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When Origin Speaks by Itself: Schindler's List and the Return to the Promised Territory
**Redeeming the Face of History**

On the basis of my analyses in previous chapters, I have demonstrated that the process of narration in new Hollywood cinema involves recognizable structures, including intersubjective exchange, spatial detours, temporal deferrals, causal reversals, sons generating their fathers or what I have additionally described as “facing the father.” The operation of “facing” as I have pointed out in chapters three and four, is dependent on causal reversals and generational reordering, or rather on repairing the preposterous constructions of history. “Facing” can also be understood as citing the term “father” disloyally, to use Butler’s appropriation of Derrida’s concept. This gives rise to the future return of the same as different, that is, the improved version of the same. The discursive dependency between the father and the son secures the futurity of the signifier of paternity: via the son the father is restructured and repaired. Setting history in order implies intervening into the past, but the history that needs ultimately to be set in order is the future history.

I have suggested that setting things in order is related to a reinstitutionalization of patriarchal discourses, but paradoxically enough, this is achieved through the transgression of categories and boundaries, a decentering of self, a deterritorialization or recolonizing by the colonized, hence through phenomena which are very much in keeping with the contemporary epistemological perspectives and the political realities of the postcolonial world. As a result of this tendency, the female characters have come to figure as the “outside” which constitutes the intersubjective exchange between the male characters. This is especially evident in the examples discussed in chapter five: the tendency to posit the female characters in-between an intersubjective exchange, whereby the production of subjectivity is blocked, can be seen as the converse of decomposition in the process of narration.

This also implies that the process of storytelling in question is haunted by a plethora of ghosts who indicate that the play with decentering of subjectivity which pretends to undermine mythical discourse actually works toward reinforcing the dominant patriarchal myths. In the previous chapter I focused on the examples which bring about women’s existence in a “non-place,” in an “extra-territory” and I argued that this place of non-existence can be taken as an exemplary position and constitutes an opening up of possibilities...
from which we, women in particular, can envision ourselves within our cultural present. I discussed the discursive potential of this “extraterritoriality” and I emphasized the role of narrative in the (re)construction of female subjectivity. In relation to this, it is important to add, that such persistent play with the mechanisms with which the vision of the world can not only be imposed but also repaired displays the potentially productive and transformative forces of popular cinema. While maintaining the focus on the productive potential of new Hollywood cinema, in this chapter I will shift the focus from gender to the problem of ethnicity and race, addressing the issue of extraterritoriality more concretely, in relation to the loss of a homeland. The existence of in-between territories, in the place where constitutive outsiders are “housed,” will come to figure as the “home” of a specific people.

I will draw on concerns introduced in particularly chapter three, as well as chapter four. In chapter three, I suggested that the national and implicitly racial-ethnic conflicts in the *Indiana Jones* trilogy manifest the displacement and refiguring of historical origins or a (re)negotiation of history and identity through mythical discourse. I placed a special emphasis on the connection between narrative, history, myth and transgenerational memory. I discussed the ways origins are “fathered” through myths and how both filial and paternal positions are inscribed. My argument in relation to the *Indiana Jones* trilogy was that through the specific strategies of telling, history can be more than just recounted, it can be repaired. One of the crucial conditions for the restorative function of the process of telling is precisely mythical discourse. The room for the other, as the trilogy demonstrates, needs to be marked in mythical discourse. It needs to be fabulated. Only then can it affect history and accordingly, cultural memory.

While in the *Star Wars* trilogy, and particularly in the *Indiana Jones* trilogy the operation of giving a face to history remains implicit, *Schindler's List* - the example I will examine in this chapter - is a blockbuster film which explicitly engages in facing the most fraught case of cultural, national and racial conflict and alienation. With the example of this film I will take a specific moment in the history of Jewish people as exemplary of an existence without/on an impossible territory. Giving a face to this moment in history involves the myth of exile and return and, as the analysis of
the film will demonstrate, the structure of this myth governs the process of fabulation. I will suggest that *Schindler's List* is an example of the ultimate clash of mythical and historical discourse; this clash is the result of the recurring concern of the new Hollywood cinema with redeeming both the fabula and history.

Spielberg's film stages a redemption in such a way as to build up an expectation for the arrival of the "Messiah" who is to save the "chosen people." The people who are saved and ultimately led to the "Promised Land," this analysis will argue, are the people whose names were on Schindler's list. This preoccupation with the "chosen people" is already announced in the film's title.

Significantly, the original title of Thomas Keneally's novel *Schindler's Ark* is changed into *Schindler's List*. Thereby, the Genesis narrative gives way to the story of the "chosen people" from Exodus.

"Noah's" act of salvation of the species from the collective doom brought down by the wrath of God, is replaced with "Moses" liberating the chosen people from slavery and leading them on their passage towards the Promised Land. The operation of saving in the film involves the collapse of the miracle of salvation onto the ungraspable horror of history. As a result of the process of telling, the myth of redemption intervenes into the story of countless individual deaths.

The issue of redemption as it is bound up with history has profound connections with Walter Benjamin's philosophico-historical views. I am alluding in the first place to his notion of the temporal index of the past by which the past is referred to redemption, implying conversely that the future does not have a Messianic function but that it is interwoven into the historical *now*:

The past carries with it a temporal index by which it is referred to redemption. There is a secret agreement between past generations and the present one. Our coming was expected on earth. Like every generation that preceded us, we have been endowed with a weak Messianic power, a power to which the past has a claim. (Benjamin, 1998: 254)

Benjamin's concept of history sharpens our awareness that dealing with the past involves indexical mediation. This mediation bears in particular on exile and return. The movement which binds exile and
return is reflected in the temporal index that structures history through redemption. This process, whereby history is indexed through redemption, will prove just as significant for the structuring of subjectivity. To illuminate the connection between the redemption myth and the constitution of the Jewish subject, we need to take into consideration, as Gershom Scholem states, that “the history of Judaism and its influence has been exercised almost exclusively under the conditions of the exile as a primary reality of Jewish life and Jewish history” (Scholem, 1995: 2).

In his discussion on the Messianic idea in Judaism, Scholem explains that within rabbinic Judaism as a social and religious phenomenon there are three forces which need to be taken into account: conservative, restorative and utopian. The conservative forces are directed toward preservation of that which was always in danger in the historical environment of Judaism, and hence toward the construction and continuing preservation and development of religious law:

This law determined the nature of the Jew’s life in exile, the only frame in which life in the light of Sinaitic revelation seemed possible, and it is not surprising that it drew to itself, above all, the conservative forces. The restorative forces are directed to the return and recreation of a past condition which comes to be felt as ideal. More precisely, they are directed to a condition pictured by the historical fantasy and the memory of the nation as circumstances of an ideal past. Here hope is turned backwards to the re-establishment of an original state of things and to a “life with the ancestors.” (Scholem, 1995: 3)

The contiguous relations between exile and return which play a formative role in the history of Judaism, govern the (re)structuring of history in Schindler’s List. The restorative forces bind the exile to redemption and bring about the hope of “going back to the future,” returning as it were, to the lost homeland.

There is a simultaneous movement implied which points both forward and backward. In that sense, and this is of crucial importance for the concerns of this study, mythical discourse has the capacity to affect both the present and the future of a specific iden-
tity. The exile from the Land as a signifier of identity is also an exile from identity, and the promise to return to this lost origin is thus conditioned on exile. Drawing on the past, replaying the lost unity, engenders and encourages hope for the future. In the case of Schindler's List, I will argue, there is a staging of the possibility of return, hence of fulfilling the mythical promise of reacquiring the long lost unity emblematized in the lost territory.

The redemption myth entails the notion of a home as a memory of the past projected into the future, but also the arrival at a Promised Land and the reacquisition of a long lost territory. On the one hand then, the film deals with a disastrous period in the recent history of the Jews. On the other hand, however, this historical narrative is (re)framed through the redemption myth. As a result of the process of fabulation, the danger may arise, as Leo Bersani argues, that we remain oblivious to the actual catastrophe of history (Bersani, 1990). On the basis of my analysis of the film I will put forward a counter argument: I will demonstrate why and how the process of redeeming history can have a productive function. To complicate the discourse on the redemptive function of art and the tendency it displays to cover up the disasters of history, I will examine the film according to the "pragmatics of territoriality." This implies that the structuring of the narrative and accordingly, the structuring of subjectivity will be mapped out across specific territories. The mapping of territories in the film structures our understanding of the dependency between the characters and the territory they inhabit. The fact that the Jews are left without a territory on which they are permitted to exist, is more than a case of troubled history. As Schindler's List has it, it is a catastrophe of history.

The structuring of subjectivity in Schindler's List, corresponds to the movement of exile and return. This implies that the relations between characters can be defined in terms of the territories they (do not) control. There are three lines of action in the film: the line of Oscar Schindler, the line of the Jews, and the line of the Nazis. Each of the lines pertaining to an actant is defined by concrete territories; while the Nazi aim was to make the deterritorialization of the Jews final, leaving no possibility for future returns, Schindler held the promise of the return to the lost "homeland."

I will trace the movement of deterritorialization in the film as it is dependent on the structuring of narrative and subjectivity.
The "pragmatics of territoriality" is based on a specific set of assemblages and it can serve as a point of departure for setting up the relations between the elements in the narrative. It is obvious that the movement of deterrioralization imposed by the Nazis can be taken as a manifestation of the despotic regime. The progressive effacement of the territory on which the Jews were allowed to exist is commensurable with the progressive decimation of the Jewish population. The historical conditions, then, which brought about the Holocaust and the systematic annihilation of the Jews exemplify the ultimate horror of a regime which imposes exile and deterrioralization.

Apart from the movement forward which presupposes deterrioralization, the structure of exile and return is predicated on a simultaneous movement backward, that is, reterrorialization. The joining of two contradictory movements into one, can be referred to as de/re-territorialization. De/re-territorialization, as Schindler's List shows, becomes tied to arriving at the territory where life would be possible. Once this is attained a new set of signs will come into play. The emerging issue that will need to be addressed is the vision that exceeds the fictional world of the film. I am referring to the previously introduced co-dependency between the social and the narratorial agent. The specific ways in which the movement of de/re-territorialization is "told" will ultimately be brought into connection with Spielberg's concerns as a social agent.

**Mapping the Territory**

The film begins in color, with a family during a Sabbath prayer. As the prayer is ending, the candle is dying out and color is gradually drained out of the image. The scene ends with a detail of the smoke emitted from the extinguished candle. With this dissolving smoke the image fades out and then immediately fades into the bulk of smoke coming out of a locomotive arriving at the Krakow train station. The year is 1939, and the registration of the Jews arriving at Krakow has begun. They were ordered to leave their homes in the countryside and relocate to major cities. For the moment, their new location is unknown. Their locus will be determined according to the list.

In the opening of the film we are at that stage where the deterrioralization of the Jews has just begun. This is confirmed
through the imposing process of transfer and uprootedness. It is a
time of war; the text superimposed on the images in the train sta-
tion scene informs us that the Polish army was defeated in two
weeks. This implies that Poland as a territory has fallen under
Hitler's control. From the scenes that follow we realize that the new
conditions have affected all levels of society.

One character who is quick to adapt to the new conditions
is Schindler. The first convincing example of his versatile personality
is the night club scene. Even though in the beginning of the scene
the Nazi officers of the highest rank are undoubtedly the most
prominent guests and Schindler is only an outsider, he manages to
insert himself into this territory and into the company of those who
control it. I will argue that his capacity to acquire territorial control
has to do with the ways he is elaborated as a character. The analysis
will show that Schindler is continuously invested with a double-
meaning. As a character who plays a duplicitous role, he can be per-
ceived as the outsider and insider. This capacity to join contradictory
positions will enable him to emerge as a "mediator," as the one who
will ultimately forge an in-between space, a middle ground on which
twelve hundred people will find safety.

Already in the brief scene of Schindler's preparation for a
night out, he is presented as a "man in the making." The scene con-
sists of ten shots, there is no establishing shot, and his body is cut
up (in a double sense) into a series of shots depicting various
details. The "cutting up" of Schindler into details effectuates the
dismemberment of his character-image. The care he takes in select-
ing a suit and accessories, informs us immediately that this man is
busy creating an appealing "look," and that he wants to approxi-
mate a specific image. This is confirmed in the end of the scene
where the most important details come into play. First, he takes a
stack of money from a drawer. In the shot that follows, there is
another detail of a hand taking out more money. Rather than finally
revealing the face of this man, the scene ends with a detail of his
hand attaching a Nazi pin. He thus literally attaches meaning to the
image that he has constructed. Or rather, he "pins a meaning" to
himself.

There are two conclusions we can draw here. First, the man
in question is evidently framed through a fascist symbol. (At this
point we do not know it is Schindler). Nevertheless, as this is elabo-
rated in the scene, “putting on” this symbol can also be understood as part of an appearance he aims to create. Second, the fact that his character-image remains literally cut up in details keeps his identity dismembered, as it were, and therefore, suspended.

The reasons for investing such care in his appearance are revealed as soon as he arrives at the night club (scene 1). We soon grasp that he needs an impeccable image because he has come here to put himself on display. By the same token, we can gather that his identity is suspended because he is in the process of negotiating his position on Nazi territory. In the very first shot of the scene he manages to impress the maître d’ and secure an attractive spot in the club. The efficiency with which Schindler operates is condensed through the narrative economy of this shot. As he enters the shot his back is turned to the camera. By the end of the shot when he is seated at his table in a medium close-up, viewed from a slightly low angle in a semi-profile, his stature has already acquired a monumental quality.

On the basis of the camera movement and angle we can conclude that the unidentifiable narratorial authority has framed Schindler in such a way as if to inform us that he is a man of grandeur. The slightly lower angle from which Schindler is viewed indicates a voluntary submission of the narratorial authority. The shot ends with Schindler assuming a pose. The effect of the process of telling in shot 1 can already be seen in the following shot. In shot 2 the headwaiter is gazing. Clearly, his interest and curiosity are aroused. This is confirmed in the shot of Schindler (shot 3) focalized internally by the headwaiter.

The scene progresses with Schindler offering himself as the object of vision, but now he is looking and he is also inviting us to look at him. In shots 5 and 12, for example, Schindler sits perfectly still, yet he still provokes the movement of the camera. The narratorial authority making itself present through the camera movement seems to be reacting to Schindler’s look directed at the camera. Schindler displays an awareness that he is being watched but even more importantly, he is looking for an encounter. He is addressing us, but he is at the same time observing the important guests in the night club. The objects of his vision in shots 6, 9, 11, 13, and 15 are focalized internally. Since he is also looking at us, hence, engaging in “second person” discourse, we can conclude that his focalization
is split. He is the focalizing agent on whose point of vision narration relies, but by directing his look at the camera he is also seeking contact outside the time and space of the story world.

Schindler is not the only character looking for an encounter. The importance of establishing contact is further underscored through the presence of the woman photographer. In shots 8, 36, and 48, she directs her photo camera at us. When the light flashes in the same shot, we have the sense that it could be us she is photographing. The “now” implied in the photographer’s and Schindler’s eyes directed at us has an important narrative function. As an in-between moment, composed through the split between internal focalization and second person discourse, it works in such a way as to obscure the difference between the fabula-time and the story-time. The scene is elaborated in such a way as to create the impression of the continuity of action, but it also aims to attain an extreme reversal in the relationship between the characters. In terms of the fabula-time of Schindler’s List, this type of reversal actually requires a period of longer duration, much longer in any case, than the time it takes for the scene to evolve. Therefore, what is in fabula-time a series of scenes, in story-time is condensed into a single scene. The photo camera which persistently affirms the “now” of the process of telling is, then, a means of obscuring disruption or discontinuity. The covering up of the gap between the two temporal continuums results in the collapse of the fabula onto the story. On the one hand then, each direct address to the camera can be interpreted as an ellipsis. On the other hand, however, these shots are also filling in the temporal gaps and propelling the process of telling.

Similarly, the series of Schindler’s close-ups (1.6, 5, 10, 12, 15, 15.6, 27 and 30), functions in such a way as to sustain spatial and temporal continuity. One way this is accomplished is through the clash between “history” and the “historical present”: Schindler looks at us yet observes the characters in the story. The other way is through framing. Since Schindler is framed in close-ups, the space he occupies gradually acquires the status of an imaginary, that is, extra-diegetic space. As a result of this process of telling, fabula-time clashes with story-time, and what is in fact an iterative pattern can be perceived as a sequential ordering. This gives the impression of temporal continuity and unity of action. I would suggest that the
story intervening into the fabula reasserts the clash implied in Schindler's dual focalization. Hence, history becomes bound up with the present of meaning production.

If Schindler is to be inserted into the territory controlled by the Nazis, he needs to insert himself into the historical narrative he is relating. And to do this, he must literally “get into the picture.” In the first part of the scene, Schindler is observing those who are being photographed. It is clear that the Nazi officers have caught the eye of the woman photographer, but it is through Schindler's focalization that their prominence is asserted. In shot 8, the woman photographer takes a picture. The man in shot 9 who is the object of her attention is depicted without a head. His uniform, that is, his rank, is the center of focus. In the shot that follows (shot 10), we realize that the vision of the uniform is the product of Schindler’s focalization. The next object photographed is again a Nazi officer (shot 11). He too is without a head. As in shot 9, the focus is placed on the uniform and this vision can also be attributed to Schindler. It appears that Schindler's prospects for “getting into the picture” are good, because he too is illuminated by the photographer’s flashlight. This will happen in the closing of the scene where he is photographed with those who are in control of this territory. The series of shots 48 through 56, elaborated as a photo session, demonstrates that the power relations have drastically changed: Schindler is present in every snap-shot.

From the very beginning, the night club is introduced as a territory where power relations are strongly marked. Through structures of focalization, a relation is soon established between those who have power and those who do not. At the outset, Schindler is the observer while the Nazis are the observed. In the scene’s closing however, the observer is the uninformed Nazi officer who arrives too late, while Schindler is the center of attention. The relation between the observer and the observed is marked through the juxtaposition of two tables in the club. One table is set in front of the stage with the sign “reserved” on it, the other marks the place where Schindler is seated. Guests are awaited, and judging by Schindler's interest, they are of considerable importance. In shot 12 Schindler is in a close-up, just gazing. In shots 13 and 14 we notice the reserved table. In shot 15 a Nazi officer of a higher rank enters accompanied by a female escort and an officer of a lower rank. Schindler desires
the company of the Nazi officers, yet, rather than joining them at their table, he will bring them over to his "territory," to the table at the other side of the club.

Schindler’s ability to simultaneously act as a focalizor and as a focalized object will play a central role in this transition. In shot 15 he observes the situation, but now he also puts on a performance for the external focalizor. Two focalizers are joined in this shot, internal (Schindler), and an unidentified external focalizor. When he raises his hand in shot 15, just as the important guest is entering the club, a banknote swiftly glides through his fingers, practically out of nowhere. This first trick has the effect of a magical wand and we are immediately made aware of its powers: the waiter pops up in the same shot, as a materialized wish, ready to jump at Schindler’s command. We can retrospectively attribute the external focalization in the first part of the shot to the waiter. In the next shot (shot 16), external focalization shifts to internal focalization: the Nazi officer holding a bottle of expensive cognac in his hands is the product of Schindler’s vision.

The (re)mapping of the territory through the play of focalization continues throughout the entire scene. On the basis of Schindler’s focalization in shots 25 through 45, we can notice that the power relations have reached a new stage. Shots 25 and 26 are focalized internally by the Nazi officer (26.1), but his vision is overruled by Schindler’s internal focalization. Schindler is looking at that which attracts the attention of the Nazis, hence, their gaze is embedded into his (shot 27). Shot 29 of the cabaret girls is focalized by the Nazi who applauds enthusiastically in shot 28. The vision of the Nazi looking and seeing is twice inserted into Schindler’s vision (shots 27 and 30). In shot 32 Schindler is conversing with the waiter and in shot 35 the waiter counts Schindler’s money. In shots 37 and 38 the cabaret girls have joined the Nazi officers at what appears to be a feast, orchestrated by Schindler.

At the end of the scene (shots 46-47), a Nazi officer arrives at the table in front of the stage, only now this “territory” appears much less important than the territory where Schindler is entertaining a large group of men in uniforms. This is confirmed through focalization. Now the gaze is directed at Schindler. Focalized from the perspective of the Nazi who has just arrived, Schindler emerges as the most important man in the club. The last part of the scene
depicting Schindler “in the picture” coincides with his newly acquired control of the territory. Schindler has achieved more than that, however. The last snap-shot depicts the uninformed Nazi officer posing with Schindler. This implies that Schindler has become such a significant figure that the rulers of this territory want to be in the picture with him.

We can conclude that Schindler has managed to secure a position on the Nazi territory through his capacity to play a double role. This is particularly pronounced in the continuous overlapping of levels of focalization. Schindler, functioning simultaneously as the subject and object of vision, is the semiotic product of narration that “tells” that he can act from a reverse position, that he has the capacity to turn the situation around. Schindler arrives at the new territory as an outsider, a total stranger. At the end of the scene, the outsider is the Nazi officer who is the only guest in the club not acquainted with Schindler. The story “speeding” up the fabula enhances the impression that Schindler is an extraordinary character whose role in history is yet to be determined.

I have already suggested that Schindler is so effective in attaining his aim because he is able to perform a double role. Much like the women escorts in the club, Schindler proves appealing enough to “seduce” the Nazi officers. At the same time, however, he is acting from a reverse position. Via Schindler we can conclude that the interaction with the Nazis involves prostitution in a double sense: he is elaborated as attractive enough to grab their attention, to entertain them, show them a good time, but at the same time Schindler pays abundantly for their company, for the mere opportunity to sit at their table. It is Schindler who lures the Nazi officer away from his female escort (shots 20–23), but it is the same Nazi who takes the woman’s place in the photo to get closer to Schindler (shot 49). I would suggest that Schindler’s status as a man who is good in presentation (and not interested in work), as he himself tells Stern when he comes to propose his dubious scheme, is already announced in the night club scene. In that respect, I contend that Schindler does not simply turn from a negative character into a positive character, but that his negative traits - his ability to act as a trickster and a master manipulator which enable him to turn the state of affairs to his advantage, are the necessary preconditions for the good deeds he will ultimately perform.\textsuperscript{ix}
**Territory Suspended**

Maintaining a favorable position amongst the Nazi officers takes more than good social skills or acceptable political conviction; it costs money. To insure cooperation with the Nazis, Schindler must constantly present himself as the man who knows the meaning of the word “gratitude.” But this “face” of Schindler is constructed through decomposition. Scene 2 is actually a series of scenes which depict different Nazi officers receiving Schindler’s gifts. It begins on the factory platform with two women carrying a large basket of gifts (shot 1), and dovetails to an office (shot 2) where an adjutant is walking toward a desk carrying the basket. In shot 3, the adjutant is reading Schindler’s letter while his superior is examining the gifts. In shot 4 we see a photograph from the night club scene depicting Schindler in the company of the Nazi officer. Shot 5 shows the officer from the photograph happily examining his gift while his adjutant reads the letter. In shot 6, another Nazi officer receives Schindler’s gifts. He is framed through the basket of gifts and the camera movement reveals yet another adjutant reading Schindler’s letter. The final camera movement in this shot directs our attention toward a framed photograph of Schindler with the receiver of his gift. The sequence is unified through a synecdoche, the basket - the gift - but more importantly, we hear Schindler’s off-screen voice reading his letter. Although we hear one voice, we see three different men reading the same letter successionaly and synchronously.

At the point when the Jews are waiting in lines to deliver their complaints to the Jewish Council, when laws are being issued that forbid them to practice their religion, own businesses, or take part in any cultural institutions, Schindler is making preparations for his big enterprise: he wants to have a factory, he is asking Jewish investors to put up all the money, and he is offering Itzhak Stern, a Jewish accountant the opportunity to be the plant manager and run the company for him. The process of telling, whereby Schindler’s character-image is elaborated as suspended, puts pressure on the information we gather from the fabula: Schindler is introduced as the one who is on the rise, and hence, progressively acquiring control of the territory, whereas the Jews are simultaneously being dispossessed of everything they own.

The doom of the Jews, marked by a state of suspension and transition, is underscored in the extremely wide shot where a vast
crowd of people laden with luggage is crossing a bridge. We immediately learn that it is March 20, 1941, the deadline for entering the Ghetto. At this stage, when the status of the Jews is on the verge of total decline, Schindler is unmistakably emerging as a direct profiteer of the new conditions. This contrast is even elaborated through parallel editing: while a well-to-do Jewish family, the Nussbaums, is evicted from their apartment and forced into the overcrowded territory of the Ghetto, Schindler is expanding his territory and moving into a spacious apartment. Confronted with such a demise of their living conditions, the Nussbaums ask themselves whether things could possibly get worse, while Schindler, stretching out on a king size bed concludes that things couldn't be better.

The meeting organized by Stern with the potential investors that is to take place in Schindler's car is another assertion of Schindler's territorial expansion at the expense of the Jews. The "negotiation" is a one-way process, for Schindler's alleged partners do not have a say in the matter; they can only accept or refuse his proposal. Their concerned faces framed in the rear view mirror as they are struggling to comprehend the potential benefit of Schindler's highly exploitative scheme most clearly reveal their disadvantageous position. On the basis of the elaboration of this scene we can conclude that the Jewish investors are not only cornered and without any maneuvering space, their position within Schindler's enterprise, just as in the mirror, is literally a fictive one.

If there was hope amongst the Jewish people that in spite of hunger and poverty the Ghetto could be a safe territory, with hindsight we could conclude that this hope was in fact a cherished illusion. At this point, the Nazis are issuing new lists and their purpose is to decrease the Ghetto population. With the new laws declaring forced labor for the Jews, survival becomes contingent on one's professional skills. The new lists separate the essential workers from those who are considered superfluous. No need to say that the Nazi war machine had no use for people who were too old to work, or too ill, and that it had even less use for Jewish intellectuals. Rabbis, professors, writers, painters, musicians could at any moment be ordered into a truck and taken away to a concentration camp.

One possibility for frustrating the deportations from the Ghetto at this particular stage was to have a blue card, indicating a profession that could facilitate the Reich economy. The other
options were much more complicated because they involved either the acquisition of forged work certificates, or direct intervention of the employer. In any case, whoever could prove to the Nazis that s/he is an essential worker can have some kind of temporary guarantee that s/he was on safe grounds. Since Schindler’s deal with the Jewish investors does go through, with Itzhak Stern as the financial manager, Schindler’s enamel factory DEF is in immediate need of a work force. Schindler’s decision to hire Jewish rather than Polish workers is based on very simple calculations - the Jews themselves do not receive a salary and therefore, hiring them is a matter of making good profit. Stern is the one who supplies Schindler’s newly acquired territory with a work force, and he is especially engaged in furnishing the “dispensable” inhabitants of the Ghetto with documents which certify that they will be essential occupants of Schindler’s territory - metal press operators, metal polishers, metal workers of all profiles. As a German and a member of the Nazi party, Schindler is the person who enjoys the financial profit and his major task is to provide a “face” for the factory that is appealing to the Nazis. This is literally the case in the film, for it is in fact Stern who ensures that this territory will remain operative and that Schindler’s financial moves will have a productive effect on the business.

According to the film, there seem to be only two paths leading out of the territory of the Ghetto - one to Schindler’s factory, the other to the concentration camps. We soon realize how incommensurable these two options are. While there is momentarily a group of three hundred fifty workers on their way to Schindler’s factory, there are already long chains of cattle wagons taking people away toward death. The scene in which Schindler manages to prevent the deportation of Stern underscores this disproportion. The fact that he can save Stern attests to Schindler’s power, but his intervention demonstrates at the same time how extremely limited his capacity to act as a savior actually is. There is an important follow-up to the deportation scene, and as this is elaborated in the subsequent scene, the action takes place behind Schindler’s back.

As Schindler and Stern are leaving the train platform and exiting the shot, the camera reveals Jewish capos pushing carts loaded with luggage. We follow them into a large obscure space, evidently a storage room, with all kinds of piles - clothes, shoes, silverware, memorabilia. Everything is being sorted out systematically.
We do not know yet toward which territory the train is headed, instead the camera follows the capos to the catacombs where the belongings of the deported Jews are stored. Although each person was asked to clearly label his or her suitcase, it is certain that no luggage will ever be forwarded to those who had to leave it behind. Nor are they expected to return to collect their things. Or their memories. While watching a huge pile of photographs we realize that only we can “undo” the Nazi intention of casting them into oblivion. Sadly enough, the safe territories we can offer are in our mnemonic archives. At this stage of the film, the destiny of the Jews, deterritorialized from their last resort in the ghetto remains uncertain. We do know that the one and only person who could get off the train is an inhabitant of Schindler’s territory.

**Territory Erased**

As a juxtaposition to Schindler’s enamel factory, another territory is introduced in 1943 - the Plaszow labor camp, run by Amon Goeth. Until two years earlier this territory had been a Jewish cemetery; gravestones were shattered and used to pave the path at the camp’s entrance, and the mortuary building was turned into the commandant’s stables. Here, any of the workers can be executed at random. Killing is part of Goeth’s daily routine carried out from the balcony of his villa, on the hill, overlooking the camp.

With the arrival of Goeth, the territory of the Ghetto as the last resort for the Jewish population will be liquidated. Remarkably, Goeth’s speech preceding the liquidation of the Ghetto which commences and ends with the words “today is history,” is counterposed to the shots which affirm tradition, vitality and survival. Miriam Hansen discusses the importance of combining images of the living people with Goeth’s speech, as a way of nullifying his pledge to erase history:

In the shots that follow, the speech appears to
function as a kind of voice-over, speaking the history of the Ghetto's inhabitants and the imminent erasure of this history and its subjects. But the images of the living people we see - a rabbi praying, a family having breakfast, a man and a woman exchanging loving looks - also resist this predication. So does the voice of the rabbi that competes with Goeth’s voice, into the subsequent shots of Ghetto inhabitants (so that in one shot, in which we hear the subdued synchronic voices of the family at breakfast, there are actually three different layers of sound); the praying voice fades out just before the last sentence of Goeth's speech. Not coincidentally, all the Jewish characters shown in this sequence will survive; that is, they will, as individuals, give the lie to Goeth’s project. (Hansen, 1996: 304)

The process of telling in this scene, whereby the story intervenes into the fabula, can also be understood as a case of reading history against the grain. History which needs to be read against the grain is Goeth’s so-called history. We need to recall here “the redemptive, corrective agenda of Benjamin’s historiography” for as Michael Steinberg asserts, “he indeed wants to give voice to those deprived of voice, in the past as in the present and future” (Steinberg, 1996: 3). The images and voices of the future survivors counterposed to the impending loss of the territory, can be understood as a recourse to the memory of the future, to the time and space where their voice will have been heard. That is, to the here and now.

Goeth’s speech is additionally countered by a shot of Schindler inserted into this sequence. Each man is framed in a close-up, shaving. The action and framing suggest similarity, but the composition of each profile within the shot at the same time infers opposition. The series of events that follow will radicalize the relation between Goeth and Schindler: while the former is an agent of evil in history, the latter will emerge as a savior. In the scene that follows, Schindler is the focalizing agent on whose point of vision the presentation of this history relies. This will condition his role in the fabula - in the long run, Schindler will counter Goeth’s history by saving twelve hundred people from death.\(^x\)

Just as the Ghetto havoc is about to begin, on March 13, 1943, Schindler and his mistress Klonowska arrive on horseback at
the edge of a hill overlooking the Ghetto territory. Buildings are in
the foreground. The buildings seem to be blocking the view, there is
an empty street quite far away in the background, on the right side.
Schindler is looking, but as the sequence is elaborated, the events
that follow are not exposed to his vision. There is a cut to the
Ghetto home of the Dresner family; they are reacting to the sound
of commotion coming from the street. In the next scene the Nazi
troopers storm down the street fully prepared to carry out a series of
horrible deeds - executions, deportations, tormenting and humiliat-
ing the Ghetto inhabitants. There is panicked screaming, failed
attempts to run away, desperate searches for places to hide. No one
is safe from murder and destruction; there is a calculated madness
in this operation and human lives seem to be spared only by chance.

In the first part of the sequence which depicts the Ghetto
massacre, Schindler is looking, but there is no confirmation that he
has seen the horrors taking place. In fact, the liquidation is evolving
without him seeing it. In scene 3, he is still on the hill accompanied
by his mistress, looking towards the Ghetto. But now, he will actual-
ly be able to see something. In shots 1, 3, 5 and 7, his attention is
directed toward the street where a little person, a little girl dressed
in red is walking aloof from the rest of the people. Shots 2, 4 and 6
are extreme long shots and it is difficult to distinguish separate indi-
viduals. To draw the girl to Schindler’s attention a special device is
employed – the coat she is wearing is red. Shot 8 is a long shot that
provides us with a closer view of the child. Interestingly, with the
closer view of the girl, we can also distinguish the inhabitants of the
Ghetto from the Nazis.

From Keneally’s novel we know there was a three-year old
girl called Genia who had a passionately favored color - red. Her
parents were hiding in the countryside, and as the story goes, the
people who took care of her indulged her passion. She wore a red
cap, red coat, small red boots. Dressed in a red coat in this black
and white film, she appears conspicuously different from everyone
else, and her presence in this scene will help Schindler to produce a
vision of what is happening. As she is walking in shots 4 and 6, we
notice people shot in the middle of the street. Even though she is
dressed in red she will manage to move through the crowds as she
pleases. Like a little ghost she will remain completely unnoticed by
the Nazis.
The person to whom she is evidently not invisible is Schindler. While Genia’s presence testifies to the Nazi blindness to humanity, she is the manifestation of Schindler’s insight. Most importantly, via the little girl he becomes a witness to the crimes. Red Genia guides Schindler’s look toward the scenes of the crime. Shots 9 and 10, just as 2, 4, and 6 are again extremely wide, and here, our view is not so much focused on Genia but on the Nazi who is throwing suitcases and other belongings from a balcony. In the street, there is a long line of people being led away by the men in uniforms. In shot 11, Schindler is again in medium close-up, looking. The following shot (shot 12) is the product of his vision. It is an extremely wide shot; the branches of a tree are in the foreground on the left, on the right side there is a big pile of luggage. In the background people are moving right to left. In the crowd, we notice Red Genia. As she is moving with the crowd, the camera slowly pans to the left, simulating Schindler’s gaze. The little girl in red brings us to the wall where a group of men is lined up for execution. She continues to walk and disappears behind the wall but the camera remains focused on this scene until the execution is over and the corpses are lying on the ground. Hence, even though Schindler is guided by Genia, the site of the execution detains his look. It is a brief moment but there is enough time to see that Goeth’s Great Dane is at this site and that Goeth is performing the killing.

Schindler’s gaze (shot 13) follows Genia to the other side of the street (shot 14), where people are lined up for deportation. As the people in the foreground are ordered into a truck, we notice Red Genia entering into a building in the background. In shot 15 she is climbing up the stairs. In shot 16, Schindler and Klonowska turn their horses around and ride away. Now, the little girl is in an empty and demolished apartment. She creeps under a bed. Genia does not have her “red disguise,” her mission is over and therefore, her coat is no longer red.

Schindler has seen enough, but the terror goes on until every single inhabitant is forced out of this territory. While watching the fierceness of the Ghetto massacre perversely joined, in a specific scene, with the Nazi passion for Bach (or Mozart), I recalled Goerge Steiner’s discussion in the Extra-Territorial on the “puzzle of the dissociation between poetic humanism on the one hand and political
sadism on the other, or rather, on their association in a single psyche” (Steiner, 1972: 46):

It is a fact, though one with which neither our theories of education nor our humanistic, liberal ideals have even begun to come to grips, that a human being can play Bach in the evening, and play him well, or read Pushkin, and read him with insight, and proceed in the morning to do his job at Auschwitz and in the police cellars. (35) The ability to play and love Bach can be conjoined in the same human spirit with the will to exterminate a ghetto or napalm a village. No ready solution to this mystery and to the fundamental questions it poses for our civilization lies at hand. (46)

Speaking in terms of territoriality, this is what we repeatedly encounter in Schindler’s List in relation to the Nazis - explicit barbarism “housed” together with an appreciation for the beautiful things in life.

The scene where Goeth is looking at his mirror image and playing with the possibility of “pardoning” his workers is another example of this implied contradiction. Goeth extends his index finger toward the mirror and touches his reflection. He pauses for a brief moment, as if to revoke the position of God in Michelangelo’s Creatione di uomo.\textsuperscript{xi} Just a while later he perverts this role and kills his servant Lisiek. This kind of incomprehensible behavior is even more shocking in the way the SS react to children. As the crowd of people is proceeding toward the gas chambers in Auschwitz, a guard is smiling and greeting the children. Similarly, in one moment an SS caresses a child and in the next he executes a Ghetto inhabitant in cold blood.\textsuperscript{xii} I would suggest that by taking into account the split between barbarism and beauty, (instead of depicting the Nazis as one-dimensional, for example), the film establishes a basis for negotiation. Precisely
because Goeth is so invested in the pleasurable things in life, Schindler can bargain with him for people’s lives.

As the film repeatedly reminds us, Schindler can save only a small group of people. Nevertheless, this fact testifies to his humanity. The saying “whoever saves one life saves the world entire,” engraved in the ring the survivors give to Schindler, celebrates his gesture and grants him the “face of a redeemer.” If one saved life can metonymically represent the world entire, then Red Genia symbolizes, I would suggest, all the people Schindler could not save. Schindler will see Red Genia again during the exhumation and the incineration of the bodies at Chujowa Gorka in April of 1944 (scene 4). Upon his arrival to Chujowa Gorka Schindler finds a death factory. Thousands of corpses are piled up, systematically loaded on a conveyor belt and thrown into a furnace. It is difficult at moments to separate the living prisoners who are pushed into the mass graves and forced to exhume the bodies, from those who are already dead. And it is in fact a matter of technicality, for those who are momentarily alive will be sent to Auschwitz once the Plaszow camp is closed. In shot 3 the prisoners are pushing carts loaded with corpses in the direction of the camera. As the first in the row comes closer we see the little girl in a red coat, dead, lying on top of other bodies. As the cart moves hastily to the left, the camera pans to the right revealing a close-up of Schindler. He is looking right-left and then, following the action in the off-screen space, left-right. In this scene, then, Genia is elaborated as a retrospective product of his vision. While in the scene of the Ghetto massacre Schindler depended on Genia to produce a vision of atrocious events, at this stage Genia depends on Schindler to produce a vision of her dead body.

During the liquidation of the Ghetto, Red Genia was helping Schindler to see, to witness the crimes. The little girl in the red coat, invisible to the Nazis, becomes joined with the scenes of the crime, and by extension, she comes to figure as a sign of the atrocities. Her dead body in Chujowa Gorka alludes to the disappearance of the sign of the crimes, and the advent of the crisis of both witnessing and remembering. Now that Nazis are burning the evidence of their atrocities, turning it into ashes, and Red Genia is about to disappear, along with all the scenes of the crime, and along with millions of people who could not be saved from death, the only operation of “saving” that remains, is saving the victims from oblivion.
There are two issues that come to the fore here: the problem of representing the Holocaust and the problem of remembering the Holocaust. The former issue is related to the critique of the redemptive function of art which remains oblivious to the catastrophes of history. This critique dovetails with the debate regarding the representation of the Holocaust and the recurring question of whether Holocaust can stand for anything else except itself. The latter issue has to do with the “specific crisis posed by the Nazis’ destruction of the very basis and structures of collective remembering” (Hansen, 1996:310). The imposing question is, how do we counter the Nazi belief that when they dispose of the sign, everything will be as if it never happened?

I would suggest that in Schindler’s List, both issues are evoked through the little girl in red. In scene 3 Genia could be understood as a sign of the Nazi atrocities. Her dead body on its way to oblivion in scene 4 radicalizes the intention of the Nazis to erase the possibility of the future returns of this sign. In spite of the Nazi attempt then, to rush her off into a furnace, Schindler manages to catch a glimpse of Genia’s dead body. Focalized through Schindler, the little person in red comes to stand for all the people he could not save from death, who would never arrive at the Promised Land.

Magical Deeds: Schindler’s “Haven”

Schindler’s new insight depicted in scene 3 has direct impact on his decision to bargain with Goeth for territorial independence. Through his vision then, his role in the fabula will be defined. The scene following the liquidation of the Ghetto reveals Schindler alone in his office, looking through the glass wall onto the empty platform. The occupants of his territory have disappeared. All the workers have been forced into the Plaszow labor camp and now he has to bring “his people” back to DEF. At a point where people at Plaszow are at constant risk of losing their life, Schindler’s factory emerges as the only safe territory. The safety of this territory as opposed to the Plaszow labor camp is underscored through focalization in relation to the points of vision. For example, even though his office is located above the factory platform, unlike Goeth, Schindler does not exercise his privilege to look down on the “inhabitants of his territory.” When he is seen in his office from the perspective of the factory
platform, the low camera angle, which alludes to a disadvantageous point of vision is often external and cannot be attributed to a specific character.

Focalization from this point of vision clearly suggests a voluntary submission of the narratorial authority (as in shot 1, scene 1, for example). Others see Schindler as powerful. The vision of those who look at him is what makes him powerful, rather than the other way around. Contrary to Schindler, Goeth, who is constantly performing the vision from above while carrying out the killings, is not seen from a point of vision which would grant him a “higher” status as a character. Furthermore, even though Schindler’s office has a glass wall and thus offers the possibility of monitoring the workers, Schindler never engages in such practice. The one instance when Schindler stares through the glass wall, disturbed by Elsa Perlman’s story about the rumor that his factory is a haven, he only sees his own reflection.

Schindler’s authority is confirmed through his deeds, predicated on his capacity to maintain territorial independence. On the level of the fabula his ability to act as a savior can be observed through his talent at startling the Nazis with his acts of gratitude. On the level of the story, his miraculous deeds are elaborated through his capacity to insert the future into the present. This process can also be described as a flash forward. In such a case the future event is effectuated before the present conditions for its occurrence are set up.

Schindler’s power position is further relativized by the way he shares it with Stern. The next scene is a follow-up to a discussion between Schindler and Stern. Schindler is shouting at Stern because he holds him responsible for the rumor that his factory is a haven. And in fact, Stern is the one who is the main witness of the gruesome acts of killing at Plaszow. This grants him a significant function in the narrative, for it is through his focalization that these events are related. Just as importantly however, he is the one arranging the transfer of the Plaszow workers to DEF, systematically increasing the population of Schindler’s territory.

Even though Schindler storms into Stern’s office in anger, Stern gives him yet another reason why his help is necessary. Schindler is desperate and powerless it seems, in a situation where he clearly cannot transfer all the people onto safe ground. Suddenly,
he takes a piece of paper from his pocket and reads out the name “Perlman” (scene 5; shot 1). In shot 3 we see the Plaszow grounds where workers are summoned. In shot 4 Schindler is still in Stern’s office. He adds, “husband and wife.” Shots 5 to 9 depict the Perlman’s on the Plaszow grounds as they are called to step out of the crowd. With shot 10, we are back in the present where Schindler is handing his watch to Stern in order to make the action which has already taken place in the future, possible.

The incommensurability between the Nazi capacity for killing and Schindler’s ability to save is much more pronounced in this phase, for new decimation measures are applied with a shocking efficiency. The sick are separated from the healthy and deported to the concentration camps, the children are “abducted” and taken to unknown destinations. Not to mention the routine killings at Plaszow. Although Schindler has managed to bring his workers back to DEF, once the Plaszow camp closes down, Goeth will send them to Auschwitz. This means that Schindler will again have to find a way to provide a safe territory for his people. Schindler cannot save all the people, but his struggle to save a specific group, the population of his territory, “his Jews,” is what invokes the comparison with Moses. A divine intervention in the present is indicative of Schindler’s Mesianic powers. Comparable to the character-image of Indiana Jones, Schindler will become the father of a race. We shall see that this will occur through inversion, predicated on the single place of the son and the father.

All the “magical deeds” are just preparation for the ultimate act Schindler will perform - buying his workers from Goeth and taking them away to Brinnlitz. Goeth even comments on Schindler’s Moses-like behavior toward his workers but gives in, mesmerized by Schindler’s magical powers. Goeth lets Schindler’s people go when he is presented with a suitcase full of money. The people who will be led to the safe territory are the people whose names are on Schindler’s list. The list of the future survivors is completed with Stern’s help. The connection established between the two men is emphasized in a single shot (scene 6).

The shot opens with a silhouette of Schindler’s face cut into the frame on the left. He is holding the list which dominates the space within the frame. In the background, out of focus, Stern is sitting behind his desk. As the list disappears into the off-screen space,
Schindler's full profile comes to occupy the left half of the frame. For a brief moment, Stern remains out of focus. Stern is in the background, in the right part of the frame. At this point he realizes that Schindler is paying for the people whose names are on the list. This new awareness is expressed through the focus shifting to Stern, a rare instance in the film when this device is employed. The list redefines the relationship between the two men: the list Schindler hands to Stern is a gift of life, but the focus on Stern who is deeply moved by Schindler's gesture, gives a "face" to Schindler 's deed.

The territoriality of three separate groups of actors in the film is reflected in the tripartite function of the list. Lists with names are the clearest indicators of the connection between the Jewish population and the progressive loss of the territory on which they are allowed to exist. Lists are the crucial mechanism of control for the Nazis; via their lists individuals are absorbed into a totality of names and numbers, which can be shipped, transferred, ghettoized, exterminated. Contrary to the Nazi lists which signify death, Schindler's list signifies life, and it holds the promise of return.

From this point on, a new ground will be forged. With the arrival at Brinnlitz the three lines of action, as they are dependent on the characters and the territories - the line of Schindler, of the Jews, and of the Nazis - converge into one. Arrival at this territory can be understood as a form of arrival at a utopic place. This is already staged in the scene where Schindler is leading the women released from Auschwitz to the premises of his Brinnlitz factory. There, on the in-between territory, the candle that faded to black and white in the film's opening, is lit again and glowing in color. The Nazis living under the same roof can hear the Hebrew prayers but the entire atmosphere of Schindler's territory as outside the "real world," prevents them from taking measures. They sit quietly in their quarters and listen. Lastly, the inhabi-
tants of this territory manage to keep up the pretence that the factory is producing ammunition, while in actuality its function is to preserve human lives.

At the end of WW II Schindler's slave workers will be freed, and as he himself states, he will be hunted like a criminal. This is where the third function of the list comes in - this is the list of names the survivors will give to Schindler. The story of Oscar Schindler and his list which guaranteed the lives of twelve hundred people will acquire historical significance through the Schindlerjuden, those people whose names were on his list. In the film's closing, their list is constructed. This kind of reversal where Schindler and his people are made to exchange places emphatically evokes a very recognizable structure: to save Schindler's life, his Jews have written a letter "explaining things," as rabbi Lewartow, a Schindler survivor and a character in the film says, and each of the workers has signed it.

Thus, to secure a place for him in the future, Schindler's "children" ultimately become his parents, his source of honor. Through this exchange Schindler will acquire a face. More precisely, it is this third list, the list of the survivors that serves as yet another indication of Schindler's Moses-like qualities. Through the play with the split of the paternal position, the "offspring" will (re)produce their "father." Quite comparable to the doubling of the character-image, (particularly) in the Indiana Jones trilogy, Schindler's capacity to act as a savior will condition his own salvation.

"Jerusalem of Gold"
The play with the notion of land or territory in the film, as it is related to the mythical pretext, involves more than the opposition between the safe territory, such as Schindler's factory referred to by the workers as the "haven," and the territory of death, that is, the Plaszow labor camp. There is a third option to be attained as we learn from the film, and it is the in-between territory, or the "Promised Land." This third option which carries with it the theological hope of returning to Jerusalem, is a reminder that deportation and diaspora as they emerge and evolve in the biblical narratives are constitutive of Jewish identity. The Nazi investment in "solving" the problem of the exile or deterritorialization of the Jews through annihilation, is thus countered by the redemption myth, that is, with the
story about salvation and the affirmation of Jewish identity.

The utopian features of the Brinnlitz factory are additionally confirmed in the scene that follows. The war is over, Schindler's Jews are ready to leave the Brinnlitz factory, and on the basis of the elaboration of the scene it is possible to conclude that the "Promised Land" can be seen from the factory premises (scene 7). The scene begins with a mass of people lying motionless on the ground, as if dead. It seems they are brought back to life with the arrival of a Russian soldier who proclaims their liberation. They all wake up. When the survivors ask the soldier where they should go, he tells them not to go East or West. In response to their question where they can get food, he points to the right (shot 11), but in the reverse shot (shot 12) which immediately follows, it appears that he is also pointing to the left. According to the soldier, in the off-screen space, somewhere between right and left, there is a city. In shot 13 we see a large group of people on the horizon walking toward the camera, with the land vast and undefined dominating in the foreground. At this point, we acquire information about Goeth and Schindler. The former is the ultimate representative of evil and as the one who has committed crimes against humanity he is hanged (shot 18). Schindler on the other hand, is pronounced a righteous person (shots 19 and 20). The survivors remain in the middle of these two extreme poles, walking through the promised territory.

I would suggest that the movement of reterritorialization in the case of Schindler's List entails an arrival "home" in a triple sense. Home can be understood as an actual place, but it also signifies a symbolic space. The condition for the return to the actual home is dependent on the symbolic function of the term, but the negotiation between the two is dependent on the notion of home as the mind, where the memory of all the departures and returns is stored.
Reterritorialization, or arrival at the Promised Land is thereby suspended between the inside and the outside, between myth and reality. The historicizing of mythical territory complicates this tension even further. Firstly, the act of reterritorialization is a powerful way to counter the act of deterritorialization imposed by the Nazis. On the other hand, however, the recourse to the people’s anthem of Israel in the closing of the film alludes to the tenuous conditions awaiting at “home.”

With the arrival of the survivors to the Land, in the film’s closing, Neomi Shemer’s song “Jerusalem of Gold” is sung off-screen. It is useful to add that it won the Israeli National Song Festival in 1967, just weeks before the Six-Day War started. It was immediately embraced by the people for its nostalgic tone drawing on the images of Jerusalem as a deserted city, which stands alone divided by the wall. By the end of the war, Israel had conquered enough territory to triple the size of the area it controlled and this enabled Israel to unify Jerusalem. Shemer’s song became the hymn of the paratroopers and a suggestion came about that the words of the song be changed in accordance to reflect the new conditions in Jerusalem. Ultimately, the words were not changed but two new verses were added which invested the song with a more optimistic tone, speaking of the end of desolation and the return to the Dead Sea and the Jericho Road. In the closing of Schindler’s List the original version of the song is heard. What needs to be taken into consideration here is the imaginary status of the Land as it is complemented by the song that had such a formative function for the people of Israel. Such an emphatic dissociation of the sound and image echoes a series of contrary and almost irreconcilable poles.

In Deleuze and Guattari’s view becoming-music is the most intense form of deterritorialization. They assert that “music has a thirst for destruction, every kind of destruction, extinction, breakage, dislocation [. . .] Whereas the refrain is essentially territorial, territorializing, or reterritorializing, music makes it a deterritorialized content for a deterritorialized form of expression” (Deleuze & Guattari 1996: 299-300). When comparing music to painting they add that “music seems to have a much stronger deterritorializing force, at once more intense and much more collective, and the voice seems to have a much greater power of deterritorialization” (302). Interestingly enough, the song “Jerusalem of Gold” emerges at the
moment of “reterritorialization” of the Promised Land. The clash between the mythical past and the historical present is thereby underscored, I would suggest, through the deterritorializing force of the song.

**Mapping the Way Home**

According to Deleuze and Guattari, reterritorialization has negative implications. In terms of the Jewish semiotic, the negative line is related to the intrinsic striving of the Jews to return to the long-lost territory. They argue that the Jewish semiotic is defined by a unique procedure, that of “subjectification.” Deleuze and Guattari underscore the connection between subject and state subject as theorized by Althusser. “Althusser clearly brings out this constitution of social individuals as subjects: he calls it interpellation [. . .] and calls the point of subjectification the Absolute Subject” (130). In their view, the production of subjectivity through language is not in fact a linguistic operation and they assert that a subject is never the condition of linguistic possibility or the cause of a statement. “There is no subject,” they contend, “only collective assemblages of enunciation” (130). The split between the “I” and a “you,” the constitution of the self at the expense of the other, can also be understood as a momentary death which Deleuze and Guattari describe as “an absolute deterritorialization expressed in the black hole of consciousness and passion.”

Therefore, on the one hand, the procedure of subjectification decenters the sign; that is, the center of signification is replaced due to the split of the subject into “two faces turned away from each other.” The subject of enunciation results from this point of subjectification and of the turning away. On the other hand, however, according to Deleuze and Guattari, the subject of enunciation that generates the movement of deterritorialization recoils into the subject of the statement. In their view, the subject of enunciation is the Althusserian State subject, and correspondingly the succession of proceedings is accompanied by what they call a “a new form of priest and bureaucracy.” The movement of deterritorialization is thereby marked by a continuous turning back/recoiling/reterritorialization, which makes the line of flight “freed but segmented, remaining negative and blocked.” In that sense, they take the movement of reterritorialization and the striving of the Jews to return to
the long lost territory as an allegory of the production of subjectivity in language. In other words, the Jews come to personify the recoiling subjects of enunciation.

I would argue however, that the aspiration toward reterritorialization needs to be observed in terms of the historical period in which the de/re-territorialization occurs. While the notion of return principally implies a reacquisition of the long lost territory, in *Schindler's List* reterritorialization is elaborated as a possibility for overcoming deportation and ghettoization. The Jews' movement of reterritorialization can be opposed to the movement of deterritorialization imposed by the Nazis. The arrival at the long-lost territory which marks the end of deportation, will eventually put pressure on the myth of "one people," and in that sense, *Schindler's List* will confront us with yet another face of history. More precisely, in the film's closing, reterritorialization as the theological symbol of Judaism merges with specific signs that refer to another period in the history of the Jews: the Six Day War which raises the issue of the tenuous conditions in the present-day Israel. By staging a tripartite overlap of returns in the film's closing, Spielberg, in line with Deleuze and Guattari, imaginatively seems to problematize the Jewish semiotic in terms of the positive and negative line of its movement. While the universalism inherent in mythical discourse is a way of affirming the identity in question, the overlapping of returns, lands and faces of history in the end of the film at the same time questions the notion of the Promised Land as a safe territory - for all its inhabitants.\textsuperscript{xxi}

The structuring of the territories in *Schindler's List* through the opposition between good and evil, left and right, utopia and death suggests that through this opposition a middle ground is provided - the third term is an empty place, a u-topos, an impression of a face, or rather a screen on which the face of history is mapped.\textsuperscript{xxii} The no-man's-land, or the middle ground
becomes the point where new limits of what is thinkable and possible have to be re-invented. Reinventing the middle ground can also be understood in terms of the concerns discussed in the previous chapter, for the Promised Land as the home of a specific people alludes to the temporary unity of the signifier of identity. The “futurity” of the signifier, as it is related to the myth of exile and return is crucial for this operation. For just as it thematizes the end of deportation and ghettoization of the Jewish people, it holds the promise of a return home for all the constitutive outsiders and extraterritorials.

The movement of de/re-territorialization in *Schindler’s List* demonstrates that the territory of arrival corresponds to a space which is neither “right” nor “left,” and according to the effect of continuity-editing it emerges as an imaginary space. Given the clash between the Land as a theological symbol, and Land as a concrete place, it is possible to conclude that the process of reterritorialization is an ongoing process, and that in many ways it is still not complete.\(^{xxiii}\) The process is continuously in the making, because it involves subjects whose identity is dependent on their cultural present and cultural memory.

**footnotes**

i In the edition published subsequent to the film, the title of Keneally’s novel was changed to *Schindler’s List*.

ii It is important to add that the spirit of Jewish tradition, as Benjamin himself claimed, was one of the most important and persistent themes in his thought. See for example, Hent de Vries, “Anti-Babel: The ‘Mystical Postulate’ in Benjamin, de Certeau and Derrida.”

iii Scholem adds that in its origins and by its nature, Jewish Messianism is a theory of catastrophe. “This theory stresses the revolutionary, cataclysmic element in the transition from every historical present to the Messianic future” (7).


v Bersani’s argument can be extended to the debate regarding *Schindler’s List*, particularly in relation to Claude Lanzmann’s *Shoah*. See Thomas Elsaesser’s “Subject Positions, Speaking Positions: From *Holocaust, Our Hitler* and *Heimat* to *Shoah* and *Schindler’s List*,” in Sobchack. For a privileging of

For a discussion of the productive function of films such as Schindler’s List on popular memory, see Miriam Hansen’s “Schindler’s List Is Not Shoah: The Second Commandment, Popular Modernism, and Public Memory.”

In a broader sense a connection can be made here with Deleuze and Guattari’s discussion on the territoriality of signs in their A Thousand Plateaus. Their fourth regime of signs, the “postsignifying semiotic” or the so-called Jewish semiotic, is characterized by a double movement - de/re-territorialization. In Deleuze and Guattari’s terms the “despotic regime” is characterized by universal deception. Due to this regime’s capacity to control signification, a specific sign can be charged with everything that was “bad” in a given period. They take the historical conditions which imposed exile on the Jews as an exemplary movement of deterritorialization. The act of deterritorialization can in their view be taken as a way to counter the despotic regime. The striving of the Jews to return to the lost territory, or reterritorialization, has negative implications in their view. Although I agree with Deleuze and Guattari that acts of re/territorialization can prove to be profoundly negative, what needs to be considered in relation to the Holocaust, is that the act of deterritorialization imposed on the Jews was synonymous with death. It left no possibility for future returns. In this light, I will argue, the act of reterritorialization must also be seen as a possibility to counter the despotic regime. I will return to this problem in the last section of the chapter.

This device is not new in Hollywood cinema. An example of a similar process where there is both a continuity and discontinuity of action is the breakfast scene with Charles Foster Kane and his first wife, in Orson Welles’s Citizen Kane. The husband and wife are sitting at a table having breakfast, but through an ongoing repetitive pattern of different breakfast scenes, we can note the passing of time but also the changes in their relationship. Their ultimate drifting away from each other is marked via the space of the huge table that gradually becomes wider and increasingly separates them, each at the table’s utmost extremes by the end of the scene. With this kind of manipulation of time via filmic images Welles has established the filmic terms for “frequentative tense.” For the description of this process in literary works see Genette and Bal.

In a documentary on Oscar Schindler, the survivors make an explicit connection between Schindler’s contradictory features. According to some views, his negative characteristics are the precondition for his good deed. In contrast, Hansen mentions that “out of that cipher of a con man/grifter/gambler develops an ‘authentic’ person, an integrated and intelligible character” (310). On the basis of the analysis of the specific scenes, I would disagree with Hansen. I am arguing that his negative features are the precondition for the good deeds Schindler will perform.
In *Narratology* Bal discusses the effect Schindler's focalization has on the development of the fabula.

The perversity of the Nazi obsession with art is elaborated with even a more disturbing effect in a film such as *Night Porter*, for example. The "clinical" coldness of a space where a performance of a male dancer is staged enhances the implied contradiction. The "perversity" is further underscored through the group of Nazi men enjoying this performance. What is "perverse," of course, is the fact that the Nazis at the same time persecuted homosexuals.

The contradictory behavior of the Nazis which only confirms their power to pardon or to kill, brings to mind Theodor Adorno's and Max Horkheimer's discussion from *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*. They write: "When industrial magnates and Fascist leaders want to have pets around them, their choice falls not on terriers but on Great Danes and lion cubs. These are intended to add spice to power through the terror they inspire. The murderous Fascist colossus stands so blindly before nature that he sees animals only as a means of humiliating men. [...] The Fascist's passionate interest in animals, nature, and children is rooted in the lust to persecute. The significance of the hand negligently stroking a child's head, or an animal's back, is that it could just as easily destroy them. One victim is fondly stroked shortly before the other is struck down, and the choice made has nothing to do with the victim's guilt. The petting demonstrates that all are equal in the presence of power, that none is a being in its own right" (253).

I am referring particularly to Leo Bersani's *Culture of Redemption*.

For further exploration of the problem of representing the Holocaust, see for example, Saul Friedlander's (ed.) *Probing the Limits of Representation*, Dominic La Capra's *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma*, and Ernst van Alphen's *Caught by History: Holocaust Effects in Contemporary Art, Literature and Theory*.

Spielberg's film *Saving Private Ryan* ends in the present day (just as *Schindler's List*) where a survivor who symbolizes salvation is paying tribute to the man who saved him. He is the one American soldier who was saved while thousands of others were killed in the war. This film recalls the saying from *Schindler's List* that whoever saves one life "saves the world entire."

For a discussion on witnessing in *Schindler's List*, see Hansen's "*Schindler's List* Is Not *Shoah."

Saving the other so as to save oneself can also be seen in Capra's *It's a Wonderful Life*. The angel in the film who wants to stop George Bailey from committing suicide, jumps into the river. Rather than jumping into the river to kill himself as he had planned, Baily jumps to save the angel. This is what conditions his own salvation. But it is also a moment where the angel saves George only because he needs to be saved. The action is temporally structured and it reminds us of Benjamin's "angel of history" whose face is turned toward the past as he is moving forward to the future. Salvation, just like the future, is dependent on the past that is yet to come.

The Six Day War broke out on June 5, 1967, following three weeks of tension. After just six days of fighting, Israeli forces broke through the enemy lines and were in a position to march on Cairo, Damascus and Amman. With the victory, the territory of Israel had increased from 8,000 to
26,000 square miles. Apart from being able to unify Jerusalem, Israeli forces had also captured the Sinai, Golan Heights, Gaza Strip and the West Bank. More than three quarters of a million Palestinians remained on the Israeli territory. Israeli and Palestinian scholars have addressed the extremely sensitive political issues that have necessarily come to the fore. See for example, Evron Boas’s chapter “The Hebrew People versus the Palestinian People,” in *Jewish State or Israeli Nation?* as well as Edward W. Said’s “Zionism from the Standpoint of its Victims,” in *The Questions of Palestine* (1992).

I am very grateful to Aurel Pelleg for translating both versions of Nemer’s song.

*Jerusalem of Gold* (literal translation)

Mountain air, clear as wine  
And the smell of pine  
Carried in evening’ wind  
With the sound of bells.  
In the sleep of tree and stone  
Imprisoned in her dream  
The City that sits alone  
And in its heart, a wall.  

*Chorus*  
Jerusalem of gold  
Of copper and of light  
To all your songs  
I am a violin.  
How the water wells dried  
The Market square empty  
And no one comes  
To the mountain of the house  
In the Old City.  
And in the caves that are in the rocks  
The winds howl  
And no one goes down to the Dead Sea  
On Jericho’s road.  

*Chorus*  
But today when I come to sing to you  
And to you to tie the crowns  
I am younger than your youngest sons  
Smaller than the last of poets.  
Because your name burns the lips  
Like an angel’s kiss  
If I’ll forget you Jerusalem  
That is all of gold.  

*Chorus*  
(two verses added)  
We are back at the water holes  
To the market square  
The horn is calling on the mountain of the house  
In the old city  
And in the caves that are in the rocks
A thousand shining suns
And again we go down to the dead sea
On Jericho’s road.

For an elaboration of the complex relationship between film and “becoming-music” see Patricia Pister’s chapter 9, in *Eye to Brain, Gilles Deleuze Refiguring the Subject of Film Theory.*

Emmanuel Lévinas foregrounds this problem in *Beyond the Verse, Talmudic Readings and Lectures* and asserts that although the Jewish people were granted a state on account of their role as victims, peace on this territory is still far from attained (1994). In “Moving Bodies, or the Cinematic Politics of Deportation,” Samira Kawash discusses the position of the non-Israelis; she contends that the settling of Israel is achieved at the expense of the Palestinian population and in her view, Palestinian identity is “effaced, managed and contained” (131). In *Deleuze & Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy and Culture,* eds. Eleanor Kaufman and Kevin John Heller. For a discussion on the clash between the past and the present and the effect it has on the constitution of Jewish identity, see “Diaspora: Generation and the Ground of Jewish Identity” (Daniel Boyarin and Jonathan Boyarin), and Evron Boas’s *Jewish State or Israeli Nation?* See also Laurence J. Silberstein’s “Toward a Postzionist Discourse,” in *Judaism since Gender.*

This concluding remark is inspired by Paul Ricoeur’s *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia,* ed. George H. Taylor. Ricoeur reminds us that since utopia is the view from “nowhere” the literal meaning of the word ensures that we no longer take for granted our present reality. In that respect, utopia has a constitutive role in helping us rethink the nature of our social life. “It is the ‘fantasy’ of an alternative society and its exteriorization ‘nowhere’ that works as one of the most formidable contestations of what is” (1-3). In Ricoeur’s view, utopia acts not only to de-reify our present relations but also to point to those possibilities that may yet be ours. He adds that the correlation of ideology and utopia offers an alternative to the failed model that opposes ideology to reality. What is important here is the productive character of imagination which encourages the exploration of what is possible. Because there is a positive as well as negative side to both ideology and utopia, the polarity between the two sides of each term may be enlightened by exploring a similar polarity between the two terms. According to Ricoeur, this polarity between and within the two terms, may be ascribed to some structural traits of what he calls cultural imagination.

In his article “Invention, Memory, Place,” Edward Said discusses memory as a social, political, and historical enterprise which has been complicated by the role of invention. He asserts that memory is not necessarily authentic but rather useful; people rely on refashioned memory especially in its collective forms to give themselves “a coherent identity, a national narrative, a place in the world” (179). Said takes Jerusalem as an example of a city invested with all sorts of invented histories and traditions, all of them “emanating from it, but most of them in conflict with each other” (180). He emphasizes that this conflict is intensified by Jerusalem’s mythological as opposed to actual geographical location. In his view the same holds for Palestine, whose landscape functions in the memories of Jews, Muslims, and
Christians entirely differently. He adds that because of the collective Palestinian inability as a people to produce a convincing narrative with a beginning, a middle, and end, “Palestinians have remained scattered and politically ineffective victims of Zionism [...]” (185). Said points out that as the stronger community the Israeli Jews must acknowledge the most powerful memory of Palestinians - the dispossession of an entire people, whereas as the weaker party Palestinians must also face the fact that Israeli Jews see themselves as the survivors of the Holocaust (192).