Time Flies

Austin, Hailey J.

Published in:
Colloquy: text, theory, critique

DOI:
10.4225/03/592229316ddd5

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Time Flies: Remnants of Auschwitz in Art Spiegelman's *Maus*

Hailey J. Austin

ABSTRACT: This article examines Art Spiegleman's *Maus* (1997) in the context of Marianne Hirsch's notion of postmemory and Giorgio Agamben's definitions of the terms *wargus*, colossus, and *Muselmann*, in order to understand how the graphic novel illuminates the ways in which relationships contribute to intergenerational trauma. The relationships between survivors and the second generation, as well as their individual relationships with the Holocaust itself, continue to traumatise all involved. Though some writers have argued against the validity of the second generation as a true witness to the Holocaust or as sufferers of intergenerational trauma, *Maus* renders such arguments powerless and reveals them to be unhelpful. Instead, *Maus* demonstrates that relationships and a lack of real, tangible connection to the events of the Holocaust can create a trauma that extends through the past and perpetuates itself in those who come after.

KEYWORDS: Art Spiegelman, *Maus*, Holocaust, intergenerational trauma, Marianne Hirsch, postmemory, Giorgio Agamben, homo sacer, *Muselmann*

Art Spiegelman's two-part graphic novel *Maus* (1997) is counted among the leading works in the medium that portrays the intergenerational effects of trauma. Other notable titles include Marjane Satrapi's *Persepolis* (2000) and Alison Bechdel's *Fun Home* (2006). *Maus* depicts a cartoon version of Spiegelman, referred to as "Artie," interviewing his father, Vladek, about his experiences in Auschwitz. Spiegelman portrays what he envisions of Vladek's trauma from his time in Auschwitz, as well as Spiegelman's own trauma as the child of a survivor. However, *Maus* distinguishes

Colloquy: text, theory, critique 33 (2017): 25–38. https://doi.org/10.4225/03/592229316ddd5

itself within the medium and genre due to the self-reflective treatment of *Maus I* (1986) in the second chapter of *Maus II* (1992), titled "Auschwitz (Time Flies)," as well as the second-hand account of his father's experiences. These elements of the work have called into question the validity of Spiegelman and other children of survivors as victims of trauma when they did not experience the Holocaust themselves. However, *Maus* is able to push beyond the question of the validity of a second-generation sufferer as a witness and give insight into the depth and extent to which the Holocaust continues to injure, well beyond the time and place of the event of the mass violence itself. This article will examine *Maus* in the context of Marianne Hirsch's notion of postmemory and the relational theories of Giorgio Agamben in order to examine how the graphic novel illuminates the ways in which relationships contribute to intergenerational trauma. The relationships between survivors and the second generation, as well as their individual relationships with the Holocaust itself, continue to traumatise all involved. Though some writers have argued against the validity of the second generation as a true witness to the Holocaust or as sufferers of intergenerational trauma, *Maus* renders such arguments powerless and reveals them to be unhelpful. Instead, *Maus* demonstrates that relationships and a lack of real, tangible connection to the events of the Holocaust can create a trauma that extends through the past and perpetuates itself in those who come after.

Ruth Franklin argues against the validity of the accounts of intergenerational trauma from the children of Holocaust survivors in *A Thousand Darknesses: Lies and Truth in Holocaust Fiction* (2011), asserting that "driven by ambition, guilt, envy, or sheer narcissism, a number of the children of survivors … have constructed elaborate literary fictions in which they identify so strongly with the sufferings of their parents as to assert themselves as witnesses to the Holocaust."[1] She does not claim the second generation actually believe they suffered in the camps, but instead that "they have convinced themselves, often by means of complicated maneuverings in postmodernism and trauma theory, that they are in some essential way primary in this dark story—that the second generation's 'memories' of the Holocaust are as valid as those of the survivors."[2] While she goes on to clarify that she does "not take issue with the idea that the children of survivors are affected by the experiences of their parents," Franklin problematises the extent to which the second generation is able to be affected by their parents' experiences, writing: "my problem is with the literalization of the metaphor: the idea that this is somehow an organic experience, that it comes out of their blood and inevitably shapes everything they do for the rest of their lives."[3]

Like Franklin, Dominick LaCapra argues against the validity of the accounts of children of Holocaust survivors, like Spiegelman, on the basis of their status as second-generation, or indirect, sufferers. LaCapra asserts: "For both survivors and those born later, the imagination may seem to be superfluous, exhausted, or out of place with respect to limit-events; even their allegorical treatment, transformation, or reduction in scale poses difficult, perhaps intractable, problems of tact and judgment."[4] LaCapra does not consider that the relationships between survivors and those born later are the root of the trauma felt by the second generation. Instead, he argues that the second generation should not place the trauma of the first onto themselves: "Those born later should neither appropriate (or belatedly act out) the experiences of victims nor restrict their activities to the necessary role of secondary witness and guardian of memory."[5] In other words, those who have not experienced the trauma themselves should not remain confined by the trauma of others, for fear of adopting the tragedy and consequent trauma as their own. However, in *Maus*, Artie's trauma comes from his relationship with his Jewish identity, his father, and the past. Though Franklin and LaCapra go on to praise aspects of Spiegelman's work, their assertions about the ways in which, or the extent to which, the second generation experiences and comes to terms with their relationship to the Holocaust is problematic.[6] While Franklin's argument allows the second generation to be affected by their parents, it does not allow their trauma to affect and shape their lives. Likewise, LaCapra's argument asserts that the second generation should not place their parent's trauma onto themselves.

Compared to these two approaches to the second generation, Marianne Hirsch's concept of postmemory allows for a much more nuanced and critical approach to the ways in which *Maus* depicts intergenerational trauma. Hirsch defines postmemory as that which "describes the relationship that the 'generation after' bears to the personal, collective, and cultural trauma of those who came before."[7] Postmemory affects the ways in which second-generation sufferers relate to their families and the world around them because of their unique position. The second generation's complicated relationships with their family members continues to create tension and trauma in their lives due to an inability to relate to one another. Hirsch argues that "the structure of postmemory clarifies how the multiple ruptures and radical breaks introduced by trauma and catastrophe inflect intra-, inter- and trans-generational inheritance. It breaks through and complicates the line … draw[n] connecting individual to family, to social group, to institutionalized historical archive."[8] The children of Holocaust survivors have a unique relationship with their

parents as well as the event their family members survived. These complicated relationships between generations of Holocaust survivors contribute to the intergenerational trauma Artie and other second-generation sufferers may experience. In this respect, the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben's theories of the *wargus*, colossus, and *Muselmann* allow one to chart the dynamics of the tumultuous relationships between Vladek and Artie, whose complexities come from their individual traumas, their struggles with painful memories, and their subsequent expectations of one another. Their relationships with each other, as well as their relationship to the Holocaust itself, create tension and trauma that neither can escape.

In *Maus,* Spiegelman draws his characters as humans with animal heads, basing their animal designation on their country of origin and whether they are Jewish: the Germans are drawn as cats, the Polish as pigs, and the Jews as mice. By doing so, Spiegelman depicts characters that fit Agamben's definition of the *wargus*, a term which was used in Germanic and Anglo-Saxon texts to refer to a wolf-man who is banned from the city.[9] The *wargus*, according to Agamben, is "a monstrous hybrid of human and animal, divided between the forest and the city."[10] This human-animal hybrid has the head of a wolf and the body of a man. Spiegelman's characters can all be considered *wargus* in that they are paradoxically both human and animal and, thus, "precisely neither man nor beast," dwelling "within both while belonging to neither."[11] They are all anthropomorphic characters whose distinct animal designation divides them based on their beliefs and from where they originate. However, Spiegelman further complicates his representations by depicting himself, and others, as humans wearing animal masks in the second chapter of *Maus II*. Although Artie is depicted as a mouse elsewhere, here in "Auschwitz (Time Flies)" he is portrayed as a man wearing a mouse mask. This suggests that even within an anthropomorphic realm of characters that determine one's identity or beliefs, there are those like Artie who have a more complicated sense of identity. The "Time Flies" chapter demonstrates that, like the *wargus*, Artie is divided: both by being the embodiment of a man and a beast, but also by his struggle to identify himself as wholly mouse, and thus, wholly Jewish. Spiegelman's utilisation of the *wargus* allows the reader to engage with the trauma Artie faces due to his relationships with his Jewish identity, his father, and, ultimately, the dead.

In "Time Flies," Artie reflects on the success of *Maus I* and the guilt he feels associated with it. The first panel begins with the play on words "Time flies," meant in terms of how quickly time goes by.[12] Here, and on the following pages, Artie exemplifies the life of the *wargus* in that he feels he does not belong with the Jews in

the Holocaust, as his physical being was not subject to violence—or death—at the hands of the Nazis. Artie's guilt could be seen as validating LaCapra's suggestion that those born later should not adopt the trauma of their parents as their own. However, Artie's trauma comes from his relationship with his Jewish identity, as evidenced by the mouse mask he wears in this passage, as well as his relationship with the past. This is evident when Artie says, "In May 1987 Francoise and I are expecting a baby… Between May 16, 1944, and May 24, 1944 over 100,000 Hungarian Jews were gassed in Auschwitz."[13] Here, Artie contrasts his present, and what may be the happiest moment in a couple's life, with the past event of a mass genocide. As a *wargus,* Artie lies ambiguously between both what happened in the past and what he is expecting in the future. However, his relationship with his Jewish identity, as well as the guilt associated with the past, does not allow him to enjoy his present or look towards the future.

By the bottom of the first page, however, the "Time Flies" chapter becomes more complex. The first few panels of the page depict Artie sitting at his desk, considering things in the past and present as a few flies buzz around his head. While at first the words "Time flies" seem to refer to how quickly time passes, the meaning shifts as the final panel depicts Artie's desk sitting atop a pile of naked, dead mice.[14] The flies buzzing around his head in the previous panels are swarming the dead bodies underneath his desk. In this panel, Artie considers, "I've gotten 4 serious offers to turn my book into a T.V. special or movie. (I don't wanna.)"[15] *Maus I* has become an international success, yet he cannot enjoy this success, as he notes, "In May 1968 my mother killed herself. (She left no note.) Lately I've been feeling depressed."[16] The combination of these words with the graphic images on the page associate Artie's depression, and inability to enjoy his present, with the dead anthropomorphic mice at his feet. Artie is unable to enjoy the success of his first book, because it has come as a result of the death of millions of people in the Holocaust. Spiegelman represents this by drawing the "time flies," or flies that represent the past, which embody a physical manifestation of intrusive, traumatic memories that prevent Artie from enjoying his present. The past continues to intrude upon him, placing him in a liminal space from which there is no escape.

Remnants of the collective trauma of the Holocaust return later in the graphic novel. At Vladek's home in Florida, Artie's wife, Francoise, reflects: "It's so peaceful here at night. It's almost impossible to believe Auschwitz ever happened." [17] In the next panel, however, Artie is immediately bitten by a fly and replies, "but these damn bugs are eating me alive!"[18] Here, Artie is literally consumed by the past, as

represented in the "time fly." This is in sharp contrast to Franciose's idea that the present is so peaceful it is easy to forget the past. Artie immediately being bitten by the "time fly" after she says this shows that the past continues to haunt him and he cannot control when he will be reminded him of a trauma he never encountered firsthand. According to Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, this is common for survivors of traumatic events, who "live not with memories of the past, but with an event that could not and did not proceed through to its completion, has no ending, attained no closure, and therefore, as far as its survivors are concerned, continues into the present and is current in every respect."[19] Holocaust survivors have often battled the intrusion of the unwanted past into their present lives, in a sort of collapse between the past and the present. The instability of these categories—past and present—creates a secondary form of trauma for survivors. However, Artie experiences the same intrusions of the past into his present even though he was born long after the camps closed. Felman and Laub argue that the survivor "is not truly in touch either with the core of his traumatic reality of with the fatedness of its reenactments, and thereby remains entrapped in both."[20] As a *wargus*, Artie lies between the past and present, in that he cannot escape the past his heritage pushes on him while he attempts to create a future for himself. Artie does not assimilate his trauma with that of his father's. Instead, he is depicted as belonging in neither the past or the present, nor even consistently as an anthropomorphic character in his own comic, because of his status as a second-generation sufferer. Thus, he resides in the realm of the *wargus* as a victim of postmemory, in which the second generation is privy "to experiences they 'remember' only by means of the stories, images, and behaviors among which they grew up. But these experiences were transmitted to them so deeply and affectively as to *seem* to constitute memories in their own right."[21] While the children of survivors were not physically present at Auschwitz, their relationships with their parents create a unique formation of experiences and interactions with the survivors, which in turn creates a kind of memory of the event. In this respect, Artie's status as a *wargus* demonstrates the ways in which his unique relationship with his parents, as well as the past, creates a kind of memory of the past that he cannot escape.

While the *wargus* enhances the understanding of Artie's trauma due to his relationship with his Jewish identity and his absence during the Holocaust, the relationship between the living and the dead can be understood through Agamben's term *Muselmann*. Prisoners used the term in Auschwitz in reference to the walking dead: those who were beyond help and about to die from starvation. The *Muselmann* were ignored and chastised by the other prisoners for their diminished humanity

because "everyone in the camp recognize[d] himself in his disfigured face."[22] In order to survive, the other prisoners in Auschwitz had to ignore the *Muselmann,* considering them to be non-human and thus separate from the others in the camp because they were beyond help. According to Agamben, "the most likely explanation of the term can be found in the literal meaning of the Arabic term muslim: the one who submits unconditionally to the will of God."[23] He also notes with a sense of irony that "the Jews knew that they would not die at Auschwitz as Jews," and were instead in a threshold between the living and the dead, the Jewish and the muslim.[24]

Many Jewish prisoners died in Auschwitz from starvation as *Muselmann* while inhabiting a unique role as those who were not-quite-living but not-yet-dead. The *Muselmann* are the non-human amongst those who were already considered in Nazi society to be non-human. As Agamben argues, "there is thus a point at which human beings, while apparently remaining human beings, cease to be human. This point is the *Muselmann*, and the camp is his exemplary site."[25] Auschwitz was a camp meant to dehumanise and kill certain people. However, within that group of dehumanised beings the *Muselmann* ceased to bear any resemblance to humans. Instead, they represented an in-between stage, like the *wargus*, to those "living" in the camps and those who had already perished. The *Muselmann* are a physical manifestation of the *wargus* in that they belong with neither the living nor the dead, but inhabit both while belonging to neither. This affects the ways in which the survivors of Auschwitz feel the need to bear witness to the accounts of the *Muselmann* in that they are the only ones left able to do so. The relationship between the *Muselmann* and the survivor bearing witness to them creates a complicated trauma that can manifest in the second generation.

Artie's father, Vladek, describes many encounters with other prisoners in Auschwitz who, as *Muselmann*, did not ultimately survive the camp. *Muselmann*, here, is used to describe those who can no longer tell their stories, and those who experienced the full extent of the Holocaust because of their death in the camps. As a witness to the *Muselmann*, Vladek is required to tell the stories of the true witnesses of Auschwitz. His memories of the deceased create within him a need to bear witness to their experiences. Vladek tells Artie about his friend and bunkmate Mandelbaum, whose ill-fitting uniform made his time in the camps more difficult.[26] Vladek describes how he taught English to a Polish inmate in exchange for food and favours so that he could give Mandelbaum a more adequately sized uniform. This was all for naught, though, as Vladek explains: "How long I could, I kept him. But a few days later the Germans chose him to take away to work… *nobody* could help this. So… it

was finished with Mandelbaum. I never saw him more again."[27] Despite his best efforts, Vladek was unable to save his friend. However, he is able to bear witness to his story and pass it on to his son. Because of his role as a witness to Mandelbaum's story, Vladek can be considered a witness to the *Muselmann*.

Although Vladek and other survivors like him provide the only first-person accounts of the Holocaust we have, Agamben argues that survivors of the camps are not true witnesses to the Holocaust. Responding to the work of Primo Levi, Agamben claims, "the 'true' witnesses, the 'complete witnesses,' are those who did not bear witness and *could not* bear witness. They are those who 'touched bottom': the Muslims, the drowned. The survivors speak in their stead, by proxy, as pseudo-witnesses; they bear witness to a missing testimony."[28] Agamben suggests that the survivors of the Holocaust inhabit a unique role in that they are pseudo-witnesses to an atrocity they will never understand because, unlike the dead, they never fully experienced it. Thus, for Agamben, the *Muselmann* is the only true witness to the Holocaust, while even those who are witness for the *Mulsemann*, such as Vladek, are, as survivors, one degree removed from the tragedy. While his definitions of ancient terms describing relationships bring new value to the text, Agamben's assertion that there are no true witnesses to the Holocaust, because they all died in the camps, is problematic. Rather than argue that survivors like Vladek are pseudo-witnesses, it is more constructive to recognise that their positions as witnesses create a unique trauma because "the survivors bore witness to something that is impossible to bear witness to."[29] The trauma survivors faced from the camps is augmented by their position as the last remaining witnesses and the last remaining voices to tell the stories of the dead. Instead of denying the validity of the survivors, it is more beneficial to consider Agamben's claim: "if the survivor bears witness *for* the *Muselmann*—in the technical sense of 'on behalf of' or 'by proxy' … it is in some way the *Muselmann* who bears witness."[30] By being able to relate the atrocities he and others endured, Vladek, then, is unable to be a true witness of Auschwitz because everyone who experienced the whole of Auschwitz died there. This impossibility leads to a disconnect between the dead, the survivors, and those who were not present. Because of his role as the witness for the *Muselmann*, Vladek struggles to maintain his relationships with his son as well as with time.

In another interview with his son, Vladek describes dismantling the Auschwitz crematorium with other workers who had witnessed the burning of both the living and those killed in the gas chambers in mass graves. [31] Immediately after telling this story, Vladek declares: "It's 2:30. Look how the time is flying. And it's still

so much to do today."[32] For Vladek, the "time flying" functions in a very different way to the "time flies" that attack Artie. The time jolts Vladek from his witnessing the past and back into the present where he is forced to worry about everyday life, whereas Artie is unable to enjoy the birth of his daughter because he is constantly sucked into the trauma of the past. Vladek and Artie constantly bicker throughout the graphic novel. This same page depicts Vladek breaking his favourite dish as he prepares for dinner. Artie does not understand why his father is so upset, saying, "It's only a *dish*!"[33] The two continue to argue as they clean up and prepare for dinner. However, when Artie volunteers to do the dishes, Vladek replies, "No. You can defrost out the turkey legs… You only would break me the *rest* of my plates."[34] Father and son struggle to relate to or understand each other, even when performing simple everyday actions. Vladek can only look to the past and attempt to bring it to the present, while Artie is plagued by his father's past and unable to fully appreciate the present. Their relationship with each other is strained due to their individual relationships with the Holocaust: Artie as *wargus* and Vladek as the witness for the *Muselmann*.

Artie and Vladek's relationship is further complicated by Artie's role as the colossus. Unlike the *wargus*, who resides paradoxically between the human and animal realms, and the *Muselmann*, who requires witnesses, the colossus is the physical manifestation of both the living and the dead within one body. According to Agamben, the colossus is the double who takes the place of the missing corpse in a kind of "funeral … or, more precisely, in the vicarious execution of an unfulfilled consecration."[35] In the absence of a body, Romans would use a colossus so that there could still be a proper burial. The body, or statue, was used as a physical manifestation of both the living and the dead within one body that acts as the proxy for the dead in both the present and the future. Here, Agamben cites Primo Levi, who wrote that "many survivors of the camps felt each man is his brother's Cain, that each of us (by this time I say 'us' in a much vaster, indeed, universal sense) has usurped his neighbor's place and lived in his stead."[36] It is common for Holocaust survivors to feel that they have taken the place of someone who died. However, Artie, as a second-generation sufferer, has a more distinct role as the colossus. More specifically, Artie is the colossus for his brother Richieu, who was poisoned by his aunt before being taken to Auschwitz. Artie is the second son, or double, for both of his parents as he represents the life his brother was never allowed to have because of the Holocaust. Like the *wargus*, the colossus represents the threshold between both the living and dead realms. Artie resides in both, but belongs in neither. His relationship with his

father continues to be strained because Artie feels he is a replacement for his brother, who is only able to exist in the past.

Artie and Vladek's relationship is complicated by Artie's role as the colossus for Richieu and the subsequent barrier between past and present. LaCapra notes that, "[t]o a significant extent, the present is always haunted by memories, revenants, or repressed aspects of the past, for example, in the manner in which Artie, for his father, is always wearing the phantom-like shroud of his dead brother, Richieu."[37] Artie and Vladek struggle to relate to one another, not just because of Vladek's role as the witness for the *Muselmann*, but because Artie's life represents what Richieu was never allowed to have. When describing the death of his first son, Vladek explains, "it was a tragedy among tragedies. He was such a happy, beautiful boy!"[38] Vladek tends to describe the positive aspects of his first son, leaving Artie feeling that he can never live up to his brother's perfection. Artie not only has to live with the fact that he will never be able to relate his life experiences to his father's survival in Auschwitz, but also with the fact that he will never compare to the dead brother he never got to meet. Spiegelman retaliates against the supposed perfection of Richieu by drawing him in the panels as a troublesome, crying child that is throwing food on the floor.[39] Though there is no way for him to know that Richieu acted in such a way, his retaliation against his brother illuminates his role as the colossus for him as well as his strained relationship with the effects of the Holocaust.

While *Maus II* is dedicated, "For Richieu," and includes his photograph, the final image of the graphic novel shows that Artie continues to be haunted by his brother. [40] On this page, the first panels depict Vladek's triumphant reunion with his wife, Anja, after being freed from the camps. The next image depicts a sickly Vladek telling Artie, "I'm *tired* from talking, Richieu, and it's *enough* stories for now."[41] The last words Vladek speaks to Artie in the graphic novel are directed toward the brother he replaces. The very next image is of the Spiegelman family gravestone, followed by Art Spiegelman's signature and the start and finish dates of his work. This creates a visual association with the start and end dates of his parents' lives. In this regard, Spiegelman associates his life with his work, *Maus*, which is now finished. As the colossus, Spiegelman must give his life in order to "reestablish … relations between the world of the living and the world of the dead."[42] Spiegelman suggests that his life as double for his brother, as well as his interviews with Vladek, have fulfilled his father's need to be a witness for the *Muselmann*. His roles as a *wargus* and colossus complicate his relationship with his parents, the past, and himself. However, he must inhabit these roles and have these relationships because of his position as a child of

Holocaust survivors. Artie must allow his father to fulfil his role as witness by listening to his stories and continuously thinking about the past. However, this is ultimately detrimental to Artie, as it continues to cause damage after his father's death. He feels his "father's ghost still hangs over" him, preventing him from enjoying the birth of his daughter or the success of his graphic novel.[43] Artie cannot even recall fond memories of his father, saying to his "shrink," Pavel: "Mainly I remember *arguing* with him … and being told that I couldn't do anything as well as he could."[44] Artie is haunted by the memory of his father, who continues to have power and control over him, even after his death. While his father was living, Artie had to inhabit the role of the colossus and represent the physical body of his brother. However, even after his death, Artie is still haunted by his memory and continues to be stuck between the past and present as the *wargus*. His relationship with his father before and after death continues to contribute to his intergenerational trauma.

As shown in the "Time Flies" chapter, the past continues to intrude upon Artie in the cartoon form of a fly, placing him in a liminal space from which there is no escape. On top of being the bridge between the living and the dead, the colossus can also be used to describe a second life or a second death. In their analysis of the film *Shoah*, Felman and Laub claim that "when we are made to witness this re-enactment of the murder of the witness," there is a "second Holocaust that appears spontaneously before the camera and on the screen," which addresses the spectator with a challenge in the meaning and significance of the work.[45] This witnessing of a second Holocaust is present in Artie's everyday life, as his status as a second-generation survivor means he is constantly traumatised as a result of his relationships, as well as his postmemory. According to Hirsch, Artie's interviews with Vladek, "illustrate how familial postmemory works through the transformation and mediations from the father's memory to the son's postmemory."[46] Vladek's stories about his experiences in Auschwitz thus pass his trauma on to Artie, in turn problematising Artie's relationship with his father, the Holocaust, and himself, because of his roles as the *wargus* and colossus.

For Artie, the "time flies" that attack him at his desk, as well as his father's home, represent the deaths of millions of Jews in the past that prevent him from living in the future. He feels this way because of his position as a second-generation survivor, which inherently places him into the roles of the *wargus* and colossus. Ultimately, these roles are illuminated in Artie's relationship with his father. As the *wargus*, Artie lies both within and without the human and animal realms of his own story as a man wearing a mouse mask at different points in the graphic novel, while

his father is always a mouse. This role gives Artie a complicated relationship with the past and the present, as he cannot look forward to the future because of the past trauma of the Holocaust. He articulates these things because his father serves as the witness for the *Muselmann*, or the witness to what cannot be witnessed. For Vladek, the "time flies" pull him back into the present and remind him that he must tell the tales of the *Muselmann* to the next generation. However, for Artie this creates its own kind of trauma, as he feels guilt for not experiencing the Holocaust and yet he cannot be in the present to enjoy his life. Having grown up as the colossus for his brother, Artie's life represents the life Richieu was unable to have because of the Holocaust. As such, Artie has strained relationships with his father, his history, and his own identity. Though he never experienced the horrors of the Holocaust, Artie's relationship with his father as a colossus forces him to be seen as a stand in for Richieu, unable to establish an identity of his own. Spiegelman creates an autobiographical account of his relationship with the Holocaust through interviews with his father not because he feels he can claim witness to Auschwitz, but as a way to represent the intergenerational trauma caused by his relationships with both his father and the Holocaust. Regardless of their distance from the event of Auschwitz itself, for Artie and Vladek, the memories and trauma of the Holocaust, just like the *Muselmann*, "have not an *end*, but a *remnant.*"[47]

HAILEY J. AUSTIN is from Bennett, Colorado, USA and is currently finishing her Master's in Comics and Graphic Novels at the University of Dundee in Dundee, Scotland. She will be continuing there to pursue her PhD, ultimately hoping to become a Comics Studies Professor. She was the recipient of the 2015 Creighton University CURAS Summer Research Scholarship in Genocide/Holocaust Studies, which enabled her to undertake research at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: This research would not have been possible without the generosity of the Creighton University CURAS Summer Research Scholarship or the Klutznick family. I would like to thank any and all faculty who have helped shape this research, namely Dr Lydia R. Cooper and Dr Matthew Reznicek for helping spark it and encouraging me every step of the way. A quick thank you also to Mom, Dad, and Lewis for reading, listening, and supporting throughout this process.

NOTES

[1] Ruth Franklin, *A Thousand Darknesses: Lies and Truth in Holocaust Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 216.

[2] Ibid, 217.

[3] Ibid, 230.

[4] Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1998), 181.

[5] Ibid, 198.

[6] Franklin, 231; LaCapra, 140.

[7] Marianne Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 4.

[8] Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory*, 111.

[9] Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Soverign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford, CA: Stanfort University Press, 1998), 63).

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Art Spiegelman, *The Complete Maus* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1997), 201.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid, 234.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 69.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory*, 4.

[22] Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (New York: Zone Books, 2002), 52.

[23] Ibid, 45.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Spiegelman, *The Complete Maus,* 189.

[27] Ibid, 194. (Emphasis in original)

[28] Ibid, 34.

[29] Ibid, 13.

[30] Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz*, 120.

[31] Spiegelman, *The Complete Maus,* 232.

[32] Ibid, 233.

[33] Ibid. (Emphasis in original)

[34] Ibid. (Emphasis in original)

[35] Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, 60.
[36] Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz*, 91.
[37] LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz*, 175–176.
[38] Spiegelman, *The Complete Maus,* 111.
[39] Ibid, 77.
[40] Ibid, 165.
[41] Ibid, 296. (Emphasis in original)
[42] Agamben, *Homo Sacer,* 60.
[43] Spiegelman, *The Complete Maus,* 203.
[44] Ibid, 204. (Emphasis in original)
[45] Felman and Laub, *Testimony*, 268.
[46] Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory*, 119.
[47] Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz,* 159. (Emphasis in original)