. First she uses primary Jewish sources, particularly personal diaries which provide the daily worries and moods at a particular time. Secondly, archival sources such as the General Commission on Jewish affairs shed light on Jew’s relations with government

---

<sup>36</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 1.

<sup>37</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, ix.

bureaucracy and the police. The third category is personal memories and testimonies published after the war, which provided supplementary input.

Poznanski begins with describing the Jewish community at the onset of WWII. There were between 300,00 and 330,000 Jews in France, with such diversity that Jewish community was “nothing but a fiction.”<sup>(1)</sup><sup>38</sup> The primary distinction that affected how Jews responded to the Holocaust was the division between French and foreign Jews. Some 90,000 French Israelites belonged to families which had long been established in France and could be distinguished by their high degree of integration in French society. There was of course diversity in this group as well, reflecting the diversity of French society. The diversity of the foreign Jews was much greater, with a first wave of Russian, Romanian, and Polish Jews immigrating in the 1880s, followed by a second wave of immigrants following the end of WWI from the Baltic countries, Hungary, Poland and Romania, followed by a third wave in the 1930s from Central Europe fleeing the Nazis<sup>39</sup>. This formed a complex set of social, political, and national identities. Poznanski illustrates these identities with personal examples of each group, giving life experiences that illustrate the different ways Jews encountered antisemitism. Foreign Jewish immigrants faced an antisemitism born in xenophobia and were more likely to be politically active, these collective organizations often playing a large role for Jews who did survive. Many did not distinguish their Judaism from private and public life, which French Jews had carefully done due to their prior experiences with French antisemitism. By demonstrating the variety of

---

<sup>38</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 1.

<sup>39</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 2.

their lives and beliefs, she shows the high degree of diversity within the community and emphasizes their individuality, striking a contrast with Vichy's crude distinction between French and foreign Jews in their actions.

The work chronologically examines how Jews were affected by German and Vichy antisemitic measures. By showing how the Jewish community viewed the first measures time, their reactions are placed in the context of 1940-41 France, with the possibility of state sponsored murder unthinkable. This is shown by reactions to the census of Jews in 1940. Few Jews dodged the census due to the fear of being caught by the Germans. Foreign-born Jews could not hide due their distinctive way of speaking and dress and had previous experience registering for a work permit or visa. French Jews also registered, but sensed something had changed, and many emphasized their patriotism, such as Colonel Pierre Brisac who fulfilled his duty of registering in full military attire.<sup>40</sup> This census was used to create a system of four subfiles making it possible to classify Jews according to name, address, nationality, and occupation. This was used extensively during the Holocaust, but Poznanski demonstrates that while the Jewish community had sensed a shift, no one could have thought of how this information would be used. Jewish responses to these first measures highlight their resistance and courage in the face of persecution. Bernard Picard and Albert Weill both had a child after the enactment of the Jewish Statute: one naming his daughter Francine and other naming his son Francois, Picard stating, "Both of us wanted to prove that we were French in spite of the statute that our national identity could not be

---

<sup>40</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 32.



taken away from us.”(98)<sup>41</sup> A student recounts the day her history teacher was dismissed, “The last class given by Marguerite Glotz was extraordinary: it was a hymn to our country, its history, and its values, ending with a resounding ‘Vive la France’ that I am not about to forget.” (45)<sup>42</sup> Jews simply did not have things happen to them, in some instances they reacted with courage and defiance, they made an impact on their fellow French citizens.

A witness at the time in 1941 stated that “the morale of the Jews depends on the attitude the French Public opinion displays toward them.” (47)<sup>43</sup> This dichotomy between Jews and the French populace is at the center of Poznanski’ analysis. For the Jews at the time, this relationship was often confusing, as their day to day interactions with non-Jews do not seem to have deteriorated between 1940-41, while an unrelenting application of exclusionary laws were met with approval from the Parisian populace when they came from French authorities. This is contrasted with expressions of kindness and sympathy that streamed in when Jews were victims of German measures. The social relationships between the Jews of Paris and the French is a centerpiece of her analysis. This support reinforced Jew’s impressions that they were not isolated in French society in 1941. One is struck by the amount of conflicting forces and information the Jews of France had to analyze before the Final Solution began, and their focus was understandably just on getting by day to day. This relationship between Jews and French society

---

<sup>41</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 98.

<sup>42</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 45.

<sup>43</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 47.

in Vichy was steeped in contradictions, as Poznanski demonstrates that personal relationships remained as friendly as before the occupation, while publicly there was widespread indifference to the plight of Jews. She demonstrates the effect this had on Jews seeking help for their communities, “Prominent Jewish leaders were not always aware of the huge gap separating the two levels of social relations and were often misled by the warmth and friendliness that was displayed toward them, especially since they rarely were met with a flat refusal.” (78)<sup>44</sup> The tracing of social relations is extremely useful for the study of the effects of antisemitic measures, as Jews and non-Jews continued to interact in cordial terms in the face of widespread indifference to Jewish suffering. It helps explain why many Jews still clung to the belief that nothing that horrible could happen to them in France, as they still received some support by individual members of French society. This phenomenon displays the nature of French casual anti-Semitism, with many Jews not understanding how such hatred could be directed against them when their personal relationships remained friendly. As stated during the Paxton analysis, the Vichy regime created an environment for anti-Semites to flourish. All they needed was popular indifference to Jewish suffering.

The differences in Jewish experiences in the Occupied Zone and the Non-Occupied zone are studied by comparisons of their reactions to antisemitic policy. This line of inquiry is absent in previous works studied, as Poznanski’s social history allows Jews to speak for themselves on the differences between these two separate antisemitic measures. As shown in the previous works studied, Vichy’s antisemitism operated separately and was enforced vigorously. The racial

---

<sup>44</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 78.

anti-Semitism imposed by the Germans in the North never popular gained support, with disapproval of overt public forms of discrimination imposed by the Nazis. The Southern Zone saw another form of anti-Semitism, marked by economic fear and xenophobia, this grassroots anti-Semitism was French<sup>45</sup>. Many Jews had fled into the Southern Zone, believing that Vichy France would better protect them than the Nazis. When the first large scale roundups occurred in 1941, the majority of foreign-born Jews who had been arrested were confined to camps set up and controlled by Vichy French authorities.<sup>46</sup> Jewish aid agencies acted vigorously to improve conditions and save children from these camps. This focus on the advocacy of Jewish groups demonstrates Jews attempts to work within the French bureaucracy and through different religious and social channels to help their fellow Jews. The Southern Zone's antisemitism had a devastating effect on the Jewish community, who could not blame these measures on the Germans. One of those who had fled Paris for the South stated, "here we can go still go from place to place without having to fear that we will be arrested at any minute. But as far as the attitude of French people is concerned, we feel much more at home in France in the Occupied Zone."<sup>47</sup> ( 85) Reading these personal accounts of Jews trying to navigate the political situation, the consequences of Vichy's actions are displayed, with Jews being at a loss of what to do to survive with their dignity intact. Previous works discussed provide a summary of the laws and measures taken, but the state of unknowing and precarity that the Jews of France felt can only be fully displayed by examining how Jews felt at the time using their personal accounts. Crucial for

---

<sup>45</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 481.

<sup>46</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 65.

<sup>47</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 85.

this study is the chronicling of the extensive efforts by Jews to help their own who were interned. Poznanski devotes large portions of her work describing the efforts to build Jewish solidarity in the camps and efforts made outside to improve the lives of those interned.

Poznanski devotes the latter half of her work to the deportations and Jewish responses to these actions. Jewish organizations struggled between passivity and resistance, with communist groups urging armed resistance and the UGIF (Union Générale des Israélites de France) being placed in the difficult role as the official Jewish social aid organization in Vichy France, sometimes forced to cooperate with the arrests. Communist memory and a more militant Jewish memory remain highly critical of the UGIF. Poznanski does not discredit these criticisms but like with a lot of things relating to the Holocaust in France, it is complicated. She states, “The UGIF was neither a Gestapo Front nor a Resistance organization. It was the German’s whipping boy in the Occupied Zone, an interlocutor for the French authorities, and a social safety net for a large number of Jews. It fostered an illusion of normality, but provided cover for rescue efforts. Some of its leaders conducted themselves valiantly, while other proved cowards.” (488)<sup>48</sup> Poznanski’s social history allows for the ambiguity of institutions, as individual Jews were always adapting to changing circumstances. Jewish leaders in the UGIF often had to make horrible cost-benefit decisions while under the constant weight of Vichy and Nazi control over the Jews of France. Describing the deportations, Poznanski places a focus on those arrested and their suffering. She gives a deeply personal history of the horror that Jews endured during the deportation process.

---

<sup>48</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 488.

The constant state of fear and deterioration of Jewish morale after the round ups of 1942 is shown using Jewish primary sources. The human impact of the Holocaust in France is laid bare.

In her conclusion, Poznanski emphasizes that the fate of most Jews was ultimately dictated by “overriding” national interests, their plight was little more than a card Pierre Laval could play when negotiating with the Germans. Jewish response during the war typically emphasize either resistance or passivity<sup>49</sup>. One of Poznanski’s stated goals in her introduction was to remove the Jews of France from this dichotomy. By studying the social history of Jews during the war we gain knowledge on motivations for their actions. She explains the reasoning for French Israelites who maintained their Jewish identity throughout the war, accepting the onslaught of anti-Jewish action. Most secular Jews accepted their Jewish identity and did not go underground. This fact requires examining how secular Jewish individuals viewed their identity, rather than viewing their reluctance to abolish it as passivity. Russian immigrant Nina Gournfinkel stated on the subject, “Paradoxically, by depriving us of any sort of Judaic training, our parents forbade us from forgetting that we were Jewish, we had to proclaim we were Jewish, because Jews were being humiliated and offended and none has the moral right to exempt themselves from this suffering.”<sup>50</sup>(484) This pride that non-religious Jews felt is shown throughout the work and can explain their actions during the war. For French Jews who had been in France for centuries, the honorable thing to do was to follow the law, stressing their patriotism. Foreign-born Jews were much more vulnerable, but their political and social

---

<sup>49</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 483.

<sup>50</sup> Poznanski, *Jews in France during World War II*, 484.

organizations formed support networks they could use for survival throughout the war, in the face of deportations at any moment. In the context of so much misinformation during the Shoah, Jews gathered in synagogues, soup kitchen, and the facilities of Jewish organizations to share information and build solidarity. The cultural development observed during the first two years sprung from these gatherings and made it possible to reinvigorate Jewish identity. By studying Jewish social history in France during Vichy, Poznanski firmly places her study as one of both Jewish and French tragedy. This view of the Holocaust in France took decades to develop, with Jewish and French memory finally being to coexist with a public understanding of Vichy involvement in the Shoah.

### *Conclusion*

Several main factors contributed to the development of the historiography of Vichy involvement in the Holocaust. Archival power has been constant, with a lack of access to archives operating as a gatekeeper preventing historians from fully examining Vichy involvement in the Holocaust. However, archival power on its own does not explain why it took until the 1970s for public recognition of Vichy's crimes. Social change and a reawakening of Jewish memory also contributed to changing how French society viewed the Vichy regime. Laws surrounding archives are not implemented arbitrarily, and they reflect governmental and social concerns. Take the period of 1970-1979, bookended by two laws surrounding archives: the 1970 law granting access to all documents before July 10, 1940, and the 1979 law granting access to all documents after 30 years. The time between saw an enormous number of events surrounding Vichy and the Holocaust. Individual books exposed Vichy's crimes, films displayed on screen the true nature of Vichy, and the legal system finally bent to societal pressure and began

prosecuting Frenchmen who had participated in the Holocaust. Archival power does not explain the impact of Robert Paxton's first work, as he used captured German documents already available. Rousso said of Paxton's work "Those who agreed with Paxton properly expressed regret that the book had not been written by a Frenchman."<sup>51</sup> In the 1950s, the CDQJ had published accounts of state sponsored anti-Semitism and genocide and compiled extensive archives of the Shoah in France<sup>52</sup>. Had historians wanted to study the uniqueness of the Final Solution in France, they would have had information available. Further analysis is needed to understand why the historiography of Holocaust only really began in the 1970s.

A brief summary of Jewish memory in France before the 1970s is helpful, as well as a discussion on the backgrounds of the individuals that confronted French society with Vichy's crimes. By the 1950s the Jewish population was half what it was before the war. Many Jews converted to Christianity, changed their names and took the lead of their countrymen to not discuss les Années Noires. This silence also had more practical causes: Out of 76,000 Jews deported only 2500-3000 survivors returned. Their dramatic arrival in Paris in 1945 made an impact on French society, but not one with lasting impact to cause a reckoning for Vichy's crimes. Survivors could not or did not want to talk about what they had endured. This is even more understandable, given that large elements of the French bureaucracy that had persecuted them remained intact. In any history, power always silences the voices of the oppressed. It would

---

<sup>51</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 253.

<sup>52</sup> Rousso, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 243.

be the children of these survivors and the first generation to grow up in a post-Holocaust world that would expose Vichy's role in the Holocaust.

The backgrounds of individuals who have had a role in changing our perception of the Holocaust in France are helpful to show why their work had an impact when it did. Major French Holocaust historians that were the children of victims of the Holocaust include Serge Klarsfeld and Pierre Vidal Niquet. Filmmakers Claude Lanzmann (*Shoah*) and Marcel Ophüls (*Sorrow and the Pity*) both were Jewish survivors who were in their teenage years during the Holocaust. Henry Rousso, born in 1955, was also Jewish and an immigrant from North Africa. Finally, Robert Paxton was an American who had not experienced Vichy and was motivated to pursue a study of Vichy due to his animosity towards national conformism. Besides Paxton, the French Jewish community's impact stands out as well as their personal connection to the Holocaust. Having been a child or a teenager during the war, the younger survivors and the second generation did what their parents could not - talk about it. Klarsfeld in particular dedicated his life to remembering victims of the Holocaust in France. The existing Jewish community in France had to take matters into their own hands. Paxton's motivations provide a clue on the other influence for acceptance of their works, namely societal change. Paxton's opposition to the Vietnam war and the unrest of 1968 Paris Riots both reflect the distrust people had with not only the government, but with everything they had been told about history. Coming in the wake of the May 1968 revolt and the death of De Gaulle, Paxton's *Vichy France Old Guard and the New* completely changed the study of Vichy, with an impact matched by very few historical works. Paxton himself has been careful to stress the importance of May '68. that had proved the decisive element here, as "students began challenging their elders' reticence," and the French started to



confront “the dark side of their response to Nazi occupation.”<sup>53</sup> This environment in the 1970s proved to be accepting for discussions of past horrors and injustice. Historians have tried to pinpoint when this shift occurred, but the Touvier Affair is reflective of the changing public perception of Vichy. Touvier was a Frenchman who participated in the Holocaust, was unrepentant, and received a pardon in 1971 from Georges Pompidou. This triggered a national outcry, with Touvier being indicted for crimes against humanity in 1973, and disappearing with the help of the Catholic Church until his death in 1989. This public recognition of Vichy involvement in the Holocaust and the divisions that still haunted France are helpful for understanding both what had changed about France (trials for crimes against humanity, public outcry) and what had stayed the same (Right wing Catholic support for Vichy).

Paxton published *Vichy France and the Jews* in 1981 after “the mirror broke” to use Rousso’s language. Since then his findings on Vichy’s willful participation in the Final Solution have become the definitive account of how the Vichy administration participated in the Holocaust. In its wake came a wealth of studies of the Occupation, including those by Philippe Burrin, Rod Kedward, John F. Sweets, Pascal Ory, Jean-Pierre Azéma, and Bertram Gordon<sup>54</sup>. His work proved Aron’s claims of a dual game with the Allies, the Vichy Shield and of two Vichys to be false. His history is now the history the French government recognizes in schools and with their public displays of remembrance. Vichy had a separate anti-Semitic policy with different goals and they willfully participated in the Final Solution, with these two claims established as the truth, historians could explore other areas of inquiry. Rousso realized the difficulty France has had with memory of Vichy and published *The Vichy Syndrome* to explore

---

<sup>53</sup> Wolfreys, *How France’s Vichy Regime Became Hitler’s Willing Collaborators*.

<sup>54</sup> Wolfreys, *How France’s Vichy Regime Became Hitler’s Willing Collaborators*.

the causes of this and how it manifested itself in historical memory. His finding that the Vichy Syndrome and Vichy itself stemmed from the same roots carries large implications for French society and show the usefulness of a historian pursuing memory as a field of study. Renée Poznanski followed with her own monumental work in 2001, giving details on day to day life as a Jew in France during the Holocaust. By giving agency to the Jews of France, there is a more personal understanding of the effects of the Holocaust, and we gain insight into their mindsets and perception of Vichy and Nazi measures. From victims to subjects, Poznanski recognizes Jewish efforts to improve their conditions and survive.

The long path France has taken to recognize Vichy involvement in the Holocaust does not bear well for colonial memory of the Algerian War. Maurice Papon, the French politician that was convicted in 1989 for the deportation of 1,300 Jews during the Holocaust, also ordered the Paris police to attack Algerian demonstrators in 1961, killing between 50-200, their bodies thrown into the Seine.<sup>55</sup> France's long road to recognition of their involvement in a genocide was exposed due to the intellectual curiosity of Paxton and due to Jewish reawakening of memory. Hypotheticals make for bad history writing, but one wonders what could have happened if it was not for a few determined individuals that confronted France with their crimes. Luckily, historians have been able to study Vichy extensively as Paxton's claims have been accepted. The last street sign bearing Phillipe Petain's name was taken down in 2013, the Algerian War and colonialism will most likely haunt French society in a similar manner as Vichy. The voices of the oppressed can only be suppressed for so long, and the contradiction between what happened and what is remembered is never resolved in a quiet fashion.

---

<sup>55</sup> Wolfreys, *How France's Vichy Regime Became Hitler's Willing Collaborators*.

## Bibliography

Aron, Robert. *Histoire De Vichy*. Paris, France: A. Sauret, 1974.

Marrus, Michael Robert, and Robert O. Paxton. *Vichy France and the Jews*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2019.

Williams, L. Pearce. "Robert Aron's History of Vichy." *Yale French Studies*, no. 15 (1955): 115-19. Accessed December 12, 2020. doi:10.2307/2929246.

Poznanski, Renée. *Jews in France during World War II*. [Waltham, Mass.]: Brandeis University Press in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2001.

Rousso, Henry. *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Vichy France and the Jews, revisited. YouTube. October 20, 2015. Accessed December 14, 2020.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S8xsaMqturA&ab\\_channel=ColumbiaMaisonFrançaise](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S8xsaMqturA&ab_channel=ColumbiaMaisonFrançaise).

Williams, L. Pearce. "Robert Aron's History of Vichy." *Yale French Studies*, no. 15 (1955): 115-19. Accessed December 12, 2020. doi:10.2307/2929246.

Wolfreys, Jim. "How France's Vichy Regime Became Hitler's Willing Collaborators." *Jacobin*. October 07, 2020. Accessed December 14, 2020. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/07/vichy-france-holocaust-nazi-hitler-world-war-ii>.

## Rubric for Historiography Paper, History 400

Element	Excellent	Good	Not Good
Address the Assignment	Paper explores the selected works (books) thoughtfully, crafting a story of changes in the field with insight and critical thinking <i>Terrific work here – excellent choice of works, and each is carefully described.</i>	Paper presents the selected works with competence but leaves the reader wanting more analysis	Paper is more descriptive than analytical without sufficient compare and contrast to describe changes in an historical field.
Demonstrate Comprehension of Books	Clear understanding of the books' methodologies, approaches, and significance <i>The books are placed nicely in their historiographical and methodological contexts – well done.</i>	Books are well summarized, but methodologies and approaches are fuzzy or key elements are underdeveloped	Books are not well summarized; methodologies not described or understood; approaches not mentioned
Analytic Quality	Consistently clear comparison and contrast of interpretations, methodologies, approaches; strong conclusion <i>Strong conclusions, careful analysis. Bravo.</i>	Solid work comparing and contrasting the books, but with some weakness; conclusion under-developed	Excessive summary of books; insufficient analysis; what is the change over time?
Clarity of paper	Paper flows in a clear and logical fashion; well-organized; nearly flawless proofreading	Some problems with clarity and organization; generally well-written; some carelessness <i>Some grammar issues – see my text. And the</i>	Confusion hampers the paper; disorganized; many distracting errors

		citation method is off – I have a comment on this. Easily fixed for future papers.	
	A	B	C

Adam,

I'm grateful for the additional material since the draft – it is all well-done and hits crucial points. The Poznanski book is rich and complex, but you've summarized it nicely. And it's complexity suggests the shift in historiography – from demolishing myths to understanding the nuanced responses of humans in incredibly difficult situations, that brought out the best and worst in people, and everything in between. It appears that Poznanski is less interested in confronting history and more interested in agency and voice. Similarly, Rousseau's memory approach, with all its interesting psychologies, suggest that historians don't want to just know "what happened" (Paxton's task), but "why it happened," and how we remember it all. Vichy France is a case study in these massive historiographical shifts. Superb choice.

And great work here – a pleasure to read.

Sincerely,

Brad Hunt

Paper Grade: A

Course Grade: A