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Abstract

This master’s thesis investigates the memory of the Holocaust in the Swedish Jewish community by focusing on how Nazi trials and demands for justice shaped perceptions of the past. More specifically, I look at how the Nuremberg trials that took place in the end of 1945-1949, and the Eichmann trial that took place in 1961, impacted the social memory of the Jewish community in Sweden. My main materials are the journals *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk Tidskrift*. The purpose is on the one hand to investigate how the memory of the Holocaust was shaped during these trials and on the other hand to see what kind of justice the Jews in Sweden requested in relation to the traumatic past during the time of these trials. The results demonstrate that the Nuremberg trials did not initiate discussions concerning the Holocaust or justice. During the latter part of the 1940s the creation of Israel is seen as more important in terms of justice than the punishing of perpetrators in trials. The Eichmann trial is in contrast portrayed as the first judicial opportunity for the Jewish people to demand reparations for the injustices committed against them by the Nazi regime. However, rather than being an opportunity for reconciliation through forgiveness and through punishing the perpetrator with a verdict, the trial is mainly seen as an opportunity for which the story of the Jewish trauma can be told to the world. Even though the Nuremberg trials were not ascribed importance in terms of achieving justice after the Holocaust, the journals still published articles on the Holocaust during both of the time-periods, which strengthens the hypothesis that Jewish communities have vigorously discussed and analyzed the Holocaust even during its immediate aftermath.
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Introduction

Once a primarily Jewish trauma, the Holocaust is now a universal symbol that plays a significant role in contemporary politics and to questions concerning justice and human rights. However, each European country has its own relation to this genocide. Sweden has often been referred to as a “bystander state”. The American researcher Victoria Barnett writes that the “role of ‘bystanders’, then, encompasses a continuum of involvement between active and passive involvement, and it includes individual as well as institutional actors whose motives are often obscured”. Sweden both performed actions that have been deemed praiseworthy and dishonorable during the Holocaust. In all, Sweden’s role during these dark years was complex. Although the question has been debated, the memory of the Holocaust did in general not play an important role in Swedish politics and culture during the first post-war decades and it was not until the 1990s that a significant discussion began concerning questions of guilt in regards to the Jewish trauma. Positive aspects of the past were given more importance and in Sweden the positive aspects of neutrality during the war became a part of a post-war national identity.

However, in 1945 at the end of the war, Sweden accepted 185,000 refugees among whom 10 percent were Jews with direct experiences of the Holocaust. For these Jews, the memory of the Holocaust was extremely present, and this also affected the Jewish community in large. What is more, the national movement of Zionism was thriving both among Jews in Sweden and internationally and in 1948 the state of Israel was founded. In general, the period after the Holocaust thus became a time of reflection for the Jews on their Jewish identity with regard to the recent past, and this spurred debates that were often concerned with questions about justice in the shadow of both different kinds of legal processes and a desire for retribution. This master’s thesis is about how the Swedish-Jewish social memory of the Holocaust was shaped in relation to justice during the Nuremberg trials that took place from

---

1945 to 1949 and the Eichmann trial that took place in 1961. It will investigate how a discussion on the Holocaust developed among Jews in Sweden, at the time when Sweden’s glorification of its politics of neutrality became an important narrative, which compare to contemporary discussions on Nazism and the Second World left little room for the particular experience of the Jews in historiography and public debate.\(^6\)

The impacts these two trials have had on the Jewish memory of the Holocaust have been heavily debated in the scholarly community and these trials therefore typify two alleged critical junctures of this memory.\(^7\) The Nuremberg trials were the first international courts that tried individuals responsible for crimes against humanity and in this case in relation to the Nazi persecutions of Jews and other groups, although they have been criticized for downplaying the Jewish trauma. The Eichmann trial, that took place in Israel, focused on the particular Jewish experiences and in contrast to the Nuremberg trials, involved many Jewish witness accounts. Both trials were largely covered in the media and had a significant impact in the Western World.\(^8\) How the Jews in Sweden saw and debated ideas of justice and how it influenced their memory of the Holocaust\(^9\) is therefore relevant to investigate, as these Jews were apart of the ethnic minority group that had been targeted for annihilation and now had to debate on how victims, perpetrators and bystanders should be handled for justice to prevail.

### Purpose and research questions

This master’s thesis will examine how the Swedish-Jewish social memory of the Holocaust was shaped in relation to justice during the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial in the Swedish-Jewish journals *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk Tidskrift*. The purpose is on the one hand to investigate how the memory of the Holocaust was shaped in general around the time of these trials and on the other hand to see what kind of justice the Jews in Sweden requested in

---


9 The term "Holocaust" was not yet widely used during this time-period, however, I will use this term in the discussions. In the journals the authors often refer to Swedish terms such as “Kastastrof”, “Utrotningskampen av judar” eller “Judeutrotningen”, which in English would translate to “Catastrophe” and “The extermination of Jews".
relation to the traumatic past during the same time. The thesis is consequently attempting to
generate a prevalent understanding on how Jews in Sweden discussed and dealt with the
Holocaust around the time of these important trials. This social memory of the Holocaust will
be analyzed in regards to the categories of victims, perpetrators and bystanders and the
demands of justice in regards to different types of justice. The aim is to understand how the
social memory of this event influenced discussions of justice and thus enlighten the
relationship between Holocaust memory and demands of justice. This will ultimately be
useful for other studies that investigate social memory in relation to trials or justice in general,
and this thesis proposes the combination of two theoretical perspectives for this purpose that
will be explained below. The purpose can break down into the following questions:

- In what way was the Holocaust represented in *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk Tidskrift*
  around the time of the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial?

- To what extent was the Holocaust memory related to the trials?

- In what way did the memory of the Holocaust influence various demands of justice
  among Jews in Sweden?

**Disposition**

This master’s thesis will be divided into the following parts: “Theory, methods and previous
research”, “Empirical analysis”, and “Conclusion”. In the first part of the “Theory and
methods-section” I will present a research overview that deals with Holocaust remembrance
as a research field. Subsequently, I will describe my choice of two theories: social memory
theory and a theoretical framework of types of justices that are commonly applied in
transitional justice processes. Following this, I present this master’s thesis main materials and
methodological choice of framing analysis. The first part of the “Empirical analysis-section”
will consist of historical backgrounds of the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial, which
will be followed by an analysis of the main materials. In the analysis, I will first present my
findings related to the Nuremberg trials, and then present my findings related to the Eichmann
trial. I will end this section with a discussion of all the findings. The last part of the master’s
thesis will consist of a final conclusion.
Theory and method section

Previous Research Overview

Holocaust remembrance as a research field

This previous research overview deals with the early memory of the Holocaust as the focus of the master’s thesis is on the Swedish-Jewish social memory during the latter part of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1960s. Holocaust remembrance has steadily developed as a research field since the beginning of the 1990s. A first wave of research, including scholars such as British Tony Kushner, French Annette Wieviorka, American David S. Wayman, American Charles H. Rozenwig, American Peter Novic and Swedish Klas-Göran Karlsson, held that the Jewish trauma during the Holocaust did not start to receive proper attention in different national contexts until the Eichmann trial in 1961, with the ensuing Arab-Israeli War in 1967. These scholars have argued from different perspectives that the Eichmann trial contributed to temporarily breaking the silence on the topic of the Holocaust, which was followed by more intense discussions in the 1970s and 1980s in the Western World. Israeli scholar Avi Becker explains, for example, that the Holocaust started to become discussed more widely first due to the Eichmann trial in 1961, and then due to the publications by writers such as the Holocaust survivors Elie Wiesel and Primo Levi. This, in turn, led to that the Holocaust started to be featured more in mass media where TV-shows such as the mini-series The Holocaust (featured in 1978) had a large impact on the wider public.

In a similar vein, scholars such as German Otto Kirchheimer, Israeli Hanna Yablonka and British Donald Bloxham argue that the Holocaust was marginalized, and not at center-stage in trials prosecuting Nazi offenders such as the Nuremberg trials, and that instead, these trials were used as celebratory events in which focus was on the Allies victory over the Nazi Regime. For this reason, they state that the early Nazi trials in general did not contribute to

the development of the memory of the six million murdered Jews. In contrast, these scholars argue, that the Eichmann trial was the first time that a judicial process focused on the genocide against the Jews and heard Jewish witnesses to the catastrophe and that for this reason, the trial and the controversies it caused had a profound effect on the shaping of the social memory of what has become known as “the Holocaust”. 13

In the past decade, the alleged silence in the postwar years has been questioned by a large amount of scholars, including for example American scholar Hasia R. Diner, Israeli scholar David Bankier and Israeli-Dutch scholar Dan Michman.14 These scholars claim that, in fact, a multitude of remembrance institutions have existed, as early as in the immediate postwar years and that Jewish communities have dealt with the Holocaust even in its immediate aftermath, which previously had been ignored or underestimated in research on post-war memory of the Holocaust. Moreover, the scholars of this second wave of investigations point to that there have also existed Jewish congregations and documentation initiatives that have dealt with testimonies of survivors as early as in the immediate aftermath of the Holocaust; examples include the Wiener Library in London and the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw.15

Although Holocaust memory in Sweden has not yet been thoroughly investigated, similar positions are also apparent in the Scandinavian context. In general, it has been commonly held in Sweden that there was silence or little discussion on the Holocaust from 1945 until the late 1980s and the early 1990s.16 During this time-period, the Scandinavian countries predominantly viewed themselves as rescue-nations.17 The Finish scholar Antero Holmila and the Swedish scholar Karin Kvist Geverts state that interest in the Holocaust has become “increasingly noticeable in the Scandinavian countries in the last decades, with a growing number not only of dissertations, monographs and other publications, but also in

---

13 Kirchheimer, Political justice: the use of legal procedure for political ends, 332; Yablonka, "The Eichmann trial: was it the Jewish Nuremberg?,” 301; Bloxham, Genocide on Trial: war crimes trials and the formation of Holocaust history and memory, 221-228.


public debates and controversies relating to the Holocaust”. They explain that this newfound interest in the Holocaust “broadly reflects the dynamics and the contested nature of collective memories of wartime Scandinavia”.

Holmila, however, has also re-examined the early Holocaust memory in Sweden by analyzing how the Swedish, British and Finnish press reported the Holocaust from 1945-1950. He argues that it is too simplistic to claim that the Holocaust was deliberately marginalized during these years. Holmila looks at how the Swedish press reported on the Nuremberg trials, and explains that “towards autumn 1945 news from and about Germany was becoming more prominent again, as a result of the approaching trial of the major Nazi war criminals”. The extermination of the Jews was focused on in relation to the covering of the trials, and besides covering the trials and the Holocaust, the Swedish press also focused on discussing Jewish displaced persons, Palestine and the Cold War. Holmila also points out that more research needs to be devoted to examining the Holocaust narratives of countries like Sweden as the Anglo-American frame of the Holocaust has so-far dominated. He writes that ”grappling with the Holocaust’s legacy only within the Anglo-American frame runs a risk of succumbing to a teleological view of history in general and the wartime in particular, where the victorious Western Allies’ narratives define the parameters for perceiving the Holocaust’s meaning in Western culture”.

While Holmila covered the mainstream society by looking at the press, there have also been a few studies devoted to Jews in post-war Sweden and the Holocaust. The Swedish historian Malin Thor Tureby and Swedish Karin Sjögren, in the field of religious studies, have both conducted relevant research on how the Swedish-Jewish community has been affected by Holocaust victims coming to Sweden. Thor Tureby has looked at Judisk Krönika and Judisk Tidskrift and focused on the immediate aftermath of the Holocaust. She has examined the role of the Holocaust survivors in Swedish-Jewish press and found that survivors that had arrived in Sweden after the war were present in the Swedish public discourse. Moreover, her results indicate that the Holocaust narratives at this time were somewhat ambiguous as they

were both characterized by a desire to aid the Jewish refugees, but at the same time they displayed a desire to create distance between the Swedish Jewish community and the refugees by framing the Jewish refugees as temporary guests that did not intend to stay in Sweden but instead were going to resettle in Palestine. The journals also contrasted Swedish Jews from Eastern European survivors in terms of manners and conduct. Sjögren has examined *Judisk Krönika* and focused on how Swedish Jews discussed Zionism during the years 1948-1958. She found that the articles in *Judisk Krönika* mainly focused on the creation of a strong state up until 1948 and that after this period the journals instead emphasized the importance of the state of Israel and the cause of Zionism, which sometimes entangled with the memory of the Holocaust. Both studies indicate from different perspectives that there was an ongoing discussion on the Holocaust among Jews in Sweden during the early post-war period.

**The research lacuna and area**

I have presented an overview of relevant research regarding Holocaust remembrance as a research field and it is clear that there exists a research lacuna regarding how the memory of the Swedish-Jewish community has been affected by trials such as the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial. Even though there exists some previous research done on how the Swedish-Jewish community has dealt with the Holocaust, there arguably lacks extensive research in this area. This master’s thesis will first of all further deepen the discussion about the significance of the Holocaust during these early years and thus be a part of the international re-examination of early memory of this genocide, as explained above. The Jewish community in Sweden has not been sufficiently explored in this regard and not at all from the perspective of justice. The thesis also has a theoretical significance, since it will look at the relationship between justice and memory; both how the processes of justice shaped Holocaust memory and also how this memory contributed to various demands of justice among Jews in Sweden. Thirdly, the master’s thesis will also contribute to Swedish-Jewish history. The materials I am focusing on, *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk Tidskrift*, have not been sufficiently explored in this regard.

---


26 Religious scholar Karin Sjögren has looked at *Judisk Krönika* in her thesis, but her focus was mainly on how the Jews viewed themselves in relation to Israel and Zionism, see: Sjögren, *Judar i Det Svenska Folkhemmet: Minne och Identitet i Judisk Krönika 1948-1958*. Malin Thor Thureby has examined *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk*
Theory I – Social Memory

Previous research about the aftermath of the Holocaust has often been based on theories of collective memory, history culture or history consciousness to investigate representations of the past. These various concepts can have different meanings but often with similar focus depending on the nature of the study. This master’s thesis will use the term social memory of the Holocaust among Jews in Sweden in order to stress the fact that attitudes towards the past are created in a social context of communication and interaction between various groups and individuals. The term social memory thus emphasizes the social context where individuals and groups shape their identities and their conflicting attitudes towards the past. In this case the two Jewish journals chosen for the investigation (see below) can be defined as a Swedish-Jewish social arena where attitudes towards the past were expressed and discussed. However, the theoretical approach in this master’s thesis is also inspired by scholars within “memory studies” that in some cases uses other terms, such as collective memory, but nevertheless share a common interest in the social aspect of memory and the general understanding of the changing nature of representations of the past.

Collective memory theory was in fact first developed by the French scholar Maurice Halbwachs in his work La mémoire collective that was published in 1950, but has since then been revised and expanded on by many researchers. Halbwachs argues that collective memory is the shared pool of knowledge and information in the memories of two or more members of a social group. According to Halbwachs, individual memories do not exist, as all memories are apart of collective memory. When we remember we recollect imprecise impressions that we reshape into stable memories. Halbwachs writes that: “Often we deem ourselves the originators of thoughts and ideas, feelings and passions, actually inspired by some group. Our agreement with those around us is so complete that we vibrate in unison, ignorant of the real source of the vibrations.” He gives the example of that individuals often present ideas borrowed from books, magazines or from friends believing it is their own original deeply held convictions.

---

*Tidskrift* but focused on the immediate aftermath of the Holocaust, see: Thor Thureby, “Swedish Jews and the Jewish survivors – The first public narratives about the survivors in the Swedish-Jewish press”.


Halbwachs, ”The Collective Memory,” 139.
Although the Halbwachs view on memory is rather reductionist, in the sense that all memory is necessarily part of a collective, the social aspect is also important for him and has been developed by others. The Swedish scholar Klas-Göran Karlsson argues, for example, that the communication of collective memory takes place in public arenas such as memorials, museums and in written texts such as in journals, which has contributed to the increasing interest in this field. Memory aids individuals to expand their horizons as memory transcends the current now. Individuals can claim to be apart of stories that took place before their time and by making such claims these individuals become a part of groups that share a sense of belonging.\(^\text{30}\) Regardless if the term social memory or collective memory is used, its relationship to identity is indeed always important. Memories of the past are shaped among individuals that share certain cultural experience, as the German scholar Chris Weedon and American scholar Glenn Jordan have emphasized:

Collective memory, as we conceive it here, signifies narratives of past experience constituted by and on behalf of specific groups within which they find meaningful forms of identification that may empower. Collective memory and the institutions and practices that support it help to create, sustain and reproduce the “imagined communities” with which individuals identify and that give them a sense of history, place and belonging.\(^\text{31}\)

Weedon and Glenn primarily agree with the basic assumptions of collective memory theory as described by Halbwachs but expand the theory by further discussing memory in relation to minority groups that wish to affect and challenge existing national narratives. This approach shares features with this master’s thesis since the focus here is also on the memory within a minority group that presumably after a traumatic experience as the Holocaust seeks a sense of history, place and belonging, as Weedon and Glenn states above, which could challenge national remembrance of the past. Weedon and Jordan write that it has been apparent in especially recent decades that national narratives have been challenged by a variety of interests groups that aim to delegitimize the existing hegemonic national discourses by “fighting to have their histories acknowledged, documented and commemorated, with the aim, in part, of reshaping national stories”.\(^\text{32}\) These groups can differ in size and constellation, as they can constitute of nations, religious groups, ethnic groups, local communities or families.\(^\text{33}\) This master’s thesis will in a similar way expose how the Jews in Sweden in


\(^{32}\) Weedon and Jordan, "Collective memory: theory and politics," 144.

\(^{33}\) Weedon and Jordan, "Collective memory: theory and politics," 144.
various ways sought recognition of their experiences by investigating the relationship between justice and memory among the Jews.

In this regard it is also important to evoke that there are certain specific Jewish traditions that relate to the past. American scholar Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi has conducted significant research on Jewish memory and found that Jews have a tradition of remembering events without writing down their history. The “collective zakhor”, or the so-called collective remembering of the history of the Jewish people was scrutinized heavily by the Rabbis and deemed as not intellectual. The remembering of Jewish history was instead done through the celebration of Jewish holidays. As Jewish historiographies became more prominent in the modern age, this way of remembering started to evade and the modern form of the memory of the Jewish people started to take form. In terms of social memory among Jews, the so-called “Lachrymose concept” of Jewish history is of relevance. The “Lachrymose concept” of Jewish history is “the notion that gentile persecution and Jewish suffering have been the shaping forces of Jewish history”. This conception of Jewish history thus emphasizes that the Holocaust was somehow predestined to happen due to the historical constant suffering of the Jews. In this master’s thesis the “Lachrymose conception” can help to enlighten whether or not the authors in the journals frame the Holocaust in this specific Jewish tradition or if they offer another perspective on why the Jews were chosen as the major victim target group by the Nazi regime.

In order to understand how the social memory of the Holocaust was formed it is also necessary to focus the analysis on certain aspects of this historical event. A useful way to analyze reactions and attitudes to this event is to separate between victims, perpetrators and bystanders, which is common within Holocaust research in general. The American scholar Raul Hilberg has described how these were also the three major social roles present during the Holocaust. Hilberg was the first to reflect upon these three social categories in relation to the Holocaust, and they have subsequently been adopted as the three standard social categories to examine in genocide research. They are, however, complex and in reality not clear-cut as a

35 This concept was first developed by Salo W. Baron. See for example: Salo. W. Baron, ”Newer Emphases in Jewish History,” *Jewish Social Studies* 25, no. 4 (1963), 240.
person can, for example, identify both as perpetrator and victim. These ascribed roles can be seen as “social representations of positions in genocide”.\(^{39}\) As long as the fluidity and complexity of these roles are acknowledged, they can also be used as social categorizations in order to understand how a minority group, like the Swedish Jewry, remembers a past trauma like the Holocaust.\(^{40}\) The categories also seem particularly useful in relation to justice since they illuminate justice on various levels. To operationalise social memory theory, I have therefore chosen to focus on how individuals in the Swedish Jewish community frame victims, perpetrators and bystanders. These social categories can thus be used to demonstrate how the memory of the Holocaust was constructed in the journals, and they will be described shortly below for this purpose.

**Victims:** A victim is an individual that involuntarily face persecution of some kind.\(^{41}\) It is commonly acknowledged that the Jews were the main targeted victim group of the Nazi Regime, which worked with the aim to annihilate the Jewry. In total, there were around six million Jews murdered in the Holocaust. Other Holocaust victims included, among others, Ethnic Poles, Ukrainian Slavs, Soviet POWs, Belarusian Slavs, Serbs, disabled, Romani, Freemasons, Slovenes, homosexuals, leftists, Jehovah’s witnesses and Spanish republicans.\(^{42}\)

**Perpetrators:** A perpetrator is an actor that actively chooses to persecute a targeted victim group.\(^{43}\) There were many actors involved in the implementation of the Final Solution, some more directly than others. The Nazi plan to exterminate the European Jews were installed primarily by the Schutzstaffel, also called the SS. The SS was a paramilitary organization that functioned under the command of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party (NSDAP). Other often acknowledged perpetrators were, among others, the Wehrmacht, the German police and ordinary people that participated in the killings of victims for various motives. Countries such as Poland and Austria have, among others, also been pointed out as

---

\(^{39}\) Vollhardt Ray and Bilewicz, ”After the Genocide: Psychological Perspectives on Victim, Bystander, and Perpetrator Groups,” 3.

\(^{40}\) Vollhardt Ray and Bilewicz,”After the Genocide: Psychological Perspectives on Victim, Bystander, and Perpetrator Groups,” 3.

\(^{41}\) Barnett, ”Reflections on the concept of ‘Bystander’,” 37.


\(^{43}\) Barnett, ”Reflections on the concept of ’Bystander’,” 37.
guilty in contributing to the implementation of the Final Solution with perpetrators on various levels.\textsuperscript{44}

\textit{Bystanders:} Barnett explains how the term bystander in regards to the Holocaust is complex, this as the Holocaust occurred during a long period of time that involved many different actors that can be defined as such, including “individuals, institutions such as churches and universities, entire professions and businesses, and international bodies such as state governments, international banks, and aid organizations”.\textsuperscript{45} Barnett further argues that in “looking at the bystander, we are looking at what seems on the surface to be silence, indifference, apathy, and passivity – in order words, at a \textit{lack} of action”.\textsuperscript{46} Bystander behavior can therefore be seen as a process that involves both active and passive actions over a longer period of time. A bystander has the choice to act or to not intervene in the conflict, and it is the choice to not intervene that leads to this actor being ascribed guilt and defined as “bystander”.\textsuperscript{47}

\textbf{Theory II – Types of Justice}

This master’s thesis will furthermore connect social memory together with a theoretical framework of justice in order to analyze the data. On a more general level, the American scholar Jeffrey K. Olick, the Israeli scholar Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi and the German-American scholar Daniel Levy argue that justice and different kinds of identity politics in order to achieve restitution is a central aspect of memory and that it is “clear that since the Second World War we have moved to new ways of contemplating historical justice, reparations, and the ‘ethics of memory’”.\textsuperscript{48} In a similar way, the American scholar Mark Osiel argues that law and memory forms a nexus that impacts social cohesion. He states that “those responsible for large-scale state brutality have captured the public imagination in several societies and insofar as they succeed in concentrating public attention and stimulating reflection, such proceedings indelibly influence collective memory of the events they

\textsuperscript{45} Barnett, "Reflections on the concept of "Bystander’,” 35.
\textsuperscript{46} Barnett, "Reflections on the concept of "Bystander’,” 35.
\textsuperscript{47} Barnett, "Reflections on the concept of "Bystander’,” 37-38.
judge”.49 Trials therefore have the power to affect a group’s memory of past trauma but, however, this impact of influence can happen to varying degrees.50 Osiel describes how it is the task of researchers to examine why certain trials impact memory, and some do not.51 As stated, the memories that we make are not objective, but rather reflect a limited recollection of our pasts. Memories help shape our individual and collective identities and the challenge when human rights abuses have been committed is to foster authentic forgiveness that can be accepted both at an individual and collective level. This means that the victims need to be able to forget the wrongdoings to the extent that they are able to move beyond the trauma. Mark R. Amstutz argues that:

It is important to stress that memory is a foundational element of forgiveness. Since forgiveness is a means of confronting and overcoming past wrong-doing, reconciliation through forgiveness is possible only through the prism of memory – that is, by recalling and redeeming the past. But if memory is necessary for the healing of past injustices and the restoration of broken relationships, it can also serve (…) as the basis for continuing resentment, anger and vengeance.52

The memory of past wrongdoings can differ for those victims that have forgiven and for those who have not, as the memories will be charged with different types of emotions. It is harder to forgive if, for example, the memories of the trauma are still loaded with emotions of anger. To forgive does not mean that the victims need to totally forget what has taken place, but rather that they can view the past from a new focal point that enables them to change focus from past to future.53 When human rights abuses have been committed transitional justice processes are installed to redress the crimes committed and to attempt to restitute the victims. Amstutz defines transitional justice as such:

In confronting the crimes and injustices of former regimes, emerging democratic governments have pursued a variety of strategies, ranging from denial to trials. The challenge of how to best reckon with regime atrocities – a process that scholars have termed ‘transitional justice’ – will depend, of course, on the emerging regime’s commitment to justice and human rights, and on the political resources available to address the crimes and injustices of former governments. Some of the major goals that transitional regimes have sought to advance through these strategies include the restoration of the rule of law, the consolidation of democratic institutions, justice for human rights victims, political reconciliation and national peace and unity.

---

53 Amstutz, *The healing of nations: the promise and limits of political forgiveness*, 8-10.
Transitional justice means finding appropriate responses to human rights crimes committed and Amstutz argues that governments have traditionally involved two kinds of approaches – “engagement or denial, accountability or avoidance”.\textsuperscript{54} To follow the engagement approach nations need to inaugurate strategies of accountability before there can be reconciliation and healing. The nations need to handle the crimes committed as failing to do so can lead to harming “normal interpersonal and civic relationships”.\textsuperscript{55} There are numerous methods that nations can employ to redress accountability. The most common method is setting up legal prosecutions like in the case of the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial. Bloxham argues that it is imperative to investigate how legal milieus have helped form the understanding of the Holocaust:

\begin{quote}
Much evidence on the murder of Jews has emerged from the legal milieu, understanding that context is an important step in understanding the genocide, and in breaking down the generalizations used to construct all-encompassing concepts like 'the Holocaust'.\textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

Other methods besides trials include instigating truth commissions that aim to investigate past wrongdoings, public apologies, or compensation programs like in the case of the German compensation programs in the 1950s. Accountability can also be achieved through the reforming of laws and institutions and these methods of accountability responses are not necessarily mutually exclusive.\textsuperscript{57}

Justice can thus be viewed on different levels and legal processes deal with one level of justice.\textsuperscript{58} Nations can also choose to follow the second approach of avoidance and denial for a number of reasons, but the main reason is usually that only focusing on a smaller number of perpetrators with leader positions takes away guilt from all other groups that have directly or indirectly supported the human rights abuses. Amstutz also describes how prosecution of a smaller number of perpetrators can lead to dividing societies as prosecution of offenders might hinder nations from reconciling by putting focus on the past atrocities, rather than moving on and letting time heal the trauma that has taken place. Nations sometimes also avoid accountability in order to emphasize “the building and consolidation of a humane political order over claims of retributive justice”.\textsuperscript{59}
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In my analysis of how social memory influenced various claims of justice, I need to identify different types of justice. I therefore need to present the categories of justice that groups that have been exposed to human rights abuses can seek as restitution. There are primarily four commonly recognized types of justice in this category: Retributive justice, Restorative Justice, Procedural Justice and Distributive Justice.\(^\text{60}\) I will use this scheme of four types of justices in my analysis when I identify how the Swedish Jewry portrays justice. These types of justice are not mutually inclusive, and it is not always easy to completely separate them. As there will be many different voices in the journals it is possible that there is not uniform agreement how justice should prevail. However, these four types of justice will aid me in discerning how the discussions of justice are framed. Below is a description of these four types of justice:

*Retributive justice* is a system of criminal justice based on the punishment of offenders. This type of justice appeals to the notion that justice cannot be achieved until the offender’s crime has been identified and punished accordingly. For example, if Adolf Eichmann is responsible for murdering Jews, then his punishment should be of the same severity as his crime and he must suffer because of his transgressions. Retributive justice hence takes into account the victims’ feelings of the verdict that the offender receives. It can, therefore, often be associated with revenge, as the satisfaction of the victim over the verdict of the offender is of importance. Deterrence here also plays a key role, as the punishment that the offender receives must be severe in order to prevent future similar crimes. This type of justice is often in the forefront in legal proceedings concerning war crimes, human rights abuses and international law and trials are, consequently, linked to retributive justice.\(^\text{61}\)

*Restorative justice* puts less emphasis on the punishment of the offender and legal retribution, and instead emphasizes repairing “broken relationships and to heal the wounds of victims and offenders alike”.\(^\text{62}\) It seeks to mitigate sentiments of anger, bitterness and the desires for vengeance. The main difference between restorative and retributive justice is the concept of reconciliation, which is realized when anger, bitterness and the desire for
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\(^{62}\) Amstutz, *The healing of nations: the promise and limits of political forgiveness*, 110.
vengeance is altered into feelings of tolerance and acceptance. Reconciliation enables new amity and cooperative relationships instead of enmity. Offenders are encouraged to express authentic apologies and to show genuine feelings of remorse.\textsuperscript{63} That restorative justice puts less focus on the legal prosecution of offenses does not mean that it does not believe in the adhering to rule of law, it simply enhances the reconciliation and the healing of “individual and collective injuries”\textsuperscript{64}.

Procedural Justice deals with the concept of fair play. If the people involved in a process experience that they have been treated fairly then it is more likely that they will accept the verdict set in place. This type of justice is also often associated with negotiation and mediation. In a trial, procedural justice can be achieved through procedures that are set up impartially.\textsuperscript{65} For example, Germany had after the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 claimed impartial treatment, and therefore, the experiment of an international court at Nuremberg was established with the aim of realizing the appearance of impartial justice.\textsuperscript{66}

Distributive Justice is the idea that people should receive fairness in what they are receiving, but what constitutes as “fair” is often hard to discern. Fairness could be based on, for example, equality, equity or on need. Equality means that everyone receives the same share even though what s/he has contributed with might differ. In contrast, equity means that a person receives his/her share depending on exactly what s/he has contributed with. Need-based distribution means that those who are most in need receive the most shares. Contemporary issues of distributive justice often cause debates concerning issues like, for example, taxes, health care and salary.\textsuperscript{67}

Material

The main materials of this master’s thesis will be the journals \textit{Judisk Krönika} and \textit{Judisk Tidskrift}. I will include the entire time-period of 1945-1949 and 1960-1962. The Nuremberg trials started in November 1945 and ended in October 1949. However, I read the articles published all throughout 1945-1949 in order to also capture articles that dealt with the setting up of the trials, as well as articles published right after the end of the trials. The Eichmann trial started in April 1961 and ended in December 1961. Adolf Eichmann was also hanged the
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1st of June 1962. Similarly as the with the case of the Nuremberg trials, I read all articles published throughout 1960 to 1962 to find articles published during the setting up of the trial and the end of the trial. I included articles published in 1962 in order to read articles related to the hanging of Eichmann. My aim is not to compare the two journals, but rather the idea is to capture as many Jewish voices as possible. However, if large differences between the journals occur, these findings will be accounted for. In total, I read through 2136 articles.

The names of the authors of the articles are visible in Judisk Tidskrift but in Judisk Krönik the majority of the articles are published anonymously, which makes identifying all the authors of the journals not viable. The articles in the journals are principally written in Swedish and not all Jews in Sweden were therefore able to publish articles in the journals, as not all of them spoke Swedish. Due to this, the difficulty of identifying all authors and the possibility for non-Jewish authors to publish articles in Judisk Tidskrift it is therefore not accurate to claim that these journals represented the entire Jewish community in Sweden; however, these types of journals did function as the main media outlets for the Jews in Sweden during the time-period this article is focusing on. The journals were published in Stockholm but were read throughout Sweden. Thor Tureby explains that the “periodicals were the only functional communities that could bring people together who were scattered over large geographical areas”. She also explains how the journals can “be seen as forums where Swedish Jews presented themselves to Swedish society at large (...)”. The journals were used as a voice of the Jewish community, and as an arena to discuss issues like the Holocaust, identity and justice.

Two brothers, Daniel and Simon Brick, first founded Judisk Krönik in 1932. Daniel Brick became the editor of the journal and he wanted it to function as a Zionist periodical. The aim of the journal became to “mould a Swedish Jewish identity, to stimulate the Diaspora’s continuous identification with the ‘homeland’, to encourage emigration to Palestine and later Israel, and to mobilize opinion in Sweden for Zionism and later the state of Israel”. The journal was read throughout Sweden and functioned as a platform for Zionist
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Jews in Swedish society. It still publishes around twelve issues a year and it remains as one of the main information channels on Jewish matters for the Swedish Jewish community.\(^{73}\)

*Judisk Tidskrift* was first published in 1929, with Marcus Ehrenpreis, the Chief Rabbi of the Jewish congregation of Stockholm as founding editor. Ehrenpreis wanted the journal’s main function to be to inform both Jews and gentiles about Judaism. In contrast to *Judisk Krönika*, the aim of *Judisk Tidskrift* was not to represent any particular movement.\(^{74}\) The Swedish historian and Zionist, Hugo Valentin, also co-edited the journal from 1949, and took over as main editor in 1951. Businessmen, politicians, academics and other educated Jews saw the journal as a means to reach both the Jewish as well as the Gentile public. Non-Jews were also welcomed to publish articles in the journal and it was distributed for free in public libraries. The journal published around twelve issues a year but stopped being published in the middle of the 1960s.\(^{75}\)

**Methodology – Framing Analysis**

The chosen method for this master’s thesis is framing analysis. Framing analysis aids a researcher in discerning how reality is depicted in communicative texts. It is a methodological approach but it also inhabits a social constructivist theoretical framework, as it presumes that reality, as we perceive it, is affected by how others present it to us and by our own selective memory.\(^{76}\) Framing analysis is, consequently, a suiting method to use in conjunction with social memory that also argues that our memories are based on subjective fragments of the past. Frames make it possible to “diagnose, evaluate, and prescribe” problems portrayed in communicative texts.\(^{77}\) Robert E. Entman describes how:

Frames, then, define problems – determine what a causal agent is doing with what costs and benefits, usually measured in terms of common cultural values; diagnose causes – identify the forces creating the problem; make moral judgments – evaluate causal agents and their effects; and suggest remedies – offer and justify treatments for the problems and predict their likely effects.\(^{78}\)
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Nevertheless, it is possible that frames are constructed that do not advocate remedies and solutions but simply highlight certain aspects of realities. Robert E. Entman describes how frames have four so-called “locations” that are present in the communication process: communicators, receivers, the texts, and something called the culture. Communicators consciously and unconsciously frame reality when making claims as they are affected by their preconceived values and beliefs. There is no such thing as neutral texts, as all texts inhabit frames that are created by “presence or absence of certain key-words, stock phrases, stereotyped images, sources of information, and sentences that provide thematically reinforcing clusters or facts or judgments”.79 The receiver of the text may or may not adopt the message of the text and s/he is also affected by his/her previous values, beliefs and ideas about the issue at stake. Moreover, the less the receiver knows of the problem described in a text the more likely it is that s/he will be influenced by the frames used by the communicator. The so-called culture is the most commonly used frames that people apply in a certain discourse.80

Framing analysis, hence, makes it possible for a researcher to examine how a communicative text exuberates power and to discern the “empirical and normative controversies” in communicative texts.81 To conduct the framing analysis, the researcher first reads through the material and looks for the broader themes of arguments that exist in the discourse. This makes it possible to recognize what is being emphasized and what is potentially being left out of the discussion. Subsequently, the researcher will be able to identify repeated patterns of arguments and how these arguments fit within possible frames.82

Framing analysis can also be conducted both qualitatively and quantitatively and the main approach chosen for this master’s thesis is of a qualitative character, as I will use the method to conduct an inductive textual analysis. I will close read the materials in a chronological order. The main aim of the analysis is thus not to, for example, generate numerical data that can be used for statistical data. The approach to the material is instead that of a qualitative character, as I want to create a prevalent understanding of the use of arguments in the articles. By selecting a qualitative approach, I can dig deeper into the ideas that were used to develop trends of thoughts and it also makes it possible to better understand the arguments in connection to surrounding historical contexts. However, in addition to the
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qualitative textual analysis I will count the total number of articles, how many articles that deal with the topic of the Holocaust and how many articles that refer to the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial. This quantitative aspect of the data collection is simply to create a better understanding of how often the Holocaust was dealt with during the years in focus. As previously mentioned, an imperative aspect of this master’s thesis is to examine if the Jewish community in Sweden actually dealt with the Holocaust during the early postwar years.

In this master’s thesis I will, as stated, look at how three social categories (victims, perpetrators and bystanders) and four categories of justice (retributive justice, restorative justice, procedural justice and distributive justice) are framed. Each of these categories, thus, represent a frame. For example, if I want to understand how the social category of “victim” is framed I will then look for themes of arguments that relate to victims, such as: Who are the victims discussed? Are the discussions exclusively focused on Jews or are other victims acknowledged? What are the reasons for that these victims have been targeted for persecutions? In terms of justice it can be themes relating to for example: How should the perpetrators be punished? Is there a possibility for reconciliation through forgiveness? How should the trials be set up in order for justice to be achieved? It is also possible that the articles treat themes that, for example, relate to solely some of the categories.

Below I have created an analytical scheme that I will make use of in my analysis. This analytical scheme demonstrates that the social categories of genocide and types of justice will aid me in examining the social memory of the time-periods focused on. These sets of frames should thus not be regarded as separate as it is jointly that these frames will contribute to a deeper understanding of how the Holocaust is represented in the journals. In my analysis I will first present how the frames are constructed separately, and then discuss how they intertwine and together can tell us something about the social memory of the Holocaust among Jews in Sweden.
Data collection

For this master’s thesis I have read through all the articles of *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk Tidskrift* to get an idea of the social memory of the Holocaust during the chosen time-periods, and to understand which types of justice were requested in the discussions. Firstly, to capture the social memory of the Holocaust, I have, as stated, chosen to focus on how victims, perpetrators and bystanders were depicted and to what extent the discussion of these categories were related to the trials. To use framing analysis in order to do so, I have examined how these three social categories were framed. The analysis included looking at who constitutes each category and their prescribed characteristics. I read through the articles of both the time-periods and focused on patterns of themes that were related to victims, perpetrators and bystanders.

Secondly, as discussed, there are also four kinds of justice that victims can claim that have been exposed to human rights violations: retributive justice, restorative justice, procedural justice and, lastly, distributive justice. The second part of the analysis is thus about how the social memory of the Holocaust influenced various demands for justice. Each type of justice represents a frame in this analysis, or a so-called perspective of reality that a communicator of a text (i.e. in this case an article) tries to persuade the receiver to accept. These frames, consequently, construct arguments by structuring reality by highlighting certain
elements and characteristics of problems and their solutions. For this purpose I have examined how the authors in the journals employed frames in their argumentation. Framing analysis aided me in depicting how the communicators of the texts structured their arguments by framing victims, perpetrators, bystanders and types of justice, and this in turn made it possible to discern how the Swedish Jewish social memory of the Holocaust was constructed during the time-periods of the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial. To provide a more prevalent understanding of how much the Holocaust and the trials were discussed I also counted the total number of articles and the number of articles that dealt with the Holocaust, the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial. Moreover, it is of importance to point out that the main materials, i.e. Judisk Krönika and Judisk Tidskrift, are written in Swedish and I attempted to translate the quotes from the articles in the journals into English as close as possible to the original texts.

Empirical Analysis

In this section I will first provide historical backgrounds of the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial. It is of importance to provide historical backgrounds as to connect the discussions of justice in Judisk Krönika and Judisk Tidskrift to broader historical contexts. By looking at the historical surroundings of the discussions it is possible to interpret and analyze the journals as through a launch pad in the past, rather than merely judging the discussions by contemporary standards. Subsequently, I will present the analysis of my primary sources which has been divided into two parts. The first part deals with the Nuremberg trials and the second part deals with the Eichmann trial. I will end the master's thesis with a discussion on all findings and a final conclusion.

Historical Background – The Nuremberg Trials

In the Moscow agreement of October 8th 1943, Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Joseph Stalin had announced that those who had committed major war crimes under the Hitler regime during the Second World War would receive their punishment after the war was over. During the year of 1945, the collecting of evidence against Nazi war crimes intensified, and on August 8th 1945, the four Allied powers signed the Charter of the
International Military Tribunal (IMT), which initiated the litigation process by the establishment of the Nuremberg trials. The Nuremberg trials were a series of thirteen trials carried out by the International Military Tribunal between the years 1945 to 1949 against high-ranking leaders of the Nazi regime. These trials took place at the Palace of Justice in Nuremberg, Germany, and it was the first attempt by the four major allied powers (the USA, France, Britain and the Soviet Union) to prosecute those who had committed war crimes during the Second World War.

The International Military Tribunal (IMT) recognized four categories of crimes: the commission of conspiracy, crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity and it was the first time that these terms were used in a legal context. Additionally, it was also the first time that the crime of “genocide”, developed by Raphael Lemkin, was discussed in a legal setting. However, even though it was articulated in especially the beginning of the trials, it was not fully applied during the trials. The Canadian researcher Hilary Earl describes that: “while it is clear that Lemkin’s ideas penetrated the thinking of the Nuremberg prosecutors, they were not turned into positive law here”. The Nuremberg trials, nevertheless, affected the development of the crime of “genocide”, and the efforts of Lemkin eventually led to the establishment of the UN Genocide Convention in 1948.

The most commonly known set of trials of the Nuremberg process were those that took place the 20th of November 1945 to the 1st of October 1946. In these trials the International Military Tribunal were tasked with trying twenty-four of the highest-ranking Nazis. A team of prosecutors represented the four Allied powers that each had an eight-member panel of judges. The basis for the legal work had come from the London Charter of August 8th. Adolf Hitler, propaganda chief Joseph Goebbels and SS chief Heinrich Himmler had all committed suicide before the trials but held in custody and present in court were, among others, Hermann Göring, foreign minister; Hans Frank, Reich Law Leader and Governor-General of the General Government in Occupied Poland; Wilhelm Frick, Minister of Interior and Reich

Protector of Bohemia and Moravia; Ernst Kaltenbrunner, nominated Hitler successor; Joachim von Ribbentrop, leading Nazi security officer; Albert Speer, Minister of Armaments from 1942, and Wilhelm Keitel, Head of Oberkommando der Wehrmacht and defense minister.  

These set of trials represented the first time in history that war crimes were officially recognized as crimes in International law and that the leaders of a defeated country in war were being held accountable for their actions in an international court. Out of the 24 defendants, there were twelve that received the death penalty (two of these committed suicide). Furthermore, there were four defendants that received 10-20 years in prison and three defendants that received lifetime sentences in prison. Three of the accused were also acquitted. Other known trials in the subsequent Nuremberg trials are, among others, the Doctors trials, the Judges trial, or the so-called Justice trial, and the Einzatsgruppen trials. The Doctors’ trial led to the creation of the Nuremberg Code, which is a set of ethics principles that restricts future medical experiments involving human subjects.

During the Nuremberg trials the prosecutors decided to rely mainly on documents as evidence and solely a few witnesses were summoned. However, even if the Jewish trauma was not focused on during the Nuremberg trials, many of the other victim groups of the Holocaust were not acknowledged during these trials whatsoever. For example, there was no mention of the killings of Roma or homosexuals during the trials. The trials have, as described, become known as so-called “victors trials” in which emphasis was put on that the victorious Allies set in to judge the crimes committed by Nazi Germany. Despite this, the Nuremberg trials vigorously affected the state of transitional justice in that they made it possible to prosecute war criminals internationally. Before the trials, events taking place inside a nation-state were not impacted by international law, but, in Nuremberg it became
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92 Margolies, ”The legacies of Nuremberg in International Law and American Policy,” 455.  
established that it would no longer be possible for any state to commit human rights abuses without being held accountable.\textsuperscript{96}

American scholar Herbert Rejnbogin and German scholar Christoph Safferling argue that a “thread of international human rights law did exist even before World War I. Yet the idea of inalienable right of human beings and humanity materialized in 1945 at the Nuremberg trials”.\textsuperscript{97} The charter of crimes drawn up in these trials and the judicial constitution of the Nuremberg courts eventually led to the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) under the Rome statute in 2002. Christian Tomuschat describes that the “ICC encapsulates the ambition to establish at world level a judicial function that is not dependent on state consent but authorized to discharge judicial functions even without or against the will of states”.\textsuperscript{98} In the ICC it became possible to prosecute cases of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. The Nuremberg trials also established that it is possible to prosecute groups and organizations internationally and during the trials there were six organizations that were tried which among others included the SS.\textsuperscript{99}

**Historical Background – The Eichmann trial**

Adolf Eichmann was a lieutenant colonel (Oberstrumbanfuhrer) in the German SS during the Holocaust and he is known as one of the main administrators of the Holocaust. His first main task was to organize forced emigration of Jews in Hungary, and he later also became responsible for deportation and expulsion of Jews to concentration camps and ghettos in Eastern Europe. In 1942, after the Nazi regime had decided to exterminate all Jews, Eichmann got tasked with the logistics. Despite this, he had little to do with the actual concentration camps.\textsuperscript{100} At first, Eichmann was relatively unknown to the public, but after the Holocaust, evidence against Eichmann was slowly usurping. After staying in Austria until 1950, he decided to flee to Argentina to avoid being arrested.\textsuperscript{101} He lived in Argentina relatively peacefully until the 11\textsuperscript{th} of May 1960 when he was found and arrested by Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad. He was brought to Israel to be put on trial for the crimes he had
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committed against the Jews during the Holocaust. The Eichmann trial commenced the 11th of April 1961 and lasted for 56 days, and in the end Eichmann was found guilty and sentenced to death. After an unsuccessful attempt at appealing his verdict, he was executed the 1st of June 1962.

The Eichmann trial received massive attention in mass media. In contrast to the Nuremberg trials the prosecution relied heavily on witnesses as 111 witnesses were summoned to testify. Yablonka describes how the narrative of the Eichmann trial as a consequence was completely different from the Nuremberg trials as it focused more on the specific experience of the Jews. As described, the narrative of the Nuremberg trials focused on emphasizing the Allies defeat of the Nazi regime, which led to that the experiences and tragedies of the Jews were marginalized. Despite this, some critics, including many Jews, doubted whether or not it was just for newly formed Israel to prosecute Eichmann, as Israel was unbiased in their view of the Nazi regime. Israel’s Prime Minister David Ben Gurion counterfeited this argument and argued that Israel had the primary right to hold the trial, precisely due to the fact that it was the Jews that had been persecuted.

Scholars such as English David Cesarani, German Jurgen Mätthaus, Israeli-American Saul Friedländer and Israeli Omer Bartov have found that the Eichmann trial also had a profound effect on the perception of Nazi perpetrators within Holocaust historiography and that this was mainly due to that the focus of the trial was on Adolf Eichmann that came to represent the typical Nazi perpetrator. The behavior of Eichmann sparked intense debates concerning the psychological understanding of the motives behind the typical Nazi perpetrator. The defense of Eichmann was built on the argument that he was simply following orders, and that he therefore could not be held accountable for the results of his actions. Also conspicuous was the fact that Eichmann displayed a considerable lack of remorse and did not seem to grasp the gravity of the crimes committed by himself and the Third Reich.

German-Jewish political theorist and philosopher Hanna Arendt that had been employed by the New Yorker to witness and write about the trial was baffled by the
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“normalcy” of the behavior and appearance of Eichmann. She later wrote the famous work called *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* in which she discusses the lack of guilt displayed by Eichmann during the trials. Her hypothesis in this work is that Eichmann was not a sociopath, but rather a normal unintelligent man that functioned in a reality in which committing terrible crimes was of the ordinary. His inability to think for himself, therefore, led to him assisting in the murdering of millions of Jews.\(^{108}\)

Arendt’s work led to more debates concerning the typical Nazi perpetrator and whether or not the Nazis were ordinary men that committed terrible crimes, or if they were somehow predestined to commit atrocities due to an anti-Semitic German past. Within Holocaust studies, these respective standpoints have become linked to mainly two American scholars, namely Daniel Goldhagen and Christopher Browning. Goldhagen argues that Germans were more inclined than other European peoples to commit genocide against the Jews as their “eliminationist” anti-Semitic identity was unique and had been shaped by centuries old German anti-Semitic traditions and cultures.\(^{109}\) Browning, on the other hand, argues that Nazi Germans were ordinary men and that the Holocaust occurred because of reasons like anti-Semitic and racist propaganda, isolation, peer pressure and pressure from authority as well as numbing. He, consequently, asserts that it was not chiefly the urge to kill or hatred that drove the Germans to commit genocide against the Jews.\(^{110}\)

The Eichmann trial, hence, emphasized the faith of the Jews and made the Holocaust into a subject discussed worldwide. Schabas explains how the “Eichmann trial is the first reported judgment based upon the provisions of the 1948 Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide”.\(^{111}\) It was also the first instance during peacetime that a person was sentenced for crimes against humanity.\(^{112}\)
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Analysis Part I – The Nuremberg Trials

Representation of the Holocaust during the Nuremberg trials

The Nuremberg trials were mentioned in 5 articles out of a total of 790 articles in Judisk Krönika during the time period of 1945-1949, which is demonstrated by FIGURE 2 and FIGURE 3. In Judisk Tidsskrift, the Nuremberg trials were mentioned in 7 articles out of a total of 477 articles during the same time-period, which is demonstrated by FIGURE 5 and FIGURE 6. Each of these articles treated the subject of the Holocaust. However, as illustrated by FIGURE 2 and FIGURE 4, the Holocaust in general, both within the framework of the trials and outside, was the topic of focus in 82 articles out of 790 articles in Judisk Krönika during the same time period. As illustrated by FIGURE 5 and FIGURE 7, the Holocaust was the topic of focus in 136 articles out of a total of 477 articles in Judisk Tidsskrift during this period as well. The graphs display a curve of decline of articles treating the Holocaust starting in 1945. In light of this, the Nuremberg trials did not activate discussions concerning victims, perpetrators, bystanders or justice in a significant way but this does not mean that aspects of the Holocaust were not discussed. While the Holocaust was extensively featured in 1945, an emerging interest in Zionism was discernable starting in 1946, which led to that more articles treated this subject, rather than the Holocaust. However, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to count how many articles that dealt with Zionism.

Noteworthy is that the aim of the analysis is not to provide a statistical analysis based on numbers. Yet, these numbers demonstrate that discussions concerning the Nuremberg trials were not prevalent at this time. Similar for both journals is that the discussions pertaining to the Nuremberg trials were marginalized and fragmented as none of the articles had the Nuremberg trials as the main topic of discussion. The Holocaust, nonetheless, was still featured in both journals, even though the memory of this trauma did not merge with the Nuremberg trials to a particularly large extent. An overall conclusion is that the Holocaust was strongly present but not because of these trials. Below, I will show how the social memory of the Holocaust was formed by focusing on how victims, perpetrators and bystanders were framed in the journals. I will also show how this memory gave rise to demands of justice among Jews in Sweden – claims that in the latter part of the 1940s in most cases were formulated independently of the trials.
FIGURE 2. Total articles per year in Judisk Krönika

FIGURE 3. Articles dealing with the Nuremberg trials in Judisk Krönika

113 Judisk Krönika published 10 issues a year in 1945, 1946 and 1947 and 20 issues a year in 1948 and 1949, which explains the increase of articles in 1948 and 1949.
FIGURE 4. Articles dealing with the Holocaust in Judisk Krönika
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FIGURE 6. Articles dealing with the Nuremberg trials in Judisk Tidsskrift
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FIGURE 7. Articles dealing with the Holocaust in Judisk Tidsskrift
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The framing of victims

Framing means that the communicator of a text accentuates certain aspects of reality. In regard to the social category of “victim” this means that the articles in the journals together make up an image of who the victims were during the Holocaust. The representations of victims in the articles can as a result tell us something about the social memory of the Holocaust. I found that during the time-period of the Nuremberg trials the Jews are framed as the main targeted victim group, which is in line with today’s established understanding of the Holocaust as the genocide of six million Jews. The authors simply refer to other victims without discussing them, such as Poles, Czechs, French, Dutch, Serbs, Norwegians and Danes. There is also no mention in any of the articles of the persecution or killings of other victim groups such as Roma, Homosexuals, Ethnic Poles, Ukrainian Slavs, Soviet POWs, Belarusian Slavs, Serbs, disabled, Freemasons, Slovenes, homosexuals, leftists, Jehovah’s witnesses or Spanish republicans. Even though the focus is on Jews as victims, the journals mainly portray the Jewish survivors as collective entities without distinguishing between traits such as nationality or manners. The journals moreover do not depict the experiences of newly arrived survivors in Sweden, but rather focus on the situation and hardships of Jewish displaced persons in Europe. This can most probably be explained by the fact that the journals display a tendency to regard the Jewish survivors in Sweden as temporary guests that has the aim of emigrating to Palestine, a fact that has been pointed out by Thor Tureby. However, as both journals are engaged in the Zionist cause, emphasis is also put on that all Jews should unite as a people in order to support this ideology.

Framing also means that the communicator of the texts promotes certain problems and then evaluates these problems, which contributes to the shaping of the frame. In line with these assertions, the main problem diagnosed in relation to victims during the years 1945-

---

1949 is that the Jewish people have been persecuted throughout history with the Holocaust being the epitome of this persecution. The focus on Jewish victims in the journals was to be expected, as the journals are in fact Jewish, however, the suffering of the Jewish people is also contrasted to the sufferings of others. Even though it is acknowledged that other victim groups also suffered it is commonly held throughout the time-period that the Jewish people have suffered more than any other victim groups. For example, in 1948 in *Judisk Tidskrift*, Mia Leche-Löfgren argues that:

> Those who adore and admire the Jews, not least because of their incredible long-suffering during centuries of injustices and persecutions, would of course wish that they were different from all other people, in that they could never become angry, hate, endorse nationalism or exhibit asocial elements. Indeed, the Jews are the people who would need these superhuman qualities, because the crime or foolishness of one Jew is always said to originate from race.

As the quote illustrates, the so-called “Lachrymose concept” of Jewish history is used as an argumentative framework for the discussions which means that the Jewish history is depicted as a history of suffering caused by gentile persecution, which inevitably led to the Holocaust. The gentile persecution connotes that the Jews have been wrongfully blamed for various misfortunes throughout history, this notwithstanding if the Jews have lived integrated or isolated, been rich or poor, religious or non-religious.

In terms of Jewish victimhood, Polish Jews are depicted as having experienced the most severe persecution during the Holocaust. As argued by Thor Tureby, there is also an inclination in the journals to point out the distinctive manners of Eastern European Jews as a contrast to the Western manners of the Swedish Jews. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the victim group is predominantly framed as Jews the emphasis of the discussions during 1945-

---


121 See for example: Leiser, "De återvände aldrig,” 351-353; Benedikt, "Förnuftets bankrutt,” 148-152; Mia Leche-Löfgren, "Benadottes minne och judarnas sak,” *Judisk Tidskrift* 21, no. 10 (1948), 291.


1949 is not on the Jewish victims’ experiences during the Holocaust, but rather on the current situation of the Jewish refugees, on the importance of Zionism and the creation of Israel.\textsuperscript{126} Sjögren explains how little was done at a government level in Sweden at this time to enliven the Jewish collective memory of the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{127} This is somewhat mirrored in the discussions in \textit{Judisk Krönika} and \textit{Judisk Tidskrift} as the memory of the Holocaust is rather fragmented. In especially 1945 the experiences of Jewish victims during the Holocaust are featured, but in the following years these types of articles start to become less frequent.

Frames also do not solely define problems but sometimes also advocate solutions and remedies.\textsuperscript{128} The remedy suggested in regard to constant gentile persecution of the Jewish people is that all Jews should emigrate to Israel. The creation of Israel is seen as pivotal for the future survival of the Jewish people as it is only in Israel that the Jewish people can build a home and protect themselves from the future dangers of gentile persecution. The discussions during this time-period are therefore characterized by a desire to look toward a brighter future for the Jewish people in Israel in which they no longer constitute as victims. The authors are thus encouraging the Jewish community in Sweden to embrace Zionist ideals, this as Israel is perceived as a state in which the Jewish people can unite and move beyond the epithet of “victim”.\textsuperscript{129} Sjögren has found that \textit{Judisk Krönika’s} focus on Zionism can be seen as a desire to unite the Jewish community by focusing on similarities within the Zionist cause instead of focusing on differences within the different branches of the community in order to unite all Jews.\textsuperscript{130} This can thus similarly be argued for the case of \textit{Judisk Tidskrift} as this journal also puts emphasis on that all Jews need to unite in order to support the cause of Israel.

\textsuperscript{126} See for example: Michales, "Förskräckelsen utan slut – Till den Europeiska judefrågan,” 77-79; Valentin, ”Kring Palestinakrisen,” 200-204; Marcus Ehrenpreis, ”Varthän bär vägen?,” \textit{Judisk Tidskrift} 20, no. 1 (1947), 1; Erwin Leiser, ”Judisk ungdom vid skiljovägen,” \textit{Judisk Tidskrift} 20, no. 5 (1947), 164; James G. McDonald, ”Vart kan flyktingarna ta vägen?” \textit{Judisk Krönika} 20, no. 4 (1947), 73; ”Vad skall ske med de judiska flyktingarna?,” \textit{Judisk Krönika} 1, no. 8 (1947), 140; ”Majoriteten av Europas judar önskar utvandra till Palestina,” \textit{Judisk Krönika} 15, no. 3 (1946), 75-78.


\textsuperscript{128} Entman, “Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm,” 52.

\textsuperscript{129} See for example: ”Ingen tysk ångrar, vad som hänt judarna,” \textit{Judisk Krönika} 17, no. 3 (1948), 36-37; Michales, ”Förskräckelsen utan slut – Till den Europeiska judefrågan,” 77-79; Benedikt, ”Förmuffets bankrutt,” 148-152; Leiser, ”Judisk ungdom vid skiljovägen,” 164; Erwin Leiser, ”Obehagliga minnen,” \textit{Judisk Tidskrift} 20, no. 9 (1947), 299; Hugo Valentin, ”Den judiska försvarsmakten,” \textit{Judisk Tidskrift} 21, no. 4 (1948), 97-102; ”Palestinakommissionens undersökning av den judiska situationen,” \textit{Judisk Krönika} 15, no. 2 (1946), 54-60; McDonald, ”Vart kan flyktingarna ta vägen?” 73; ”Vad skall ske med de judiska flyktingarna?” \textit{Judisk Krönika} 20, no. 8 (1947), 140; Lestschinsky, ”Judarna efter kriget,” 3-4.

The framing of perpetrators

The focus of the articles in regards to perpetrators is predominantly on the National Socialist German Worker’s Party, which is commonly referred to as the Nazi Party.131 This focus is inline with the understanding of Kushner that argues that in the years following the Holocaust the crimes committed were chiefly blamed on the Nazi regime, which inexorably led to that other nations failed to evaluate their own roles.132 The roles of ordinary German citizens are also considered, and the authors concur that a majority of the German citizens supported the growth of the Third Reich and voluntarily voted for Hitler in free elections. These citizens are also represented in the articles as having been aware of the atrocities committed by the Nazi regime. The German state is conspicuously demonized in the articles and is depicted as having committed terrible atrocities throughout history. The Holocaust is seen as having led to that Germany has a so-called “blood-debt” which is the result of that the German nation has committed such a heinous crime against the Jews that no apology, legal-punishment, or compensation can atone for it.133 For example, in 1945, in Judisk Tidskrift, Ragna Aberstén-Schiratzki argues that:

In present work, the very old traditions of Germany in regards of cruelty against inherited people and minorities is emphasized; partly in relation to the application of its special occupation system that Germany acquired long before the war through the treatment of their own Jewish citizens.134

As illustrated by the quote, Germany is seen as nation that has fostered anti-Semitic sentiments, even long before the Second World War. After the war, the authors are also concerned about the unsuccessful denazification of Germany.135

---

131 See for example: Aberstén-Schiratzki, “Så härskade herrefolket,” 189-191; Michaels, ”Förskräckelsen utan slut – Till den Europeiska judefrågan,” 77-79; Marcus Ehrenpreis, ”Vad vänta vi av pennans män?” Judisk Tidskrift 19, no. 6 (1946), 160-161.
132 Holmila and Kvist Geverts, ”On forgetting and Rediscovering the Holocaust in Scandinavia: introduction to the special issue on the histories and memories of the Holocaust in Scandinavia”.
133 See for example: Micheales, ”Förskräckelsen utan slut – Till den Europeiska judefrågan,” 77-79; Lena Kaplan, ”Utrotningen av Europas judar – en översikt,” Judisk Krönika 15, no. 6 (1946), 73; ”Doktor Raschers illdåd avslöjas,” Judisk Krönika 15, no. 1 (1946), 200; Lestschinsky, ”Judarna efter kriget,” 3-4; Leiser, ”Två världar,” 83-86; Ernst Benedikt, ”Ett verk om koncentrationslägren,” Judisk Tidskrift 20, no. 10 (1947), 324-327; Aberstén-Schiratzki, ”Så härskade herrefolket,” 189-191; Wahrberg, ”Polska intryck,” 120; Peter Blachstein, ”Tyskar och judar,” Judisk Tidskrift 21, no. 6 (1948), 180-182.
134 Aberstén-Schiratzki, ”Så härskade herrefolket,” 189.
135 See for example: Stillschweig, ”Judiska efterkrigsproblem,” 14; Ehrenpreis, ”Israel’s martyrs,” 130-131; Micheales, ”Förskräckelsen utan slut – Till den Europeiska judefrågan,” 77-79; Erwin Leiser, ”Tidens spigel,” Judiskt Tidskrift 19, no. 4 (1946), 121-125.
Yet, even though emphasis is put on the Nazi regime and the German nation in terms of responsibility and guilt, the image framed of the perpetrators during this time-period is not clear-cut. Guilt is specifically ascribed to England\textsuperscript{136} due to its restrictive immigration policies both during and after the war. The journals highlight that if England had let more Jews emigrate to Palestine during the war years, more Jews would have survived the war.\textsuperscript{137} The persecutions and killings of Jews are also seen as the fault of what is in vague terms referred to as Christian nations and “humanity”. The authors assert that the annihilation of the European Jewry is the all-time low of humanity and that all peoples in Europe took part in the murder of the Jews as they failed to prevent it from happening, this something that will be discussed more in the next section of the master’s thesis that is treating the subject of bystanders.

**The framing of bystanders**

In regards to bystanders, the focus of the articles is on ascribing guilt to those nations that failed to impede the terror of the Nazi regime, and more specifically the terror directed against the European Jews. As stated, framing means accentuating certain problems and scrutinizing these said problems.\textsuperscript{138} In line with these assertions, guilt is ascribed in the articles to all the populations of Europe as the authors allege that the majority of the European people stood idly by while atrocities were being committed against the Jews.\textsuperscript{139} For example, in 1946 in *Judisk Tidskrift*, Erwin Leiser argues:

> In Nuremberg, the issue of guilt is discussed with a few prominent Nazi leaders, but not only Hitler, Himmler, Göring, Streicher and their conspirators are guilty, but also the entire civilized world, who continued living their tranquil lives in peace and, as they thought, without being disturbed by the calls for immediate help from the persecuted. Are not all those peoples guilty who refused to lift a finger in our defense? The punishment has often become terrible, many have

\textsuperscript{136} The authors themselves mainly refer to "England" in the articles eventhough England during this time-period was apart of Great Britain. Due to this, I will also refer to England in my analysis. 


\textsuperscript{138} Entman, “Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm,” 52.

shared our destiny – but that does not change the issue at hand. You can also become guilty by choosing not to act.\textsuperscript{140}

As earlier described, Amstutz explains that a principle reason that leads to that nations sometimes choose not to prosecute human rights offenders in trials is that the focus becomes on solely a smaller number of perpetrators which can lead to that guilt is not attributed to all others that directly or indirectly were responsible for the crimes committed.\textsuperscript{141} As illustrated by the quote, Leiser is, as stated by Amstuz, concerned that the issue of guilt in regards to the Holocaust is not dealt with in its entirety by only prosecuting a few responsible leaders from the Nazi bureaucracy. However, neither of the journals represent the role of bystanders in any greater depth, as no specific nation is discussed in relation to this social category.

As discussed, frames also sometimes highlight possible remedies and solutions for the accentuated problems.\textsuperscript{142} The authors in the journals concur that Jews cannot feel safe moving back into their old neighborhoods living next to those who have betrayed them by choosing not to participate in the rescue-efforts of Jews. Jews are, therefore, encouraged to not return to their old homes, and instead to resettle in Israel.\textsuperscript{143} Daniel Brick moreover argues that in order to "aid the Jewish survivors in achieving reconciliation, the democratic world should meet the demands from them – to let them return home (i.e. to Israel), but not to the countries, where everything they hold dear has vanished from earth, where they will always feel abandoned, unwanted and not safe (…)".\textsuperscript{144} Consequently, even though the Nazi regime bears the main responsibility for the persecution of the Jews, it is not solely the Nazis that are accused of contributing to the continued discrimination and persecution of Jews.

Additionally, as have been described, the Scandinavian nations were primarily viewed as rescue-nations up until the late 1980s to the early 1990s, when they were scrutinized and ascribed a more complex image of bystanders.\textsuperscript{145} From 1945-1949 the Scandinavian nations are both praised and criticized for their actions during the Holocaust. Denmark, in particular, is framed as a rescue nation as the Danes managed to save the majority of the Danish Jewry.

\textsuperscript{140} Leiser, "Två världar," 83.
\textsuperscript{141} Amstutz, The healing of nations: the promise and limits of political forgiveness, 9.
\textsuperscript{142} Entman, “Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm,” 52.
\textsuperscript{144} Daniel Brick, "Inför Freden,” Judisk Krönika 14, no. 5-6 (1945), 71.
by helping them flee to Sweden. Sweden is also commended for taking in Danish Jews as well as other Jewish refugees and for providing them with food and shelter. However, the roles of the Scandinavian nations are somewhat perused with further analysis. Herbert Friedländer argues that even distinguished and intellectual Swedes chose to not believe that the Jews were being severely mistreated by the Nazi Regime. He also points out that not all Danish Jews were saved, and that those who were captured were sent to Theresienstadt where they experienced inhumane treatment. Sig Benedixon discusses how the Swedish press has expressed anti-Semitic sentiments both before and during the war years. In 1945, an article by Mia Leche-Löfgren is posted in which she criticizes Sweden’s stern immigration politics during the war, and that Sweden approved that the Nazi Regime could use Swedish railways.

Erik Vendefelt argues that the average Swede had difficulties apprehending and accepting that such cruelties happened to the Jewry during the war years, which consequently lead to inaction after the war in aiding refugees and in a lack of empathy towards the affected victims. As Sweden was mainly unaffected by the war some authors allege that the Swedish nation should feel obligated to assist with humanitarian aid and to attempt to counter existing anti-Semitism. For example, in 1945 in *Judisk Tidskrift*, Mia Löfgren-Leche argues that:

> While other small countries have fought almost to death for their peace and freedom, we have been able to keep ours with very few victims. Should we not, with the humanitarian tasks that make out our contribution to reconstruction work, be able to incorporate the fight against the most dangerous of mental illnesses?

Despite this, as stated, the discussions revolving around the Scandinavian countries roles during the Holocaust are marginalized and not at forefront in the discussions.

---

148 Herbert Friedländer, "På livets botten," *Judisk Tidskrift* 19, no. 3 (1946), 87-91.
149 Stig Benedixon, "Är den svenska nyhetsförmedlingen antisemitisk?" *Judisk Krönika* 14, no. 9 (1945), 157.
150 Mia Leche-Löfgren, "Inför freden," *Judisk Tidskrift* 18, no. 5 (1945), 140-142.
152 Leche-Löfgren, "Inför freden," 142.
The framing of retributive justice

Retributive justice is, as described, a system of criminal justice based on the punishment of offenders and this type of justice appeals to the notion that justice cannot be achieved until the offender’s crime has been identified and punished accordingly. In framing analysis, as stated, the researcher looks for common themes in the texts that contribute to reinforcing thematic clusters as this makes it possible to recognize what is being emphasized and what is potentially being left out of the discussions. In terms of retributive justice, there are no articles that directly treat the issue of how the defendants at the Nuremberg trials should be punished. However, in 1945 in *Judisk Krönika*, without specifically referring to the Nuremberg trials, Kurt Stillschweig argues that:

Of course, the punishment of the guilty does not solve the Jewish question. But punishment is a prerequisite for that the Jewish question becomes dealt with. Only through the punishment of the mass murderers can it be reaffirmed in Western jurisprudence that even the killing of a Jew is murder, that robbery remains robbery even when committed towards a Jew.

As illustrated by the quote, Stillschweig argues that the crime of a Jew is considered as worse than the crimes of others due to the racial discrimination that Jews face and he provides indirect support for the kind of justice that the Nuremberg trials give rise too.

Another common theme present in the articles is that the Allies do not act earnestly in their claimed attempts to bring about justice for the European Jewry after the Holocaust. On the one hand, the Allies claim to sympathize with the Jewish victims as they assert that those Nazis who committed human rights abuses during the war will be brought to justice in, for example, the courtrooms at Nuremberg. On the other hand, outside of the Nuremberg trials courtrooms they find that the Allies display emotions of indifference towards the Jewish refugees and, additionally, towards the Jewish strife to establish the state of Israel. This inconsistency in their attitude towards the Jewish people leads to that the authors do not trust that the Allies genuinely care about achieving justice for the Jewish people. This as a result means that even if the Nazis receive legal punishments, these punishments are not reflecting the crimes they have committed specifically towards the Jewry.

156 See for example: Benedikt, "Förnuftets bankrutt," 148-152; Kaplan, "Utrotningen av Europas judar – en översikt,” 73; Dobkin, "De överlevande judarnas öde – En historia om ’skam och förödmjukelse,” 122-125;
The framing of restorative justice

The journals highlight that the Jews do not desire to reconcile with the perpetrators of the Holocaust and a common theme present is that no authentic apologies by the perpetrators are sufficient to amend the crimes of the perpetrators. Neither the Nazis nor the German people are seen as showing any signs of remorse for the crimes they have committed during the Holocaust.\(^\text{157}\) The focal point in regards to restorative justice is instead on the foundation of the national state of Israel. For example, in 1945 in *Judisk Tidskrift*, Maurice Samuel argues that:

> Jews should demand to be treated equally. But freedom does not only mean freedom from persecution and oppression, but also equals a positive attitude of the other peoples; they must hold a kind and benevolent interest to the Jews as Jews, not just as individuals. Unless this kind of freedom is established for the Jews, they can once again, in endless harm to themselves, fall victim to a future explosion. The first symbol of justice in the new system that will now be established will be its attitude to the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine, not just as a place to send the homeless and impoverished, but as a true center of all Jewish life.\(^\text{158}\)

Israel is thus seen as the chief compensation for the Holocaust and the journals, as stated, predominantly call for all Jews to unite in order to support the cause of Zionism. However, there are a few articles posted in *Judisk Tidskrift* by professor Eli Heckscher that questions the creation of the national state of Israel as the sole solution to end gentile persecution of Jews.\(^\text{159}\)

The framing of procedural justice

Procedural justice in relation to the Nuremberg trials is not discussed whatsoever. Nevertheless, Moshe Braver discusses another trial in *Judisk Krönika*, namely the Belsen trial in Luneberg, which was conducted at the end of 1945. Braver conceives that the Nazis prosecuted at this trial are guilty of genocide, and that they appear seemingly indifferent

---

\(^\text{157}\) See for example: Michales, “Förskräckelsen utan slut – Till den Europeiska judefrågan,” 77-79; Benedikt, ”Ett verk om koncentrationslägren,” 327; ”Med en FN-delegation hos de tvångsförflyttade,” *Judisk Krönika* 16, no. 7 (1947), 121-124; ”Vad tvingas vi till?” *Judisk Krönika* 17, no. 1 (1948), 7-8; ”Ingen tysk ångrar vad som har hänt judarna,” *Judisk Krönika* 17, no. 3 (1948), 36.

\(^\text{158}\) Maurice Samuel. ”Världens nationer och det judiska problemet,” *Judisk Tidskrift* 18, no. 6 (1945), 181.

\(^\text{159}\) See for example: Eli Heckscher, ”De hemlösa judarnas framtid,” *Judisk Tidskrift* 20, no. 9 (1947), 161-162; Eli Heckscher, ”Brevväxling mellan professorerna Heckscher och Ehrenpreis,” *Judisk Tidskrift* 20, no. 8 (1947), 241-248.
towards the crimes they have committed.\textsuperscript{160} He also argues that all Nazis who participated in the persecution and killings of the Jews should receive the death penalty, and that the court is not treating these perpetrators with enough sternness. Braver writes:

You only have to prove that the accused were guards, doctors etc. to make them accountable for what took place within the walls of this horrible death camp. If this had been done, the process would have been completed in less than a week. It is a known fact that if a criminal gang plans to kill someone, they go to the victim's residence. If one of them enters and executes the murder themselves while the others are guarding, the whole band is responsible for the murder, and each member is subjected to a death sentence.\textsuperscript{161}

Braver also thinks that the witness testimonies of Holocaust survivors at the trials are not received with adequate sympathy by either the judges or the perpetrators. He describes that after “sitting in the courtroom for several days witnessing the far-reaching negotiations, the courtesy and consideration, with which these beasts were treated for whose crimes our vocabulary has no name, I can only think that this cannot be called justice”.\textsuperscript{162} Consequently, even though procedural justice in relation to the Nuremberg trials is not discussed in neither of the journals, it is evident that an author (Moshe Braver) do not find that justice is achieved at the Belsen trial which is a similar legal set up in which Nazis are being prosecuted within the same time-period. Yet, the fact that the memory of the Holocaust, to a limited extent was coupled with the Nuremberg trials makes this kind of justice less relevant during the late 1940s.

\textbf{The framing of distributive justice}

The authors do not discuss the Nuremberg trials within the framework of distributive justice whatsoever.

\textbf{Analysis Part II – The Eichmann trial}

\textbf{Representation of the Holocaust during the Eichmann trial}

The Eichmann trial was discussed in 51 articles out of a total of 665 articles in \textit{Judisk Krönika} during the time-period of 1960-1962, which is demonstrated by \textit{FIGURE 8} and \textit{FIGURE 9}. In \textit{Judisk Tidskrift}, the Eichmann trial was discussed in 18 out of a total of 204 articles during the same time-period, which is shown in \textit{FIGURE 11} and \textit{FIGURE 12}. As shown in the

\textsuperscript{160} Braver, "Belsenprocessen,” 161-162.
\textsuperscript{161} Braver, Belsenprocessen,” 162.
\textsuperscript{162} Braver, Belsenprocessen,” 162.
graphs, there was a peak of articles treating the Eichmann trial in both journals in 1961, which is the year the trial took place. The Holocaust was discussed in 150 articles out of a total of 204 articles in *Judisk Krönika*, which is illustrated by *FIGURE 8* and *FIGURE 10*. In *Judisk Tidskrift*, the Holocaust was discussed in 73 articles out of a total of 204 articles as illustrated by *FIGURE 11* and *FIGURE 13*. Despite the fact that the Eichmann trial was shorter, these numbers demonstrate that compared to discussions about the Nuremberg trials, the Eichmann trial was much more widely discussed and considered important among Jews in Sweden. The articles also focused on the actual trial, and did not solely mention the trial more in passing as with the case of the Nuremberg trials. Just over a third of the articles that treated the Holocaust also concerned the Eichmann trial. Thus, the Holocaust memory during this time came to be more closely linked to the trial, which was not the case during the late 1940s. The Eichmann trial furthermore also initiated discussions concerning victims, perpetrators, bystanders and justice. To illustrate how the social memory of the Holocaust was formed during this time-period I will below present how victims, perpetrators and bystanders, and types of justice, were framed during the time-period of the trial.
Graphs

FIGURE 8. Total articles per year in Judisk Krönika

FIGURE 9. Articles dealing with the Eichmann trial in Judisk Krönika
FIGURE 10. Articles dealing with the Holocaust in Judisk Krönika
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FIGURE 11. Total articles per year in Judisk Tidskrift
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FIGURE 12. Articles dealing with the Eichmann trial in Judisk Tidskrift
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FIGURE 13. Articles dealing with the Holocaust in Judisk Tidskrift
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The framing of victims

Similarly as when I conducted a framing analysis of the articles in the latter part of the 1940s, I looked for clusters of themes relating to the social categories of genocide and types of justice in the early 1960s. In terms of victims, it is apparent that the weighty involvement of witnesses during the Eichmann trial is of importance in the journals. As earlier described, in contrast to the Nuremberg trials the prosecution at the Eichmann trial relied more on Jewish witnesses. The journals emphasize that it is through the stories of these witnesses that the trauma of the Jews can be told and that the Holocaust was as a unique event in history in which unprecedented civil atrocities were committed against the Jews by the Nazi regime.

These results are inline with the research of Kirchheimer, Yablonka and Bloxham that state that the Eichmann trial was telling the story of the Holocaust.

The results also demonstrate that during the trial the Jews are framed as the main victim group of the Holocaust. Similarly as during the Nuremberg trials, the authors do not elaborate on other victims groups. The “Lachrymose concept” of Jewish history is also used as an argumentative framework for the discussions which means that the Jewish history is again depicted as a history of suffering caused by gentile persecution, which led to the Holocaust. Nonetheless, instead of attempting to move beyond the epithet of “victim” and looking towards the future, the articles during this time-period focus on the past trauma that has occurred and the role that the Jews played during the Holocaust. The trial is seen as an opportunity to examine the crimes committed against the Jewish people, and how the trauma has affected the Jews as a group.

163 Yablonka, ”The Eichmann trial: was it the Jewish Nuremberg?” 304.
165 Kirchheimer, Political justice: the use of legal procedure for political ends, 332; Yablonka, ”The Eichmann trial: was it the Jewish Nuremberg?” 301; Bloxham, Genocide on trial: war crime trials and the formation of Holocaust memory, 221-228.
The discussions during the Eichmann trial also revolve around the sheer amount of Jewish victims and the issue of Jewish resistance. Jews were thus not only considered as victims but at the same time as heroes who fought against Nazism. This dual role became more important in the social memory of the Holocaust among Jews in Sweden in the early 1960s than in the late 1940s. Welner Pinches poses the following question in *Judisk Tidskrift*: “How was it possible to annihilate six million Jews, without them resisting, without them punishing their enemies? The Eichmann-process inaugurates this entire chapter once more with all its terrible horror”.168 The Nazi Regime’s effectiveness in exporting Jews to ghettos and concentration camps is perplexing to the authors, who are struggling to dismantle the notion of the European Jewry being passively led to slaughter without resisting.169 There are a variety of opinions expressed on the dilemma of Jewish resistance during the Holocaust. For example, Bruno Bettelheim describes how the Jewish people refused to accept that they were in danger, and that it was their defiance to accept the reality of their situation that led to their downfall.170

Another author, Joachim Israel, disagrees with Bettelheim and asserts that as the Jewish people constitute of many different kinds of groups their behavior cannot be explained by adhering to solely one theory. Israel argues that the behavior of a German middleclass Jew cannot be understood similarly as the behavior of a Polish middleclass Jew. He describes how the German Jews had been relatively accepted by society and to revolt against authorities were not apart of their mindset, this as they had learnt to obey the social order. They hence did not believe that the authorities had the intent to annihilate the Jewry, which led to them accepting the exportations. In contrast, Israel argues, the orthodox Polish Jewry had lived isolated from society for decades which led to that these Jews were accustomed to persecution, pogroms and economic exploitation by authorities and therefore did not put their trust in authority figures but rather in God. As their lives were a series of events planned by God, they had to accept their destiny, no matter the outcome. In their minds, the Holocaust could not be avoided by resistance, but rather they had to accept the challenges put before them. Israel also holds that the Jews who in fact did revolt were those that had Zionist and

---

169 See for example: Welner, ”Den räddhågade juden,” 153; Bruno Bettelheim, ”Har vi lärt oss något av Anne Franks läxa?” *Judisk Tidskrift* 34, no. 4 (1961), 120-129; Cordelia Edvardson, ”Anne Franks läxa en gång till,” *Judisk Tidskrift* 34, no. 5 (1961), 150-152; Joachim Israel, ”Anne Franks läxa,” *Judisk Tidskrift* 34, no. 6-7 (1961), 182-184; ”Ghettokämparnas by,” *Judisk Krönika* 30, no. 6 (1961), 154; ”Hyllning av ghettokämparna,” *Judisk Krönika* 30, no. 6 (1961), 161; Lydia Frankenstein, ”Aktivt motstånd,” *Judisk Tidskrift* 34, no. 6-7 (1961), 185-188.
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socialist backgrounds and that it was their preexisting ideological mindset that led to them being more likely to resist.\textsuperscript{171} The various positions on this issue indicate that the social memory of the Holocaust during this period contained different views on the victim’s ability to resist, depending on whether they were Western European or Eastern European.

There is, however, a common consensus in the journals that the Nazi perpetrators were able to deceive the Jewish people by making them believe that they were being exported in order to work, not to be killed, and once put in the concentration camps the Jews were emaciated by work and starvation, which led to them being too weak to resist.\textsuperscript{172} Despite this, the authors are conscientious to highlight examples of Jewish resistance during the Holocaust. Examples brought forth are, among others, the Warsaw ghetto uprising in 1943, the revolt of Sonderkommando 7 in the Auschwitz concentration camp and the incident of a female dancer in Auschwitz that managed to shoot and kill a guard before she was gassed. Additional examples include the uprisings in the ghetto of Bialystok and the concentration camp of Treblinka.\textsuperscript{173} Welner asserts that it is possible that more ghetto uprisings occurred, but that the participants were killed before being able to retell of the events.\textsuperscript{174} However, he also states in \textit{Judisk Tidsskrift} in 1961 that if “you know anything about what was taking place in the concentration camps and in the ghettos, then you refrain from asking why they did not revolt and other such things, and the more you admire the Warsaw ghetto uprisings and its heroic end”.\textsuperscript{175}

### The framing of perpetrators

From barely being mentioned before in the journals, Adolf Eichmann takes a central role in the early 1960s social memory of the Holocaust among Jews in Sweden. During the trial he is framed as a symbol for the typical Nazi perpetrator. He is seen as an anti-Semite that found pleasure in persecuting and killing Jews, this as he attempted to proceed in the killing of Jews even after the fall of the Third Reich. He is seen as an average man that has committed terrible deeds due to him living in a dictatorship nation in which committing human rights abuses was of the normal. Eichmann is put on trial for the crimes he has committed against
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the Jewish people during the Holocaust but during the trial it is obvious to the authors that he lacks the ability to feel sympathy for his victims and that he is oblivious of the magnitudes of the crimes he has committed. The authors conclude that Eichmann demonstrates no signs of remorse or sympathy for the sufferings of the Jewish people. Eichmann pleads non-guilty stating that he was simply following orders and that he did not issue any orders himself, but the authors consider that following orders cannot justify committing terrible human rights abuses and that humanity and awareness of responsibility cannot be replaced by stringently following orders. He is thus seen as responsible for contributing to the deaths of millions of Jews.  

The authors are also perplexed by the outwardly ordinariness of the Nazi perpetrators, and how these seemingly ordinary individuals can turn into killers taking part in the genocide. Relevant for this time-period is consequently the debate initiated at the Eichmann trial by Hannah Arendt on the “ordinariness” of the Nazi perpetrators. Even though this debate mainly took place after both of the trials, the opinions expressed by the authors in *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk Tidkrift* resonate with Arendt’s opinions voiced in the debate, and the discussions can therefore be seen as predecessors to this debate. The authors commonly agree with the later voiced opinions by Arendt on that the Nazi perpetrators, and specifically Eichmann, was affected by the fact that they lived in a totalitarian regime in which committing atrocities was normal. It is also highlighted how the Nazi perpetrators continued to persecute Jews even after they knew they would not win the war. The authors find that Eichmann’s seemingly outwardly ordinariness in conjunction with his ability to take part in genocide demonstrate the notion of that the Nazi ideology permeated the entire German population. The above-mentioned Pinches argues, for example, that the “tragedy of the Germans was that the mentality of the mob completely dominated, from the top of the hierarchy to the bottom.

---


Scientists, thinkers, philosophers, artists, yes, even a few Nobel-prize winners were transformed into gangsters”. 178

The framing of bystanders

The clusters of themes identifiable in the journals in the 1960s demonstrate that during the time-period of the Eichmann trial the authors describe the nations of Europe as bystanders. Countries that witnessed the Holocaust but did not act sufficiently are thus becoming a part of the social memory of the Holocaust, which means that the issue of guilt is ascribed a more complex meaning than during the late 1940s. The European countries mentioned that adhere to this description include Austria, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, England179, France, Belgium and the Netherlands (also referred to as Holland).180 In 1961, Golda Zimmerman argues in Judisk Krönika that:

Of course there were convinced collaborators in Western Europe, but in general people participated in the persecution in hopes of them receiving some benefits on their own behalf and not because of any hatred towards the Jews. There were governments who participated due to them being controlled by the Nazis. But even when these facts are taken into account, one must wonder how the highly cultivated France could accept such a scheme and how Holland and Belgium, with their ancient, traditional Jewish congregations, could so easily deliver the Jews.181

These mentioned nations are, as the quote demonstrates, seen as guilty for not refusing orders by the Third Reich and more specifically for exporting Jews. The authors also specifically view England’s actions during the Holocaust with certain skepticism. Even though it is commonly acknowledged that England largely contributed to the downfall of the Third Reich, some of its actions are regarded with disbelief. For example, in Judisk Krönika in 1961, an unknown author highlight England’s failed inactions during the war years by pointing out England’s decision to not bomb the gas chambers of Auschwitz, their decision to not drop Jewish parachute jumpers in occupied Europe, their decision to not let all Jews in Europe be declared under British or Anglo-American protection and lastly, to not issue a warning to
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railway workers that anyone who contributed to the deportations of Jews would be regarded as war criminals.182

The roles of the Scandinavian nations are not discussed with any greater depth or in relation to the Eichmann trial and when referred to, the Scandinavian nations are mainly framed as rescue-nations that after the Holocaust have amicable ties with Israel. Denmark is specifically mentioned as a heroic nation as its population helped rescue a large proportion of its Jewry.183 The more critical attitude towards Sweden had not become a part of the social memory of the Holocaust among Jews in the 1960s.

The framing of retributive justice

As described, retributive justice focuses on the punishment of offenders.184 When looking for clusters of themes relating to retributive justice, it is possible to conclude that the authors find that Eichmann is guilty even before the start of the trial, which means that they do not consider that the main aim of the trial is to assess whether or not Eichmann should receive a punishment or not.185 The authors agree that Eichmann should receive a stern legal verdict, however, whether or not he should receive the death penalty is not widely discussed in 1960 and 1961. Yet, in 1962 in Judisk Krönika, an article is posted by Moa Martinson and Daniel Brick in which they discuss the issue of Eichmann’s punishment. Martinson argues that Eichmann’s crime is too severe for him to be executed by the death penalty. Instead, she proposes that he should be kept in an isolation cell until he dies of natural causes. This type of punishment would allow Eichmann to be studied for a longer period of time, which would help create a better understanding of his malevolent and unremorseful behavior.186

Daniel Brick agrees with Martinson, and similarly writes that Eichmann should not receive the death penalty as this punishment is too generic in regards to the severity of the crimes he has committed. Brick additionally invokes a religious argumentative framework,
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and states that all men should have the ability to repent before their finals days and that it is up to God to decide when an individual should die. Moreover, Eichmann’s crimes are seen as so severe that a legal verdict cannot atone for the crimes he has committed and even though the Jewish people can attain some justice during the trial, the trial cannot amend the past. The authors argue that the world, and specifically the German nation, will forever be in debt to the Jewry for their actions against the Jewish people during the Holocaust. The aim of the trial is therefore not represented as an opportunity to demand revenge, but rather to let the Jewish victims witness about their sufferings.

As described, deterrence is important in terms of retributive justice, as the aim of applying this type of justice is often to prevent similar crimes from taking place in the future. The Eichmann trial is, in line with these assertions, represented as an opportunity for future generations to gain knowledge about the era of the Nazi regime and their crimes against the Jewish people. The Eichmann trial is understood as a unique event in which it is possible to conduct a systematic and detailed review of the Holocaust and the Nazi regime’s attempt to annihilate the Jewish people. The authors thus consider that a main aim of the trial is to spread knowledge about the Holocaust to current and future generations in order to prevent any further persecution of Jews and other minority groups. The trial is also seen as an opportunity to review the historic role of anti-Semitism. In terms of retributive justice, the emphasis is put on the symbolic effects of the punishment of Eichmann, as it represents a verdict not only on Eichmann the perpetrator, but also on Nazism and anti-Semitism.

The framing of restorative justice

While retributive justice emphasizes the punishment of offenders, restorative justice focuses more on rehabilitation of the affected victims and perpetrators through reconciliation.

---
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Jewish testimonies during the Eichmann trial are seen as imperative aspects of restorative justice as it is through these testimonies that the Jewish people are given a chance to redeem themselves in their own and the world’s eyes. The lack of Jewish witnesses at the Nuremberg trials are mentioned once in an article that features a speech by David Ben-Gurion on the 13th anniversary of Israel:

Certainly, the Nazi war criminals have already been brought to justice in Nuremberg - and there were also mentioned the six million murdered Jews. But the voice of the Jewish people themselves was not heard in this trial.

Ben-Gurion thus argues inline with Kirchheimer, Yablonka and Bloxham that assert that the Nuremberg trials downplayed the specific Jewish trauma during the Holocaust by not making use of many survivor testimonies. The behavior of Eichmann during the trial also does not mitigate any feelings of anger among the authors in the journals. An unknown author argues the following in *Judisk Krönika* in 1961:

One could have expected that, at least sixteen years after the defeat of Nazism, he would have expressed at least some form of conscience. But instead, he began his testimony by, in a well-known Nazi style, distorting facts and claiming that the war was imposed on Germany. His cynicism reached its pinnacle when he declared that the war against the Jews was also imposed on the German people. He does not believe in remorse. He believes that remorse is childish and meaningless because the dead still cannot be brought back to life. But what does he believe in then? Yes, that the loyalty he swore Hitler justifies his deeds and frees him from all responsibility. He denies facts and seeks excuses, all to hide and smooth over the blasphemous crimes and his own hideous share in them.

As the quote states, the authors consider that Eichmann is unable of demonstrating any signs of remorse. The trial is therefore not seen as an event that can open up a satisfying dialogue between the Jewish community and the perpetrator, this as the perpetrator refuses to confess responsibility for any of the crimes he is accused of.

---
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The framing of procedural justice

The use of many witnesses during the Eichmann trial is also seen as a vital aspect within the framework of procedural justice, this as the use of Jewish testimonies reflects how the procedures of the trials are set up. The authors argue that the use of many Jewish witnesses during the Eichmann trial demonstrates that the Jewish trauma is at center-stage.199 Another common theme present in the discussions is that the authors engage in defending why Israel is entitled to hold the trial against Eichmann. For example, in Judisk Krönika in 1960, an unknown author argue that Israel is entitled to hold the trial due to that the largest amounts of eyewitnesses reside in Israel, and that “at least three Israeli institutions possessing authentic documents have been engaged in investigating the Nazi war crimes”.200 This author explains that Israel can rely on the "National Passive Principle of National sovereignty" because more victims of the Nazi Terror live in Israel than in any other country”.201

The author also emphasizes that it has been pointed out in media outlets that Israel did not yet exist when Eichmann committed his crimes against the Jewish people. However, s/he states that Israel can be seen as a continuance of the Jewish Palestinian term of office and that it is not possible to appoint an international court, as no international institution exists, which would be entitled to appoint the judges in this court.202 Similarly, in 1961 in Judisk Krönika, another unknown author argues that there is “no reason to believe that Israel could not hold these negotiations at the highest legal level and that the people of the world must remember that the idea of justice forms the Jewish spiritual tradition for hundreds of years, and this tradition has characterized the rebirth of the Jewish state”.203 The fact that media outlets were able to record and document the trial is also discussed and the presence of foreign media is seen as necessary in order to achieve a fair and transparent legal process.204
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The framing of distributive justice

The authors do not discuss the Eichmann-trial within the framework of distributive justice whatsoever.

Discussion

According to Holmila, the Nuremberg trials were extensively featured in the Swedish press throughout the trials duration. However, the results demonstrate that this was not the case in *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk Tidskrift* as the trials were only mentioned in passing without being thoroughly discussed. On the other hand, it is important to acknowledge that a significant discussion on the Holocaust was going on among Jews immediately after the Second World War, which scholars focusing on national memories tended to disregard. The results therefore correspond to the research done by scholars such as Diner, Bankier and Michman that argue that Jewish communities have actively dealt with the Holocaust during even the early postwar years. The Holocaust was especially discussed throughout 1945, but starting in 1946 the articles that directly treated the Holocaust started to become more infrequent, while articles that dealt with Zionism became more numerous. This curve of decline in articles treating the Holocaust demonstrates that an emerging interest in Zionism occurred, while the Holocaust was treated as one of the major reasons for the necessity of the existence of a national Jewish state.

The increasing interest in Zionism can be explained by both the foundation of the national state of Israel in 1948, and a desire in the journals to support the efforts to build a better future for the nearly annihilated Jewry. The pertinence of Zionism is also strongly associated with a growing fear of an ongoing anti-Semitism on the European continent, and an earnest disinterest of the Allied countries in countering this. Israel is in view of this seen as the only solution to end gentile persecution of Jews, as it is solely a Jewish state that can protect the Jews from imminent discrimination. Nonetheless, that Zionism was a topic of focus in *Judisk Krönika* was to be expected, as it is a self-stated Zionist journal. However, the

same results are also observable in *Judisk Tidskrift*. The results for that reason also correspond to the research done by Sjögren that has similarly found that *Judisk Krönik* emphasized the importance of the state of Israel and the cause of Zionism in the late 1940s.\textsuperscript{208} Diner has also found that from 1945 to 1948, the strife of American Jews after the Holocaust was also chiefly linked to the Zionist movement, the creation of Israel and the struggle of Jewish displaced persons. She points also points out that the American politically active Jews used the Holocaust as an argument for the necessity of the creation of Israel.\textsuperscript{209} Similarly, the same kind of rhetoric is visible in the journals.

In contrast to the Nuremberg trials, the Eichmann trial was extensively featured in both *Judisk Krönika* and *Judisk Tidskrift* throughout 1961 and contributed to various perspectives on the Holocaust. There are also a few articles posted on the trial in 1960 and 1962. The trial repeatedly initiated discussions concerning both the Holocaust as such, and regarding how justice can be achieved in light of the trauma that occurred. The discussions pertaining to the trial was characterized by a distinctive approach of dealing with the Holocaust by evaluating who the victims, perpetrators and bystanders were and how each of the social categories should be handled with for justice to prevail. The stories of the witnesses were seen as the most effective method of telling the story of the Jewish trauma, as the voices of those affected could be heard by the world.

By looking at how the social categories of victims, perpetrators, victims and types of justice were framed I was able to attain an apprehension of how the social memory of the Holocaust in the journals was constructed. As described in the methods-section, the framing analysis was conducted by focusing on patterns of themes relating to each category. In terms of the social category of “victim” I found that both of the journals framed the Jews as the main victim target group of the National Socialist Worker’s Party (NSDAP), or the so-called Nazi party. There was a lack of articles posted about the experiences of survivors in Sweden in the journals in the latter part of the 1940s, but as stated by Thor Tureby this fact can most probably be explained by the fact that these survivors were seen as temporary guests that would later emigrate to Palestine.\textsuperscript{210}

The focus on the Jews as victims can be explained by the fact that the journals are in fact Jewish and it is also closely related to the predominant understanding of the Holocaust as

the genocide of six million Jews. The Jewish nature of the journals, however, does not inevitably lead to a devaluation of other victim groups’ experiences that felt victim to Nazi persecution. In view of this, the suffering of other victim groups were in fact acknowledged during both time-periods and these groups included Poles, Czechs, French, Dutch, Serbs, Norwegians and Danes. Nevertheless, these groups were solely referred too and there was no mention of the persecution or killings of other victim groups such as Roma, Homosexuals, Ethnic Poles, Ukrainian Slavs, Soviet POWs, Belarussian Slavs, Serbs, disabled, Freemasons, Slovenes, homosexuals, leftists, Jehovah’s witnesses or Spanish republicans. The actual experiences of the acknowledged groups were also not taken into account in the discussions pertaining to the Holocaust.

The “Lachrymose-concept” of Jewish history was also used as an argumentative framework during both time-periods and it was evident that the Jewish suffering was compared to that of other victim groups and evaluated as more severe. The discrimination of the Jews was represented as a result of relentless gentile persecution caused by anti-Semitism. However, despite this common theme, the focus of the discussions regarding victims was considerably different during the respective time-periods. The discussions during the latter part of the 1940s were characterized by a desire to look toward the future of the Jewry in Israel and effort is put on moving beyond the epithet of victim. In contrast, the discussions during the Eichmann trial were characterized by a desire to examine the past trauma and the role that the Jews played during the Holocaust. The discussions during the trials were as a result intrinsically different as the authors want to move beyond the epithet of victim during the Nuremberg trials, while the Eichmann trial influenced the authors to embrace and discuss how this epithet has affected them as a group. Despite this, neither of the journals represented the Jews as only victims as emphasis was put on highlighting Jewish resistance.

In terms of perpetrators, the main focus during both time-periods was on the Nazi perpetrators. The articles also framed the Germans as aware and supportive of the atrocities committed by the Nazi regime. Germany is portrayed as a nation infused with anti-Semitism, which in itself was represented as an ideology that aims for the absolute destruction of the Jewry. However, the discussions that took place in the early 1960s dealt more with the psychological behavior of perpetrators than the articles in the latter part of the 1940s. Eichmann is, as discussed, represented in the journals as a perpetrator with a convinced anti-Semitic mindset, which symbolized the typical mindset of the Nazi perpetrators during the Holocaust. As stated, in framing analysis the researcher concentrates on looking for themes of arguments that makes it possible to discern what is being emphasized in the communicative
texts and what is potentially being left out. Congruent with this approach, it is evident that the specific focus of the Eichmann trial on a Nazi perpetrator lead to that the focus of the journals exigently became on the role of Nazi perpetrators. The accentuation on the roles and behaviors of Nazi perpetrators resulted in that discussions dealing with other types of Holocaust perpetrators became less recurrent.

However, the roles of bystanders were discussed in both journals, but in the latter part of the 1940s these were only referred to vaguely as Christian nations in Europe and “humanity”. The Christian nations in Europe were encouraged to support the cause of Israel, as the Jews are portrayed as not wanting to return to their old homes due to the persecution they experienced there during the Holocaust. England was also criticized for not letting more Jews immigrate to Palestine during the Holocaust. During the early part of the 1960s the nations defined as adhering to this social category included Austria, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, England, France, Belgium and the Netherlands (also referred to as Holland). Even though guilt was attributed to these nations for their actions during the World War Two and in terms of aiding Jews, more emphasis was put on their relationship with Israel after the war and it is primarily this relationship that determined whether these nations were deemed as laudable nations, or if they deserved critique.

Weedon and Jordan moreover argue, as explained above, that minority groups often challenge existing national narratives. The results in this study demonstrate that the focus of the journals mainly framed the Scandinavian nations from a positive point of view during the latter part of the 1940s. In 1945, one article critiqued Sweden for its stern immigration laws during the war, and for letting the Nazi regime use Swedish’s railways. For the reason that Sweden was relatively untouched by the war, it is also pointed out that Sweden is required to provide humanitarian aid and assistance to Holocaust victims after the war. However, the image portrayed of Sweden was, as stated, predominantly as that of a rescue nation. It was moreover acknowledged by some authors that Jews were taken from both Norway and Denmark to concentration camps like Theresienstadt. Nonetheless, as with the case of Sweden, especially Denmark was represented as a rescue nation that deserved praise for organizing rescue-efforts of the Danish Jews. In the early 1960s, the Scandinavian nations were also by and large viewed as praiseworthy nations, but not because of their actions during the Second World War but rather in light of their amicable relationships with Israel.
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Bloxham argues, as stated above, that evidence linked to the Holocaust has been congregated largely in trials, examples include the documents that were gathered during the Nuremberg trials and the witness testimonies presented at the Eichmann trial. These types of trials have affected the formation of existing generalizations and ideas of the Holocaust. In order to create a more prevalent understanding of how the Holocaust is understood in contemporary contexts, it is therefore essential to explore these types of judicial contexts. In the latter part of the 1940s, it was apparent that the idea of justice in relation to the Holocaust was linked to the creation of Israel while justice in the early part of the 1960s was more directly related to the Eichmann trial.

Still, Israel did play an imperative role even during the Eichmann trial, as the authors engaged in defending why Israel was entitled to hold the trial. The journals represented Israel as entitled, precisely due to the fact that it was Jews that were the main targets of the Nazi Regime. Moreover, even though the punishment of Eichmann was of importance for the authors in the journals, the trial was not seen as an event that could amend the past. Reconciliation through forgiveness of the perpetrator was hence not seen as an option and this was reinforced by the fact that Adolf Eichmann did not demonstrate signs of remorse for the crimes committed. The results seemingly correspond to previous research by Kirchheimer, Yablonka and Bloxham that assert that the Eichmann trial can be seen as a critical juncture in postwar Jewish history that initiated discussions about the Holocaust, justice and retribution and asserted Israel as a nation in the international arena.

Conclusions

The master’s thesis has examined how the Swedish-Jewish social memory of the Holocaust was shaped in relation to justice during the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial. The purpose has been on the one hand to investigate how the memory of the Holocaust has been shaped in general around the time of these trials and on the other hand to see what kind of justice the Jews in Sweden requested in relation to the traumatic past during the same time. My main materials consisted of articles in the journals Judisk Krönika and Judisk Tidskrift during 1945-1949 and 1960-1962. The results of the master’s thesis point to that the Nuremberg trials and the Eichmann trial had contrasting effects on the social memory of the

---

213 Bloxham, *Genocide on trial: war crime trials and the formation of Holocaust memory*, 221-222.
214 Kirchheimer, *Political justice: the use of legal procedure for political ends*, 301; Yablonka, ”The Eichmann trial: was it the Jewish Nuremberg?” 301; Bloxham, *Genocide on trial: war crime trials and the formation of Holocaust memory*, 221-228.
Holocaust among Jews in Sweden. The Nuremberg trials were only mentioned briefly in articles that primarily dealt with other subjects and these trials did moreover not initiate discussions concerning the Holocaust or justice.

However, it is not accurate to state that the Holocaust was not dealt with in the journals during this time. The Holocaust was especially featured in articles published in 1945, but after this year articles on the subject started to decline while a emerging interest in Zionism was observable which can be explained by the foundation of Israel in 1948 and the desire of the Swedish Jews to contribute to the creation of a brighter future for the Jewry in Israel after facing near destruction during the Holocaust. During the latter part of the 1940s, the Israeli Declaration of Independence and the unabated support of Israel is seen as the way to compensate the Jewish people for the Holocaust. The social memory of the Holocaust rather mainly influenced what here has been termed restorative justice where the creation of the national state of Israel is seen as more important in terms of justice than the punishing of Nazi perpetrators in trials. Retributive justice in the form of punishing the perpetrators with verdicts were not widely discussed in relation to the Nuremberg trials, however, there was consensus that the Nazi perpetrators deserved to receive punishments for their crimes. There were moreover no discussions concerning procedural justice or distributive justice in regards to the Nuremberg trials.

Dissimilarly from the Nuremberg trials, the Eichmann trial was discussed frequently in the beginning of the 1960s. In this case the trial inspired discussions in a significant number of articles on the Holocaust in the journals, which indicate an important influence from the trial on the social memory of this genocide. During the Eichmann trial, emphasis was still placed upon the importance of the existence of Israel as a nation, but rather in regards to procedural justice in the form of Israel hosting the Eichmann trial on Israeli grounds. Israel is depicted as entitled to hold the trial due to the fact that it was Jews that were the main targeted victim group of the Nazi regime. The Eichmann trial is seen as an event in which Israel can deal with the trauma of the Holocaust by prosecuting a Nazi for the crimes he has committed against the Jewish people. Adolf Eichmann represents the typical Nazi perpetrator and the Eichmann trial is portrayed as the first judicial opportunity for the Jewish people to demand reparations for the injustices committed against them by the Nazi regime.

However, the crimes committed by the Nazi regime against the Jews are seen as so vile that restoration through forgiveness is not seen as an option. Rather than being an opportunity for reconciliation through forgiveness and through punishing the perpetrator with a verdict, the trial is mainly seen as an opportunity for which the story of the Jewish trauma
can be told to the world. Despite this, retributive justice in the form of a verdict was also discussed and opinions were voiced for and against the death penalty. The punishment of Eichmann is represented as a verdict not only on Eichmann the perpetrator, but also on Nazism and anti-Semitism. The demands for justice during the Eichmann trial led to that the authors in the journals engaged in reviewing the Holocaust and issues relating to guilt and responsibility, this in order to construct an idea of how these issues should be dealt with in order to achieve justice at the trial. Nonetheless, distributive justice was not discussed whatsoever in relation to the Eichmann trial.

The results of this master’s thesis demonstrate that it is imperative to investigate how different legal contexts have affected the development of Holocaust memory. It is apparent that more research needs to be devoted to examining why certain trials that deal with human rights abuses affect the social memories of minority groups while some do not. This becomes eminently apparent by intersecting the results of this master’s thesis that illustrate that justice and the development of social memory can be profoundly coupled, depending on the importance the affected minority group attaches to the trial that is prosecuting the perpetrators responsible for committing the crimes. Theories of social memory in combination with theories of transitional justice, which this thesis has used as an analytical framework, can be fruitful in this regard. The Nuremberg trials were not widely featured in the journals but the Eichmann trial did not only contribute to the development of the Swedish-Jewish social memory of the Jews in Sweden, but also initiated discussions about the Holocaust, justice and retribution. However, even though the Nuremberg trials were not ascribed importance in terms of achieving justice after the Holocaust, the journals still published articles on the Holocaust, which strengthens the hypothesis that Jewish communities have vigorously discussed and analyzed the Holocaust even during its immediate aftermath. Recommendations for future research would be to examine how Holocaust trials have affected other local Jewish communities. More research is needed that focuses on how the social memories of these types of communities have been influenced and altered by trials that have dealt with justice and retribution after the Holocaust.
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