Holocaust Studies

A Journal of Culture and History

ISSN: 1750-4902 (Print) 2048-4887 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rhos20

Nurturing the pain: audiovisual tributes to the Holocaust on YouTube

Mykola Makhortykh

To cite this article: Mykola Makhortykh (2019) Nurturing the pain: audiovisual tributes to the Holocaust on YouTube, Holocaust Studies, 25:4, 441-466, DOI: 10.1080/17504902.2018.1468667

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/17504902.2018.1468667

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 02 May 2018.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 1527

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Citing articles: 3 View citing articles

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rhos20

source: https://doi.org/10.48350/171940 | downloaded: 26.4.2024

HOLOCAUST STUDIES
2019, VOL. 25, NO. 4, 441–466
https://doi.org/10.1080/17504902.2018.1468667

Nurturing the pain: audiovisual tributes to the Holocaust on YouTube

Mykola Makhortykh

Department of Slavonic Languages and Cultures, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands

ABSTRACT
This article examines how digital technology interacts with Holocaust remembrance in post-socialist countries. Using the Lviv pogrom of 1941 as a case study, it explores how Russophone and Ukrainophone web users engage with audiovisual tributes to this event on YouTube. The article scrutinizes user engagement with Holocaust memory on two levels: the level of representation (how the pogrom is represented on YouTube) and the level of interaction (how users interact with tributes to the pogrom). The article suggest that digital media can democratize existing memory practices, but it does not necessarily lead to more pluralist views on the past.

KEYWORDS
Ukraine; Russia; YouTube; digital memory; digital media

GEOLOCATION INFORMATION
49.8397° N; 24.0297° E

Introduction

In her work on photography and war, Sontag argues that remembering conflicts is ‘not to recall a story but to be able to call up a picture.’[1] While this argument can be applied to nearly all of the conflicts which have taken place since the mass distribution of photographic technology in the mid-nineteenth century,[2] the Second World War occupies a special place among them. As Bathrick notes, the employment of visuals – both static photographs and moving pictures – is an ‘absolutely integral’[3] practice in the representation and interpretation of the Second World War. Media visualizations are important for representing different aspects of the Second World War; yet, almost none of them are as influential as the ones related to the representation of war atrocities, in particular the Holocaust.

Audiovisual materials have not only served as evidence documenting war crimes during and after the Second World War but have also allowed the post-war generations to witness the wartime horrors personally. In doing so, media visualizations became an integral part of cultural remembrance of the Second World War by facilitating the construction of the shared perspective on the conflict first at the national and, then, at the international level. The development of audiovisual technology in the 1960s and the 1970s became an integral part of the ‘memory boom’[4] which brought memory of the Holocaust into North American and Western European mainstream societies.[5] Since then, Holocaust memory became

CONTACT Mykola Makhortykh makhortykhn@yahoo.com Department of Slavonic Languages and Cultures, University of Amsterdam, P.C. Hoofthuis, Spuistraat 134, 1012 VB, Amsterdam, Netherlands

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

increasingly mediatized,[6] leading to the production of movies of various genres and the establishment of audiovisual collections of survivors' testimonies, which, combined, have resulted in 'a globalization of discourses on the Holocaust.'[7]

The article asks how globalization of the Holocaust remembrance is affected by the replacement of analogue mass media by digital media as the main means of defining and redefining collective memories.[8] According to Hoskins,[9] the current post-broadcast age[10] is characterized by an increased connectivity between forms, agents, and discourses of memory, leading to unprecedented opportunities for archiving, retrieving, and interacting with the past. However, the exact implications of this 'connective'[11] or 'prosumerist'[12] turn in cultural remembrance, in particular the rise of new audiovisual formats for (re)constructing the past together with new ways of engaging with these formats, remain unclear in the case of the Holocaust remembrance, especially when it comes to post-socialist countries, where extreme politicization of the Second World War memories often leads to marginalization of Holocaust memory.[13]

For this purpose, the article examines how one episode of the Holocaust in Eastern Europe – the Lviv pogrom on 1 July 1941 – is represented and interacted with on YouTube. Despite its intense commercialization and aggressive communication culture, YouTube remains a world's leading video-sharing platform, the impact of which on the discursive construction of the past is increasingly recognized. As Hilderbrand notes, YouTube's functionality makes it a veritable 'portal of cultural memory'[14] which allows individuals and collectives to share their views on the past, by making and disseminating audiovisual memorabilia, and to express their (dis)agreement with existing memory practices, by commenting upon others' creations. Combined with the significant popularity of YouTube in Ukraine and Russia,[15] two countries which are the locus of the current study, these features render the choice of YouTube as a case platform for exploring how digital media affect the construction of shared perspective on the Holocaust in the post-socialist space.

In order to investigate how digital technology and Holocaust memory interact on YouTube, the article begins with a background section that examines the historical context of the Lviv pogrom. It is followed by a review of the literature concerning YouTube and cultural memory, in particular the Holocaust remembrance. It then goes on to describe the research methodology employed to collect and analyze audiovisual tributes to the pogrom, followed with an overview of the findings, which includes the discussion of different formats of tributes and an examination of the ways YouTube users interact with them. The article ends with a conclusions section which discusses implications of dissemination of digital technology for Holocaust remembrance in post-socialist countries.

Historical background

On 30 June 1941, German troops entered Lviv, the largest city in Western Ukraine. Before the Second World War, Lviv had already hosted one of the largest Jewish populations in the Republic of Poland; after 1939, when the city was occupied by the Soviet Union, the number of Jewish inhabitants increased further and exceeded 150,000[16]. Upon entering Lviv, German units established control over strategic elements of the city's infrastructure, including the local prisons, where mutilated corpses of political prisoners – mostly Ukrainians, but also Poles and Jews[17] – were discovered. The prisoners – more than 2000 in

total[18] – were murdered by the NKVD, the Soviet secret police, in the first days following the outbreak of the war.[19]

The discovery of the corpses at the Lviv prisons incited a wave of violent actions against local Jews, encouraged by the Germans and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN).[20] The first anti-Jewish actions started already on 30 June; however, as Struve[21] notes, these were mostly isolated acts of violence. Jews were taken from their homes and sent to the city prisons, where they were forced to exhume and clean the bodies of the NKVD's victims. Many Jews were beaten, and some even killed during these acts of violence. The Ukrainian militia, established on the morning of 30 June, was responsible for the majority of these anti-Jewish actions; however, some acts of violence also involved German soldiers as well as the occasional civilians.[22]

The most violent phase of the pogrom began on the morning of 1 July, when the violence took on a more ritualized form.[23] Jews were forced to clean the streets, being abused, and beaten as they worked. Men and women underwent maltreatment and humiliation; in addition, many women were stripped naked and, in some cases, raped. In a number of cases, Jews were also forced to participate in anti-Communist spectacles, which included mock marches and mock praises to Stalin.[24] As on the previous day, members of the Ukrainian militia actively participated in the pogrom, along with Ukrainian and Polish civilians.[25] According to Struve,[26] a number of German units were also involved in the pogrom, including members of the Nachtigall battalion made of soldiers of Ukrainian origins and Einsatzgruppe C.

The worst acts of violence occurred in the prison courtyards, where Jews were forced to exhume bodies of NKVD victims. Most of the forced workers were brutally beaten, and some of them were stabbed to death or shot while working.[27] The majority of deaths occurred at the Brygidki prison, where several dozens of Jewish workers were killed. Similar events also took place in two other Lviv prisons, on the Lontskoho and Zamarstyniv streets, though the death tolls were lower there.[28] It is hard to assess the total number of victims, but existing estimates vary from 4000 to 7000 killed.[29] Struve,[30] however, argues that these high numbers result from the summing of the mass killings on 5 July and of another pogrom on 25–26 July, whereas the actual number of victims of the pogrom on 30 June–1 July was lower and did not exceed a few hundred killed.

The pogrom that happened on July 1 was only the first among many atrocities that befell the Jewish population of Lviv. In the days following the pogrom, Einsatzgruppe C started an organized killing campaign, which culminated on 5 July, when between 1000 and 1500 Jews were murdered.[31] On 25–26 July, another wave of pogroms – known as 'Petliura days' – had occurred; while the exact number of victims remains unknown, Struve[32] suggests that approximately 1500 people were killed. In the end of 1941, the Lviv ghetto was established, leading to intensification of mass killings which culminated with the liquidation of the ghetto in 1943. Yet, among these atrocities, which depleted the Jewish population of Lviv from 150,000 to a mere 800,[33] the first pogrom occupies a special place, remaining one of the particularly marginalized episodes in the context of 'the marginality of the Holocaust remembrance'[34] in post-socialist countries.

The origin of reasons behind the marginality of this episode of the Holocaust can be traced to the post-war time, when cultural practices of Second World War remembrance were developed in the Soviet Union. Similar to Western Europe, audiovisual technology played a significant role in the codification of wartime traumatic experiences in the

1960s and 1970s, particularly through Soviet war movies.[35] The subject of the Holocaust, however, was usually absent from audiovisual tributes to the Second World War produced in the Soviet Union; in those rare cases when the Holocaust was mentioned, it was subjected to the process of 'Sovietization'[36] (i.e. denying Soviet Jews their ethnic identity and presenting them as abstract Soviet citizens). The ignorance of the Holocaust was particularly pronounced in those cases, when anti-Jewish atrocities were perpetrated by 'brotherly' Soviet nations, like Ukrainians, which, according to the Soviet narrative of the war, unanimously – except a small group of collaborators – fought against fascism.[37]

Since the end of 1960s, as Gershenson[38] notes, the Jewish-themed cultural production in the Soviet Union was terminated because of political reasons, and the mediatization of the Holocaust was resumed only during the Perestroika era. The collapse of the Soviet Union led to the significant changes in the domain of Second World War remembrance in the countries of the ex-Soviet block, including the gradual recognition of the Holocaust during the 1990s. These changes, however, did not bring fundamental changes to the Holocaust representation through regional analogue media: since 1991, only a few Holocaust-themed movies were produced in the post-socialist countries,[39] thus offering a sharp contrast with the Western European and Northern American cases.

Such a difference, as Rohdewald[40] notes, can be attributed to the growing 'nationalization' of Second World War memories in the post-socialist states, which resulted in the renewed marginalization of Holocaust memory. An illustrative example of challenges related to Holocaust remembrance in the region is offered by Russia and Ukraine, two countries which are in the focus of the current study. In Russia, where the main emphasis in Second World War commemoration was made on the notion of the Great Victory, the narratives of heroism attracted larger attention than the narratives of suffering[41]; consequentially, the Holocaust did not occupy a special place and remained largely viewed as part of common victimhood of the Soviet people. In Ukraine, the increasing emphasis on the martyrdom of Ukrainian people led to the competition between the Jewish and Ukrainian narratives of suffering[42] that was further complicated by the glorification of OUN on the state level in 2000s.[43]

The intensification of 'memory wars'[44] in the post-socialist space, following the annexation of Crimea by Russia and the conflict in Eastern Ukraine, further complicated matters of Holocaust remembrance in the region. The increasing appropriation of Second World War memory as means of public mobilization in Ukraine and Russia led to highly pragmatic attitudes towards the past, including the manipulative use of Holocaust memory for framing political opponents[45] or downplaying of importance of Holocaust memory projects under the pretext of them being a threat for national security.[46] Under these circumstances, the deterritorialized domain of digital media can offer possibilities to challenge the instrumentalist approach towards Holocaust memory by nurturing alternative narratives and practices; however, as Bernstein[47] shows, it can also reinforce hegemonic mnemonic discourses in respective societies, which can lead to further marginalization of Holocaust remembrance in the region.

Theoretical background

An impressive number of studies examine the use of media visualizations in the context of Holocaust remembrance. However, these studies focus mainly on the representation of

war atrocities on 'old' media, such as Holocaust cinema,[48] audiovisual testimonies of survivors,[49] and documentary films.[50] In contrast, not much research has been done on strictly digital media and Holocaust memory: a few article-length exceptions include the works by de Bruyn,[51] Gray,[52] and Pfanzelter.[53] Even fewer studies consider the audiovisual dimension of online remembrance of the Holocaust: two prominent exceptions include the study by Reading[54] on the use of audiovisual technology in Holocaust museums and the work by Jones and Gibson[55] on YouTube clips and Holocaust memory.

A number of reasons can be brought forth to explain such a delay in recognizing the growing impact of digital technology on Holocaust remembrance, including the complexities associated with digital data collection and the analysis of multimedia memory. However, one particular reason, which may be significant in the case of memories related to past atrocities, is the potential fear of 'desacralising'[56] these traumatic narratives by considering them in the commodified environment of digital media, a context which is also often characterized by an aggressive communication culture. Unsurprisingly, the subject of Holocaust denial is one of the prominent topics which are discussed by existing studies[57] on digital media and Holocaust remembrance.

Despite their commodified and often aggressive ecology, digital media are increasingly used for sociocultural interactions which involve reconstruction of the past. Digital technologies allow users to employ various technical and narrative formats to make their engagement with the past more interactive and personalized. This significant engagement potential is further enhanced by participatory mechanisms of digital media which encourage feedback exchange and facilitate collaboration between users. Together, these features can evoke performative and participatory empathy from users engaging with the past despite the above-mentioned drawbacks of digital environments, leading, as Pfanzelter argues, to 'unprecedented forms of remembrance.'[58]

According to Uffelmann,[59] the diversity of platform-specific formats and practices results in the formation of distinct digital memory genres, characterized by the specific 'technical conditions as well as rhetorical rules and cultural particularities,' which determine how digital mementos are published, stored, and interacted with. YouTube with its distinct platform profile and extensive audience reach can be viewed as one of the major genres of digital remembrance, which specifically deals with the reconstruction of the past through audiovisual means. A number of studies[60] note YouTube's creative potential and refer to it as an example of online participatory culture;[61] however, Burgess and Green[62] note that YouTube practices can actually lead to the formalization of amateur productions, by propagating certain production patterns which become dominant when users are led to assume that these patterns will make their videos more successful. The crystallization of specific audiovisual formats, however, does not prevent YouTube from offering diverse content, even while the ways of presenting it share a number of similarities; in doing so, it still provides a variety of possibilities for cultural self-expression, including articulation of user attitudes towards the past.

These reasons lead Knudsen and Stage to argue that YouTube's functionality 'enables the creation of a democratized memory practice'[63] by allowing users to produce and experience tributes to the past in a way which is different from established memory practices in respective societies. Knudsen and Stage also suggest that those opportunities are particularly important in the case of war memories, which are often defined by a small selection of dominant discourses geared towards promoting national unity. Under these

conditions, the possibility of expressing ‘public commemorative disagreement’[64] can be viewed as an important instance of YouTube’s democratizing impact on the remembrance of past conflicts.

The argument about YouTube’s democratizing influence on cultural remembrance of past atrocities is further developed by Jones and Gibson[65] in their study of the ‘Dancing Auschwitz’ YouTube video series.[66] Based on their analysis of a video triptych made by Australian artist Jane Korman and her father – a Holocaust survivor – Jones and Gibson claim that digital media provide an unprecedented opportunity to construct and develop collective memories,[67] including those dealing with the atrocities of the Second World War. Similar to Levy and Sznaider, who argue that digital technologies facilitate new forms of memory which ‘span territorial and linguistic borders,’[68] Jones and Gibson view YouTube as a means of transcending traditional modes of war remembrance. By opening new spaces for memory interaction, they argue, YouTube expands the limits of remembrance, both for individuals and collectives, and creates new commemorative experiences which are much less susceptible to official memory politics.

In contrast to these optimistic suggestions, Danilova[69], in her study of virtual memorials to British fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan, notes that the use of digital media, in particular YouTube, can foreclose public discussion of ethical dilemmas by sustaining mainstream interpretations of a contentious past. Similarly, Benzaquen[70] suggests that YouTube’s entertainment-oriented environment and the aggressiveness of its communication culture turns it from being an active outlet for democratic interpretations of the past into ‘a battlefield in transnational politics.’[71] Finally, Drinot, in his study of remembrance of the War in the Pacific and YouTube, further criticizes the idea of the platform as an outlet of memory pluralization, arguing that YouTube more often than not serves as an outlet for ‘ultra-nationalism inflected by virulent racism.’[72]

These divergent evaluations call for the critical assessment, undertaken in this article, of YouTube’s impact on Holocaust remembrance, and especially in Eastern Europe, where ‘digital media form a pivotal discursive territory’[73] for reconstructing the past. By examining how Ukrainophone and Russophone users interact with Holocaust memory on YouTube, the article tests varying assumptions listed above, by questioning the purposes behind these interactions, as well as their potential consequences. While it is hardly debatable that YouTube can, in theory, provide alternatives for hegemonic discourses of the Second World War in post-socialist countries and challenge the marginalized position of Holocaust remembrance in the public sphere, the current study strives to understand to what extent the platform is actually used for this purpose and whether it also gives space to intolerant, or even downright instrumental, attitudes towards the past.

Methodology

Data collection

To collect the data for the study, YouTube’s native search engine was used. On 4 March 2015, two different search queries – ‘ljvivsjkyj poghrom 1941’ and ‘lvovskij pogrom 1941’ (in Ukrainian and Russian, respectively; both are translated as ‘the Lviv pogrom 1941’) – were employed to search for videos which could be relevant to the study. The two queries returned 109 and 234 results, respectively; none of YouTube filters were applied during the

search. After acquiring the raw data, collected videos were scrutinized for identifying clips which were explicitly related to the pogrom in Lviv. For this purpose, the descriptions of videos on YouTube were examined; in the cases when such descriptions were absent, the video's content was viewed in order to make the decision on whether it should be included in the study.

Out of 343 results returned by the two queries, only 40 videos appeared pertinent to the study.[74] The remaining videos were mostly related to other pogroms which took place in Eastern Europe, either during the Second World War (e.g. the Jassy pogrom) or at the beginning of the twentieth century (e.g. the Odessa pogrom), or else to the activities of Ukrainian nationalists (particularly the Ukrainian Insurgent Army). Such a wide range of results shows both how rich the selection of historical materials available through the platform is and how challenging the process of data collection on YouTube, using the platform's native search engine, can be.[75]

Because YouTube provides limited data on its users, many of whom prefer to stay anonymous or develop fake identities for communicating across the platform, it is often hard to determine the nationality of videos' creators or commentators. For this reason, the article employed a variation of participant observation approach to reproduce search queries which would be most probably used by Russophone and Ukrainophone users interested in YouTube content related to the Lviv pogrom. While this approach does not guarantee that these videos were engaged with only by Russophone and Ukrainophone users – instead, a number of comments were produced in English, German, or Polish – it offers an insight into which audiovisual tributes will most probably be recommended to Russophone and Ukrainophone users and thus can be used for investigating their engagement with Holocaust memory on YouTube.

Data analysis

Similar to earlier studies on YouTube and traumatic memories,[76] the article employed web content analysis to examine how YouTube users engaged the Lviv pogrom on two levels: that of representation (i.e. how the event itself was presented on YouTube) and that of interaction (i.e. how users interacted with the audiovisual tributes to the event). In order to examine the first level, the content of the videos, along with their descriptions, was explored in order to understand how the Lviv pogrom is presented online, and how different audiovisual formats are used to encode Holocaust memory in the Web 2.0 environment.

For investigating the second level, the article investigated how YouTube users received these audiovisual tributes by examining different forms of feedback provided by the platform. While the majority of earlier studies[77] explore how users interact with audiovisual tributes verbally – i.e. through the YouTube comments – the platform also enables nonverbal interactions, namely through its view count and 'like' or 'dislike' buttons. While these forms of feedback have lesser interpretative value than explicit comments, they can exhibit general patterns of interaction and point to format-dependent variations in the way users interact with the representations of the past. Because of these reasons, the article considered both verbal and nonverbal forms of interactions to investigate how users engage with tributes to the pogrom and what factors influence their reactions to Holocaust videos on YouTube.

Findings

Representation

This section examines the audiovisual clips of the Lviv pogrom found on YouTube. Using web content analysis, four formats of pogrom videos were identified: requiems, records, documentaries, and shows. The majority of these formats are not unique to YouTube or to digital media in general[78]; however, their use in the context of remediation of the Holocaust on YouTube currently remains under-investigated. The following subsections explore precisely how each of these formats was used for the representation of the Lviv pogrom on YouTube.

Requiems

The format of a requiem comprises user-generated videos which provided tributes to the victims of war atrocities. These videos were focused on death and mourning; however, despite their name, they did not restrict their content to musical compositions and sometimes also included other forms of expression such as dance performance or acting. Unlike other formats, which were characterized by a significant uniformity in the way they structured the representation of the Holocaust, requiems tended to be more diverse and personalized. While the choice of content varied significantly among requiems, the majority featured historical photos or video footage accompanied by music (e.g. Yiddish songs and mournful instrumental compositions). Sometimes, requiems also reused fragments of contemporary documentaries, together with some explanatory texts which provided brief historical notes to the videos.

Despite the diversity of their content, almost all of the eight requiems that were examined in this study followed the similar pattern of narration of suffering. The 2012 video entitled 'Horrific Images of the 1941 Lviv Pogrom in Ukraine'[79] can be viewed as a model example of this pattern. The video starts by showing historical footage of Jews cleaning up prison's courtyard and being humiliated as they work; the degree of abuse, however, is relatively mild at this point. The video then moves on to images of beatings, mainly of Jewish men pursued by angry crowds. Then, it proceeds to scenes depicting women being beaten – first clothed, and successively naked. The last few seconds of the video are reserved for images of dead bodies, which are presented as the final stage of the Lviv pogrom, thus completing the traumatic escalation in the requiem's narration.

The pattern of gradually intensifying scenes of suffering was followed not only by requiems on the Lviv pogrom but also by YouTube videos on other pogroms (e.g. the Jassy pogrom) which were examined during the data collection. Furthermore, the same pattern was found in the Ukrainophone requiem dedicated to the political prisoners killed by the NKVD at the Lonsky prison,[80] even while it actually downplayed the subject of the Holocaust. The video bearing the title 'Memorialjnyj Muzej "Tjurma na Loncjkogho"' [Memorial Museum 'The Lonsky Prison'][81] borrowed similar footage of Jews being beaten by the crowds, but followed it with images of bodies of Ukrainians killed in the Lviv prisons. It thus, arguably, not only downplayed the issue of the pogrom but also equaled Jewish suffering with the suffering of Ukrainians. Similarly, another requiem to the Ukrainian victims of the NKVD titled 'Ljviv 1941 Tjurma "Bryghidky"' [L'viv 1941 the 'Brygidki' Prison][82] used the same footage of Jews clearing the

prison courtyard, but referred to them as Ukrainian relatives of the victims, trying the recover the bodies of their loved ones.

The use of mislabeled images in the latter case can be explained by different reasons, varying from conscious theft of suffering originating from the ongoing 'competition of victims'[83] in Ukrainian society to the genuine lack of awareness of the misinterpretation. The recurring use of same narration principles, however, can be viewed as one of the quintessential features of the requiem format which relies significantly on existing patterns of media representations of the war atrocities. The origins of the requiems dedicated to the Lviv pogrom can be traced back to the tradition of Holocaust movies, which look into the past and emphasize the deaths and suffering.[84] By reproducing this narration logic, YouTube users employed technological potential of digital media to replicate patterns of the Holocaust representation from analogue media in the digital environment.

While such replications might seem inevitable, a few of the requiems also provided alternatives to the traditional Holocaust representation. In the case of the Lviv pogrom, these representation patterns were challenged by two videos titled '"Yanina Hesheles–Return" 2011'[85] and '"Dva tango." Lvov period okkupacii 1941–44. Holokost' ['Two tangos.' Lviv during the occupation 1941–44. The Holocaust] (Spasibo za Zhizn', 2011). The videos were produced by the creative group 'Pervaja Zapadnoukrainskaja evrejskaja kinostudija' [The First Western Ukrainian Jewish Film Studio], which is affiliated with the Hasem-Areh, the Ukrainian Jewish Charity Fund.

The first video followed one Holocaust survivor, Yanina Hesheles, on her trip to contemporary Lviv, where she had lived during the Second World War. The video combined modern footage from Lviv with historical records of the city in the years of the war; the requiem also included several scenes in which actors revisited episodes from Hesheles' childhood. Similar techniques were used in the second video, which showed a series of photos related to the pre-Holocaust lives of Jews in Lviv, followed by images of the destruction inflicted by the Holocaust, and then a combination of photos from pre-war and contemporary Lviv, and scenes, again, reenacted in the present.

In contrast to the other requiem videos, the requiems produced by The First Western Ukrainian Jewish Film Studio were not focused entirely on the event in question – the Lviv pogrom. Instead, both 'Yanina Hesheles–Return' and 'Two tangos' tended to put the events of 1941 in Lviv in a larger perspective, by referring both to interwar and contemporary Jewish communities in the city. In doing so, these two requiems replaced the simplistic, linear model of suffering (humiliation → abuse → death) found in the other requiems, with a more complex cycle of life and death, in which the Holocaust was positioned not as the existential end of everything – the 'black hole'[86] of history – but as one episode of a Jewish history in Lviv which continues to this day.

This focus on the present, albeit viewed through the prism of a painful past, is one of the features which unite these nontraditional requiems with another piece of Holocaust memory on YouTube: the 'Dancing Auschwitz'[87] piece which was mentioned earlier. Similar to the 'Dancing Auschwitz' series which shows three generations of the Korman family dancing at various Holocaust sites, the 'Two tangos' and 'Yanina Hesheles–Return' requiems animate black-and-white photos with live action performances by the studio's members. While at times the latter requiems demonstrated what Burgess and Green refer to as 'the showcasing of technique rather than of artistry'[88] – one example, for instance, the overuse of color filters and special animation effects which produced

at times a humorous effect – it represents an approach to Holocaust remembrance which does not reproduce established commemorative patterns, but rather enhances them, or even offers an alternative reading of the past.

Records

Unlike the user-generated requiems, the format of a record is composed of pieces of historical footage, uploaded onto YouTube without any additional intervention from the user side. Often, the records included the same historical footage of the pogrom as the requiems did; however, unlike the latter, the records did not include any personal comments. Because of the limited availability of historical footage, the majority of records were based on two recordings by Germans in 1941. The first record was made in the prison courtyard and showed Jews clearing the bodies of Ukrainian prisoners, whereas another record used footage from the Deutsche Wochenschau[89] film on the capture of Lviv. Besides displaying German troops entering the city and the destruction of Stalin busts, the latter film briefly showed Ukrainians beating Jews, after a significantly longer shot on the victims of the NKVD found at the Lviv prisons.

While the users did not embed extra content in the records, there was still certain variety in their representations of the Lviv pogrom. Firstly, the length of the records varied, depending on the personal preferences of the video's creator. For instance, while the majority of records were based solely on the Deutsche Wochenschau film, in some cases, the footage's beginning or the end was cut, resulting in a shorter duration of the record in question. Secondly, despite reusing the same historical record, videos were often titled differently: the above-mentioned Wochenschau film appeared under several names, including 'Lwow Lemberg 1941' [Lviv Lviv 1941][90] and 'L'vov v ijule 1941 goda' [Lviv in July 1941].[91]

The relatively limited variety between the records was contrasted by their extensive use for constructing contrasting narratives of suffering and victimhood. Similar to the requiems, the records often employed mislabeled images: a number of records (in particular, the ones uploaded by Russophone users) emphasized the barbarity of Ukrainians by presenting images of Ukrainian victims as evidence of suffering of Jews and Poles. One interesting case is represented by the video titled 'Posle evrejskih i pol'skih pogromov vo L'vove 1941g.' [After the Jewish and Polish pogroms in Lviv in 1941].[92] The video was supplemented with a description, according to which the bodies shown lying on the streets belonged to Polish and Jewish victims of Ukrainian nationalists. In contrast to the title, however, the video showed Jews gathering the bodies of Ukrainians killed by the NKVD on the prison courtyard.

Like earlier, it is hardly possible to judge if the decision to use mislabeled images shall be attributed to a conscious theft of suffering or the lack of awareness about the misinterpretation; however, the manipulation of the records' names and lengths was not the only problematic aspects of the representation of the Lviv pogrom through this format. It can be argued that the origins of the records render their use for the Holocaust remembrance questionable: because the historical footage used for them was produced by German soldiers – or even propagandists – the records tended to present the events which followed the seizure of Lviv under a specific angle.

This selective representation is especially controversial in the case of the Deutsche Wochenschau film, which in itself is a piece of German propaganda. The lack of proper

attribution of such records on YouTube can make viewers interpret them not as propagandist videos, though, but as authentic pieces of historical evidence – which was in fact the goal Goebbels' Ministry of Propaganda intended to achieve. This perspective is particularly problematic, considering the tendency of YouTube users to view historical records as documents, which, as Kaspe points out in her study of documentality in post-socialist countries,[93] makes those materials appear more authentic and truthful to the uncritical viewer.

Documentaries

The extensive use of historical photos and footage was also common to the third format of audiovisual representations of the Holocaust found on YouTube: the documentary. This format comprises non-fictional films which embody 'a simulacrum of the perceptual experience of human existence.'[94] Most of these films were produced for educational purposes and then uploaded to YouTube, either in their entirety or in fragments. As in the case of the records, such a selective uploading of traditional media content constitutes a recognized pattern of YouTube users' activity[95]; furthermore, it can be viewed as a specific mode of cultural meaning making that Hartley labeled as 'redaction.'[96] According to Hartley, redaction is a form of production of new material based on editing of existing content (e.g. documentaries produced for TV broadcasts).

While all three formats – requiems, records, and documentaries – used historical material to illustrate their statements, documentaries usually supplemented them with contemporary content, such as commentaries from scholars and interviews with surviving eyewitnesses. Furthermore, unlike user-generated requiems, documentaries usually featured less of the amateurish digital video-making techniques; such a difference can be attributed to their origins, as most of the documentaries were made for analogue rather than digital media and were not subjected to additional manipulation (e.g. remixing), besides fragmentary uploading of their content to YouTube.

In contrast to the requiems, the authorship of which often remained obscure, the documentaries usually provided clear information on their country of origin. This attribution allowed to connect differences in representation of the Lviv pogrom to distinctions between national historiographies of the Second World War in the post-socialist states as well as current political agendas. While all the documentaries placed the blame for the pogrom on the Germans, who encouraged anti-Jewish retaliations, their respective evaluations on the involvement of Ukrainians diverged significantly.

For instance, the Russian documentary titled 'Holokost Evreev v Ukraine – Vtoraja Mirovaja Vojna v Cvete' [The Jewish Holocaust in Ukraine – the Second World War in Colour][97] argued that Ukrainians were not only glad to meet German soldiers with 'honey and bread,' but also noted that many Ukrainians were active collaborators and perpetrators of the Holocaust. Similarly, a fragment of a Russian documentary titled 'Cvety Vremen Okkupacii' [Flowers of the Occupation Period] uploaded to YouTube in 2012 with the title 'Period Okupacii Fashistami L'vova 1941–1944' [Period of Fascist Occupation of Lviv 1941–1944][98] pointed to the active participation of Ukrainian crowds in the Lviv pogrom, though it avoided claims about the widespread collaboration of Ukrainians, unlike in the previously mentioned documentary.

A slightly different interpretation of the Lviv pogrom was provided in the English/Russian-language documentary video entitled 'N/S Part 06: The 1941 Pogrom in L'viv,

Ukraine and Modern Antisemitism.'[99] This clip, which was part of a larger project by Daniel Reynolds called 'Nazis/Skinheads: The Holocaust by Bullets and Modern Antisemitism in Ukraine,' connected the pogrom to the NKVD killings of Ukrainian prisoners in Lviv, which was presented as the pretext for the start of the pogrom, used by the Germans to ignite the rage of the Ukrainian crowd. At the same time, the documentary drew parallels between pre-war and present-day antisemitism in Lviv, showing the large number of swastikas on the walls of the city, and mentioning cases of harassment of minorities on the streets.

In contrast to the English- and Russian-language documentaries, which mentioned the participation of Ukrainian civilians in the pogrom, the Ukrainian documentaries ignored this issue almost entirely. Instead, the majority of the Ukrainian documentaries emphasized the killing of Ukrainian prisoners by the NKVD before the Lviv pogrom. For instance, the Ukrainian documentary titled 'LJVIV 1941r Palachi NKVD Lwow Lemberg NKVD Murder Western Ukraine' [LVIV 1941 Murderers of NKVD Lwow Lemberg NKVD Murder Western Ukraine][100] discussed the brutal torture of prisoners by the NKVD, presenting shocking images of dead bodies with nails in their eyes and thick layers of blood on the prison floors.

Similarly, another Ukrainian documentary entitled 'Suspiljno-Politychna Sytuacija u Ljvovi, Chervenj' [Social-Political Situation in Lviv, June 1941],[101] began with another description of the NKVD killings in the Lviv prisons, followed by the discussion of the popular euphoria in response to the declaration of the Act of Restoration of the Ukrainian state in the aftermath of the German seizure of the city. The only time anti-Jewish reprisals were mentioned in the latter documentary was when a witness of the events in Lviv noted that it was hard to look at not only the Ukrainian patriots hanged by Germans but also the Jews.

This greater emphasis on the suffering of Ukrainians, together with the deliberate ignoring of the event of the Lviv pogrom, was thus common for a majority of the Ukrainian documentaries. In fact, the only instance when the pogrom was mentioned explicitly was in relation to the discussion of the involvement of the Nachtigall battalion in anti-Jewish actions organized by Germans. For instance, the documentary, tellingly entitled 'Nachtigall ta Shukhevych ne Robyly Poghromiv 1941 Roci – Nachtigall i Shuhevich ne Delali Pogromov 1941 g' [Nachtigall and Shukhevich Were not Involved in the Pogroms of 1941][102] claimed that the Lviv pogrom was a German provocation, and that the OUN leadership was not involved in it.

Similarly, another Ukrainian documentary titled 'Nimecjka Okupacija Ljvova' [German Occupation of Lviv] (Molfarius1, 2012) also preferred to omit the issue altogether by opening the narration on the German occupation with the beginning of August 1941 – not June. Consequently, while the documentary did once mention the pogroms in Lviv, it did not go into any detail, moving immediately to the discussion of the Lviv ghetto set up by the Germans and citing instances of Ukrainians helping Jews.

Together, these observations point to one significant problem with the documentary videos, the majority of which were originally produced for traditional media and with a (mostly) national audience in mind. Even while clips of this format were subjected to redaction – which can also be viewed as a form of production of new content – they still remained largely dependent on the national historiographies of the Second World War. Unlike the requiems, which demonstrated the potential to challenge hegemonic

views on the Lviv pogrom, the majority of the documentaries were simply reiterating dominant historical discourses. In doing so, the videos of this format contributed to appropriation of Second World War memory in Ukraine and Russia and reinforced the marginalization of Holocaust remembrance in the region.

Shows

The appropriation of the past was also common to shows, which is the last audiovisual format identified in the study. Much like documentaries, shows are pieces of audiovisual content produced for Ukrainian and Russian TV channels; however, in the case of shows, the content originated from entertainment programs or news reports. Unsurprisingly, the shows tended to promote the dominant discourses on the Second World War upheld in Ukrainian and Russian societies, but in comparison with documentaries, they did so in an even less critical way. This more entertainment-focused approach, as Zvereva[103] argues, is common to journalistic shows, and sets them apart from academic documentaries. In some cases, the shows went as far as to propagate conspiracy theories based on nonhistorical sources, such as, for instance, blaming Jews for the Soviet repression and destruction of the Ukrainian nation.

One example of the distinction between shows and documentaries was the video titled 'Korchynsjkyj pro Babyn Jar: Khotilosj by Pochuty Vybachennja Jevrejiv Pered Ukrajincjamy' [Korchynsky on Babyn Jar: We Wish to Hear that Jews are Sorry for Ukrainians].[104] The video was a part of a Ukrainian television talk show featuring a speech by Dmytro Korchynsky, leader of the Ukrainian nationalistic organization 'Bratstvo.' In a passionate 3-minute speech, Korchynsky touched on a number of topics, including the Jews' responsibility for the destruction of the Ukrainian people, the active participation of Jews in the German–Soviet war on the side of Germany, and, finally, the necessity for Jews to ask for forgiveness for the Holocaust. As a case for his arguments, Korchynsky used photos from the Lviv pogrom and claimed that while the pogrom did take place, existing evidence (again, in his view) shows that the victims were not Jewish, but Ukrainian.

The findings of this section point to significant variability between tributes of the Lviv pogrom on YouTube, both in terms of audiovisual formats employed to produce these tributes and in terms of interpretations offered by them. Unlike public discourse in mainstream media in the post-socialist countries, which tends to be dominated by a few prevalent narratives of the Second World War, YouTube tributes accommodated divergent views on the past and articulated a variety of emotions. Despite a number of instances, where the platform was used for appropriating Holocaust memory (e.g. by mislabeling images of suffering), the article's observations support the earlier argument that YouTube does cultivate 'fluid, interactive and creative spaces for self-expression'[105] that can allow for actualization of marginalized memories of the Holocaust in the region.

Interaction

This section examines how YouTube users interact with audiovisual tributes to the pogrom verbally and nonverbally. It begins with the nonverbal forms of interaction such as viewing, liking, or disliking videos; the use of such metrics, as Gerlitz and Helmond note, not only allows to 'metrify and intensify user affect and engagement'[106] but also strategically exposes those parameters to other users, evoking further interactions

with specific materials. Then, the section moves on to examine verbal comments published under the YouTube videos: as has already been mentioned earlier, the analysis of comments constitutes the most frequently used technique to assess user interactions with representations of the past on the platform.[107]

Nonverbal interactions

Table 1 indicates that users' attention was distributed extremely unequally across the individual YouTube videos dedicated to the Lviv pogrom. While the view count for some of the clips ran into the hundreds of thousands, other clips had been viewed only a few dozen times. The same inequality – albeit on a smaller scale – was found in the distribution of likes and dislikes: while the majority of videos were neither liked nor disliked, or had received one or two likes, other videos provoked much stronger emotional reactions. Such unequal distribution of interest can be considered an example of the 'rich get richer' principle, which is a common feature of the contemporary digital media ecologies[108]: when digital content attracts a large number of likes – or other forms of user engagement, such as sharing and reposting – the item continues to attract even more likes, and the breadth of users' interactions increases exponentially.

While the highly unequal reception of different tributes is not surprising, especially considering its reinforcement by YouTube recommender algorithms using user feedback to recommend videos,[109] it is worth considering the reasons which determine the initial attractiveness of a specific video and lead to a gap between more or less popular Holocaust-related content. User interest towards a YouTube clip can be influenced by different factors, including the amount of promotion that the clip in question receives through external websites; however, it seems reasonable to suggest that video's content features also might affect users' preferences. The article's observations suggest that the length of a video's presence on YouTube was not an influential factor: some of the most viewed videos were uploaded to YouTube in 2011/2012, but many others appeared around the same time, without incurring as many views.

Table 1. User interactions with Lviv pogrom videos (by format).

	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
Requiems					
Views	449	810	2009.5	35,354.5	41,948
Likes	3	4,5	9	49	77
Dislikes	0	0,5	1	12	25
Comments	0	1	5	38.5	312
Records					
Views	54	238	1344	4266	82,688
Likes	0	1.5	8	11	65
Dislikes	0	0.5	1	2.5	23
Comments	0	5	4	10	522
Documentaries					
Views	49	596	1049	8121	159,621
Likes	0	1	11	41	258
Dislikes	0	0	0	9	99
Comments	0	0	2	11	167
Shows					
Views	95	148	241	400	519
Likes	2	2	2.5	3	3
Dislikes	0	0	0	1	2
Comments	0	0.5	1.5	2,5	3

Instead, the choice of language seemed to be more relevant: the majority of the most frequently viewed videos used either English/German in their titles ('Lemberg 1941') or a mixture of languages ('Lvovskij Pogrom 1941 Goda / Lvov Pogrom in 1941'). This strategy allowed the videos' creators to target not only Ukrainophone and Russophone but also Anglophone or Germanophone users. Even though the latter would not necessarily be able to understand the language spoken in the videos, they still experience the music or visuals therein. In this way, comparatively language-free formats of requiems and records could reach broader audience and attract more viewership.

The most important factor linked to the popularity of a given clip would in fact appear to be the format. Table 1 suggests that requiems and documentaries attracted significantly more user attention – both in terms of views and explicit responses – than records and, especially, shows. While there are many possible reasons for this kind of distribution of interest, it can be suggested that requiems and documentaries offer more emotional and authentic commemorative experience, which may result in a reverberation of affective states on and off YouTube.[110] Furthermore, requiems and documentaries usually provided viewers with more cohesive narratives of the pogrom than records, which is another reason that can explain their popularity.

Unlike shows relating the content to contemporary commemoration practices and records providing very brief – and usually quite arid – commentary on the pogrom, both requiems and documentaries were often affectively charged, as they shared a wide range of memorabilia with the viewer, varying from historical photos to interviews with eyewitnesses. They also made active use of sound, such as songs in Yiddish or sad instrumental motifs, to mobilize interest among viewers, who experienced what Thompson and Biddle call 'affective transmissions.'[111] Unfortunately, a more in-depth examination of the reasons behind the attractiveness of a particular format for nonverbal interactions remains beyond the scope of the current research, though it is certainly deserving of a separate study.

Verbal interactions

Unlike nonverbal forms of interactions, which pointed to a number of differences in the reception of different formats of audiovisual tributes, content analysis of verbal interactions indicated a much lower inter-format variety. Instead, the majority of verbal responses, independently of the video's format, expressed negative feelings, varying from anxiety to rage, whereas positive emotions were expressed quite rarely. Such a significant degree of negativity is not surprising – YouTube is known for its highly aggressive comment culture[112] – yet it seems to be a significant limitation for remediation of cultural memories on digital media. Instead of growing connectivity between prosumers of memory, aggressiveness of digital platforms like YouTube can lead to disconnection between memory agents as well as products they create.

The content analysis of the comments suggests that users' reactions mainly revolved around three major subjects: the denial of guilt, the call for vengeance, and the expression of sympathy for the victims (whoever these were perceived to be). The first most common type of reaction revolved around the denial of established narratives of the pogrom, either justifying the actions of the perpetrators or suggesting that the pogrom – or even, according to some, the Holocaust itself – was in fact orchestrated by the Jews. The first strategy – justifying the perpetrators of the pogrom – involved emphasizing the responsibility of Jews

for alleged crimes, past (‘*Zhydy vynyshhyly gholodomorom 8 miljjoniv ukrajinciv. Svit krughlyj, i nichogho tak prosto ne mynajetjsja*’ [Jews killed 8 million Ukrainians with the Holodomor. The world is round, so the retribution is inevitable][113]) or contemporary (‘*Naihitrejshie pravil’nej, zabravshie sebe ch’i-to zaslugi i vystavivishie ih kak svoi, prichem idja po golovam, ubivaja vseh i vsja neugodnyh, schitaja sebja vysshej rasoj, a ostal’nyh grjaz’ju, v t.ch. i russkij narod! A vysshaja rasa - jeto nemcy, a evrei takie zhe araby kak i vo vsem arabskom mire, chernye, privykshie voevat’, ubivat’ i detej i starikov*’ [They [Jews] are the most insidious ones, they usurp others’ achievements and present them as their own, they step over others, they kill everyone whom they do not like, they behave like they are the master race and all others are just dirt, including the Russian people! But Germans are the master race, whereas Jews are just Arabs like other parts of the Arab world, dirty, always ready to fight, and kill children and elderly]).[114]

In contrast, the second strategy simply transferred the blame for the pogrom to the Jews, by referring to conspiracy theories (‘*nevezhestvenen jeto ty) ibo holokost jeto evrejskoe zhertvoprinoshenie … talmud pochitaj tam pochishhe fashizma, shulhan oruh naprimer)))*’ [It is you, who are illiterate)[115] The Holocaust is the Jewish sacrifice … read the Talmud, it is worse than fascism, Shulhan Oruh, for instance)))]).[116] While many statements of this sort were expressed by both Ukrainophone and Russophone users, it is worth noting that Anglophone comments, which occasionally appeared under videos, often revealed even larger degrees of anti-Semitic sentiment (‘*+1pen2books JEW LIER … you kill palestinians children with white phosphorus. … LONG LIVE HEZBOLLAH!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! LONG LIVE HITLER!!!!!!!*’)[117]. However, without a detailed study of user profiles, it is hard to determine whether these comments were produced by actually Anglophone users or by Russophone or Ukrainophone users striving to reach larger audiences by commenting in English.

Another common way of decoding the tributes to the pogrom was by viewing them as calls to vengeance. The majority of such comments were produced by Russophone users, which directed them either against adherents of Nazism (‘*Smert’ fashiskim podstilkam.* ’ [Death to fascist whores])[118] or contemporary Ukrainians (‘*Suki banderovskie.I jeti pidory hotjat vlasti.Rezat’ ih vseh.Ne shhadit’ galichanskih zhenshhin i detej.Vseh pod nozh*’ [Banderite bitches. And these fags want power. Kill them all. No mercy to woman and children of Galicia. Kill them with knifes]).[119] Many of these reactions appropriated the memory of pogrom for framing the Ukrainian crisis and representing it as a direct continuation of the Second World War (‘*v 2014g istorija povtorilas’, fashizm vernulsja na Ukrainu*’ [In 2014 the history repeated itself, fascism returned to Ukraine]).[120]

Similarly, many Ukrainophone users called for vengeance against perpetrators of NKVD crimes (‘*Zhydo-kacapsjku komunu my zobovjazani zmusyty vidrobyty materialjni j moraljni zbytky u 20-kratnomu rozmiri abo zakopaty jikh zhyvcem*’ [We have to make the Jewish-Muscovite commune pay material and moral damage twenty-fold or bury them alive][121]; however, in contrast to Russophone reactions, such calls were rarely appropriated to the current political situation. Instead, a number of Russophone and Ukrainophone comments were recreating the rhetorics of interwar Ukrainian nationalists by blaming Communists (‘*Komunisty vyrodky prokljati. sovky j kacapy prokljati*’ [Communists, damned bastards. Cursed Soviets and Muscovites][122]and Judeo-Bolshevicks (‘*SMERT’‘ Krasnym Rassejskim Zhido-bol’shevickim gadam!*’ [DEATH to the Red Russian Judeo-Bolshevick vermin])[123] for the suffering of Ukrainian people.

The last category of comments comprised those expressing sympathy for the victims. Such reactions varied from expressions of sorrow ('*strashno, kogda ljudi tak bezzhalostny i zhestoki* … ' [It is horrible, when people are so ruthless and cruel …])[124] to calls to share the pain of the pogrom victims ('*Jeto i nasha BOL'!!!*' [It is also our PAIN!!!]);[125] it is worth noting, however, that such types of reactions were not numerous. They thus remained barely noticeable against the backdrop of aggressive statements, many of a nationalistic ('*nacija chekatil man'jakov,jeto tvoja slava!* ' [The nation of maniacs-Chikatilos, this is your glory!])[126] and/or homophobic nature ('*pidorasty krasnopogonnye nenavizhu bljadi prihvostni ebanogo lysogo pidora i churki usatogo*' [Faggots with red epaulets, I hate you, you are the whores of the fucked bald fag [Lenin] and the mustached bastard [Stalin]]).[127]

The examination of user interactions with audiovisual tributes to the Lviv pogrom points to a clear distinction between nonverbal and verbal interactions with different formats of the pogrom videos. Nonverbal interactions varied significantly between formats: requiems and documentaries tended to provoke more intense reactions by attracting more views, likes, and dislikes from users. In contrast, records and, especially, shows stimulated less nonverbal reactions; such a difference can be attributed to different factors, including the ability of former two formats to offer more authentic (e.g. by using historical footage supplemented with acoustic elements) and cohesive (e.g. by offering a structured narrative of the event) experience content-wise.

Unlike nonverbal forms of user interaction, YouTube comments exhibited little variability between formats. The majority of comments were negative reactions, including a number of outright racist comments. While it is recognized that online discussion spaces often serve as breeding grounds for feelings 'that are at odds with mutual respect, mutual understanding, and democratic problem solving,'[128] it is still disturbing to observe such an aggressive reaction to the tributes to the war atrocities. Even more disturbing is that the analysis indicates that non-moderated spaces for commentaries on YouTube frequently serve as a breeding ground for the Holocaust denial and hate speech.

Conclusions

The article examined how audiovisual tributes of the Lviv pogrom of 1941 are produced and interacted with on YouTube by Ukrainophone and Russophone web users. Its observations indicate that YouTube does offer a space for media visualizations which can challenge hegemonic historical narratives, which in the case of post-socialist countries often tend to marginalize Holocaust memory. In this sense, digital media, including YouTube, can facilitate the establishment of 'democratized'[129] memory practices by promoting alternative readings of the region's contentious past. However, the article's analysis also implies that this process does not necessarily lead to the formation of more inclusive or 'cosmopolitan'[130] narratives; instead, it can also lead to the propagation of extreme – or even extremist – views on the past.

An illustrative example of this complexity is the striking difference between the representation of the pogrom on YouTube and the reception of these representations by the platform's users. The examination of the pogrom videos reveals a variety of audiovisual formats employed for the representation of the Holocaust online. Some of these formats (e.g. documentaries and shows) are well studied in the context of Holocaust mediatization

in analogue media, whereas others (e.g. requiems) are specific for online media and employ digital technology to produce tributes which can challenge established practices of Holocaust representation. A variety of formats used for representing the Lviv pogrom prompts for further investigation of YouTube's potential 'to enrich the remembrance experience'[131] in the context of the Holocaust.

By contrast, the reactions to the pogrom videos were predominantly formulated in highly nationalistic and, at times, racist terms. While it is hardly surprising, considering YouTube's reputation as a platform with aggressive comment culture, the prevalence of reactions which denied the Holocaust or called for violent retributions against real or imagined perpetrators is disturbing. It is hard to say how many of spiteful comments are produced by YouTube trolls and how many by genuine Ukraino-, Russo-, or Judophobes, but the predominance of hate speech diminishes the platform's potential as an 'interactive commemorative space.'[132] Not only can it undermine the role of YouTube as a platform for actualizing marginalized memories but also it can result in actual nurturing of pain through the reiteration of racist language of hate.

This duality of representation and interaction with tributes to the Lviv pogrom on YouTube poses a profound challenge for mediatization of the Holocaust online. The overwhelming popularity of digital media together with their functionality that allows users to create, disseminate, and interact with digital tributes to the past turns online platforms such as YouTube into promising outlets of remembrance. The possibilities provided by these platforms are particularly valuable for post-socialist countries, where opportunities for political and cultural self-expression for ordinary citizens are often limited. However, the democratization of public remembrance also creates new possibilities for propagating chauvinistic views on the past. The resulting dilemma – how to facilitate the freedom of expression without facilitating hate speech – is not a new one and not the one that is easily solved; however, it is important to recognize its relevance for contemporary Holocaust remembrance and problematize complex interactions between Holocaust memory and digital media.

Notes

1. Sontag, *Regarding the Pain*, 83.
2. Keller, *The Ultimate Spectacle*, 251.
3. Bathrick, "Introduction," 1.
4. Winter, "The Generation of Memory."
5. Hirsch, *Afterimage*, 4.
6. See, for instance, Hirsch, *Afterimage*; Baron, *Projecting the Holocaust*; Bathrick, Prager, and Richardson, *Visualizing the Holocaust*; Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*; Shenker, *Reframing Holocaust Testimony*; Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies.*
7. Huyssen, *Present Pasts*, 13.
8. Garde-Hansen, Hoskins, and Reading "Introduction."
9. Hoskins, "The Mediatisation of Memory."
10. Also known as the post-network era, which is characterized by 'the break from a dominant network-era experience in which viewers lacked much control over when and where to view' (Lotz, *The Television Will Be*, 15). A number of different factors influenced the transition from the broadcast to the post-broadcast state, including increased possibilities for amateur productions of audiovisual materials, new advertisement strategies, and changes in existing patterns of consumption and distribution of content.

11. Hoskins, "Media, Memory, Metaphor."
12. Drakopoulou, "We Can Remember It for You."
13. Rohdewald, "Post-Soviet Remembrance."
14. Hilderbrand, "Youtube," 54.
15. According to Alexa data from 2016, YouTube is the second most popular website in Ukraine (Alexa, "Top sites in Ukraine") and the third most popular website in Russia (Alexa, "Top Sites in Russia").
16. Mick, "Incompatible Experiences," 347.
17. Rossoliński-Liebe, "Der Verlauf," 221.
18. Struve, *Deutsche Herrschaft, ukrainischer Nationalismus*, 252.
19. For more information on the NKVD mass killings in the Lviv prisons see Musial, *Konterrevolutionäre Elemente*, and Struve, *Deutsche Herrschaft, ukrainischer Nationalismus*.
20. Rossoliński-Liebe, "The 'Ukrainian National Revolution'," 101.
21. Struve, *Deutsche Herrschaft, ukrainischer Nationalismus*, 304.
22. Ibid., 306.
23. Himka, "The Lviv Pogrom," 212.
24. Ibid., 214–215.
25. Ibid., 235–236.
26. Struve, *Deutsche Herrschaft, ukrainischer Nationalismus*, 354–366.
27. Ibid., 307–137.
28. Ibid., 323.
29. Mick, "Ethnische Gewalt und Pogrome."
30. Struve, *Deutsche Herrschaft, ukrainischer Nationalismus*, 377.
31. Struve, *Deutsche Herrschaft, ukrainischer Nationalismus*, 402.
32. Ibid., 424.
33. Mick, "Incompatible Experiences," 353.
34. Rohdewald, "Post-Soviet Remembrance," 176
35. For more information about Soviet cinema and Second World War memory, see Youngblood, *Russian War Films*; Youngblood, "When Will"; Talaver, *Pamjat' o Velikoj Otechestvennoj*. On Soviet cinema and the Holocaust, see Gershenson, *The Phantom Holocaust*; Hicks, *First Films*; Timoshkina, *Representations of the Holocaust*.
36. Hicks, *First Films*, 12.
37. Amar, "Different but the Same," 378.
38. Gershenson, *The Phantom Holocaust*, 4.
39. For more information see Altman, "Memorializacija Holokosta v Rossii," and Timoshkina, *Representations of the Holocaust*.
40. Rohdewald, "Post-Soviet Remembrance."
41. Gudkov, ""Pamiat" o Voine."
42. Jilge, "Zmahannia zhertv."
43. Rudling, *The OUN, the UPA*.
44. Kurilla, "Memory Wars in the Post-Soviet Space."
45. See, for instance, Gaufman "Memory, Media, and Securitization," and Makhortykh "#NoKievNazi."
46. See, for instance, the recent discussion on the Babi Yar Memorial Center in Kyiv in Kostiuk, "Babyn Iar - Tragediia Usiiei Ukrainy" and Siruk, "Babyn Iar i Pytannia Natsional'noi Bezpeky."
47. Bernstein "Remembering War, Remaining Soviet."
48. See Hirsch, *Afterimage*; Baron, *Projecting the Holocaust*; Gershenson, *The Phantom Holocaust*.
49. See Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies*; Simon, "The Contribution of Holocaust."; Shenker, *Reframing Holocaust Testimony*.
50. See Bathrick, Prager, and Richardson, *Visualizing the Holocaust*; Kerner, *Film and the Holocaust*; Prager, *After the Fact*.
51. de Bruyn, "World War 2.0."

52. Gray, *Contemporary Debates*.
53. Pfanzelter, "At the Crossroads."
54. Reading, "Digital Interactivity."
55. Jones and Gibson, "Remediation and Remembrance."
56. de Bruyn, "World War 2.0," 59.
57. See Rock, "Russian Revisionism."; Darnell, *Measuring Holocaust denial*.
58. Pfanzelter, "At the Crossroads," 265.
59. Uffelmann, "The Issue of Genre," 17.
60. See, for instance, Bloom and Jonhston, "Digging into YouTube videos."; Chau, "YouTube as a participatory culture."
61. The concept of participatory culture was introduced by Henry Jenkins, who defined it as a culture which stimulates artistic expression and civic engagement by endorsing 'creating and sharing creations' (Jenkins et al., *Confronting the challenges*, 5).
62. Burgess and Green, *YouTube*.
63. Knudsen and Stage, "Online War Memorials," 432.
64. Ibid.
65. Jones and Gibson, "Remediation and Remembrance."
66. Original videos are available on Jane Korman's website (http://www.janekormanart.com/janekormanart.com/16.Dancing_Auschwitz/16.Dancing_Auschwitz.html).
67. Jones and Gibson, "Remediation and Remembrance," 127.
68. Levy and Sznaider, "Memory Unbound," 91.
69. Danilova, "The Politics of Mourning."
70. Benzaquen, "Looking at."
71. Ibid., 805.
72. Drinot, "Website of Memory," 381.
73. Rutten and Zvereva, "Introduction: Old Conflicts," 2.
74. It is worth noting that the dataset incorporated all the clips returned by two queries mentioned above, which were related to the events of June 30–July 1. Consequently, it included not only videos that explicitly explored the Lviv pogrom but also videos that mentioned it only occasionally (for instance, the ones focused on the NKVD murders in Lviv prisons that preceded the pogrom).
75. One particularly interesting content group was related to the so-called 'Lviv pogroms' of 2014, a series of attacks on administrative buildings in Lviv on February 18–19, during anti-government protests. While this finding rests outside the scope of this study, it does demonstrate how the memory of the Second World War is appropriated in Ukraine and Russia – and it could thus very well serve as the subject of a separate study on the use of historical references during the Ukraine crisis.
76. Knudsen and Stage, "Online War Memorials"; Benzaquen, "Looking at"; Harju, "Socially Shared Mourning."
77. Drinot, "Website of Memory"; Jones and Gibson, "Remediation and Remembrance"; Knudsen and Stage, "Online War Memorials."
78. See, for instance, the discussion of the most popular audiovisual YouTube genres in Burgess and Green, *YouTube*.
79. Reynolds, "Horrific Images."
80. The video was included in the sample because it was returned by one of the queries specified in the methodology section; furthermore, despite its focus on Ukrainian suffering, this requiem also referenced the pogrom.
81. ninamity, "Memorialjnyj muzej."
82. Antimoskovla, "Lviv 1941 tjurma "Bryghidky"."
83. Jilge, "Zmahannia zhertv."
84. Hirsch, *Afterimage*, 18.
85. hesedweb1, "Yanina Hesheles–Return."
86. Levy, *The Black Hole*.
87. Jones and Gibson, "Remediation and Remembrance."

88. Burgess and Green, *YouTube*, 52.
89. Deutsche Wochenschau [German Weekly Review] was a newsreel series released by Nazi authorities as part of the war propaganda campaign between 1940 and 1945.
90. kolodno, “Lwow Lemberg 1941.”
91. andreistp, “L’vov v ijule 1941.”
92. Russkij Blok, “Posle evrejskih i pol’skih.”
93. Kaspe, *Kogda govorjat veshhi*.
94. Aitken, *The Concise Routledge Encyclopedia*, 2.
95. Burgess and Green, *YouTube*, 41–42.
96. Hartley, *Television Truths*, 26.
97. Istorija Rossii, “Holokost evreev v Ukraine.”
98. strubcinaorg, “Period okupacii.”
99. Reynolds, “N/S part 06.”
100. taes28n2, “L’VIV 1941r palachi NKVD.”
101. Terytoriia Teroru, “Suspiljno-polytychna sytuacija.”
102. taes28n2, “Nachtigall ta Shukhevych.”
103. Zvereva, “Istorija na TV.”
104. Yar Babyn, ‘Korchynsjkyj pro Babyn Jar.’
105. Jones and Gibson, “Remediation and Remembrance,” 122.
106. Gerlitz and Helmond, “The Like Economy,” 1361.
107. See, for instance, Drinot, “Website of Memory”; Jones and Gibson, “Remediation and Remembrance”; Knudsen and Stage, “Online War Memorials.”
108. Gerlitz and Helmond, “The Like Economy.”
109. For discussion of YouTube’s recommender algorithms, see Davidson et al, “The YouTube video recommendation system.”
110. For more information on interactions between digital media and affective states, see Karatzogianni and Kuntsman, *Digital Cultures*, and Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*.
111. Thompson and Biddle, “Introduction,” 5.
112. Drinot, “Website of Memory”; Benzaquen, “Looking at.”
113. Andrij2012, “Re: Dva tango.”
114. Russkij, “Re: Dva tango.”
115. Note: the ending parentheses designate smiles in Russophone social media language.
116. Schmeisser1488, “Re: Dva tango.”
117. mfnkmrs, “Re: N/S part 06.”
118. Atamanchuk, “Re: Lvovskij Pogrom.”
119. Cymbalov, “Re: Lemberg 1941.”
120. Alekleksandr Russkij morjak. “Re: Lvovskij Pogrom.”
121. zoreslav3, “Re: Lemberg 1941.”
122. Vacik, A. “Re: Lemberg 1941.”
123. Hauptmann. “Re: L’vov v ijule.”
124. elishaevn, “Re: Dva tango.”
125. Wazari100, “Re: Dva tango.”
126. Chernyh, “Re: Lvovskij Pogrom.”
127. theak1227, “Re: NKVD LVOV.”
128. Oegema et al., “Flaming and Blaming,” 55.
129. Knudsen and Stage, “Online War Memorials,” 432.
130. Levy and Sznaider, “Memory Unbound,” 91.
131. Jones and Gibson, “Remediation and Remembrance,” 127.
132. Knudsen and Stage, “Online War Memorials,” 420.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Mykola Makhortykh is a researcher at the Department of Slavonic Languages and Cultures at the University of Amsterdam. His research is focused on Second World War memory in Ukraine and how it is affected by the processes of de-Sovietization, nationalization, and digitization that the country is currently undergoing.

ORCID

Mykola Makhortykh http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7143-5317

Bibliography

Alekleksandr Russkij morjak. "Re: Lvovskij Pogrom 1941 Goda / Lvov Pogrom in 1941." YouTube Comment. Posted 2015. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CV0-qG9Jdug&lc=z13es5g5boqsujr2×22dwddjqpfpezq5r04.

Alexa. "Top Sites in Russia." Alexa.com. Accessed August 6, 2017. http://www.alexa.com/topsites/countries/RU.

Alexa. "Top Sites in Ukraine." Alexa.com. Accessed August 6, 2017. http://www.alexa.com/topsites/countries/UA.

Altman, I. "Memorializacija Holokosta v Rossii: istorija, sovremennost', perspektivy [Memorialization of the Holocaust in Russia: History, Compemporarity, Perspectives]." In *Pamiat' o Voine 60 let Spustia: Rossiia, Germaniia, Evropa* [*Memory about the Second World War 60 Years Later: Russia, Germany, Europe*], edited by M. Gabovich, 509–531. Moscow: NLO, 2005.

Amar T. C. "Different but the Same or the Same but Different? Public Memory of the Second World War in Post-Soviet Lviv." *Journal of Modern European History* 9, no 3 (2011): 373–396.

andreistp. "L'vov v ijule 1941 goda [Lviv in July 1941]." YouTube Video. Posted 2011, May 8. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=920COEScMw8.

Andrij2012. "Re: Dva tango [Two Tangos]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Z_yflP85cY&lc=z222f1boym3afjsqk04t1aokg0v3tn35plcru40lgz3yrk0h00410.

Antimoskovla. "Lviv 1941 tjurma 'Bryghidky' [Lviv 1941 the 'Brygidki' prison]." YouTube Video. Posted 2009, September 21. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z1kv2byKObY.

Asher, H. "The Soviet Union, the Holocaust, and Auschwitz." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 4, no 4 (2003): 886–912.

Atamanchuk, A. "Re: Lvovskij Pogrom 1941 Goda / Lvov Pogrom in 1941." YouTube Comment. Posted 2015. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CV0-qG9Jdug&lc=z13pt35ikqrnwh2ph04cizkhykbsidwarrw0k.

Baron, L. *Projecting the Holocaust into the Present: The Changing Focus of Contemporary Holocaust Cinema*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005.

Bathrick, D. "Introduction: Seeing Against the Grain: Re-visualizing the Holocaust." In *Visualizing the Holocaust: Documents, Aesthetics, Memory*, edited by D. Bathrick, B. Prager, and M. D. Richardson, 1–18. Rochester: Camden House, 2008.

Bathrick, D., B. Prager, and M.D. Richardson. *Visualizing the Holocaust: Documents, Aesthetics, Memory*. Rochester: Camden House, 2008.

Benzaquen, S. "Looking at the Tuol Sleng Museum of Genocidal Crimes, Cambodia, on Flickr and YouTube." *Media, Culture & Society* 36, no 6 (2014): 790–809. doi:10.1177/0163443714532983.

Bernstein, S. "Remembering War, Remaining Soviet: Digital Commemoration of World War II in Putin's Russia." *Memory Studies* 9, no 4 (2016): 422–436.

Bloom, K., and K. Jonhston. "Digging into YouTube Videos: Using Media Literacy and Participatory Culture to Promote Cross-Cultural Understanding." *Journal of Media Literacy Education* 2, no 2 (2010): 113–123.

Burgess, J., and J. Green. *YouTube: Online Video and Participatory Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009.
Chau, C. "YouTube as a Participatory Culture." *New Directions for Student Leadership* 128, (2010): 65–74.
Chernyh, V. "Re: Lvovskij Pogrom 1941 Goda / Lvov Pogrom in 1941." YouTube Comment. Posted 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CV0-qG9Jdug&lc=z13xhznxxvqexvigh04cen2wxtzifz0jkag.
Cymbalov, E. "Re: Lemberg 1941 [Lviv 1941]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9dDONW2EU3Y&lc=z13gjbvzrlqozfhbp04cg1ohypuxjjsoai0.
Danilova, N. "The Politics of Mourning: The Virtual Memorialisation of British Fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan." *Memory Studies* 8, no 3 (2015): 267–281. doi:10.1177/1750698014563874.
Darnell, S. *Measuring Holocaust Denial in the United States*. Retrieved from http://www.hks.harvard.edu/ocpa/pdf/HolocaustDenialPAE.pdf.
Davidson, J., B. Liebald, J. Liu, P. Nandy, T. Van Vleet, U. Gargi, S. Gupta, et al. "The YouTube Video Recommendation System." In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, 293–296. New York: ACM, 2010 September.
de Bruyn, D. "World War 2.0: Commemorating War and Holocaust in Poland Through Facebook." *Digital Icons: Studies in Russian, Eurasian and Central European New Media* 4 (2010): 45–62.
Drakopoulou, S. "'We Can Remember It for You': Location, Memory, and Commodification in Social Networking Sites." *SAGE Open* 7. doi:10.1177/2158244017712026.
Drinot, P. "Website of Memory: The War of the Pacific (1879–84) in the Global Age of YouTube." *Memory Studies* 4, no 4 (2011): 370–385. doi:10.1177/1750698011409290.
elishaevn. "Re: Dva tango [Two Tangos]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Z_yflP85cY&lc=z22zxparskn3spshp04t1aokgkqcmpz4vuruqi0hsgncbk0h00410.
Garde-Hansen, J., A. Hoskins, and A. Reading. "Introduction." In *Save As … Digital Memories*, edited by J. Garde-Hansen, A. Hoskins, and A. Reading, 1–27, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gaufman, E. "Memory, Media, and Securitization: Russian Media Framing of the Ukrainian Crisis." *Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society* 1, no 1 (2015): 141–175.
Gerlitz, C., and A. Helmond. "The Like Economy: Social Buttons and the Data-Intensive Web." *New Media & Society* 15, no 8 (2013): 1348–1365. doi:10.1177/1461444812472322.
Gershenson, O. *The Phantom Holocaust: Soviet Cinema and Jewish Catastrophe*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2013.
Gray, M. *Contemporary Debates in Holocaust Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
Gudkov, L. "'Pamiat' o Voine i Massovaia Identichnost' Rossiian ['Memory' About the War and Mass Identity of Russians]." In *Pamiat' o Voine 60 let Spustia: Rossiia, Germaniia, Evropa* [*Memory About the Second World War 60 Years Later: Russia, Germany, Europe*], edited by M. Gabovich, 83–104. Moscow: NLO, 2015.
Hartley, J. *Television Truths: Forms of Knowledge in Popular Culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
Hauptmann B. A. "Re: L'vov v ijule 1941 goda [Lviv in July 1941]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=920COEScMw8&lc=z13jgfgrrpnpejdai04cilqpsvylgxaod3k.
hesedweb1. "'Yanina Hesheles–return' 2011." YouTube video. Posted 2011, July 20. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8eS4b7QGyQI.
Hicks, G. *First Films of the Holocaust: Soviet Cinema and the Genocide of the Jews, 1938–1946*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012.
Hilderbrand, L. "Youtube: Where Cultural Memory and Copyright Converge." *Film Quarterly* 61, no 1 (2007): 48–57. doi:10.1525/fq.2007.61.1.48.
Himka, J. P. "The Lviv Pogrom of 1941: The Germans, Ukrainian Nationalists, and the Carnival Crowd." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 53, no 2–4 (2011): 209–243. doi:10.1080/00085006.2011.11092673.
Hirsch, J. *Afterimage: Film, Trauma and the Holocaust*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2004.

Hoskins, A. “Media, Memory, Metaphor: Remembering and the Connective Turn.” *Parallax* 17, no 4 (2011): 19–31.
Hoskins, A. “The Mediatisation of Memory.” In *Save As … Digital Memories*, edited by J. Garde-Hansen, A. Hoskins, and A. Reading, 27–44. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
Huyssen, A. *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.
Istorija Rossii. “Holokost evreev v Ukraine – Vtoraja mirovaja vojna v cvete [The Jewish Holocaust in Ukraine – The Second World War in Colour].” YouTube Video. Posted July 23, 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rwPs_lT85J4.
Jenkins, H., R. Purushotma, M. Weigel, K. Clinton, and A. Robinson. *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009.
Jilge, W. “Zmahannia zhertv [Competition Among Victims].” *Krytyka* 5 (2006): 14–17.
Jones, S., and P. Gibson. “Remediation and Remembrance: ‘Dancing Auschwitz’ Collective Memory and New Media.” *ESSACHESS – Journal for Communication Studies* 5, no 2 (2012): 107–131.
Karatzogianni, A., and A. Kuntsman. *Digital Cultures and the Politics of Emotion: Feelings, Affect and Technological Change*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
Kaspe, I. *Kogda govorjat veshhi: Dokument i dokumentnost’ v russkoj literature 2000-h* [*When Items Speak: A Document and Documentality in the Russian Literature of 2000s*]. Moscow: HSE, 2010.
Keller, U. *The Ultimate Spectacle: A Visual History of the Crimean War*. London: Routledge, 2001.
Kerner, A. *Film and the Holocaust: New Perspectives on Dramas, Documentaries, and Experimental Films*. New York: The Continuum, 2011.
Knudsen, B., and Stage C. “Online War Memorials: YouTube as a Democratic Space of Commemoration Exemplified Through Video Tributes to Fallen Danish Soldiers.” *Memory Studies* 6, no 4 (2013): 418–436. doi:10.1177/1750698012458309.
kolodno. “Lwow Lemberg 1941 [Lviv Lviv 1941].” YouTube video. Posted October 22, 2008. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C15VQ-gLqFs.
Kostiuk, B. “Babyn Iar – Tragediia Usiiei Ukrainy. Iak Oliudnyty Pam’iat’?” [Babi Yar – the All-Ukrainian Tragedy. How to Humanize Memory?]. News article. Published September 27, 2017. https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/28760942.html.
Kurilla, I. “Memory Wars in the Post-Soviet Space.” *PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo* 63 (2009): 1–6.
Langer, L. *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
Levy, P. *The Black Hole of Auschwitz*. Cambridge: Polity, 2005.
Levy, D., and N. Sznaider. “Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory.” *European Journal of Social Theory* 5, no 1 (2002): 87–106. doi:10.1177/136843102005001002.
Lotz, A. *The Television Will Be Revolutionized*. New York: New York University Press, 2007.
Makhortykh, M. “#NoKievNazi: Social Media, Historical Memory and Securitization in the Ukraine Crisis.” In *Memory and Securitization in Contemporary Europe*, edited by V. Strukov and V. Apryshchenko, 219–247. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
Massumi, B. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.
mfnkmrs. “Re: N/S Part 06: The 1941 Pogrom in Lviv, Ukraine and Modern Antisemitism.” YouTube Comment. Posted 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s-W5juYTW60&lc=z13xzng5jti4vzgdj23gu5brumfuutdwj04.1392954610602915.
Mick, C. “Ethnische Gewalt und Pogrome in Lemberg 1914–1941 [Ethnic Violence and Pogroms in Lviv 1914 and 1941].” *Osteuropa* 53, no 12 (2003): 1810–1829.
Mick, C. “Incompatible Experiences: Poles, Ukrainians and Jews in Lviv Under Soviet and Jewish Occupation, 1939 –1944.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 46, no 2 (2011): 336–363.
Musial, B. *“Konterrevolutionäre Elemente sind zu erschießen”: Die Brutalisierung des deutsch-sowjetischen Krieges im Sommer 1941* [*“Counterrevolutionary Elements Should Be Eliminated”: The Brutalization of the German-Soviet War in the Summer of 1941*]. Berlin: Propyläen, 2000.
ninamity. “Memorialjnyj muzej ‘Tjurma na Loncjkogho’ [Memorial Museum ‘The Lonsky Prison’].” YouTube video. Posted May 9, 2011. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OBZn-Ld_Lhw.

Oegema, D., J. Kleinnijenhuis, K. Anderson, and A. van Hoof. "Flaming and Blaming: The Influence of Mass Media Content on Interactions in Online Discussions." In *Mediated Interpersonal Communication*, edited by E. Konijn, S. Utz, M. Tanis, and S. Barnes, 331–359. London: Routledge, 2008.

Pfanzelter, E. "At the Crossroads with Public History: Mediating the Holocaust on the Internet." *Holocaust Studies* 21, no 4 (2015): 250–271. doi:10.1080/17504902.2015.1066066.

Prager, B. *After the Fact: The Holocaust in Twenty-First Century Documentary Film*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Reading, A. "Digital Interactivity in Public Memory Institutions: The Uses of New Technologies in Holocaust Museums." *Media, Culture & Society* 25 (2003): 67–85. doi:10.1177/016344370302500105.

Reynolds, D. "Horrific images of the 1941 Lviv pogrom in Ukraine." YouTube Video. Posted June 26, 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KS7CxfWLWIs.

Reynolds, D. "N/S Part 06: The 1941 pogrom in Lviv, Ukraine and Modern Antisemitism." YouTube Video. Posted June 25, 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s-W5juYTW60.

Rock, S. "Russian Revisionism: Holocaust Denial and the New Nationalist Historiography." *Patterns of Prejudice* 35, no 4 (2001): 64–76. doi:10.1080/003132201128811296.

Rohdewald, S. "Post-Soviet Remembrance of the Holocaust and National Memories of the Second World War in Russia, Ukraine and Lithuania." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 44, no 2 (2008): 173–184.

Rossoliński-Liebe, G. "The 'Ukrainian National Revolution' of Summer 1941." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12, no 1 (2011): 83–114.

Rossoliński-Liebe, G. "Der Verlauf und die Tater des Lemberger Pogroms vom Sommer 1941. Zum aktuellen Stand der Forschung [The Course and the Victims of the L'viv Pogroms in Summer 1941. The Current State of Research]." *Jahrbuch fur Antisemitismusforschung* 22 (2013): 207–243.

Rudling, P. *The OUN, the UPA and the Holocaust: A Study in the Manufacturing of Historical Myths*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg, 2011.

Russkij, R. "Re: Dva tango [Two Tangos]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Z_yflP85cY&lc=z233fbqirkn2s1eucacdp433ka4ka3rlbjhiatxclhxw03c010c.

Russkij Blok. "Posle evrejskih i pol'skih pogromov vo L'vove 1941g. [After the Jewish and Polish Pogroms in Lviv in 1941]." YouTube Video. Posted January 26, 2015. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ejrEJjBIW8Q.

Rutten, E. and V. Zvereva. "Introduction: Old Conflicts, New Media: Post-Socialist Digital Memories." In *Memory, Conflict and New Media: Web Wars in Post-Socialist States*, edited by E. Rutten, J. Fedor, and V. Zvereva, 1–19. London: Routledge, 2013.

Schmeisser1488. "Re: Dva tango [Two Tangos]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Z_yflP85cY&lc=z23aghi41kv4ztgjw04t1aokggrjq3qdbsco3k2yqt3ibk0h00410.

Shenker, N. *Reframing Holocaust Testimony*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015.

Simon, R. "The Contribution of Holocaust Audio-Visual Testimony to Remembrance, Learning and Hope." *Cahier International sur le Témoignage Audiovisuel* 1 (1998): 141–152.

Siruk, M. "Babyn Iar i Pytannia Natsional'noi Bezpeky' [Babi Yar and the Matters of National Security]." News article. Published 22 August, 2017. https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/article/cuspilstvo/babyy-yar-y-vopros-nacyonalnoy-bezopasnosty.

Sontag, S. *Regarding the Pain of Others*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003.

strubcinaorg. "Period okupacii fashistami L'vova 1941–1944 [Period of Fascist Occupation of Lvov 1941–1944]." YouTube Video. Posted October 21, 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=naRbAiy-Hp0.

Struve, K. *Deutsche Herrschaft, ukrainischer Nationalismus, antijüdische Gewalt. Der Sommer 1941 in der Westukraine* [*German Rule, Ukrainian Nationalism, Anti-Jewish Violence: Summer 1941 in Western Ukraine*]. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.

taes28n2. "L'VIV 1941r palachi NKVD Lwow Lemberg NKVD Murder Western Ukraine [Lviv 1941 Murderers of NKVD Lwow Lemberg NKVD Murder Western Ukraine]." YouTube Video. Posted November 27, 2013]. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E8gcRulteik.

taes28n2. "Nachtigall ta Shukhevych ne robyly poghromiv 1941 roci -Nachtigall и Shuhevich ne delali pogromov 1941g [Nachtigall and Shukhevich Were not Involved in Pogroms of 1941]." YouTube Video. Posted February 15, 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0hh3UzqNZXM.

Talaver, A. *Pamjat' o Velikoj Otechestvennoj vojne v postsovetskom kinematografe. Jetapy osmyslenija proshlogo (ot 1990-h k 2000-m)* [Memory about the Great Patriotic War in the Post-Soviet Cinema. Stages of Re-Thinking of the Past (from 1990s to 2000s)]. Moscow: HSE, 2013.

Terytoriia Teroru. "Suspiljno-politychna sytuacija u Lvovi, chervenj 1941 r [Social-Political Situation in Lviv, June 1941]." YouTube Video. Posted January 20, 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GVXuuOm7VWM.

theak1227. "Re: NKVD LVOV 1941 Crime in the Territory of Western Ukraine." YouTube Comment. Posted 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UNfm_ffI9ts&lc=z12rfflxvmzczdekb23uthwyhlyhsf1et.

Thompson, M., and I. Biddle. "Introduction: Somewhere Between the Signifying and the Sublime." In *Sound, Music, Affect: Theorizing Sonic Experience*, edited by M. Thompson and I. Biddle, 1–25. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013.

Uffelmann, D. "The Issue of Genre in Digital Memory: What Literary Studies can Offer to Internet and Memory Culture Research." *Digital Icons: Studies in Russian, Eurasian and Central European New Media* 12 (2014): 1–24.

Vacik, A. "Re: Lemberg 1941 [Lviv 1941]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9dDONW2EU3Y&lc=z22kfd1aypqti1xvuacdp43aaomh0ucasdnbim1jxlpw03c010c.

Wazari100. "Re: Dva tango [Two Tangos]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Z_yflP85cY&lc=z23zhv1i2mimcrelracdp43bqv5ilxlxfkhjkkuijxhw03c010c.

Wiesel, E. "Art and the Holocaust: Trivializing memory." The New York Times. Accessed August 6, 2017. http://www.nytimes.com/1989/06/11/movies/art-and-the-holocaust-trivializing-memory.html.

Winter, J. "The Generation of Memory: Reflections on the 'Memory Boom' in Contemporary Historical Studies." *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 27, no. 3 (2000): 69–92.

Youngblood, D. *Russian War Films: On the Cinema Front, 1914–2005*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2007.

Youngblood, D. "'When Will the Real Day Come?' War Films and Soviet Postwar Culture." In *Histories of the Aftermath: The Legacies of the Second World War in Europe*, edited by F. Biess and R. Moeller, 123–139. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.

zoreslav3. "Re: Lemberg 1941 [Lviv 1941]." YouTube Comment. Posted 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9dDONW2EU3Y&lc=z224yhmroymmvnviu04t1aokgdpwuz3nzwzt33rh5ronrk0h00410.

Zvereva, V. "Istorija na TV: Konstruirovanie proshlogo [History on TV: Constructing the Past]." *Otechestvennye zapiski* 5 (2004). http://magazines.russ.ru/oz/2004/5/2004_5_14.html.