

The H.W. Wilson Company/WilsonWebAUTHOR: SIMONE A. **SCHWEBER**TITLE: **VICTIMIZED AGAIN?** THE REPRESENTATION OF JEWS IN HOLOCAUST UNITSSOURCE: Journal of *Jewish Education* 65 no1-2 42-59 Spr/Summ 1999

The magazine publisher is the copyright holder of this article and it is reproduced with permission. Further reproduction of this article in violation of the copyright is prohibited.

The release of Steven Spielberg's epic Holocaust film, *Schindler's List*, prompted both widespread praise and critical condemnation. For making the Holocaust a "reality" to millions of Americans, and for its cinematic cohesiveness, the movie was lauded as helping to usher in a new age in Holocaust consciousness. However, for a variety of issues categorized in part under the heading, "the limits of representation" (Friedlander, 1992), the film's dramatization of the Shoah as well as its public reception were problematic.(FN1)

Among the most hotly debated issues regarding representation in *Schindler's List* was Spielberg's depiction of Jews. Not only did the majority of Jews shown in the film constitute a nameless, faceless background of undifferentiated victimhood, some argued, but the few central **Jewish** characters in the film elaborated historically anti-**Jewish** stereotypes. In a conversation with media analysts Wanda Bershen, Ken Jacobs, Gertrud Koch and James Young, Art Spiegelman articulated an extreme version of this argument, claiming that the Jews of *Schindler's List* "are slightly gentrified versions of Julius Streicher's *Der Sturmer* caricatures: the juiceless **Jewish** accountant [Itzhak Stern], the **Jewish** seductress [Helen Hirsch], and most egregiously, the Jews bargaining and doing business inside a church" (*Village Voice*, 3/29/94, p. 26). Spiegelman continues by explaining that the film "refracts the Holocaust through the central image of a righteous gentile in a world of **Jewish** bit players and extras [such that] the Jews function as an occasion for Christian redemption" (pp. 26-27). Another argument, closely aligned with this one, posits that the image of the Jew in *Schindler's List* is one which reinscribes **Jewish** powerlessness and passivity. As opposed to the characters of both Schindler and Goeth, the Jew is powerless at the hands of the Christian oppressors and/or saviors. As Judith Doneson writes, this image of Jewishness is thus feminized, cultivated "in the alliance of the weak, passive, rather feminine Jew being protected by a strong Christian/gentile, the male, signifying a male-female relationship" (Doneson, 1997, p. 140).

A third critique of *Schindler's List* doesn't have to do with the representation of Jews per se, but nonetheless bares implications for it. This critique stems from the plot of the movie, specifically its coded, "happy ending" which redeems **Jewish** suffering through Zionist ideology (Bartov, 1997; Doneson, 1997). Doneson summarizes the final sequence of the film in this way:

As the war ends, Schindler, a Nazi after all, is forced to abandon his Jews so he and his wife can flee the approaching liberating armies. The following morning, the Jews awaken as a lone Russian liberator approaches. Itzhak Stern asks him if there are any Jews left; where can the survivors go? The Russian answers: Don't go east; they hate you there. And, he counsels, he would not go west either. He then points toward a hill and asks, but really advises, if that is not a town over there. At this juncture, the camera captures hundreds of Jews coming over the mountain on their way to Schindler's grave in Jerusalem. The implication, coming from the Russian, is that Jews no longer belong in Europe. Go over there, in the distance, to your own **Jewish** state. Heeding his advice, the Jews march over the hill to the tune of 'Jerusalem of Gold' (Doneson, 1997, p. 149).

The "happy ending" of the movie in some ways diminishes or justifies the suffering of Holocaust survivors, if not their dead.

The Holocaust historian Omer Bartov suggests that these shortcomings are intrinsic to the medium of Hollywood film. For Bartov, the very genre of American popular film structurally compromises Spielberg's representation of Jews. Bartov claims that the 'happy ending' of *Schindler's List* is an "inevitable" consequence of its being a Hollywood production (p. 44). Likewise, according to Bartov, the movie

necessarily "[enhances] the hero's image by a diminution of all other characters, apart, of course from the villain he confronts," which serves to explain the viewer's "position of watching Schindler ... and Goeth ... towering both physically (as tall, handsome Aryans) and personally (as clearly etched, strong characters), over a mass of physically small, emotionally confused, frantic, almost featureless Jews" (pp. 48-49). In short, the tensions identified by many critics in Spielberg's representation of Jews, for Bartov, can be reduced to the constraints imposed by genre.

At issue in all of these critiques is not so much the historical accuracy of the representations of Jews as the moral implications they carry. The characters of Itzhak Stern, Schindler's accountant, and Helen Hirsch, Goeth's housemaid, after all, were based on actual historical personae; the problems arise in centralizing their roles in a narrative of otherwise nameless Jews. Likewise, the powerlessness of **Jewish** victims clearly reflects historical reality in some measure; replicating that powerlessness in a filmic representation of the Shoah, however, is more problematic, carrying political implications especially when linked with a Zionist ideology.

These vexed issues of representation raised by Schindler's List play out in **educational** arenas as well, implying that the narrative tropes Bartov illuminates are endemic to all Holocaust representations rather than being particular to the genre of Hollywood film. What representation of Jews is conveyed in Holocaust curricula as they are taught, and with what resultant moral implications?

This query drove me to empirically investigate the representation of Jews in two public school teachers' Holocaust units. The teachers both came highly recommended from at least three independent sources.(FN2) and both were teaching at high schools in California.(FN3) The high schools at which they taught were similar; both were moderately sized, suburban high schools with (1000-2400) ethnically and racially diverse students. And both teachers were **Jewish** men well-versed in Holocaust history.

The field work phase of the research took approximately one year and included the following techniques: taping interviews with teachers and a representative group of students three times each; surveying all enrolled students anonymously at the start and end of the units; conversing informally with participants as the courses progressed; collecting class materials and student work; and observing all class sessions. The resulting data was analyzed through the theoretical lens of Elliot Eisner's **educational** criticism (Eisner, 1991).(FN4) Below, I summarize the two cases briefly to serve as a context for understanding the representations of Jews that emerged within them.(FN5)

THE CASE OF MR. ZEE

Mr. Zee had taught at Maplewood High School(FN6) for over fifteen years and was widely recognized as an expert at teaching about the Holocaust when I started observing his popular, semester-long elective, Facing History and Ourselves (Strom, 1977). The course met every morning, five days per week, for fifty-five minutes, and within the first class session, I could already tell why the course garnered widespread appeal among students. Mr. Zee was exceedingly personable, learning all of the thirty students' names within the first ten minutes and talking casually with students during the announcements.

Shortly after Mr. Zee finished taking attendance, the students realized that a visitor was among them. "Why is she watching this class?" Peaches, an outspoken African-American student asked about me. Mr. Zee answered jovially that I was visiting because "this is one of those new types of classes." Continuing, Mr. Zee explained, "You know a lot of times, history classes are dull; history gets filled up with facts, and it stops being interesting -- Not in this class" (Class Observations, 1/30/96). Mr. Zee had explained my presence as an indication that this class would be unlike other history classes. Not only would the cultural norms be non-traditional, Mr. Zee implied with his casual behavior, but the content would be, too. He promised that his history class would not be dull, as he claimed fact-filled history courses necessarily are. And the familiarity of his tone implied that he, unlike other teachers, would understand the students as real people. What was interesting to them, he was projecting, was what interested him. Almost invisibly, and in a very short amount of class time, then, Mr. Zee positioned himself as being both interested in the students themselves and knowledgeable about their presumed likes and dislikes. Though his response to Peaches' query was brief, it did encapsulate Mr. Zee's approach to historical content.

Mr. Zee was also a master-storyteller, and as I would see over the next five months, almost every class session was dappled with stories from his life which spilled out of him, barely provoked.

In the first few weeks what I want is to build up the capacity of the class to be totally engaged so that there are no quiet spots that are quiet for the wrong reasons, that there's no one who feels like what they say won't be acknowledged or even honored, and we have to set that tone right away. You have to make sure that people feel like their voice is an important aspect of this course (Interview #2, 2/5/96).

As Mr. Zee explained it, the stories he told were equal-access engagement tools. All students in his

non-tracked class, whether they were college-bound or not, could participate if all that was required of them was to voice their opinions or listen to personal stories. Mr. Zee's frequent usage of these devices 'set the tone' he wanted -- that all students need to be engaged -- by making it easy for them to participate.

The course was roughly divided into four phases. In the first six weeks, Mr. Zee focused on building a sense of community among his students. Mostly, he told stories, had the students discuss issues like racism and discrimination, and together, they watched videotapes (provided by FHAO). The students rarely took notes, wrote in class or read anything longer than a page. Papers and pencils, the usual accouterments of school, Mr. Zee explained to me later, could serve as a "block" to some of his students, which is why he didn't utilize them. Even the homework assignments were untraditional. Approximately every two weeks, the students were to submit a brief project that could use any content as its basis and take any form they chose: poetry, artwork, personal story-telling, reporting, etc.

By the end of this first phase, all the students I interviewed had only high praise for Mr. Zee and his class. Erin, a shy, white Mormon senior who spoke in a whisper, expressed her enthusiasm about Mr. Zee and Facing History in terminology adopted from Mr. Zee, using words such as "community" and "voice":(FN7)

It's almost like our own little community, that's the way [Mr. Zee] started [the course]. We just began to talk about anything, you know our feelings, stuff like that....It's not like any other class I've had before. It's really quite, I don't know how to describe it -- to be able to voice our opinions about certain things, and it's okay because Mr. Zee has that attitude like he's just one of the community, so we feel a lot of freedom to talk, give your ideas....It feels freer [than other classes]. like we can do whatever comes naturally to us (Interview #1, 3/7/97).

Renee, an African-American junior described what she considered to be laudable differences between Mr. Zee's and other teachers' classes with similar sentiments. In Mr. Zee's class, she explained to me, "You can speak what's on your mind; it's not just about math or English, [it's about] life." "Other classes," she continued, are "just about work," and in them, "nothing happens -- the teacher talks and you listen, every once in a while there are conversations in the background, but nothing; it's just schoolwork" (Interview #1, 3/8/96). Whether in language adopted from Mr. Zee or not, none of the students I interviewed had anything even mildly critical to report.

The second phase of Mr. Zee's course I named 'The Identity Phase.' For approximately four weeks, the students each selected an aspect of their lives to present to the class in approximately three- to ten-minutes. Every students chose to participate, and most class sessions included three presentations on average. Before they began, Mr. Zee was careful to set up rituals which would accord each of the presenters respect. The students were instructed, for example, to applaud both before and after each presentation, and they were warned, in a sterner than usual tone, neither to have books out on their desks nor to fall asleep, or Mr. Zee would see them after class. Mr. Zee described the Identity Project of a student in another class section in order to illuminate his goals for the projects in general:

This is someone who might seem to you to be securely among the 'haves' rather than the 'have-nots'; this person has lots of friendships, socially seems very well adjusted. She's got good grades, and she's going to college next year.(FN8) Well, she brought in a candle for her Identity Project, a beautiful candle, ornate on the outside, and she talked about how she was like this candle. People saw her from the outside, and there, she seems pretty, smart, to have a lot going for her, but the inside is more like it. On the inside, she's burning, and she explained why. She talked about the generational pain of having been abused as a child and having dealt with it and how she's still dealing with it. The pain has a legacy, which is that sometimes she's afraid of being with a man and what that will be like. So, afterwards, people were shocked, shocked that this was someone they thought they knew and didn't know at all. The point is that pain is universal; struggle is universal; and sometimes the people right next to you have a real nobility in getting through (Class notes, 3/13/96).

In the projects, an amazing array of student talents, hardships, hobbies and strengths was conveyed through story-telling, video, art, dance, and music. Aija, a tall young man, who, at no other time during the semester spoke in class, rapped a poem about his identity as an African-American male. Jose told a heartbreaking story of his father's leaving their large family penniless, ending his project by pulling up his tee-shirt to reveal a tattoo of his father's name spanning his entire back. Roberto read original love poems he had written in both English and Spanish (earning him an offer from Renee to accompany her to the school prom). Colette, a mature and quiet white woman, talked about a personal ordeal she and her

brother had suffered at the hands of her mother's cocaine addiction. Peaches, the outspoken young woman with a reputation for fierceness, described taking care of her cousin, a toddler, every day after school. Each Identity Project thus provided a glimpse into the world of that person's experiences, and the range of projects revealed the range of experiences associated with differences in: race, class, culture, ethnicity, religion, family structure, language, nationality, country of origin, grade, age, gender, and historical moment.

Morally, the Identity Projects wielded tremendous impact on the students. Erin explained that the other students' projects had been illuminating and had impacted her thinking about people in general. As she told me, as a result of the Identity Projects:

I'm starting to look at people more personally now, and realize they're not just a face or how they look. They do things other than school, they have a life, and everybody's a lot more similar than they seem to be (Interview #2, 5/21/96).

For Renee, too, the Identity Projects had catalyzed a reevaluation of her assumptions about others and transformed her (reported) behavior. Whereas she used to stereotype non-Blacks, the Identity Projects had convinced her that in certain cases, her stereotypic notions were misinformed, and that more generally, her pattern of stereotyping itself was wrong. Moreover, Renee became willing to intercede when friends around her stereotyped (Interview#2, 5/23/96). All the students I interviewed reported similar refinements to their moral compasses.

For the third phase of the course, Mr. Zee had promised the students they would study the Holocaust somewhat academically. As he explained it,

We're gonna start looking more at history, [and there will be] more traditional work for a while. And some of you are gonna think, 'Cool, it's about time.' And others of you are gonna think, 'It was better when we didn't have to do this kinda study,' and it's gonna be hard to sort of pick yourselves up. The end result has gotta be here -- on the same level as the first six weeks, where you're involved, you're curious, but you're also academic(FN9) (Class Transcript, 3/18/97).

Although Mr. Zee did incorporate more Holocaust-related content, the third phase of Mr. Zee's class resumed many activities of the first phase. Mr. Zee continued to tell stories. He recycled through some key vocabulary he had taught about human behavior. And he showed videos. While the Holocaust was often a topic in these activities or came up in the surrounding discussions, it was seldom dissected historically. Rarely, in other words, was the Holocaust discussed in terms of the historical events which comprise it; rather, the Holocaust was almost always talked about in class as 'the Holocaust' -- a single, whole entity. Thus it formed a kind of thematic link between Mr. Zee's activities or it served as historical backdrop to his stories, and while it seemed to be elaborated upon, it was often left unexamined and uninvestigated.

In the second week of this phase, for example, a reporter visited Mr. Zee's first-period class, and, assuming that students understood what comprised the Holocaust, she had asked the students whether "it could happen here" (Class Notes, 4/24/96). Mr. Zee posed the same question to the second-period students I observed, asking them to write answers silently before discussing them aloud. When the students were ready, Mr. Zee opened the discussion in what he called a 'tag team' format. A group of four students revealed their ideas to the whole class and then tagged four others to do the same. What was striking to me about this activity was that a range of students' answers displayed how little prepared many were to draw careful comparisons. Atlas, in the first group 'tagged' by Mr. Zee, said, "I don't think it could happen...Back then it was unprecedented; now people have jobs studying history and they know what to look for." Renee, in the second group tagged, disagreed. "I think it could happen -- 'cause who says we're not livin' in a Holocaust now -- Just look at all the homicides and suicides" (Class Notes, 4/24/96). Renee considered the Holocaust to include 'homicides and suicides,' in part because she was never exposed to the concept of 'genocide,' and Atlas had not learned enough about 'it' to know in what ways the Holocaust was unprecedented and in what ways it was not. In this activity, Mr. Zee's students talked about the Holocaust without ever having learned what had happened during the Holocaust.

Another day, Mr. Zee summarized the autobiographical experience recounted in Simon Wiesenthal's book, *The Sunflower*. Wiesenthal was working as a slave laborer during the Holocaust when he was chosen by a nurse to minister to a dying SS officer at a nearby hospital. I quote a passage from Mr. Zee's rendition of the story to illustrate his florid story-telling style:

And the man begins to speak to him, telling him to sit on [his] bed. Simon has no idea who this man is. He turns around and sees this SS uniform. The man is an SS who is obviously

dying, and he wants Simon to listen to his confession. Simon says, 'why me? Why not a priest or a minister? Why am I here?'

The man says, basically, in not so many words, not as directly as I'll tell you -- that Simon is a representative of the people whom this man has wronged in his role as an SS man, and that he wants Simon, before he dies, he wants Simon to offer him forgiveness. And Simon...takes us through his feelings -- and the man tells him some of the things he has been involved in -- [Simon] imagines it to have been his mother, his townspeople, his relatives this man has killed.

And Simon says to himself, 'if this man were not dying, would he be still out there doing what he had done before?' 'Is he only doing this because he's dying?' And, "what right do I have to offer any kind of forgiveness?' 'I can only offer forgiveness,' he says to himself, 'against the things that have been done to me. I can't forgive in the name of other people, especially the dead. Make this peace with your God, it's got nothing to do with me.'

Moments before this man dies, he wants Simon as a representative of a persecuted people to offer him some kind of forgiveness. Twenty-five years later Simon is still bothered by this tiny little episode in his life (Class Transcript, 4/30/96).

After further elaboration, Mr. Zee opened the story up for discussion, asking the students to reflect aloud on this "tiny little episode" in Wiesenthal's life. Though many students discussed what Wiesenthal ought to have done or what they would have wanted to do in the same situation, it became clear to me in follow-up interviews that none of the students knew to what the SS referred. Mr. Zee's warnings, then, that this phase of the course would be academic, an intensive examination into the 'case study of the Holocaust,' went unfulfilled.

In our second interview, Erin expressed a dismay at this state of affairs, reflecting a concern other students conveyed to me as well. Though she still liked Mr. Zee's course, she felt "lost":

I like it [Mr. Zee's class], but it seems like, I thought we were going to be more into the history by now, I mean, maybe he is... but most of the time it's a lot of discussions, and to me, it doesn't seem like we're really into actual events. I mean, he said he's gonna try to stay away from the timeline thing, but for me, I'd appreciate it if we went over the facts of what happened more. I don't know, I'm kinda lost at this point in the class....He's a great teacher. He's a good teacher, but I'm used to teachers that just lay down what they're gonna do more than just kinda have fun with the whole class and like discuss and everything, so I'm not really used to him as a teacher, but I think he's really good (Interview #2, 5/21/96).

For the final two weeks of the semester, Mr. Zee introduced the students, through videotaped testimonies, to people whom he hoped would serve as role models for them. The students saw no fewer than ten testimonies in as many days. Among the role models who 'spoke' were: a rescuer who had shot a local policeman in order to save her *Jewish* charges during the Holocaust, a contemporary crusader who helped free jailed, battered women who had killed their husbands in self-defense, and a human rights activist who had brokered a truce between feuding gangs in Los Angeles. The students saw so many testimonies in such a short time, in fact, that at one point, they confused the heroic activities of the individuals, mistaking the Holocaust rescuer with the battered women's advocate (Class Notes, 6/5/96). "Too many videos in a week," one student muttered by way of explanation when Mr. Zee clarified the misunderstanding. Mr. Zee entitled this phase of the course "participatory citizenship" after one of the official FHAO goals.

In short, Mr. Zee's course had clear successes, among them the high engagement level of his non-tracked students, the palpable sense of community he fostered through the sharing of personal stories, the unusually broad range of topics he touched on, and the opportunities he gave students to consider morally complex issues. For all these reasons and because of Mr. Zee himself, the students considered his class to have been a positive experience overall despite the reservations some expressed over the course's lack of factual content. The students had gotten to know each other and Mr. Zee very well; they had all felt themselves to be comfortable in his classroom; and perhaps relatedly, most of the students reported impressive moral impacts. Many had recognized and curtailed their propensities to stereotype, and some even documented an increased willingness to intercede on behalf of the unjustly oppressed. Mr. Zee had instilled in his students some of the moral lessons most people would like students to have learned from the Holocaust without actually teaching them the Holocaust.

THE CASE OF MR. JEFFERSON

Mr. Jefferson's ninth grade World History class was much more 'traditional' in its orientation than Mr. Zee's. Mr. Jefferson's students sat in neat rows in the classroom. They took out their pencils and papers as class began, and Mr. Jefferson used only the polite form of address in recognizing students. ("Mr. Castanedos, please take your seat.")

In addition, there was nothing casual about Mr. Jefferson's manner or dress. Everything about him conveyed a seriousness of intent, from his pressed white shirts to his rapid fire lectures. Mr. Jefferson was a fast talker. Regardless of the topic, he knew what he wanted to say, and he needed no notes to guide him. Historical names, dates, events and even statistics he recalled easily both from his 34 years of teaching and his own life experience. His speech didn't even slow when he wrote on the chalkboard at the front of the class. Watching Mr. Jefferson lecture, I was reminded of shiny pennies flowing out of a mint; each penny -- symbolizing a historical fact -- was discrete, but generated too quickly for the mind to behold as such. Mr. Jefferson simply knew and wanted to convey to his students more information than the 50-minute class periods could accommodate.

As Mr. Jefferson spoke, his students would burrow their heads into their desks, trying to write down the sentences he dictated before racing on to his next point. At their insistence, Mr. Jefferson was forced to slow down and repeat the statements he wanted committed to paper (and memory), but soon after such pauses, his talk would quickly accelerate *again*. As one student informed me, Mr. Jefferson's formidable speed was so unmanageable for the students at the beginning of the year that he provided them with a hand-sign to silently indicate that he needed to stem the flood of information. By the last three weeks of the one-semester course, though, the students mostly yelled out "Slow down!" to try to keep up.

There were 33 students enrolled in the section I observed, (FN10) and all took notes diligently. At the end of class, the students would hand in their almost-identical sheets of notes to be assessed by Mr. Jefferson early the next morning and handed back at the beginning of the next class meeting. Class notes were usually worth a total of 25 points, a small but not insignificant portion of the final tally which constituted a student's grade for the course. Large-scale assignments, such as long papers and in-class exams, were worth 340-400 points each; in-class quizzes, approximately 100-200 points; and homework assignments were worth slightly more than in-class notes, 30-40 points each. Oral participation in class did not figure in to students' grades as there was little opportunity for them to speak.

Mr. Jefferson was careful to apprise the students of their grades over the course of the semester by posting a computer-generated grid every few weeks at the back of the class. On the chart, beside each student's name, was the point tally he or she received for each completed assignment in that time period, the total number of points accrued since the beginning of the semester, the percentage of that total out of the maximum possible number of points and finally, the grade it represented to date. On the days that this chart was posted, students would hover around the bulletin board, taking turns tracing their fingers across their names' row and walking away disappointed or proud, quiet or not. Despite the range of reactions, none of the students considered the system or the public nature of its display to be unfair. In fact, all of the students whom I interviewed for this study called Mr. Jefferson a "fair teacher" and a "nice man" who consistently offered students who had fallen behind opportunities to catch up.

The official curriculum from which Mr. Jefferson drew most of the materials for his two and a half week Holocaust unit was highly informationally laden. An impressive anthology of over 215 pages in small, single-spaced print, *Holocaust and Genocide: A Search for Conscience* was developed under the auspices of the State of New Jersey Department of **Education**, edited by Harry Furman and a group of associates, and published in 1983. The curriculum contains 116 readings by a variety of authors ranging from scholars to psychologists and from reporters to pop music stars.

On a Thursday in mid-December, Mr. Jefferson started teaching about the Holocaust. In order to give the students the "big picture," on the third day of the unit Mr. Jefferson posed for them six central questions about the Holocaust: "What was it? What happened? How did it happen? Why did it happen? Of what significance is it? And, what do we do with the information we have?" (Class Transcript, 12/15/96). It took Mr. Jefferson nine minutes total to answer the questions, testament both to the considerable speed of his lecturing and the breadth of his knowledge. His answers included cursory coverage of: a definition of mass murder (as distinct from homicide), "the bureaucratic organization of the nation state," a history of anti-Semitism, the implications for a technologically sophisticated world, and the simple moral lessons that "we need to preserve democracy" and students need to become "rescuers" (Class Transcript, 12/15/96). The students dutifully took their notes.

As Mr. Jefferson explained during an interview, the sequence of his classes was designed to mimic the questions he posed by way of introduction, though in fact the structure of the unit corresponded only loosely to the questions. The same day as this lecture, for example, Mr. Jefferson elaborated on 'What was it?' by discussing other examples of genocide -- Armenia, Cambodia and Rwanda/Burundi -- and other causes of the Holocaust: anti-Semitism, nationalism and racism. The next day, he outlined for students

four stages of the Holocaust(FN11) and showed the film Night and Fog. Mr. Jefferson explained to me later that he showed Night and Fog at the beginning of the unit in a sense to impart to students the seriousness of the subject but also to "get the students interested."

Over the next few weeks, Mr. Jefferson's unit followed the events of the Holocaust chronologically. He defined Jews and Judaism, talked about prejudice and elaborated on historically anti-Semitic myths about Jews. He also discussed German unification, the Versailles Treaty, the depression of 1929, Hitler's rise to power, totalitarianism and fascism, the Weimar Republic, German war guilt, reparations payments, and the burning of the Reichstag building.

As might be evident from this list of topics alone, Mr. Jefferson's unit was weighted heavily towards providing students with historical information. Mr. Jefferson spent the bulk of each class session lecturing about what one might expect to learn in a history course: historical facts, names, dates, places and events. Most of the time, too, he gave out the information in summary form, condensed and simplified. If he held a discussion, it was typically one where the students needed to supply only short answers, as above. While this format was efficient, in the sense that it let him dispense an enormous amount of information in a short period of time, it didn't allow Mr. Jefferson to see how, for example, the gruesome and poetic film Night and Fog had impacted them.

A week of school vacation interrupted the unit, and when it resumed, Mr. Jefferson carefully reviewed some of the events and concepts that students might have forgotten. On the Tuesday of that second week, after seven class sessions consisting mostly of lecturing, Mr. Jefferson departed from this format by having the students read aloud a play entitled Living During the Holocaust: Choices. Before assigning parts, Mr. Jefferson lectured for 35 minutes. As usual, the students were quiet and attentive as he talked, faithfully writing down the notes he dictated. At 8:40 a.m., he assigned the 13 speaking parts, asking those students selected to stand at the front of the class to read.

The play concerned the plight of a German **Jewish** family, the Guttmanns, seeking to be hidden by their friends, a German Christian family, the Strausses. In the course of the play, the Strausses discuss among themselves whether or not to incur the significant risks involved; the Strauss grandmother is willing, but the grandfather is not; the Strauss children are similarly divided along gender lines; and the parents are unsure of what to do. The students read their parts haltingly, getting stumped on occasionally sophisticated grammar or more frequently, the pronunciation of difficult words like 'ordained' or the names, 'Strauss' and 'Guttman.' As the class session closed, the characters in the play were still arguing among themselves; the students hadn't finished reading. With five minutes left, Mr. Jefferson asked the students to write their predictions as to what would happen, whether the Strausses would indeed hide their longtime friends or not.

Mr. Jefferson began the next class session by reviewing the categories of participants in the Holocaust and neatly focusing on the concept of rescue. He listed for the students characteristics of rescuers, saying for example that rescuers were usually those who "saw an opportunity to help people and seized it," that "they had the ability to help, the motivation to help," and that they were usually non-conformists who "questioned authority" and were fearless and patient. Mr. Jefferson summarized, "Rescuers were not your ordinary guys or gals; they were not your ordinary people" (Class Transcript, 1/8/97). Mr. Jefferson then had the students, one at a time, state their opinions as to whether the Strausses would care for the Guttmanns and why. The class was almost evenly divided. "I said 'No,' because their kids might have reported them," one girl explained. Elizabeth Miranda offered, "I said 'Yes,' because if they knowed them for so long, they probably think about them as their good friends, and what would they have wanted them to do if they were in trouble." Mr. Jefferson paused here to distinguish between friends and acquaintances. (In the play, the Strauss father carefully remarks to the Guttman father, "We've been acquaintances for a long time," rather than positioning their relationship as friends.) "I said that they won't help them," Vince volunteered. "Why were you so cynical, Mr. Vildu?" Mr. Jefferson prompted. "'Cause I mean at that time, the kids are already brainwashed from the schools; the grown-ups, they just didn't want to help them; and the old man, the Grandpa or whatever, he just wanted--." "Grandpa, he just wanted to obey the law!" Mr. Jefferson interrupted, too excited to let Vince finish his point. The discussion veered into brief consideration of whether people should obey unjust laws before the students were asked to continue reading the parts they had held the previous day (Class Transcript, 1/8/97).

The central tension of the play heightened when the character of a local Lutheran leader, Pastor Koenig (whose name provided repeated opportunities for mispronunciation), happened to enter the Strausses' grocery store, the setting of the drama. The Strausses tell the Guttmanns to hide behind the counters as they consult the pastor for advice. At first, when asked generally if it's important to risk one's life to save another's, the pastor agrees, supplying as illustration a vignette from World War I, where a soldier ran from a bunker amidst opposing gunfire to rescue a wounded fellow soldier. When the pastor is asked if the same principle applies to Jews, however, his message changes. Citing historical, anti-Semitic

myths and the Jews' unwillingness to accept Jesus as their savior, the pastor advocates abandoning them to their fates. The play ends without resolving what will happen to the Guttmanns, though the implications are clear. As the students handed their scripts forward along the lines of desks, Mr. Jefferson *again* asked them to predict what would happen to the Guttmanns and why. When completed, these paragraphs were also handed up to the front of the room while Mr. Jefferson explained the day's homework assignment.(FN12)

The students' reactions to the play were various. To Linnea, a talkative white girl, and to Vince, a quiet Indian-American, the play brought home the importance of caring actions. In Vince's words:

A lot of people at that time they were just like [the Strausses]. They're just going to say 'no' and not help, even just people just saying 'hi' in the streets. There was a lot of people who just didn't care as long as they were okay, like the German people, they think that as long as their life is going smoothly... (Interview #2, 1/17/97).

Felix, a young white boy, had the opposite reaction. Perhaps because of his eighth grade teacher's extensive coverage of the subject, to him, reading the play had been a "pretty pointless" exercise and an utter "waste of time." Because he felt he already knew the information it conveyed, Felix belittled the play's emotional impact and overlooked its moral messages. When pressed, however, the limits of Felix's knowledge surfaced. He could not explain, for example, whether Pastor Koenig's claims about Jews were historically accurate. He intuited that Koenig's character "was wrong," but he reasoned his way towards an explanation rather than supplying historical evidence. When I asked him why he thought Koenig was wrong, this exchange followed:

I don't know. I mean, I go to CCD [a Catholic children's organization] and everything, but I don't know that much about the Bible and everything, so.... [I pushed Felix further here, asking why he had said earlier that Pastor Koenig was wrong. Felix continued:] He shouldn't be saying that. I mean maybe -- even if they did do it, maybe some, maybe some people -- I mean like even if the Jews did kill God, maybe two Jews killed God. That doesn't mean that every Jew in the entire world killed him. That's probably how he's wrong (Interview #2, 1/17/97).

Elizabeth Miranda's reaction to the play was more complicated. On the one hand, she thought that the pastor's character was mistaken, "that he wasn't really looking at [the Guttmann's situation] the right way." According to her, the Pastor was "totally wrong" in that "he said God was supposed to be helping, but if he was, God wouldn't have been punishing" the Guttmanns (Interview #2, 1/17/97). On the other hand, Elizabeth Miranda in earlier interviews had expressed opinions similar to the ones the Pastor's character espouses in the play about why God was supposedly punishing the Jews. When asked why she thought the Holocaust happened, Elizabeth Miranda herself talked about destiny and cited the Christian teaching, now widely repudiated by most denominations, that Jews had killed Jesus. In response to my questioning, Elizabeth Miranda said, "In my eyes, I look at it and I go 'why was it supposed to happen?' It was written, just like it's destiny, you know?" When I asked her to clarify what she meant, she elaborated:

You can't really change destiny. Destiny is a thing that's already written. It's just something that's there already that no matter how you try to change it, it's always going to gang up to you and it's going to make you do it the right way.... The past was already written. They couldn't change it. They said that the Son of God was going to die so that's the way it was supposed to be. You know, well I'm Catholic. But after I think about it, it was our fault for killing the Jews, but it was their fault for killing Jesus.... It was already written (Interview #1, 12/16/97).

What Elizabeth Miranda had heard in the Pastor's scripted remarks was an affirmation of what she had already believed about the determinism for the Holocaust.(FN13)

On the last regular day of the unit, Mr. Jefferson had laryngitis, and his voice occasionally cracked as he reviewed the fifth question with which he had started out the unit: "Of what significance is the Holocaust to our lives?" In typical manner, he answered for the students:

I want to focus on the last question just a little bit because I want you to know that we would not be studying the Holocaust if we didn't want to make ourselves aware of how valuable our own democracy is. I would hope that all of you -- you know you hear this from the time you're in grade school to the present time -- support democracy, learn about the Constitution, learn

about the Declaration of Independence. But it's not idle stuff; it's a rare treasure to be cherished (Class Transcript, 1/15/97).

Mr. Jefferson at this point detailed the ways in which the United States government was originally structured to maintain a balance of power. Eventually, he charged his students with what he considered to be the moral lessons of the Holocaust. His heartfelt exhortation was imbued with a kind of added poignancy because it was such a struggle for Mr. Jefferson to speak at all:

I want you to be defenders of democracy, liberty; that means you have to participate in our political system. That means that when people are put down, you've got to defend their rights. If people are talking about persecuting this group of people or that group of people, you gotta stand up for them.... So, I want you in the future, if anytime you see some group of people being put upon, you stand up for justice, you stand up for what's right (Class Transcript, 1/15/97).

The students sat, if moved, not showing it. The final test, administered the following day, marked the true ending of the unit.

Though elsewhere I have criticized Mr. Jefferson for the flatness of his historical content, the patness of his moral messages, the lack of student engagement and the limited range of his activity formats, it was clear that the four students I interviewed had in fact learned a tremendous amount from Mr. Jefferson's class.(FN14) All four students could answer most of my questions easily, supplying a great deal of detail for some and attributing their knowledge mostly to Mr. Jefferson. When I asked, for example, what countries fought in World War II, two students were able to supply a list of ten and nine countries respectively, volunteering which countries fought for the Allies and which for the Axis powers. A third student, a student about whom Mr. Jefferson had said, "If she's getting anything out of the class, then everyone is," could supply seven country names while a fourth easily named six. All four also knew what the Treaty of Versailles was, how Hitler came to power, and each could list numerous examples of Nazi anti-**Jewish** legislation; I was impressed with this consistency.

THE REPRESENTATION OF JEWS

In reviewing the two cases in their entirety, a number of questions regarding the representation of Jews emerges, many of which echo the critiques of Schindler's List. Were Jews represented solely as a collective or in ways that spurred students to think of Jews as individuals? This question harkens back to Spiegelman's claim that the Jews of Schindler's List were, for the most part, undifferentiated. Were Jews normalized or exoticized? This question subsumes the role of **Jewish** stereotypes and passivity. Finally, what was the narrative of Holocaust history that the units constructed? Did the two units contain 'happy endings' as Bartov and Doneson maintain was the case with Schindler's List? In addition, another question more exclusive to the domain of classroom research surfaced from the observations: What was the role of the personal in representing Jews or Jewishness? In other words, were personal connections stated or implied between living people in the class and Jews studied in history?

The axes implied in these questions about the representation of Jews -- collective vs. individual, normalized vs. exoticized, 'happy ending' vs. tragic employment and personalized vs. depersonalized -- are important because of the moral messages different positions on them potentially convey. In the following pages, I describe Mr. Zee's and Mr. Jefferson's positions along these axes and the moral messages, intended or otherwise, which each communicates.(FN15)

As indicated in Figure 1, Mr. Zee's representation of Jews tended to be individualized, normalized and personalized, and the plot of his course implied a 'happy ending.' By individualized, I mean that Mr. Zee tended to refer to Jews (and all the protagonists of his stories) as individuals, to emphasize the crucial consequences of individual decision-making. In the story about Simon Wiesenthal, for example, Mr. Zee focused discussion on what Wiesenthal should have chosen to do when confronted with the possibility of forgiving a perpetrator of atrocity. In particular, through telling stories from his own life (mostly stories in which he acted heroically despite the circumstances), Mr. Zee led students to think about their own choices in life. He seemed to want to empower his largely marginalized students by showing them that they were potential agents of change and doers of good, despite their circumstances. Mr. Zee's stories, as well as activities like the Identity Projects, while meant to empower individual students, nonetheless focused almost exclusively on individuals stripped of the larger social and historical contexts of their decision-making and action-taking. This emphasis on the role of the individual was in part a strategy to universalize the Holocaust, to make its lessons widely applicable, a reflection of the universalistic orientation of Mr. Zee's official curriculum, Facing History and Ourselves. The appeal of this theme is also, arguably, very American. As many critics hold, Americans tend to believe that we shape our own destinies,

that we act as individuals, that we can overcome any limitations.(FN16)

Mr. Zee's emphasis on the theme of the individual was so complete, however, that it impeded conveying the historicity of the Holocaust. The theme of the 'individual as a moral being' -- or of a person acting individually -- doesn't lend itself to explaining mass phenomena, the issues involved in group behavior; thus, while Mr. Zee's paradigm may illuminate the decisions and actions of rescuers (albeit up to a point),(FN17) it not only obscures explanation of the perpetrators' behavior, but especially mystifies excuses for the victims'. In other words, neither the behavior of the perpetrators nor of the victims can be adequately understood in terms of a model which solely emphasizes individual decision-making. The disjuncture which resulted was highlighted in a remark Peaches made accusatorially near the end of the course, "I still don't understand how y'all let yourselves be gassed like that." Ultimately, Mr. Zee's dedication to empowering students precluded their gaining a more nuanced understanding of the Holocaust; the American ideal of individualism, no matter how attractive as ideology, is a very limited explanatory framework for Holocaust history. Though Peaches had come to see the threads of human experience in the Holocaust, she and the other students hadn't been taught enough to understand the larger fabric of atrocity.

As with the emphasis on individualism, the structure of Mr. Zee's course seemed particularly American as well. As mentioned above, Mr. Zee ended with a study of 'participatory citizenship,' which consisted of profiles of people 'who made a difference' in the world. Thus, even though Mr. Zee explicitly referred in class to the Holocaust as a tragedy, he concluded the course with an uplifting, empowering unit on rescue during the Holocaust and resistance to injustice in contemporary America, a conclusion which, while morally inspiring in its content, was intellectually questionable in its placement; the course implied a redemptive ending to a tragic event, not dissimilar to the ending of Schindler's List (though not Zionist). The structure of Mr. Zee's course implied that the Holocaust had a kind of "happy ending," or at least a substantial "silver lining." Its sequence of phases, even if designed with the best of intentions, implied an historically inaccurate, or at least misleading message about the Holocaust.

Mr. Jefferson, by contrast, had tended to speak of Jews as a collective entity rather than highlighting individual survivors' or victims' stories. With the exception of the play, Choices, almost all of Mr. Jefferson's class lectures featured "the Jews" en masse, living (or dying) through the stages of the Holocaust. Relatedly, in his strictly chronological narration of events, Mr. Jefferson painted history as inevitable and human agency as thus necessarily diminished; the implied message was that the events of the Holocaust would have happened regardless of individuals' choices. The two trends are mutually reinforcing; in other words, had Mr. Jefferson individualized his representation of Jews during the Holocaust, it would automatically have given rise to a sense of possibilities rather than of historical inevitability. Individual stories, like those told in Mr. Zee's class, tend to foreground human agency, thus diminishing the weight of historical inevitability and the power of institutions. Ironically, whereas Mr. Jefferson's orientation actually works for the events of the Holocaust, by implying a lack of choices and an inevitability of outcomes regardless of individual victims' choices -- a momentous historical reality of the Holocaust -- this orientation does not work as a lens through which to view history more generally. To most, history cannot be understood as inevitable. It also fails as a way of trying to send the message that individual agency or morality can "make a difference." Interestingly, though, this sense of inevitability heightened the role of the tragic in Mr. Jefferson's course. The notion that the collectivity of Jews was seemingly "destined" for destruction from the outset, thought historically inaccurate, nonetheless helped reinforce the tragic dimensions of Holocaust history. In terms of the first continuum, then, Mr. Zee's and Mr. Jefferson's representations were too extreme in depicting Jews either as individuals or as a collective rather than a complex simultaneity of both. And, whereas Mr. Zee's course 'emplotted' the Holocaust as redemptive, Mr. Jefferson's unit placed the Holocaust squarely within the genre of tragedy.

With respect to the continua of 'normalized' vs. 'exoticized,' and 'personalized' vs. 'depersonalized,' **again** the two teachers' depictions of Jews were polarized. Having talked about being **Jewish** in numerous personal stories, Mr. Zee came to embody Jewishness to his students, especially considering that there were few Jews who attended the high school in which he taught and none (besides him and me) in the class that I observed. In other words, his very presence, and the fact that he discussed at great length his **jewish** identity, established what was considered 'normalcy' for being **Jewish**: intermarried, open-minded, justice-seeking, good-hearted, self-aggrandizing, and financially successful.(FN18) In the stories specifically dealing with his Jewishness, too, Mr. Zee told of latent anti-Semitism and his subsequent sensitivity to it. In one story he told, for example, he shared a memory of being the only **Jewish** student in his class at school from fifth to tenth grades (Class Transcript, 3/7/96). He remembered his distinct discomfort every time his teachers would mention "religion," looking at him to evaluate his reaction. Mr. Zee never defined Jews as being separate, different or unusual in any way except in their reception by non-Jews. Thus, the image of Jewishness espoused in Mr. Zee's enacted curriculum was very 'normalized,' personalized, and projected from Mr. Zee's own position as a modern, assimilated, American

Jew. While not helping students understand the historic role of anti-Semitism in precipitating the Holocaust, Mr. Zee's image of Jewishness managed to avoid reinscribing negative **Jewish** stereotypes.

In Mr. Jefferson's unit, by contrast, though Mr. Jefferson himself was also **Jewish**, this fact was barely shared. In one class session, when a student asked whether he was Aryan, Mr. Jefferson replied in the negative and mentioned that he was **Jewish**. It was a statement in passing and went unelaborated. (It was interesting, however, that the student's question was absolutely genuine. Having been taught the categories, 'Jews' and 'Aryans' as if commensurate, this student was unable to distinguish the epistemological differences between the two.) When Mr. Jefferson defined Judaism for his students, describing some of the beliefs and practices that distinguish **Jewish** practices from other religions, Mr. Jefferson recited the Shema in Hebrew, which prompted the students to ask him how many languages he spoke. They made no connection between him and the topic he was covering. In that same discussion, he tended to describe all Jews as orthodox. Thus Jews were actually exoticized and depersonalized in Mr. Jefferson's unit, talked about almost exclusively in the third person (in collective terms) and as 'others,' the brief exception **again** being in the play, Choices. Mr. Jefferson's teaching style exacerbated the problems this psychological distance set up. Perhaps if he had gotten to know his students a little more intimately or in some way explored their assumptions about the subject matter, he could have addressed (and battled) some of the students' problematic perceptions of Jews like those held by Elizabeth Miranda. In a sense, Mr. Jefferson's treatment of Jews, though historically accurate, allowed negative stereotypes to be perpetuated.

Though it would be impossible to generalize, it seems likely to judge from Mr. Zee's and Mr. Jefferson's cases that whether a teacher is **Jewish** or not does not in itself determine the representation of Jews as much as that teacher's curricular choices and personal teaching style. Perhaps in part because of his normalized and personalized image of Jews, Mr. Zee's students were far more able to draw connections between themselves and Jews in general, whereas Mr. Jefferson's students tended to learn information rather than build empathic bridges.

In summary, teachers' choices about the representation of Jews in their curricula are important as they have the potential to deeply influence students' experienced curricula, that is, how students potentially end up perceiving Jews, Judaism, and the Holocaust itself. While both Mr. Zee and Mr. Jefferson excelled at conveying certain aspects of the Holocaust, for Mr. Zee's students, its moral lessons, in Mr. Jefferson's, its factual content, neither teacher managed to do both. For Mr. Zee's students, these oversights meant that students were left with questions about who Jews were (and are) and why Jews were persecuted and murdered during the Holocaust. (As Peaches asked me when she found out that I was **Jewish** near the end of Mr. Zee's course, "Y'all believe in Jesus Christ, don't you?") While Mr. Jefferson's students covered more of the factual terrain, they, too, were left with misconceptions about individual agency, about who Jews were (and are) and the centrality of their role in the Holocaust.

I would like to stress that these teachers' choices evidence the extreme difficulties inherent in teaching about the Holocaust rather than their personal failings. The Holocaust (like all morally laden history) inevitably involves pedagogical trade-offs, and faulting in either direction on the continua listed above is unfortunately easy. Much harder is the task of balancing between the two poles on each axis, and the subject matter, fraught as it is with moral implications, demands that we attempt to do just that. Though the Holocaust is unarguably an imperfect vehicle through which to teach about Jews and Judaism in general, an understanding of Holocaust history must be considered incomplete without it.

It is clear from even this cursory investigation, in addition, that the kinds of narrative tropes that characterized Spielberg's depiction of Jews in Schindler's List are hardly determined by genre alone, as Bartov argues, but are more likely endemic to any representation of the Holocaust, whether in a Hollywood film or a high school curriculum. If we do not attend carefully to the complex continua at play in representations of Jews in Holocaust narratives, we run the risk of doubly **victimizing** Jews: in Holocaust history and in its retellings.

ADDED MATERIAL

Simone **Schweber** recently received her Ph.D. in **Jewish Education** from Stanford University.
Figure 1. Representation of Jews along Four Continua

FOOTNOTES

1 See for example Omer Bartov's essay entitled, "Hollywood Tries Evil" for a review of these reactions. It is one of numerous essays contained in Yosefa Loshitzky's book entitled, Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List.

2 I located the teachers I studied through word-of-mouth. I spent almost one month making phone calls, seeking names of experienced teachers known for their successful work teaching about the Holocaust. I solicited recommendations from Holocaust Center administrators, Holocaust curriculum writers, history curriculum developers, superintendents' offices of instruction, workers, district social studies office

employees, professors at Stanford School of **Education**, high school social studies department chairs, Simon Wiesenthal Center for Tolerance staff members, and high school students.

3 The teacher whom I call Mr. Zee taught in Southern California, and the teacher whom I call Mr. Jefferson taught in Northern California.

4 For those unacquainted with the methodological orientation of '**Educational** Criticism,' it can best be described as an act of interpretation rendered in narrative form. As Eisner characterizes it, the "task" of the **educational** critic is to "transform the qualities of a...classroom or school, or act of teaching and learning into a public form that illuminates, interprets, and appraises the qualities that have been experienced" (1991, p. 86).

5 For a full recounting of the four cases rather than the brief summation of the two presented here, see my unpublished doctoral dissertation, *Teaching History, Teaching Morality: Holocaust **Education** in American Public High Schools*, 1998.

6 All the proper names in this article have been changed to protect the identities of the subjects in accordance with Human Subjects protocols.

7 Discourse analysts will recognize this process as language 'uptake' (Cazden, 1988), a reflection that Erin had internalized at least some of Mr. Zee's terminology. Other students' use of language reflected the same trend.

8 I have to admit that from having observed Mr. Zee's first period class for only one week, I had strong suspicions as to whom he was discussing, and I wondered if it was as easy for the students in this second period class to identify his subject.

9 Mr. Zee's anti-academic strain shows through this comment as he implies to students that one cannot be simultaneously 'involved,' 'curious' and 'academic[ally]' oriented.

10 This number exactly corresponds to the average class size in the district; according to the Annual School Report for 1996, "The negotiated agreement between the district and the...High School District Teachers Association specifies a hiring ratio of one teacher for every 27.5 students...[which] translates to an average class size of 33" (Annual School Report, 1996, p. 1).

11 The four stages Mr. Jefferson delineated were constituted by sub-categories. Stage 1 included: religious and historical anti-Semitism, propaganda and the racialized redefinition of Jewishness. Stage 2 included the gradual loss of German Jews' civil rights and property. Stage 3 involved the war in Europe, the ghettoization of Jews, and the formation of mobile killing units and the building of extermination camps. The final phase, Stage 4, Mr. Jefferson defined as including the liberation of the camps, the subsequent creation of Displaced Persons camps and the immigration of survivors.

12 On the back of an annotated map of **Jewish** emigration patterns between the years 1933 and 1938, Mr. Jefferson asked the students to write down which countries accepted **Jewish** émigrés and in what numbers, information to be garnered from the front side of the map.

13 When I pushed Elizabeth Miranda to further elaborate, asking whether she thought it was fair to blame Jews for the death of Jesus, she tempered her answer somewhat. "Well not really," she said, "because it wasn't their fault that they killed Christ is what I think." "It was just like," she struggled to find the right words, "they were just trying -- people are afraid of new things that are different [and] they wanted to be everything the same...to have everything the same" (Interview #1, 12/16/97). I interpret her remarks to mean that she considered the murder of Jews during the Holocaust not to be excusable, but at least in part explainable by Jews' having killed Jesus for fear of embracing his new ideas.

14 It is of course arguable as to how long Mr. Jefferson's students would retain their storehouses of information.

15 Though early writing on the moral dimensions of the 'hidden curriculum' tended to overlook the structure of the unit or course as conveying moral meaning (See for example, Purpel and Ryan's essay, *Moral **Education**...It Comes with the Territory*, in Giroux and Purpel, 1983), later authors have incorporated the notion. (See for example, Tom's discussion of 'Teaching as a Moral Craft' in his book of the same title, 1984.)

16 Many sophisticated thinkers have elaborated on this aspect of American culture. See for example, Lasch (1979) writing on narcissism, Coles (1980) mocking its centrality, and McGerr (1993) describing the persistence of individualism. One of the most comprehensive renderings of the toll this ideology extracts on American inhabitants was produced by Bellah et al (1985) in *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (p. 6):

American cultural traditions define personality, achievement, and the purpose of human life in ways that leave the individual suspended in glorious, but terrifying isolation. These are limitations of our culture, of the categories and ways of thinking we have inherited, not limitations of individuals...who inhabit this culture. People frequently live out a fuller sense of purpose in life than they can justify in rational terms.

17 In fact, the behavior of rescuers was significantly impacted, either facilitated or restricted, by contextual factors such as location, whether for example, a country was absorbed into the Third Reich, occupied by or allied to Germany. Even Samuel and Pearl Oliner (1988), the authors of the book, *The Altruistic Personality*, who, as indicated by their chosen title, primarily employ an individualistic paradigm to explain the characters of those who rescued, nonetheless take into account the significant contingencies of time and place, as evidenced by their chapter entitled, "The Historical Context of Rescue" (pp. 13-49).

18 Mr. Zee revealed these parts of his life in different stories, one for example about having married his wife despite the disapproval of his more religious parents, another about having just bought a new Jeep.

REFERENCES

- Bartov, O. (1997). Spielberg's Oskar: Hollywood tries evil. In Y. Loshitzky (Ed.), *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List* (pp. 41-60). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann **Educational** Books, Inc.
- Doneson, J. (1997). The Image Lingers: The Feminization of the Jews in Schindler's List. In Y. Loshitzky (Ed.), *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List* (pp. 140-152). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Eisner, E. (1991). *The Enlightened Eye*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Friedlander, S. (Ed.). (1992). *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution."* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H., & Purpel, D. (1983). *The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing.
- Hansen, D. (1993). The Moral Importance of the Teacher's Style. *J. Curricula Studies*, 25, (5), 397-421.
- Hayes, P. (Ed.). (1991). *Lessons and Legacies: The Meaning of the Holocaust in a Changing World*. Chicago: Northwestern University Press.
- Loshitzky, Y. (1997). *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Oliner, S. P., & P. M. (1988). *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rosenberg, A., & Bardosh, A. (1982-83). "The Problematic Character of Teaching the Holocaust." *Shoah: A Journal of Resources on the Holocaust*, 3, (2-3), 3-7.
- Spiegelman, A. (1994, March 29). "Schindler's List: Myth, Movie and Memory." *Village Voice*, pp. 4-31.
- Spielberg, S. (Director). (1993). *Schindler's List*. [Film]. California: Amblin Productions.
- Stern-Strom, M. (1982). *Facing History and Ourselves: The Holocaust and Human Behavior*. Massachusetts: International **Educational**, Inc.
- Tom, A. (1984). *Teaching as a Moral Craft*. New York: Longman.
- Wiesenthal, S. (1977). *The Sunflower*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Young, J. (1988). *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narratives and the Consequences of Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.