

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17" × 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6" × 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



Accessing the World's Information since 1938

300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

Order Number 8801711

**The rescuers: A socio-psychological study of altruistic behavior
during the Nazi era**

Fogelman, Eva, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1987

Copyright ©1987 by Fogelman, Eva. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE RESCUERS: A SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL
STUDY OF ALTRUISTIC BEHAVIOR
DURING THE NAZI ERA

by

EVA FOGELMAN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty
in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York.

1987

© 1987

EVA FOGELMAN

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

August 1, 1987
Date

Stephen P. Cohen
Chair of Examining Committee

July 29, 1987
Date

Robert J. Lifton
Executive Officer

Stephen P. Cohen
Charles Kadushin
Robert J. Lifton

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

THE RESCUERS: A SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL
STUDY OF ALTRUISTIC BEHAVIOR
DURING THE NAZI ERA

by

Eva Fogelman

Adviser: Professor Stephen P. Cohen

This socio-psychological study examines and analyzes in a historical context the altruistic behavior of The Rescuers, those who saved and/or aided Jews during World War II. In-depth psychological interviews were conducted with 100 non-Jewish rescuers of varying socioeconomic backgrounds from Eastern, Central, and Western European countries of origin, as well as with 100 Jewish survivors of the Holocaust. These clinical interviews were structured into three chronological time frames including (a) pre-war years, (b) war years, (c) post-war years. This interview design was intended to facilitate the investigation of the hypothesis that the rescue activity takes the form of and mirrors the rescuer's core self. Through the analysis of sociological factors, formative developmental influences, and event sequence paradigms, five rescuer types emerged: (a) Moral Rescuers, (b) Relational Philo-Semites, (c) Ideological Network Rescuers, (d) Children, (e) Detached

Professionals. Detailed case studies illustrate the psychodynamics of the five types. The statistical findings as well as the case studies confirm the hypothesized continuity of self.

An equally important finding is that all of the rescuers in the sample possessed a tremendous capacity for empathetic identification with the victims of Nazi persecution. In terms of formative developmental influences, a large majority of rescuers (a) suffered loss in early childhood, (b) had a sibling born around three years after them, (c) experienced an altruistic role model with whom they also performed helpful deeds in childhood, (d) reported learning the value of tolerance for differentness from a parent or significant other, and (e) reported being encouraged by their parents to be independent and competent.

This study both dispels the "hero myth" concerning rescuers, and reveals rescuers as complex, often conflicted human beings whose ability to act humanely and to resist a malevolent authority nevertheless points toward their potential to serve as moral models. Further research into the "rescuer self" and the dynamics of the rescue relationship are outlined and a social analysis of the rescuers in a hostile post-War society argue that suspiciousness on the part of Holocaust survivors as well as a general cultural resistance to the memorialization of altruistic behavior has contributed to a neglectful attitude toward those who risked their lives to save others during the Holocaust.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is devoted to enhancing our understanding of man's capacity to behave humanely amidst evil. Despite the despair felt in confronting humanity's unfathomable cruelty evidenced in the destruction of European Jewry, engaging in the study renewed in me a sense of hope. For this opportunity, I am forever indebted to hundreds of people who have contributed to the overall Rescuer Project of the City University of New York Graduate Center, particularly the rescuers and survivors, and to those who encouraged me in my personal and scientific search for the understanding of moral integrity in the face of inhumanity.

I was most fortunate to have committee members and readers who were not only major theoretical and methodological contributors to the social sciences. Each in his or her own way devotes energy and expertise to improving society and indeed to preventing future genocides. I would not have embarked upon becoming a social psychologist, or in this work, were it not for my inspirational mentor and friend Stephen P. Cohen. His roles as a community leader, as an important thinker, and as an activist guided me in various aspects of my life from the time of my first

encounter with him. Steve was leading a discussion on integration of self with vocational choices, in which I was participating. That discussion was the genesis of my quest and the beginning of the journey that culminated with this dissertation.

Steven Cohen initiated the development of the conceptualization of the theoretical and methodological approach to this study, and was its Principal Investigator. His confidence in my ability to serve as Project Director gave me a unique opportunity, and was important in my development as a social psychologist. Steve's perseverance in his creative albeit frustrated efforts to bring peace to the Middle East was a model for me in my own project, even during its darkest days. Steve continues to guide me; I value his counsel and judgment at important junctures and crossroads.

Since my arrival at the Graduate Center I have been befriended by Charles Kadushin and I have benefited greatly from his genuine praise of my various projects. His facility and astuteness in quantitative analysis and in working with large data sets gave me the assurance I needed to identify the appropriate methodology for systematically analyzing my data. Most important, he gave me the courage to start this awesome task, to keep at it when other activities interfered, and to know when to stop. Charles's ability to interpret detailed findings was most helpful in

my own final interpretation of the findings. I will forever be indebted to him for helping me overcome my fears of computers.

Robert Jay Lifton's seminal book on Vietnam veterans inspired my initial contact to share my work on children of survivors with him. He was most receptive to meeting with a stranger and generously sharing his time and thoughts with her. For his participation in my film, Breaking the Silence: The Generation After the Holocaust, my thanks are boundless. Our paths crossed again when Bob joined the Graduate Center faculty and agreed to serve on my committee. Although I had read many of his books, his writing took on new meaning to me, and transformed my own view of the people I was trying to understand, the rescuers. Bob helped me appreciate the nuances of the narrative form and the value of the clinical interview which ultimately gave the work a more holistic form. Just as I was trying to bring together many dynamics in each of the rescuers, so many aspects of myself came together in the work. Bob, a master at communicating ideas, helped me find a voice with which to express my perceptions and results.

My readers, Judith Kestenberg and Otto Klineberg, were tireless in reviewing several drafts of the dissertation from its early stages, and perceptive in their comments. Each brought his and her own expertise and erudition to the task, enhancing the final version and alerting me to

important concepts. Professor Klineberg's sense of the continuity of social science research was helpful in my preparing a manuscript that will be useful to future investigators. As for Judith Kestenberg, her passion and dedication to related projects energized me when I became overwhelmed. Not only did her inquisitive nature inform, nurture, and enrich this work, but she unhesitatingly interviewed rescuers and children who were rescued wherever she encountered them, translated material from other languages, and in general facilitated my data-gathering efforts. Judith has truly taught me the value of a collegial relationship.

Although the late Stanley Milgram did not live to see this dissertation completed, he brought an element of realism and vision to this work. Stanley understood the strengths and limitations of social psychology. Likewise, he had a true appreciation of the strengths and limitations of human beings, and had the wonderful ability to elicit the most out of both his students and science. Although he had difficulty in transmitting his innate creativity to students, as a teacher-exemplar he taught me basic tools of social psychology. But most of all I will cherish Stanley's altruistic nature and the positive reinforcement I received from him.

Aside from these individuals, who worked directly with me on the dissertation, I would like to express heart-

felt thanks to Harold M. Schulweis, Milton Kestenberg, Elie Wiesel, David Rosenhan, Herbert Kelman, Perry London, Ute Klingemann, Hans Dieter Klingemann, and Christine Blumenberg-Lampe. Each in his or her own way left an indelible mark. Each was there when I needed her or him for support and guidance.

Rabbi Harold M. Schulweis's pioneering efforts in probing and understanding the theological and pedagogical implications of the rescuers for Jewish and Christian communities provided the basis for my work--indeed informed my entire approach to the subject. Rabbi Schulweis brings theological erudition, practical experience, and, most of all, vast resources of spiritual energy to all of his work. His efforts on behalf of rescuers and those they saved are no exception. Rabbi Schulweis has bridged the gap from an academic approach to altruistic behavior to an acceptance of personal responsibility to perpetuate goodness in society by acknowledging those who act in a just and righteous way. I consider it a splendid privilege to be able to continue my association with him.

This research project would not have been possible without the initial financial support of the John Slawson Fund of the American Jewish Committee. I was subsequently fortunate to receive fellowships from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture and The Jack P. Eisner Institute

for Holocaust Studies. To these organizations I express gratitude.

Various people and institutions gave financial contributions to the Rescuer Project. Among them, I am especially thankful to the following: Sam and Lillie Fogelman; Dr. Judith and Milton Kestenberg of the Child Development Research and the Jerome Riker International Study of Organized Persecution of Children; Dr. Viola Bernard of the Tappanz Foundation; Dr. Jeremy and Judith Mack of the Jeremy and Judith Mack Philanthropic Fund; Dr. Herman Pineas; Steven Fisher; Jack Polak; William Grossman; Stanley Vine; Isaac Jesin; and Joseph Grossman. Heartful thanks to all.

Aside from financial assistance this work required numerous volunteers to translate books, articles, correspondence, and, most important, interviews. For their arduous efforts in this regard I want to thank: Dr. Herman Pineas, Genia Malecki, Bella Tiberg, Dr. Jeremy Mack, Renee Lee, Nusia Shimrat, Dorothy Wallace, Leor Arian, Dr. Eva Rosenfeld, Elizabeth Fuerst, Viola Wdowinsky, Dr. Judith Kestenberg, Milton Kestenberg, interviewers of the Altruistic Personality Study, Dr. Ingrid Tauber, and Aviva Kempner. In this regard, I particularly want to acknowledge Beatrice Mosberg, who, despite personal agony, transcribed and translated interviews and became a dear friend.

Two dear friends and colleagues, Dr. Harriet Arnone and Dr. Kathleen Kelly, assisted me in helping set realistic limits to this work. Each spent many hours discussing hypotheses, methodology, and individual cases. Their special interest in this work, and in me, I deeply appreciate.

Without Rachel Koenig this work would have taken much longer to complete than it did. She served as a second coder for the interviews and was able to assist me in reinterviewing rescuers in order to increase the reliability of the data and fill gaps in missing data. But what I most cherished was Rachel's enthusiasm for the work and our stimulating discussions as we came to a similar image about each rescuer.

For the final professional touch, Susan Kirby has always brought precision and erudition to my manuscripts. Her attention to detail is matched by her factual knowledge in any number of disciplines. Her encouragement at the crucial final stage was important to me.

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my loving parents, Sam and Lillie Fogelman. Despite everything they endured and lost, I profited immeasurably from their transmitting a sense of continuity and hope.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iv
Acknowledgements	vi
List of Tables	xv
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Historical Research	7
Sociological Research	17
Psychological Research	21
Socialization	21
Personality Characteristics	38
Situational Factors	41
Summary	45
Results of Pilot Study	47
The Proposed Study	52
Hypotheses	54
Hypotheses: Socialization	54
Hypotheses: Situational Variables	56
Hypotheses: Personality Characteristics	56
Hypotheses: Motivation for Altruistic Behavior	57
III. METHOD	59
Selection of Subjects and Sample	59
Selection of Subjects	59
Criteria for Subject Selection	59
Process of Locating Subjects	63
Description of Sample	77
Sociological Variables	80
Socialization Variables	84
Personal Characteristics	87
Interview Process	89
Problems in Interviewing	98
Data Analysis	101

CHAPTER	Page
IV. RESULTS	105
Moral Rescuers	107
Ideological-Moral Rescuers	111
Religious-Moral Rescuers	132
Religious-Pacifist-Moral Rescuers	138
Emotional-Moral Rescuers	142
Relational Philo-Semitic Rescuers	146
Ideological-Network Rescuers	162
Children As Rescuers	172
Concerned-Detached Professionals	181
Summary	188
Post-War Continuity	191
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	196
Sociological Factors	199
Age	199
Sex Differences	200
Religion and Politics	201
Relation with Jews	202
Social Class, Education, and Profession	202
Formative Developmental Influences	204
Altruistic Parents	204
Tolerance for Differentness	205
Birth Order	207
Value of Independence	207
Losses in Childhood	209
Comparative Findings	211
The Altruistic Response and Continuity	215
The Rescuer Self and Rescuing Relationships	216
Role Playing	218
Moral Models	219
Memorialization	220
Further Research	221
APPENDIX	
A. Consent Form	226
B. Instructions to Interviewers	227
C. Interview	236
D. Summary for Coder	278
E. Final Coding Sheet.....	283
F. Interview Schedule for Holocaust Survivors Who Were Rescued	289
BIBLIOGRAPHY	298

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Breakdown by Country of Cases and Individuals Handled by Yad Vashem 1962-1986	65
2. Location of Rescuers in This Sample	81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When helping others entails a risk of life and limb, the idea of "Good Samaritanism" takes on new meaning. Under normal conditions, law-abiding citizens may perform good deeds almost routinely. Under a malevolent authority, some ordinary people may disobey to maintain a sense of their own integrity. However, a repressive leader or strong societal norm can lead people to abandon human sympathy to avoid severe punishment.

The political philosopher Hannah Arendt examined the moral implications of compliance or disobedience to repressive norms. Her epochal work, Origins of Totalitarianism, enlightened a generation about the characteristics of Nazi and Soviet monolithic political structures and the behaviors and attitudes common people assume in the face of vast tyranny. She concedes that:

Those few who were still able to tell right from wrong went really only by their own judgements, and they did so freely; there were no rules to be abided by, under which the particular cases with which they were confronted could be subsumed. They had to decide each incidence as it arose, because no rules existed for the unprecedented. . . . What has come to light is neither nihilism nor cynicism, as one might have expected, but a quite extraordinary confusion over elementary questions of morality--as if an instinct in such matters were truly the last thing to be taken for granted in our time. (Arendt, 1963, p. 295)

Those who opposed the dictates of people in power often confronted irresolvable moral conflicts or dilemmas. As Arendt understood, resistance involves ambiguity and cannot be reduced to the simple bifurcation of the world into good and evil.

This study seeks to understand those who, despite serious personal risk, rescued Jews and their sympathizers during World War II. In order to understand the behavior of non-Jews during the Third Reich, we must have an appreciation of the unique mortal dangers they faced.

This is controversial because in examining goodness amidst evil, some readers may either be blinded to the true enormity of the Holocaust or come to suspect that history is being whitewashed. However, by not examining these extraordinary examples of altruism, we risk losing sight of the essential fact that even under the most difficult conditions, some people act with decency and humanitarian concern for others.

It is hardly surprising that for years after liberation, discourse focused on the evil of the war years. In the shadow of the gas chambers and mass graves it was hard even to consider acts of bravery and compassion. The Nazis had created a black and white world. In many ways the interpreters of history accepted this absolutist world view in which grey areas were ill-defined or simply nonexistent.

In time, voices began to be heard about the extraordinary phenomenon of the rescuers. Philip Friedman, a historian, was perhaps the first to sound this new note in the fifties (Friedman, 1955, 1957) in such books as Their Brothers' Keeper. Another pioneer was a leading theologian, Harold Schulweis, author of Evil and the Morality of God (1984). In 1962, he was one of the first to make a strong and eloquent plea to acknowledge the moral heroism of the rescuer:

Wisdom, faith, truth urge our search to know, record and hallow these acts of the righteous. Which code of ethics argues that evil be allowed to eclipse the good? Which perverse logic holds that we obliterate the memory of man's nobility so as to preserve the memory of his degeneracy? In unearthing the crimes of villainy, the virtues of humanity must not be buried. (p. 11)

By focusing on the individual's capacity to resist evil, we may discover deterrents to inhumane social norms. Moreover, by understanding the traits of the rescuer, social scientists may simultaneously be able to explain the tragic absence of an altruistic response toward the victims of Nazi persecution. As Schulweis (1962) remarks, "The behavioral sciences have long studied the bigot, the twisted soul filled with hostility, the authoritarian personality, the anti-Semite, anti-Negro, anti-Catholic, but no comparable empirical study has been done for the altruistic personality" (1962, p. 11).

This study is designed to trace how social, psychological, and historical factors are interwoven in the development of people who disobeyed a powerful, malevolent authority and risked their lives to become rescuers. And furthermore, the process of actually beginning a rescue relationship--the transformation from bystander to rescuer--will be scrutinized. Thus, the analysis of the evolving self of a rescuer during the Nazi era entails not only what the person brings to the situation but also what Lifton (1976), a noted psychohistorian, has described as "the ordeal of the individual death encounter with its possibilities for either stagnation or for renewal."

Lifton's pioneering works of "holocaust and transformation" of Hiroshima victims, Vietnam veterans and Nazi doctors, provide a framework for understanding the continuity of self in the extreme situation. His method of inquiry is of:

individual feelings and actions on the basis of immediate struggles to harmonize and recast the forms and images that have been evolving over the course of the life cycle. That interpretation must include the emotional urgency of the process: the equation of threat to form with threat to life. One must consider the intensity with which form and meaning are defended, but also the capacity to survive precisely such threats (actual or metaphysical death immersions) and to re-create and even revitalize the forms of self and the world. (1976, p. 95)

For purposes of examining altruistic responses in the face of annihilation of Jews, specific images and forms

relate to Jews as a group, notions about relationships, values of justice and fairness, attitudes toward threat and death, as well as susceptibility to fear and anxiety. The interplay between these aspects of self and the situation will contribute to an understanding of compassionate life-enhancing behavior. The interplay between individual and society creates extreme stress on moral decision making. There is a role conflict between social requirements of obedience and conformity, and the social values of ethical, compassionate behavior which must be considered in developing a social psychological theory of rescuing behavior in extremis.

This multidimensional approach of formative influences, personality characteristics, immediate situational factors, and interpersonal relations will be considered in the creation of a rescuer self. The above will facilitate in differentiating (a) the motivation to help; (b) the process of engaging in a rescuing relationship; (c) the nature of a rescuer self.

Studying behavior such as rescuing Jewish victims under Nazi occupation can help in discerning continuity and discontinuity in the lives of this group of people. Hence, we may be able to understand what is attributable to ongoing aspects of personality as opposed to the elements unique to the historical event. The literature review which follows includes existing research on rescuers during the Holocaust

and other examples of helping in specific real-life situations, as well as social psychological dimensions important to an understanding of the dynamics which come into play when people choose to risk their life to help a victim.

In the burgeoning literature and media reports on the Holocaust, heroic stories and analyses of rescue do not command as much attention as the vivid imagery of genocide. This is understandable because not only was it a comparatively rare behavior, but in order for a rescue activity to succeed it often required anonymity and secretiveness not only on the part of the people involved but also on keeping any records. Despite the scarcity of documentation and systematic research, however, a body of knowledge (and myths) is beginning to emerge about rescuers from biographies, autobiographies, chronicles, and archival material, in addition to comprehensive studies in disciplines such as history, political science, sociology, anthropology, and psychology. Therefore, in developing a conceptual framework for understanding the rescuers, previous writings will be considered.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Research

Historians, given their customary use of written records, have had a rather challenging task in studying rescuers. Since rescue operations were secret (whether conducted as part of a network or by individuals, couples, or entire families), few written documents exist. Resistance movements that included sections to aid Jews often kept only code names of potential helpers, if they kept records at all. Some rescuers functioned as part of an underground, resistance group, or network and did not know the workings of the group as a whole or the names of the others involved.

Despite such data-collection obstacles, historians have reported and analyzed general and specific patterns of rescuing. However, the controversy regarding the degree to which the generalizations can be upheld across national borders is widespread. Bauer (1978), Milton (1983), and Friedman (1955, 1957, 1980a) argue that rescue efforts were less prevalent in countries where there was a high level of anti-Semitism before the war. In general, this would imply that in such countries of Eastern Europe as Poland and the

Ukraine, we would find less rescue activity than in Scandinavia and Southern Europe (Italy and Greece); and that in Western Europe (France, Belgium, and the Netherlands), there would also have been less antagonism toward rescue efforts. Bauer even shows how this generalization explains marked differences when comparing areas within Poland. For instance, "few Jews managed to hide in the Kielce district, known for its strong, Catholic-oriented antisemitism. On the other hand, in Volhynia where the Poles were themselves a minority among the local Ukrainians, they were much more willing to help" (1978, p. 59).

While the degree of pre-war anti-Semitism may explain the prevalence of rescue attempts in some cases, situational factors such as physical terrain or attitudes toward the German occupation, the phase of the war, or other military and political factors may also come into play to explain the degree of rescuing in a particular situation. Bauer (1978) has studied the complex interaction of many of these variables. For example, in Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania the strong anti-Semitic tradition ultimately was overridden by other factors which served to save Jews. He attributes the exception in Slovakia to "the overall growth of anti-German national feeling on the one hand, and moral revulsion on the other hand, especially among minority groups and opponents of the regime." In Bulgaria, "the realization that Germany was losing the war combined in the spring of

1943 with pressure from the opposition to the government and perhaps a moral revulsion on the part of the Orthodox Church" (p. 63). And in Bucharest, the "government thought it might use Romanian Jewry as a pawn in future contacts with the West" (p. 66).

Some historians discuss specific motivation (Friedman, 1955, 1957, 1980), but more often they look at overall relationships between Christians and Jews prior to Nazi occupation, degree of anti-Semitism, role of leaders in a particular locale, differences in attitudes of religious denominations and churches, effects of Nazi occupation, and cross-cultural comparisons (Bauer, 1978; Fein, 1979; Milton, 1983).

Bauer (1978), while alerting us to a "striking similarity between the situation in Italy, Denmark, and the Low Countries," also concedes that each situation has its own nuances. For example, according to Flender (1964) and Yahil (1969), Denmark's ingrained democratic values and religious tolerance, the integration and assimilation of its Jews, the relatively lenient nature of German occupation until 1943, the coincidence of Jewish deportation with the Danes' resentment of German economic exploitation, and the proximity of neutral Sweden, which offered to harbor Jews, help to explain the Danish rescue effort.

Whereas Bauer differentiates the specific from general dynamics involved in rescue of Jews, other theorists focus

simply on generalizations. Fein (1979) emphasizes that the degree of rescue in each country depended on the kind of German occupation and the severity of SS control in various areas. In countries in which the Germans gave the local governments some autonomy or in which there had been minimal discrimination against Jews before and during occupation, the extent of rescuing activity was greater than in countries in which the SS relied on local police and administrators who were openly hostile to Jews. In reviewing the historical studies on when, how, and by whom Jews were rescued, one would tend to agree with Marrus and Paxton (1983), who conclude that the generalizations fall apart on the stubborn particularity of each country.

In addition to these more theoretical historical works, some documentation exists on specific rescue networks--the Zegota under the auspices of the largest element of the Polish underground, Home Army (Baroszewski & Lewinowna, 1970; Kermish, 1977); the Huguenots in Le Chambon-sur-Lignon (Hallie, 1979); the Confession churches in Germany (Conway, 1968; Friedman, 1980b); churches in Assisi, Italy (Ramati, 1978; Zuccotti, 1987); and underground and/or resistance movements in Holland (Presser, 1969), Belgium (Abramowicz & Hoffenberg, 1980), France (Steinberg, 1977), Lithuania (Neshamit, 1977), and Denmark (Yahil, 1977; Flender, 1964). While it is most difficult to collate historical accounts of such underground activities, these researchers

nevertheless provide a glimpse of the daily workings of rescue operations and the structure of leadership in each. What becomes clear is that a charismatic leader and shared ideology were essential ingredients in the creation of the rescue network that arose in many countries during Nazi occupation.

Although exact numbers are not available, most researchers roughly approximate that 4,000 Jews were rescued by the Zegota and 10,000 were rescued from the Warsaw ghetto (Kestenberg, 1985). In Berlin approximately 1,100 Jews were hidden by their German neighbors, mostly in the working class section of the city (Bauer, 1978; Gross, 1982). These figures may seem modest but the human effort required to elude the Nazis, whether solitary or communal, was nothing short of extraordinary. The success of these operations hinged on rescuers being loosely tied to each other in a conscious attempt at maintaining secrecy in order to avoid infiltration or betrayal by Gestapo, Nazi sympathizers, and collaborators.

Friedman (1955, 1980a), differing from other historians, attributes specific motivational factors to rescuers. Conducting the earliest cross-cultural study of rescuers, he concluded that friendship and love were often the reasons why people rescued Jews. Aryans married to Jews saved their Jewish relatives, colleagues their co-workers, party members their comrades. Underground organizations saved Jews

distinguished in science, literature, art, and social service. In cases where unknown strangers were saved, the motivation was purely humanitarian, particularly in attempts to save children. Friedman also makes an important distinction between men and women, contending that "women were more easily moved by their emotions than men" (1980a, p. 414). He notes that in underground organizations more women than men were active in the sections dealing with aid to Jews.

Friedman realized the necessity of analyzing data on a societal as well as an individual level. His method is an excellent example of how an interdisciplinary approach can help to understand complex phenomena. Friedman provides us simultaneously with rich historical data, psychological observations, and sociological analyses. Specifically, he treats the motivational underpinnings of the rescuers and their complex relationship with survivors.

Another chronicler interested in individual motivation was Emanuel Ringelblum (1975), who kept a diary of the Warsaw ghetto. Although he describes many of the Christian rescuers of children as being interested in converting them rather than saving them for altruistic reasons, this cannot hold as a general rule because motivation was too complex to be reduced to one factor alone.

Historical research on the rescue of Jews will probably never be conclusive because the necessary documents are

incomplete or not available. Moreover, many historians have come to recognize that rescuing, a complex phenomenon, demands an interdisciplinary approach. Historical research is important in understanding context, but it is not sufficient to explain individual behavioral differences. Friedlander (1984) expressed this aptly when he stated, "we know the details of what occurred, we are aware of the sequence of events and their probable interaction but the profound dynamics of the phenomenon evades us" (p. 50).

One cannot approach a psychological study of rescuing behavior during the Nazi era without familiarity with the details of the history of the war and geography of the area in which the rescue took place. Although historians tend not to emphasize the motivation of rescuers, they do differentiate between altruistic and self-serving helpers, such as those who saved Jews for conversion to Christianity (Ringelblum, 1952), for procuring a child, or for sheer monetary profit (immediate payment or expected reward from "rich Jews" when the war ended). Such motivation is screened by Yad Vashem¹ prior to awarding recognition to anyone as Righteous Among the Nations. Historians also differentiate motivation according to whether the act was performed at the beginning, middle, or end of the war. One

¹Yad Vashem is Israel's National Holocaust Museum and Archives.

of the myths about those who started helping Jews when the Germans were losing the war was that their motivation was to secure their anti-Nazi identity, in case there were any suspicions of their collaboration.

Regarding the extent of rescue, historians have attempted to determine approximate numbers of those rescued according to country and locale. But they recognize that figures are misleading if they are not interpreted within the context of the percentage of Jews in the population prior to Nazi occupation, and the number who survived or were murdered. While the number of rescue efforts in Holland seem high, those actually rescued represent only a minuscule percentage (11%) of the Jewish population (Bauer, 1978). Some authors attribute this to the large number of Nazi collaborators in Holland (Baron, 1985a; Bauer, 1978; Presser, 1969).

It is estimated that about 24,000 of the 140,000 Jews living in Holland before the Nazi occupation were hidden by Dutch people. Only 16,000 of these survived, the others were caught by the Nazis, in most cases because of betrayal by pro-Nazi Dutch elements. (Bauer, 1978, pp. 70-71).

The historical context is thus an important factor to consider in psychological research assessing whether an individual acted freely or had to defy community norms.

The nature of the rescuing relationship is also analyzed according to who initiated the help, when it took place in relation to Nazi occupation and the course of the

war effort, and the attitude toward Jews which increased or reduced the danger in a specific place. For example, Neshamit (1977) and Tec (1985) concluded that in Poland, the majority of rescuers were responding to Jews' requests for help, rather than initiating the assistance. In her sample of rescuers, Tec (1985) found that only about one-third initiated their help to Jews.

For many historians, the relationship between Jews and non-Jews prior to the war was an indicator of what one might expect during the war (Bauer, 1978). The question is, how do general trends hold up on an individual basis? What kind of Jewish-Christian relationships between neighbors, friends, colleagues, and strangers allowed people to become involved in the struggle to survive and escape persecution?

The aim of this study is to focus on individual acts of rescue, whether they were carried out alone or with others. Descriptions of the rescue activities of some individuals are available in biographies, autobiographies, memoirs, testimonies, oral histories, documentation, and Yizkor books.² Such genres tell the story within their own unique historical context. These include: Raoul Wallenberg (Anger, 1981; Bierman, 1981; Lester, 1984; Rosenfeld, 1982), Fritz Graebe (Huneke, 1985), Oskar Schindler (Keneally,

²Memorial books from different towns in Europe which describe life before, during, and immediately after the destruction of European Jewry.

1982; Wundheiler, 1985), John Weidner (Ford, 1966), and others. Less comprehensive biographies of rescuers are found in collections of stories about individuals from several different countries (Bauminger, 1969; Friedman, 1955, 1957; Hellman, 1980), or from one country or locale (Baroszewski, 1970; Baroszewski & Lewinowna, 1970; Gross, 1982; Grossman, 1958; Horbach, 1967; Iranek-Osmecki, 1971).

Some rescuers have written their own memoirs (Geis, 1987; Karski, 1944; Korbanski, 1968; Vlcko, 1973; von Staden, 1981; Vos, 1952; Zassenhaus, 1974). Like oral histories of rescuers, these autobiographies highlight the unique experiences, moral dilemmas, and day-to-day conflicts of individuals. The unique qualities, the circumstances, and the interpersonal relationships described show how difficult it is to make generalizations. For the most part, these collections leave it to the reader to discern motivation. Their narrative often makes use of poetic license and at other times vital information is omitted for psychological reasons or it is the rescuer's decision that a particular experience or concern was not relevant to their story.³ In most cases the snapshot view of their family background is insufficient for an in-depth analysis of the self prior to the rescue nor of their subsequent life.

³This assessment was derived from having interviewed some of the rescuers who have written their memoirs or were in the process of writing at the time of the interview.

Further data about rescuing relationships are recorded by survivors in oral or written testimony (Frank, 1953; Friedlander, 1978; Meed, 1972; Rochman, 1983; Tec, 1984; Wolfe, 1981). What is ironic is that the most well known testimony, that of Ann Frank which in essence is an account of being rescued, though unsuccessfully, is rarely perceived as such. For the past 40 years very little has been highlighted about the five families and others who made it possible for the Jews to hide for two years prior to being denounced and deported to concentration camps. Readers are so drawn to the victim that the rescuer is almost anonymous. So even when we have documentation the rescuer remains in the background and the victim in the foreground. In reality once such relationships started both parties were threatened with severe penalty of incarceration or being killed. Nonetheless, survivor accounts are invaluable in understanding the rescuer and most of all the interaction between rescuer and rescuee.

Sociological Research

Studies of the rescue of Jews from a sociological perspective examine classic variables such as age, sex, socioeconomic background, religious and political affiliation, and attitudes of the rescuers. Wolfson (1970, 1975) and Tec (1985) draw conclusions about which groups of people were most likely to come to the aid of Jews.

Wolfson conducted his research on rescuers in Germany, and Tec based her conclusions on rescuers and survivors in Poland. Wolfson, who interviewed approximately 40 rescuers and collected socioeconomic data on an additional 30, found scant aid to Jews among blue-collar workers and a greater frequency of males (62%) than females (38%) involved in rescuing relationships. Among those they rescued, only a small percentage were reported to have been close friends. Politically, rescuers were evenly distributed, and about 57% participated in other anti-Nazi activities. In addition, Wolfson found low level of aid among young men. It seems logical that the sample would include few young men, as many of them were drafted into the German army. Wolfson concludes that the classic sociological variables are not sufficient predictors of rescuing behavior.

These results are confirmed by Tec (1985), who conducted an in-depth sociological study of 31 rescuers and 34 survivors who were rescued, and of hundreds of additional cases from archival material (all from Poland). Regarding the classic variables, Tec (1985) found some differences between different groups in their propensity to help Jews. However, she concludes that political affiliation, social class, education, and religion were not primary factors in distinguishing a passive bystander from a rescuer. Instead, Tec found that rescuers shared a set of common personal characteristics:

(1) individuality, (2) independence or self-reliance in pursuing their personal values, (3) matter-of-fact views about rescue, which come together with the insistence that there was nothing heroic or extraordinary in their protection of aiding Jews, (4) long lasting commitment to aid the needy, a commitment that began before the war and that in the past infrequently involved Jews, (5) the unplanned and gradual beginning of rescue, at times involving a sudden, even impulsive move, and (6) universalistic perceptions of the needy that overshadow all other attributes except their dependence on aid. (p. 180)

Predictive value of the sociological variables in Tec's study is limited because hers was not a representative sample of Polish rescuers. The research does, however, corroborate the historical findings (Bauer, 1978) that rescuers often had a minority status in society. It also points to the importance of the specific relationship between rescuer and survivor (as opposed to the societal relationship between Jews and non-Jews).

One way to avoid sampling difficulties is to study a specific location within a country, acknowledging limited possibility for generalization. One such sociological-anthropological study was conducted by Henry (1984, 1985) on the relationship between Jews and Christians in a small town in the German Rhineland. She used a pseudonym for the town to protect the anonymity of its 4,000 residents, of whom 150 were Jews. Henry interviewed the minority who resisted the Nazis (a small percentage of whom gave direct aid to Jews) and those who were passive bystanders (the majority). She was not successful in interviewing any of the active Nazis

in the town (F. Henry, personal communication, 1986). Henry does not compare the different groups; rather, she describes incidents of help and some feelings of the bystanders, including why they did not rescue Jews. The latter tell of their fear of retaliation, complicated by moral dilemma. For example, "Frau Mauer" told her: "I had two small children, my husband was a civil servant who could easily be fired. How could I endanger their lives? So we did nothing."

Henry found one condition necessary but not sufficient for becoming a rescuer--a close relationship with Jews before the war. Her study begins to address the issue of control groups. Unfortunately, her research did not systematically compare the relevant four groups in the town: active Nazis, active resisters, rescuers, and passive bystanders. Her efforts to locate Nazis were in vain.

Despite the realistic limitations of sociological variables, they nevertheless are a starting point for inquiry. However, the complexity of motivations and relationships being analyzed in the case of rescuing behavior necessitates more than one dimension. Explanation must make sense in each discipline, but it also must cross disciplines. Like Tec, we set out to explain research questions in the terms of a single discipline (in Tec's case, those of sociology); as we go deeper, we find it necessary to cross lines into psychology, history, anthropology, sociology, and psychoanalysis.

Psychological Research

The social psychology and personality research is concerned with individual behavior in particular social situations. Psychological studies in the field focus on socialization, personality, the individual in relation to society, more immediate situational factors, and motivation. An overall theory will ultimately conceptualize the interaction between all of these dimensions in order to draw parallels between altruism during the Holocaust and other situations, and to discern factors which account for an altruistic person and response in a given situation.

Several areas need to be considered in distinguishing individuals who aided Jews from those who oppressed them or who were passive bystanders. Each of the areas--socialization, personality characteristics, and situational factors--has been found to influence altruism (albeit in situations far less overwhelming than the Holocaust). This section will review developmental, personality, and social psychological research on prosocial behavior, morality, and obedience to authority.

Socialization

The elements of socialization that research shows to contribute to the propensity to act altruistically include: parental (or caretaker) role models, moral development, discipline/affection, values, and birth order.

Parental role models. Several social psychological studies of rescuers during the Holocaust and other historical events show that a parental figure who acted altruistically was common in the upbringing of those who risked their lives to help others in an extreme situation (Coopersmith, cited in Oliner, 1982; Fogelman & Wiener, 1983; Huneke, 1980; Klingemann, 1985; London, 1970; Rosenhan, 1970; Tomkins, 1965). This aspect of socialization also proved to be important in a pilot study by Fogelman and Wiener (1983). Interviews with survivors and rescuers indicated that many of the rescuers had a parent or role model who was altruistic and who encouraged similar behavior in their young children.

The importance of socialization is also corroborated in psychological studies of those proffering help in diverse situations. Tomkins (1965) studied the lives of four male abolitionists during American slavery to discover why and how they became "committed reformers." In all four families, a parent had shown a pervasive concern with public service in professions such as nurse, minister, mayor, and active emancipationist. Each provided a model which predisposed the son to public service.

Along similar lines, Rosenhan (1970) found that many of the civil rights workers who traveled South to participate in desegregation efforts, and who were in other ways "fully committed" to civil rights activities, described their

parents as actively committed to a moral or altruistic cause consistent with their beliefs. One recalled his father carrying him on his shoulders to protest the Sacco and Vanzetti trial; another's father went to fight on the Republican side in the Spanish Civil War.

A child's participation as a helper also appears to increase the likelihood of prosocial behavior. Whiting (1973, 1975), in observations of children in six different cultures, found that in cultures where they were responsible for tasks helpful to family maintenance, particularly the care of younger siblings, the children were significantly more altruistic. McWilliams' (1976, 1984) psychoanalytic case studies of five extraordinary helpers (e.g., a Schweitzer-like voyager who assists lepers) confirm both formative aspects--care of younger siblings and/or a "helper" role model in childhood. In cases in which subjects had lost a parent, there was another adult who served as a model of altruistic commitment. McWilliams concluded that the determinants of altruism "have been as much the goodness of primary caretaker and the integrity of the secondary models as it was their confrontation with loss, hostility, dependency and guilt that influenced . . . a devotion to humanitarian causes" (p. 356). Nonetheless, this study supports Rosenhan's conclusions that modeling is not a sufficient explanation for the development of altruism, however important its role may be. There is a necessity for integration of several explanatory systems.

Unlike studies in natural situations, laboratory experiments on modeling or imitating a parental figure's altruistic behavior have led to inconsistent results. In a review of this research, Radke-Yarrow and Zahn-Waxler (1986) conclude that, when a child has been observing an adult model in an experimental setting, imitation of honesty, generosity, helping, or rescuing behaviors are apparent for a few weeks, a few months, or may even generalize to other situations. But imitation has not been found to be universal or automatic (Bryan & Walbek, 1970; Poulos & Liebert, 1972; Rosenhan & White, 1967).

The subtleties of what is actually being imitated from a parental model become clearer in a naturalistic study of toddlers' prosocial activities (Zahn-Waxler, Radke-Yarrow, & King, 1979). This study found no association between frequency of mothers' modeling of prosocial behavior and children's prosocial responses. Also interesting was evidence of delayed imitation, in which the children spontaneously comforted and helped others in distress in a manner similar to their mothers' behavior. Hartshorne and May (1928) found that children who were relatively more honest than others had parents who presented themselves in ways that could be interpreted as models of extreme honesty.

Findings that have been replicated in a controlled laboratory setting (Staub, 1970) concern giving children responsibility for "taking care of things." While the

experimenter was out of the room, those children who were given responsibility showed a greater tendency to respond to the cries of a child in an adjoining room than did children without such responsibility.

Discipline and affection. The relationship between rescuers and their parents or caretakers is characterized by love, acceptance, and trust. Coopersmith (cited in Oliner, 1982), who interviewed rescuers of victims of Nazi persecution, found that they felt accepted and loved as children, even when the parents disciplined them in a tough and rigid manner. Part of these rescuers' overall sense of self was derived from an upbringing that encouraged a marked sense of competence and an ability to persevere in achieving goals.

Similar family relationships--a warm, loving relationship with at least one caretaker and a sense of independence and confidence--were also found by Fogelman and Wiener (1985). Additional evidence comes from Grossman's (1982) psychoanalytic study of rescuers. She concluded that in childhood they experienced a loving and trusting relationship with an affectionate mother, had a communicative and non-authoritarian father, and were often an only or a favored child.

Comparing a sample of 21 anti-Nazi German men (not necessarily involved in aiding Jews) with passive German bystanders, Levy (1948) noted a lack of conventional and rigid upbringing in the resisters. Their parents were

described as comparatively more affectionate and less restrained, featuring a strong and affectionate maternal influence and no severity in paternal discipline. Most of the anti-Nazi Germans in the sample were only or favored children, which probably meant that they received more attention, hence increased individuation, than the bystander.

These findings were also confirmed in the unprejudiced subjects in the Authoritarian Personality Study (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). They were found to attain a considerable degree of independence from their parents and an ability to make their own decisions. In contrast, "prejudiced subjects tend to report a relatively harsh and more threatening type of home discipline which was experienced as arbitrary by the child" (p. 385).

In the Authoritarian Personality studies a clear distinction was drawn between low and high prejudiced people regarding their formative familial experiences in discipline, values, and interrelationships. As in Levy's study, unprejudiced subjects attained considerable independence from their parents and made their own decisions. Less obedience was expected of them as children, and parents were "less status-ridden," more supportive, unconditionally affectionate, and displayed less conformity to conventional rules, thus providing more freedom for individuality. The unprejudiced subjects received more love and basically felt

more secure in relation to their parents. On the whole, their independence relates to the world beyond the family, toward social institutions and authorities in general.

On the other hand, subjects who scored high on prejudice tended to report "a relatively harsh and more threatening type of home discipline." Roles were rigidly defined, and submission to the demands of the parents was strictly enforced. Parents raised these children to be highly conventional and status-conscious. This meant an absence of an individualized approach to the child. Any hostility within the family was usually displaced on weaker out-groups.

Although researchers consistently find nurturance and affection in the rearing of prosocially oriented children, Radke-Yarrow and Zahn-Waxler (1986) conclude that "love is not enough." Other variables promote or hinder the learning of empathy and altruism. In cases where children had to interact with a depressed or manic-depressive parent, there was a role reversal, and children took care of the depressed parent. Such intense involvement with emotional needs of others may continue into adulthood (Radke-Yarrow & Zahn-Waxler, 1986).

Parental techniques of discipline were assumed to be related to a child's altruism. Hoffman (1963) initially studied the manner in which parents reacted to children disobeying someone other than the parent. After obtaining

parental methods of discipline, he categorized them as power-assertive or reasoning techniques. Power-assertive techniques consisted of threats, physical punishment, and isolation. Reasoning involved alerting the child to the consequences of his or her action toward others. Hoffman found that when power assertion was low and reasoning was used, altruistic behavior toward peers was observed. This was not true when power assertion was high, even when reasoning was also used. This line of research did not consider affect in the interaction, a variable examined by Tomkins (1965). Tomkins suggested that when parents respond to the distress of children in a nurturant and sympathetic manner, the child feels free to express feelings without guilt or shame, and thus help others in distress.

Values. Further research by Hoffman (1975) suggests that discipline has been overemphasized as a determinant of altruistic behavior. He found that peer assessments of altruism were more closely linked to parents' values than to either discipline or affection toward the child.

Several studies trace part of rescuers' motivation to the values ingrained in them as children. One example is early learning to tolerate differences among people (Fogelman & Wiener, 1985; Klingemann, 1985; Tec, 1985). Klingemann (1985) notes that role models even spoke specifically about Jews and stressed the fact that Jews were like all other people. In Levy's study (1948), the anti-

Nazis' world was broadened either by parents who married across religious or national boundaries or by greater exposure to social, religious, and intellectual ideas through travel and reading. Tec's (1985) analysis concludes that Polish rescuers' motivation stems from "unique moral values of family life," while for others it relates to values inculcated during their religious or political education from parents or others.

Morality which stemmed from strong religious beliefs that "I Am My Brother's Keeper" was a motivating force in enabling certain rescuers to disobey. However, religious beliefs have also served as a rationale for intolerance and persecution of people who were different. How do we account for the variation? In the Authoritarian Personality Study, it was found that acceptance or rejection of religion is not as important as the way in which it is accepted or rejected and the context of one's religious ideology (Adorno et al., 1950).

Allport (1967) conducted an interesting study to explore how religion enhances or hinders the development of a tolerance for differentness. He examined the value and meaning of religion, as opposed to the group activities of religion (e.g., church attendance), as it affects the individual. Allport differentiated between two (not necessarily separate) types of religious motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Extrinsically motivated persons

value religion as a social institution. Intrinsically motivated religion is valued as an end in itself. Regardless of similarity in church-going, the type of motivation correlated with prejudice. Intrinsically-oriented religious people were found to be less prejudiced than the extrinsically motivated.

When it comes to helping behavior, religious orientation provides a partial explanation for some differences. In a field experiment using a Good Samaritan paradigm, Darley and Batson (1973) found a disposition to help among theology students. More specifically, those students whose religious commitment was an end in itself insisted on helping the distressed confederate, even when they were reassured that he was "fine."

In experimental studies which compare religious values and behavior with different kinds of helping, it was found that those individuals who rated high on religious commitment (Darley & Batson, 1973) and those with intrinsic religious values (Allport & Ross, 1967) were more likely to help. These are both similar concepts for religion as an end in itself. Thus, Darley and Batson (1973) suggest:

Whether a person helps or not is an instant decision likely to be situationally controlled. How a person helps involves a more complex and considered number of decisions, including the time and scope to permit personality characteristics to shape them. (p. 108)

Moral development. Whereas some people develop a set of moral beliefs and action based on religious values, others

make ethical decisions based on some consistent model of how one should behave toward others. In an extreme situation, individuals do not confront simple right and wrong choices in their daily life. Rather, moral dilemmas and conflicts create very ambiguous life-threatening conditions. During the Holocaust, what kinds of people were likely to endanger the lives of their own children and other family members to save the life of a stranger? Who was able to disobey laws and governments to affirm the value of human beings who were considered as loathsome as vermin? To answer some of these questions the research on moral development (Gilligan, 1981; Haan, 1977; Hogan, 1969; Kohlberg, 1969; Piaget, 1932; Rest, 1976) and disobedience to authority (Kelman, 1972; Milgram, 1974) is theoretically applicable.

For the most part, research on moral development focuses on the process by which individuals make moral decisions. Except for Gilligan, these theorists present hypothetical moral dilemmas to individual subjects who are then asked for solutions. Responses are assessed according to stages of moral reasoning. The individual's rationale for his or her decisions indicates higher or lower stages of moral development.

These theorists implicitly assume that people will act in real life as they would behave hypothetically. Yet we know from Milgram's (1974) classic study of Obedience to Authority that there is a vast discrepancy between assumed

and actual behavior when an individual confronts a moral dilemma in a specific situation. The omission of social context for moral decisions in some studies prevents an integrated understanding of moral development and moral action.

When Milgram queried a random sample about whether or not they would administer electric shock to a learner, most replied they definitely would not. And, in fact, in various laboratory experimental conditions, approximately 60% of the subjects complied to the command to administer shock for scientific goals. An explanation for the discrepancy between intention and action is keenly specified in an essay on Kohlberg and Milgram (Damico, 1982):

We must keep in mind social psychologists' warning that individuals move in and out of different modes of reasoning depending on the structural context that stands between men's intentions and their actions.
(p. 427)

Despite situational differences between the laboratory and the real world, certain human reactions remain constant, and are evoked when certain conditions are present. For example, in Milgram's Obedience to Authority paradigm, "the essence of obedience consists in the fact that a person comes to view himself as the instrument for carrying out another person's wishes, and he, therefore, no longer regards himself as responsible for his actions" (1974, p. xii).

In a laboratory situation, the individual has to make a decision at a specific point in time: the experiment occurs at a particular time and place. In the real world, the point of decision as to whether to comply or disobey came at a different moment in time for each person. Some individuals were spared having to make a direct decision about how to behave because of situational factors; e.g., not being of age to serve in the army or living in a town where there were no Jews. In the latter case, lack of proximity to victims spared them from experiencing a more intense moral dilemma.

The fundamental lesson of Milgram's study is that:

Ordinary people simply doing their jobs, and without any particular hostility on their part can become agents in a terrible destructive process. Moreover, even when the destructive effects of their work becomes patently clear, and they are asked to carry out actions incompatible with fundamental standards or morality, very few people have the resources needed to resist authority. (1974, p. 6)

While Kelman (1972) does not discuss rescuing behavior in extreme situations, he does elaborate on the opposite of the dehumanization process. The opposite of dehumanization or "what it means to perceive another person as fully human" is defined by Kelman as being related to two factors: identity and community. Identity involves seeing the other as an individual with entitlement to live his own life according to his own goals and values. Community is the perception of self and other as part of a social network of

individuals who "care for each other." This means "to be saddened by the death of every single person."

Many rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust were able to remain apart from the processes of authorization and routinization which spread contagiously throughout occupied European countries. By resisting the dehumanizing process, they affirmed the values of identity and community. Others, though few, performed rescuing activities even while collaborating with the Nazi machinery. How can these responses to dehumanizing, legal authority be studied in a systematic way?

Gilligan (1977), in her theory of moral development, does provide a social context for studying moral judgment and behavior. The design of Gilligan's study aims to determine how people define moral problems and which experiences presented moral conflicts in their lives. Gilligan interviewed women who actually had to decide whether or not to undergo abortions, both immediately following their decision and one year later. Although limited by its small number of subjects, her work begins to examine moral behavior in an applied, very realistic way. Like the present study, Gilligan's research utilizes interviews in trying to understand intrapsychic processes which are involved in solving moral dilemmas.

Basing her study upon a real situation rather than on hypothetical questions, Gilligan arrived at results which

suggest a different concept of moral reasoning. Whereas Kohlberg's (1969) highest stage of moral development (Stage 6) is defined by the ability of the individual to consult "universal ethical principles," Gilligan maintains that Kohlberg's Stage 3, where the individual is answerable to people rather than principles, is not lower or developmentally deficient. Rather, it is characteristic of a second style of moral reasoning.

Gilligan believes that the value of caring in human relationships is as important as justice. What matters ultimately is being in touch with the human condition, "hearing a human voice." The human need to maintain connections is honorable and not a symptom of dependency. She further explains that morality is based upon care and mutual responsibility. The ability to care for another rests upon an understanding of relationships, rather than upon upholding knowledge and truth as abstract ideals. Knowledge and truth, justice and mercy, responsibility and care are learned through the process of human interaction.

For Kohlberg (1969), on the other hand, when a moral decision in an ambiguous situation is interpreted in abstract terms of justice, rather than on the palpable dimension of compassion, we can deduce a higher level of moral development. Most of these findings are based on hypothetical paper-and-pencil tests and not real-life situations, with the exception of a small sample that was

subjected to Milgram's obedience experiments in addition to the moral dilemmas. Kohlberg's (1969) findings and interpretations are as follows:

In this study, only the Stage 6 subjects would be expected to question the authority's moral right to ask them to inflict pain on another. Stage 5, "Social Contract" subjects, would tend to feel [that] the victim's voluntary participation with foreknowledge released [them] from responsibility to him while their agreement to participate committed them to comply. As expected, 75 percent of a small group (6) of Stage 6 subjects quit as compared to only 13 percent of the remaining 24 subjects at lower moral stages. (p. 395)

Milgram (1974), however, was cautious about these results, noting that "the findings are suggestive, though not very strong" (p. 205). Perhaps a larger sample would show that not just Stage 6 people--but also Stage 3 people--would refuse to shock the learner and, despite the difference in motivation, the ultimate results would be the same.

Another approach to understanding the complexity of moral processes is presented by Blasi (1982). He provides a theoretical framework to integrate the existing controversy among psychologists about the relationship between moral action and moral thought. He concludes that the cognitive-developmental approach (Kohlberg, 1969; Piaget, 1932), which focuses on the logic by which minds operate, and the ego-psychoanalytic paradigm (Haan, 1977), which focuses on the conflict between reality and needs, are both limited. Blasi calls for an integration of moral-cognition and moral-action theories, and offers the "Self model" to bridge the gap.

The focus of the Self model is on the "transition from moral cognition to moral action and on the issue of judgment-behavior consistency." Blasi's model is based upon a number of propositions relating to the process of making moral decisions. Most relevant to this study is Proposition #6: "Consistency between moral judgment and action will be higher in the degree that the individual has attitudes and strategies to deal with interferences from conflicting needs" (1982, p. 27).

The individual's ability to undertake rescuing deeds requires consistent humanitarian values which lead to moral action even at the expense of personal needs. Integrity is "a responsible actualization of what one knows to be right and true" and is at the core of the moral issue (Blasi, 1982). Integrity appears to be independent from the logic of cognitive moral structures as they are described by Piaget and Kohlberg. Rather, it is behavior compatible with any single moral stage, and involves the development of the whole person. While Blasi integrates concepts of moral thought and action, he does not consider the impact of specific situational factors. When moral action might result in death to oneself or one's family, how does this affect moral reasoning and behavior?

Birth order. Another explanation for the ability to disobey authority for moral reasons was found in a study of resisting induction into the military (Gaylin, 1970). Using

a psychoanalytic approach to interview Americans imprisoned for resisting the Vietnam War, Gaylin found that almost all the war resisters were first-born sons. Milgram (1970) explains this finding by suggesting "that some special relationship to authority, implicit in the role of the son-who-will-replace-the-father, is at the motivational root of the resister's act." That first-born children are often extreme helpers was also found in McWilliams' study (1976, 1984).

The importance of the various elements of socialization will be tested as part of the analysis for the propensity to help Jews during the Nazi era. One's personality and the situational factors under which the rescue was performed equally influence such behavior.

Personality Characteristics

Most theorists would agree that personality alone cannot account for whether or how individuals become involved in prosocial behavior. Nevertheless, researchers have found that some personality characteristics are prevalent in those who have a disposition to help.

Altruism as a component of personality has been studied in various ways: (a) personality determinants of altruism--e.g., competence--have been studied through experimental studies, case studies, field research, and clinical review; (b) psychoanalytic case studies of renowned humanitarians based on secondary sources--e.g., Luther (Erikson, 1958) and Gandhi (Erikson, 1969); (c) case studies of less courageous

activists from a nonclinical sample (London, 1970; McWilliams, 1976, 1984); and (d) case studies of altruism either as a characteristic of a pathological personality type or as a component in fantasy--e.g., Freud's (1910/1971) analysis of one type of romantic love; an analysis of the "God complex" (Jones, 1913/1964); Rokeach's (1964) study of "the three Christs of Ypsilanti"; case studies of excessively altruistic patients (Freud, 1966), and of rescue fantasies--e.g., saving the father (Abraham, 1922/1955), and the case of Anna O. (Karpe, 1961).

In considering an extreme condition fraught with life-threatening risks needed to save another person, several personality factors have been proposed regarding rescuers. London (1970) hypothesized adventurousness as a personality trait among the rescuers he interviewed. He contends that a sense of adventure initially motivated their behavior, while other factors sustained the long-term rescuing relationships.

Fogelman and Wiener's (1985) pilot research does not substantiate these early findings. Although some of the rescuers were in fact adventurous, the majority were not. This trait, however, did influence the way people rescued victims. Fogelman and Wiener found that feelings of independence and competence, and the ability to transcend fear, seemed to be prevalent personality traits among the rescuers interviewed.

Some theorists (Coopersmith, cited in Oliner, 1982; Midlarsky, 1984) consider competence an essential element in altruism. Midlarsky describes a "benign cycle" in which competence is a precursor to helping. Competence may be general or specific in nature and may be actual or perceived. Altruism is thus not entirely selfless, because being a successful helper enhances feelings of autonomy and competence.

Internal locus of control, related to perceived competence (Midlarsky, 1971) and to favorable self-concepts (Kuypers, 1972), is also related to altruism. Internal control is a belief in one's ability to influence events and bring about desired outcomes (Rotter, 1966). It would be expected to enhance the individual's likelihood to initiate action and to pursue goals actively, including goals that involve helping others. Strickland (1965), for example, found that internally controlled subjects were not only more apt to commit themselves to social action, but also were significantly more likely to have been active participants in the civil rights activities in the South.

Other investigators argue that the best predictor of altruism is "social intelligence." According to Burley (1977), when applied to altruism, social intelligence is a cognitive factor which is "the ability to sum up the precise need of the other in the situation, and to know what actions are required to best alleviate that need." The question of "social intelligence," however, is not really relevant in

considering rescuing activities during World War II. The needs of the victims were obvious; the rescuers needed only to determine whether their own resources--both physical and psychic--were able to affect the victims' situation.

Still other predictors of altruism include such dimensions as ego strength and resilience (Block & Block, 1973; Mussen, Harris, Rutherford, & Keasey, 1970) and affiliativeness (Bond & Phillips, 1971).

Despite interesting personality differences which researchers have noted, personality is not a conclusive determining factor. Gergen, Gergen, and Meter (1972), in a review article on measured individual traits and their correlation with helping behavior, concluded that individual differences do influence whether and how certain altruistic behaviors are performed. However, a single-factor correlational approach neglects the power of situational factors. Thus, they propose an integration of dispositional and situational factors.

Situational Factors

Social psychologists have contributed to an in-depth understanding of prosocial behavior by integrating the personality with the situation in which an act is performed. As Damico (1982) has stated: "We must keep in mind social psychologists' warning that individuals move in and out of different modes of reasoning depending on the structural

context that stands between men's intentions and their actions" (p. 427).

Theorists such as Staub (1970; 1978) and Midlarsky (1984) consider situational factors to be as important as a motivation to help. Midlarsky proposes that a model of helping should include "the motivational antecedents, the behavioral components and the consequences." After summarizing the research on Good Samaritan acts, Wrightsman (1972) concluded that there is no consistent evidence that sex differences, social class differences, or personality variables are predictive of prosocial behavior. What emerges in reviewing the literature is that "characteristics of the situation and of the request for help interact in complex ways with personal characteristics" (p. 202). Wrightsman suggests approaching further studies from a situational perspective. Rather than seek personal characteristics which predict behavior in all situations, it would be more fruitful to try to identify personal traits which are related to Good Samaritan acts in specific situations.

Situational factors include: (a) awareness of the need for help (Darley & Latané, 1968); (b) characteristics of the person in need of help (Schwartz, 1975); (c) attitudes toward the person in need of help (Lerner, 1975); (d) the skills necessary to help successfully (Barton, 1969; Huston, Geis, & Wright, 1976; Midlarsky, 1984); (e) the immediate affective state of the person who is being asked to help

(Rosenhan, 1981); and (f) being in a position which allows one to help (Huneke, 1981, 1985; Oliner, 1982).

While it may seem obvious that a potential helper ought to be aware of the other's needs in order to help or respond to a call for help, Latané and Darley (1970), who conducted field experiments of emergency situations, found that level of awareness of the needs of others varies among observers. Not all people perceive a situation similarly. Furthermore, the greater the number of witnesses there are to an emergency, the less likely it is that any single witness will take helpful action. This "diffusion of responsibility" deters many people from helping.

Henry (1985), who interviewed many Nazi-era bystanders in a German town, concludes that:

the main reason for the large numbers of bystanders as compared to the small number of helpers, [has] undoubtedly to do with whether or not people actually saw, understood, and made the proper assessment of what the Nazis had done and were planning to do to the Jewish population in Germany. (p. 9)

Consider the attributes of the person in need of help. In cases in which the person is a victim (e.g., persecuted minority, victim of crime, physically or emotionally disabled), the decision to help or not takes on a different meaning. According to Lerner's Just World Hypothesis (1975), there is a general belief or assumption that people get what they deserve. Thus, victims do not receive sympathy or compassion, but rather are devalued and shunned.

Schwartz (1975) was also interested in situational variables, along with individual characteristics and particularly how they interact to activate personal and humanitarian norms. Schwartz wanted to determine which individuals will offer aid to victims, and what factors will influence their decisions. Schwartz found that responsiveness to another's need cannot always be predicted from values and that attributes of the victim and the specific situation contribute to an individual's decision to render aid.

In a study of potential bone marrow donors, Schwartz (1970) found that attributes of a person in need of a transplant influenced the donor's decision. Individuals were more willing to donate bone marrow when the salient consequences for the victim were moderate, rather than mild or severe (e.g., a "young mother" was more likely to receive a donation than either a "young woman" or a "young mother with several children"). We may infer from Schwartz's findings that the likelihood of Holocaust victims being rescued would have been very slight, which in fact was the case. And furthermore, the person needing refuge, sustenance, information, or false identification may have played a role in whether or not a rescuing relationship developed.

A final question that needs to be addressed when it comes to altruism is its paradoxical nature. There are "self-rewards" rather than external material rewards which

serve to reinforce altruistic behavior (Berkowitz, 1966; Rosenhan, 1978; Rosenhan, Underwood, & Moore, 1974). As in other situations, helping Jews brought with it its own personal and unconscious rewards such as: narcissistic gratification of outwitting the Nazis; grandiose self-image; a sense of belonging; social acceptance (e.g., a maid who wanted to be part of the family is now in the role of parent who is teaching the child) (J. Kestenberg, personal communication, 1986); and other unconscious defenses (Freud, 1946; Lifton, 1976, 1983). As Rosenhan (1978) notes, self-reward can explain away the paradox of altruism without really increasing our understanding.

Summary

When we examine the literature of different disciplines reviewed above, it becomes clear that no field has restricted itself to a single method of inquiry. This study, conducted from a social psychological perspective, takes into account the complexity of the social psychological phenomenon under study. Embedded in a particular historical context, it requires an approach that addresses both individual and society.

On the one hand, thorough understanding of rescuing during the Holocaust must include knowledge of morality, motivation, and altruism (the province of developmental and personality psychologists). On the other hand, situational factors and conditions, political and social climate, and

existing communal dynamics must be considered (usually the work of sociologists). On a different dimension, there is the human relationship between people (e.g., obedience to authority--the domain of social psychologists).

Indicative of the larger need for a variety of distinct perspectives is the variety of viewpoints historians and political scientists bring to the study of the official institutions and governments that were instrumental in establishing rescue efforts, often more formal than the networks described in this literature. This study will draw on all these components in order to develop a coherent portrait of what facilitated an altruistic response under enormous threat to one's life.

The limitation of drawing upon components of personality theory, social psychological phenomena, developmental stages, sociological variables, and a historical context is that it will facilitate in answering many questions but ultimately fragment the rescuer self and the relationships which formed under life-threatening conditions. Therefore, a more integrative approach is warranted and can be derived from "the interplay between individual psychology and historical change or in 'psychohistorical process'" (Lifton, 1967). As Erikson (1969) teaches us:

the psycho-historian will want to inquire in some detail after the stage of life in which that actor acted, the recorder recorded, and the reviewer reviewed. He will want to learn about the place of that stage in the life cycles of each of these individuals; and he will want to relate their life cycles to the history of their communities. (p. 55)

Relating this to the rescuers' motivation, each one will have to be understood on their own merit not only at the time of rescue but in their previous and subsequent lives.

Though the initial design for this study was social psychological, its final analysis was based on the narrative and the "psychohistorical process" (Lifton, 1967). Despite the nuances and dimensions, what is common is humane action in an extreme situation. This approach will follow rescuers and some of the survivors they rescued to enlighten us about who they are as people. Perhaps we can then learn how it is possible to enhance similar behavior in everyday life.

Results of Pilot Study

The goal of a pilot study for this research conducted from 1981-1983⁴ was to suggest characteristics common among rescuers in terms of socialization, personality

⁴The study was started by Dr. John Slawson, Vice-President Emeritus of the American Jewish Committee, who awarded the initial funding to the Rescuer Project with Stephen P. Cohen as Principal Investigator and Eva Fogelman as Project Director. This study was conceived of by Dr. Slawson as the counterpart to the Authoritarian Personality Study which he commissioned in the forties. He was interested in the development of an altruistic personality scale validated on a sample of rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust which would be applicable to a general population. The theoretical and practical results are discussed in this section.

While Dr. Slawson's idea was important, the pilot study showed that it was nearly impossible to (a) validate a scale retrospectively after a 40-year interval, and (b) confine analysis of rescuing to a single personality variable such as "altruistic personality." Dr. Samuel Oliner, however, is continuing to pursue this line of research.

characteristics, and situational factors, all of which might be explored further. An additional goal was to explore the unique relationship between survivors and rescuers that developed in a given social context.

The method consisted of interviews with 17 Jewish survivors aided under Nazi occupation and 9 non-Jewish rescuers. The aims were: (a) to develop an interview schedule; (b) to develop a psychological scale for personality measures; and (c) to test previous hypotheses and generate new ones.

Previous hypotheses and findings on the socialization of rescuers were tested:

1. London's (1970) hypothesis that rescuers identify with a moralistic parent and have a sense of being socially marginal;

2. Rosenhan's (1970) finding that individuals who are strongly committed to a cause had parents who were actively committed to a moral or altruistic cause consistent with their beliefs.

3. In regard to personality, London's (1970) hypothesis that the rescue effort was prompted by spirit of adventure was examined.

Findings from the pilot study generated a classification of rescuing behavior which was reported in several publications (Fogelman, 1984; Fogelman & Wiener, 1985;

Wiener, Fogelman, & Cohen, 1985).⁵ The sample of rescuers was diverse in country of origin, religious orientation, socioeconomic position, and type of helping behavior. Subjects appeared to share, however, several motivations, personal characteristics, and socialization influences.

Two motivations prevailed, though they were not necessarily exclusive of one another. Some rescuers were influenced primarily by strong moral values. They had an ethical need to act altruistically based on convictions that all human beings are equal, which opposed the very essence of Nazi ideology. Religious convictions or strong anti-fascist political attitudes were the basis for this cognitive factor.

Other rescuers were emotionally motivated to risk their lives for a close relationship. For some, intense emotions seemed to arise from a combination of their empathy with the victim and their belief that they, too, could be victimized. Others had experienced a sense of helplessness when someone close to them had been victimized. Thus, rescuers were often impelled to act not only by a sense of moral duty, but also by emotional needs which were expressed by aiding a person in danger.

⁵After the conceptualization and design of the pilot study, Valerie Wiener was involved in the project for a brief period primarily in data analysis and report writing.

The most salient personality characteristic was an ability to tolerate risk. London's finding of adventurousness was evident in a few rescuers, though not in a significant number. Other characteristics were a sense of competence and independence, as reported in interviews.

As in Rosenhan's findings, in the early socialization of rescuers, parents whose actions were consistent with their values of helping or acting morally were a prevalent influence. In addition, many of the rescuers, during their formative years, were also actively engaged in their parent's or caretaker's helping activities.

The findings that emerged from this pilot study of rescuing during the Nazi era suggest that further hypothesis-testing would add to an understanding of altruism, moral behavior, and disobedience to a malevolent authority. A multidimensional approach would be necessary to examine individual behavior in a particular social context. No simple formulations could be expected to explain so complex a phenomenon.

The study yielded an interview schedule, a personality scale, and new hypotheses that provide direction for further research. The interview schedule was developed to test the original hypotheses and to assess the basic notion that altruism in an extreme situation is more than just a personality characteristic. The details of the interview tool are discussed in the Method section (Chapter III).

Since there was no existing measurement for rescuing behavior that involved life-threatening risk, an attempt was made to develop a Tendency to Help Profile (Fogelman & Wiener, 1983). The items unfortunately did not delineate sharply enough the distinctions between moral and emotional helping among a sample of 137 subjects recruited through a social network of the researchers.

From a factor analysis, using several different rotations, two helping dimensions emerged: a general helping dimension and a risk-taking helping dimension. General helping was positively correlated with having a parent who was perceived as a role model for helping; this correlation was even greater with mother as a role model helper. General helping was also positively correlated with a higher level of ego development. Risk-taking helping was not related to ego development. Males had higher scores than females in this dimension, indicating that they perceive themselves as more likely to take physical risks in order to help. A third dimension was formed by an acquiescence factor.
(p. 18)

It would take several years to develop a valid instrument, a project which seems inadvisable given the advanced age of most rescuers. In addition, actions occurring more than 40 years ago cannot be measured as if they were personality traits. The self-report method using a structured interview is more reliable for testing stable characteristics over a life span. As a consequence, the method selected for the proposed research was structured interviews. Accuracy and perspective are checked through interviews with pairs of rescuers and the survivors whom they rescued, and people who were involved together in the same efforts.

The rescue of European Jews is an extreme instance of altruistic behavior motivated and perpetuated by a set of complex variables. The interdisciplinary literature review and the pilot study serve as a basis for further analysis of the personal development of individual rescuers, different types of rescuers, and the processes which characterized rescuing relationships. Whereas previous researchers have examined individual key factors, the current study will integrate them in a multidimensional approach.

The Proposed Study

Moving beyond the pilot study of the antecedent causes of rescuing behavior during the Nazi era, the proposed study was embedded in the context of entire life spans of individuals: before, during, and after the Second World War. Although there are clearly problems associated with retrospective research (see p. 38), there are advantages as well. Examining whole lives allows one to distinguish those people who consistently helped before, during, and after the Holocaust (dispositional rescuers) from those who responded to the specific situation (situational rescuers).

In the proposed study, interpretations of rescuing behavior will include those elements which prior research has shown to be important:

1. Recognition of the historical context which gives different meaning to similar behaviors. The historical

context will be examined by comparing rescuing behavior in different countries, at different points during the war.

2. The sociology of rescuing will be studied, as in the past, through attention to variables of class, education, religion, and politics. The difference here will be that the effect of such variables will be interpreted in the context of history, individual and social psychology.

3. Research on socialization has pointed to the importance of early childhood experiences on adult altruistic behavior. This study will examine, in particular, the influence of early loss, parental altruistic behavior, values, discipline, and personal helping.

4. Competence, independence, disobedience to a malevolent authority, willingness to take responsibility, and an ability to transcend fears and anxiety are personality characteristics which seem to be associated with altruistic behavior. To the degree possible in a retrospective study, the extent to which these characteristics were present in rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust will be determined.

5. Research has shown that altruistic behavior can be facilitated, modified, or constrained depending on characteristics of the situation such as awareness, relationships with Jews or their sympathizers, personal skills, available resources, and so forth. Consistencies in situations, across places, time, and people, will be examined in this research.

To what degree is "rescue" part of a process of formative development? Do some people who rescue develop a "self" which accounts for such acts in many contexts? Do others begin to develop such a self under an extreme environmental situation (like World War II) and then continue on that path toward integrating that experience into a "new self"? Or do they revert (when circumstances change) to the way they were before?

By following the lives of rescuers before, during, and after the Holocaust with an emphasis on their relationships, values, and personalities, we will examine how the altruistic behavior fits into their sense of self. In addition, the survivors' perceptions of the rescuing relationship will also highlight the making of a rescuer.

Hypotheses

I. Socialization

In reviewing the literature on prosocial behavior, it appears that some people are helpful in a variety of situations throughout their life, while for others, only a particular situation elicits an altruistic response. All helpers can be expected to share some aspects of early socialization:

- a. parental discipline by verbal explanations rather than strict discipline with physical punishment;

- b. encouragement to be independent and positive reinforcement for competence;
- c. being taught tolerance as a value, i.e., learning that it is important not to stigmatize people who are different from oneself;
- d. exposure to positive or neutral nonderogatory parental discussions about Jews.

In addition, we would expect those who helped not only during the Holocaust, but also before and after it, to be more likely people who:

- a. had a parent, adult caretaker, or most influential person who performed altruistic deeds congruent with their moral principles;
- b. lost a parent or caretaker in early childhood and being cared for by another person;
- c. had a sibling born when they were about three years old whom they helped raise;
- d. participated in altruistic activities with a significant adult.

These development influences--like the rescue itself--have become part of these people's evolving selves: fundamental organizing principles that are partly psychological, but also moral.

II. Situational Variables

We would also expect that those who only helped during the Holocaust would have responded to specific situational pressures. These include:

- a. experiencing a loss immediately prior to engaging in rescue activity;
- b. suffering discrimination personally due to persecutory laws;
- c. being directly asked for help (as opposed to initiating help themselves);
- d. close contact with Jews immediately prior to Nazi occupation;
- e. awareness of Nazis' intentions to exterminate the Jews;
- f. personal witnessing of vandalism, dehumanization (including Jews wearing Stars of David, deportation), atrocities, and/or murder.

III. Personality Characteristics

The retrospective nature of the study limits the viability of measuring personality dimensions most likely to have been found among a group of rescuers: internal locus of control, high self-esteem, empathy, and risk-taking ability. There are, however, other fundamental attributes which are likely to be prevalent, can be discerned from self report, and will help us to learn what kind of people these rescuers are:

- a. independence;
 - b. competence;
 - c. ability to question authority;
 - d. willingness to stand up for beliefs;
 - e. high tolerance for risk-taking;
 - f. willingness to take responsibility;
- and less frequently,
- g. adventurousness.

The attention focused on this last characteristic is due to its prominence in prior research. Results of the pilot suggest the following hypotheses related to adventurousness:

1. Among a sample of rescuers, there will not be a significant number who report adventurous activities before and after the Holocaust.

2. Those rescuers who are found to be more adventurous will tend more than others to be those who became "professional rescuers" (i.e., their role as rescuers during the war became a full-time occupation).

3. Rescue activities of "professional rescuers" will most likely be adventurous in nature and varied, involving, for example, border crossings or courier role.

IV. Motivation for Altruistic Behavior

1. Motivation will be consistent with a coherent pattern of the self. In the pilot study, these different

motivational patterns were called emotionally oriented (a person is the center) or value oriented (an abstract principle is at the center). Emotional orientation is based on an emotional attachment in a relationship or identification with the other person's situation. A value orientation is related to moral convictions based on religious, ethical, or political values that formed the basis of strong anti-Nazi or anti-fascist attitudes. We will explore these patterns further in this research.

2. Contrary to Friedman's (1980a), Gilligan's (1981), and Klingemann's (1985) findings, there will be no significant differences between emotionally or value oriented motivation according to sex.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

To develop a social-psychological study of rescuing behavior that occurred approximately 40 years ago raises a unique set of methodological issues related to (a) selection of subjects and sample, (b) interview procedures and psychological measurements, and (c) analysis of the data gathered. In each area the procedures actually chosen had certain advantages, as well as certain unavoidable constraints and limitations.

Selection of Subjects and Sample

Selection of Subjects

Criteria for Subject Selection

The acts of rescue that are the focus of this study differ from the usual concept of small and simple acts of Good Samaritanism in a number of ways. They extended over periods of time ranging from one night to several years. They involved forming and maintaining human relationships whether or not the contact was direct. Most significantly, they required a specific kind of nonconformity which was punishable by death or incarceration.

The nature of rescuing behavior in this study requires an analysis not just of the rescuer, but of the rescued as well. Who the rescued was in relation to the rescuer, and how the relationship developed, often made a difference in the rescue activity. Thus, survivors who were aided or rescued were also interviewed.

Although rescue activities during Nazi occupation differ from the Good Samaritan concept (Wispé, 1972) there are some commonalities. The similarities are exemplified in McWilliams' (1978) criteria for extreme helpers, which were based on Wispé's model:

(a) The person repeatedly engages in acts of helping which are nonnormative and nonconforming; (b) there is no obligation to help according to the conventional morality; (c) the behavior is in some way costly to the actor; and (d) the helping is nonreciprocal: the helper expects little or no recompense from those who are helped. (p. 37)

Despite the diverse action and motivation of subjects, the criteria used to select rescuers were based on the theoretical models of altruism discussed above, as well as the criteria developed by Israel's Commission on the Righteous Among the Nations. Selection of subjects started out by following the criteria of the Commission's Martyrs and Heroes Remembrance Law, which was enacted in Israel in 1953 to recognize individuals worthy of the title "Righteous Among the Nations." Initially, this law merely mentioned "the high minded gentiles who risked their lives to save Jews," without defining who they were (Bejski, 1977).

An altruistic individual, family, or organization becomes eligible for the award of "Hassid/at Umot Haolam" (Hebrew for "Righteous Among the Nations") upon the submission of notarized testimony from two (preferably unrelated) witnesses to the special commission at Yad Vashem in Israel. This strict criteria was established in reaction to the discovery that during the war, some people had helped certain Jews while harming others. The submitted document must clearly demonstrate that the candidate did not perform acts of rescue for personal gain or participate in the Nazi machinery. Another important consideration is whether the candidate became engaged in rescue activities only once the defeat of the Germans seemed imminent; more than a few people hastily discontinued Nazi activities and attempted to secure their future as noncollaborators by saving Jewish lives at the tail end of the war. Finally, as "Hassid/at Umot Haolom" is reserved for those of other religions, it is also required that the rescuer have a non-Jewish family background. Though many Jews successfully disguised themselves as non-Jews and rescued their own kin, such people are not eligible for the award. It should also be noted that the controversy concerning the criteria used to evaluate who is considered a Jew in Israel today may either include or exclude certain potential rescuers from the award.

In order to broaden the range of possible interview subjects, certain of the Yad Vashem criteria have been augmented for the purpose of this study. A person was therefore considered a strong potential subject for interview when recognized or under review by the commission at Yad Vashem, or when personally recommended to the project by a survivor/rescuer. Other, less dependable sources of referral included references from those who knew of people who had rescued Jews during the war; children of survivors who knew about but had not witnessed their parents' war experience; rescuers honored or recognized by their own nations or by institutions other than Yad Vashem; resistance fighters whose direct help of people had previously remained undocumented; rescuers who directly sought out participation.

Given the above criteria for deciding who to interview, the selection of subjects presented interesting challenges and questions. Was a baptised person with a Jewish mother, and a nonpracticing Christian father to be considered a non-Jewish rescuer if they never lived as a Jew? According to Jewish law they would be considered Jewish. And was a person who was in the underground fighting Nazis and sabotaging their efforts at persecution a rescuer? After all, one might reason, success at inhibiting the Nazi machinery saved many lives indirectly. Was an infertile woman or couple who saved a Jewish child considered

altruistic, or opportunistic if one suspected they risked their lives in order to have a much-desired child to raise? For purposes of subject selection, should the sample include people who gained economically from the rescuing relationship that developed? Finally rather than projecting a decision as to eligibility before interviewing the subject in question, each case was decided on its own merit. This proved a wise decision, as it became clear through interviewing that rescuers fall into many different categories broadly defined according to whether they aided Jews directly, engaged primarily in sabotage activities, or were anti-Nazi bystanders. These subtleties would not have emerged had a priori rules been established concerning prospective subjects. There were instances of false positives and false negatives, but for the most part, these were rare.

Process of Locating Subjects

Over the past five years rescuers were found through a number of channels, both formal and serendipitous. The most official means was to procure names and addresses from the Department of Righteous Among the Nations of Yad Vashem with the hope that the people would still be alive and residing in the same locale as when they were honored. Though this seemed like the most expedient and logical route to pursue it proved otherwise.

From 1962 to December 31, 1986, the Commission of Yad Vashem honored 6,948 individuals involved in 4,042 cases (e.g., a family is considered one case). This Department hasn't the financial means or personnel to follow up these individuals--an impossible task in many cases as names and addresses of rescuers and the survivors who nominated them were never collected or recorded in any systematic way. For example, when giving testimony for a rescuer, a survivor may have used a maiden name. As marital changes were not at the time reflected in the record keeping, both rescuer and survivor became impossible to locate. This was the state of affairs when the Rescuer Project began to seek subjects in 1981. Since that time the greater attention given rescuers in the media and among scholars facilitated change in the Department of Righteous Among the Nations; this new attendance to detail has--even within the past year--simplified the task of locating rescuers in Israel.

Although there is no update of where rescuing individuals live today, statistics have been updated to reflect the countries in which their rescue activity took place (see Table 1). Because of a lack of systemized documentation, archival research was initiated. Some files documenting rescuers residing in the United States and Germany were reviewed in order to assess the probability of finding them alive. Some rescuers were honored posthumously; others, already in their sixties when they received recognition, had

Table 1

Breakdown by Country of Cases and Individuals Handled by
Yad Vashem 1962-1986

Country	Cases	Individuals involved in all cases
Holland	1,579	2,972
Poland	1,202	2,074
France	303	428
Belgium	247	415
Germany/Austria	214	290
Russia/Ukraine	55	79
Lithuania	88	144
Latvia/Estonia	9	13
Yugoslavia	32	57
Czechoslovakia	46	95
Hungary	80	110
Italy	89	136
Greece	39	60
Romania	20	29
Bulgaria	10	10
Other countries	29	35
Total	4,042	6,948

perhaps died in the intervening years. An additional list exists of hundreds of rescuers whose merit for the award of "Righteous Among the Nations" is still under review.

A sure way to meet rescuers about to be honored by Yad Vashem was to attend their ceremonies in Israel, the United States, or other countries where an Israeli Consulate serves to represent the State of Israel.

A second major route to locating potential subjects was via survivors who were saved by non-Jews. In June of 1981, a World Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors took place in Israel. The conference provided an opportunity to circulate questionnaires to survivors who were perhaps in contact with the people who had helped them during the war years. Survivors' reactions to the notion of who is a "rescuer" in some ways set the tone for the kinds of subjects eventually included in the sample. Survivors were reluctant to recommend "rescuers" who charged them high fees for hiding places, identification papers, or aid in crossing borders. Though they acknowledged the risks taken by these non-Jews, survivors did not feel indebted to those who demanded payment for their assistance. It also became evident that survivors often did not know the real names of their saviors--particularly when they had been aided by anonymous members of resistance groups and underground networks based on religious or political ideology. A few survivors were ambivalent about identifying their rescuer(s)

because they suspected pro-Nazi sentiments; in one case, for example, a Jewish concentration camp inmate was aided by an SS doctor. Encounters with survivors over the course of the project were a constant reminder of the importance of interviewing survivors for reliability in cases of survivor-rescuer pairs. Survivors often provided information helpful in locating rescuers who had remained unrecognized by authorized institutions such as Yad Vashem; above all they provided valuable insight into the dynamics of rescuing relationships.

It should also be noted that those survivors who were children under the age of 13 at the onset of persecution were even more reluctant than adult survivors to have their rescuers contacted. Through the Jerome Riker International Study of Organized Persecution of Children¹ interviews were conducted with child survivors who were rescued. Information was also gathered from several sessions with this group (approximately 20 people) which focused on their rescuing relationship.

Many names were gathered through survivors, but the majority of rescuers have stayed in their indigenous

¹A psychohistorical study of those who suffered from legalized persecution of children and those who witnessed it as children during the Nazi era. Under the direction of Dr. Judith Kestenberg and Milton Kestenberg, systematic data are being collected from archival material, literature, and interviews.

country--hence more than a few referrals were impossible to follow up. On occasions when reunions between survivors and rescuers in the United States were televised, immediate efforts were made to locate the people. Other rescuers were located through survivors who responded to (a) advertisements, (b) articles on the pilot study, and (c) posters at national and international gatherings of Holocaust survivors, which called for both rescued survivors and non-Jewish rescuers to contact the project.

These grass roots efforts generated dozens of names but the limitations of funds made it almost impossible to continue interviewing beyond the Greater New York area. Several alternatives emerged which initially seemed genuine possibilities for gaining access to interviews despite the lack of financial resources. In the spring of 1983, Samuel Oliner, Project Director of the Altruistic Personality Study, asked if the two projects could merge under his directorship. Arrangements were made to exchange data with the understanding that I would make use of the above data to pursue a more broad social psychological approach for a doctoral dissertation as well as to participate as an Associate of the Altruistic Personality Project.

During my two-year involvement, several preliminary articles reflecting the Rescuer Project were published in popular American magazines in which the merger of the two projects was announced. As a result, American publishers

began to approach the Altruistic Personality Project. Despite the collaborative nature of the work, Oliner signed an exclusive book contract with his wife and his statistician, informing all the associates that at a future date another book would perhaps be published jointly. When I requested access to the data, I received a revised contract stating that unless I agreed to not publish any study on the rescuers for four years, except in dissertation form, I would be denied access to the previously agreed upon data.

It took me over a year to gain access to several of the Altruistic Personality Project interviews. I have yet to get back the interview tapes (30 with survivors, over 20 with rescuers) which I handed over; when I finally received the interview transcripts, they had been severely edited and many were unusable. So much for academic cooperation.

Another fruitless attempt at collecting data was at the historic conference, Faith in Humankind: Rescuers of Jews During the Nazi Era, sponsored by the United States Holocaust Memorial Council in 1984.² This event provided a great opportunity to interview rescuers from Canada and the United States and to make initial contacts with rescuers which could later be followed up. But due to financial limitations, very few rescuers were invited to the

²Under the Chairmanship of Professor Elie Wiesel. See also Rittner/Myers (1986).

conference from abroad. Nevertheless, rescuer individuals, couples, and families who until the conference had been strangers expressed a feeling of bondedness and sense of belonging together. This was particularly true for those people who had rescued anonymously; never before had they had an opportunity to share memories and feelings with lost comrades or with the unknown people they helped. These rescuers often knew only one or two other people in their network, and many of these comrades had since died. At the conference, these often-isolated rescuers began to meet people from other networks and countries of rescue in an effort to overcome their shared sense of alienation. Parenthetically, several have continued to maintain contact and develop friendships.

Because of time limitations at this two-day conference, my interviewing schedule was shortened and a team of people was trained to conduct the interviews according to the edited schedule. This rare opportunity to conduct longer, in-depth interviews was not fully realized because of exigencies of time and money. Again I never received copies of the promised transcripts because the conference coordinators decided to use the material for a book themselves.

Despite these false starts at building a substantial sample I was determined to find a feasible way to collect my own data. Though my ideas were incorporated into the Altruistic Personality Project and the interviews conducted

at the Rescuer Conference, I have come to appreciate the importance of the role of the researcher in this very personal work.

In the spring of 1986 I was invited by the Diaspora Museum at Tel-Aviv University to lecture on the rescuers. This gave me an opportunity to resume my archival work and to attend a ceremony to honor a Polish rescuer. The importance of the celebration of goodness, what Schulweis has coined as "Yom Todah," Day of Thanks, was highlighted when the survivors and their rescuer came to the workshop we conducted at the Diaspora Museum. The participants had an opportunity to personally share memories of the rescue as well as its aftermath. The people in the room had never met a rescuer and their response was to doubt the altruism and grill the survivor about the rescuer's motivation. The difficulty of accepting people who acted humanely toward the victims rejuvenated my motivation to continue to understand the rescuers.

The search for rescuers residing in Israel was hastened by an updated list prepared by Yad Vashem on my next visit in the winter of 1986. Israeli television and newspapers had reported on the dire living conditions of some of these people which prompted the Israeli Parliament to convene a special session to investigate their economic needs. The Department of Righteous Among the Nations arranged for social services and special events. The interviews for

this study coincidentally followed this flurry of national attention.

Several months later, in the summer of 1986, Harold Schulweis founded the Foundation to Sustain Righteous Christians. For over 25 years he has befriended rescuers, facilitated reunions between rescuers and those they saved, and in essence became a one-man social service agency providing for rescuers in their waning years. One rescuer I interviewed remarked, "If it wasn't for Rabbi Schulweis no one would ever know what happened to me during the Nazi occupation in Poland and I never would have been reunited with the children I saved." Like the survivors who were rarely called upon to bear witness to atrocity, a conspiracy of silence prevailed about acts of goodness in the midst of evil. The Foundation, which I now direct, has several goals: to actively search for non-Jewish rescuers; to record their experience for the historical record; to facilitate the process of honoring them locally and at Yad Vashem; to assess the rescuer's social, emotional, and financial circumstances; and to respond to their needs so they can live out their remaining years in dignity.

In order to insure that psychological barriers on the part of survivors would not interfere in the important process of recognizing and rewarding altruism, Schulweis (1986) wrote an "appeal to Jewish Holocaust survivors" which was published in newspapers and magazines. It is a moral plea:

to lend dignity to the remaining life of these extraordinary human beings who would not join those who found reasons not to help. Jews have a unique stake in this witness. Surviving Jews possess a double memory: one of unspeakable evil and of incredible good.

Schulweis's call for converting rhetoric into action has indeed inspired survivors to search for their rescuers and to understand their own varying reactions to having been a helpless victim.

The active search for rescuers sheds light on other dimensions of the survivor-rescuer relationship which are beyond the scope of the current study. Essential to an understanding of the present sample of known rescuers is the significant fact that very few survivors have gone through the official channel of having their protectors recognized. The role of survivors is crucial in documentation of rescuer history; survivors are also critical to our understanding of psychological dynamics.

By its very existence the Foundation to Sustain Righteous Christians has given survivors the support they need to begin to face those traumatic years. Since its formation, many survivors have been inspired to write testimonies to Yad Vashem, to make immediate contact with their rescuers, or to let us know about rescuers who are in dire condition, without the financial means or social support they desperately need. One woman called to say:

I always meant to be in touch with my college classmate who hid me in Hungary but somehow, whenever I tried to get a visa it got too complicated so I gave up. I read

what Rabbi Schulweis wrote and suddenly I realized if I don't act today it will probably be too late. I found her and this time did not give up until I got her a plane ticket to come to the United States for a visit. She is sitting right here now. What should I do to get her recognized?

Immediate plans were made to interview her for this study.

In recent months the publicity about the Foundation has generated dozens more rescuers who for practical reasons could not be interviewed. Over this five year period one never knew where an interviewee might be found; in fact, I often came upon rescuers by sheer accident. A German-born friend of mine who was purchasing a typewriter ribbon recognized the store owner's accent as German. In the course of their conversation, the store owner revealed that he was a Jew who was saved by a German Christian woman he later married. This rare case had never been documented because the rescuer did not want to be recognized for having done "the right thing."

Serendipity, however, also functioned contrarily. Talking at a party to a woman in her sixties who had come from Poland to visit her children, I was reticent to bring up the war years despite my curiosity. Only after she had returned to Poland did I happen to meet with her daughter, who told me that her mother, a non-Jew, had rescued her father, a Jew, along with others in a hospital in Lvov. Efforts are currently being made to interview the rescuer in Poland.

The difficult search for rescuers described above would have been easier, perhaps, with availability of funds. But lack of funding was not the only reason I ran into problems. I am reminded of the early efforts we made to have data collected in Germany under the auspices of the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung. Unfortunately, in the spring of 1982 German society was not ready to confront the rescuers. (However, recent dialogues with young Germans confronting their past have proved most fruitful.) In Israel, the whereabouts of the rescuers were not readily available. In America, the survivors who helped organize the Rescuer Conference were concerned that a focus on the courage to care would undermine the unique and unprecedented historical event of Hitler's Final Solution. As for myself, the odyssey of gathering a subject sample brought me closer to my worlds: to Europe, that lost world of my parents . . . into which, I was born; to Israel, where I spent the early part of my childhood; and to the United States where I have chosen to live as an adult, even though I have never fully come to accept it as my home. Europe, Israel, America--I am often conscious of embodying them all, and I can't help but conclude that despite my so-called "objectivity," and "methodology," even the most basic act of locating prospective subjects can intimately reflect one's subjectivity.

This prolonged and arduous search for rescuers and survivors who were rescued has left many on the waiting

list. For purposes of this study the details of the survivor sample (N = 100) will be highlighted when it is significant to our understanding of the rescuers. The sources that ultimately gave me access to a sample of 110 rescuers and 4 resisters included in this study fall into the following groupings. It should be mentioned that in some cases more than one referral source was operative. For example, a reunion between a survivor and rescuer which was televised was easily followed up because the researcher's family knew the people involved and was informed about it prior to the media event.

Referral Sources for Rescuers

Source	Number of rescuers
Rescuers of Jews Conference, Wash., DC and other research projects	48
Yad Vashem Archives	37
Serendipity	12
Israeli Consulates in US	8
Survivors	6
Well Known Rescuers (published)	5
Media Coverage of Reunions	4
Other Rescuers	2

It is also important to mention that of all the rescuers contacted very few refused to be interviewed. Some accepted the appointment with reluctance, some were neutral, while others were more eager. Rescuers themselves have not approached the project to be interviewed, although one rescuer called the Foundation about getting recognized-- she had agonized for many months and finally picked up the phone. Though she has warm, loving relations with the people she rescued they never gave her name to Yad Vashem and she does not want to ask. Recognition is important to her because of personal circumstances and because she feels there should be an historical record so that future persecutions might be prevented. For most other potential rescuers there was always an intervention of a third party or a serendipitous situation whereby I realized that I was talking to a potential interviewee. In a few cases a survivor would not share the name of the rescuer for confidential reasons as a way of protecting the rescuer who wanted to remain anonymous. Details of the interview process will follow a description of this nonrandom sample.

Description of Sample

The number of subjects interviewed as potential non-Jewish rescuers totalled 114. The interview process revealed different types of rescuers and clarified behaviors that do not fit the criteria as previously discussed. Only

a few cases (4) of young adults who participated in anti-Nazi resistance groups did not exemplify extraordinary direct aid to Jews. Prior to being interviewed none claimed to be rescuers per se.

In one case, despite the strong anti-Nazi sentiments and empathy for the plight of the Jews, protest was negligible, and the man continues to be plagued with guilt for not having done more. Since the war he has been intimately involved with Jews, and with the Peace and Anti-Nuclear Movement. Most recently he has been writing and speaking about lessons of the Holocaust, and in particular highlighting the necessity of resistance to oppressive regimes. Another person, though somewhat more active, was not as compassionate about the persecution of Jews. The continuity for her is also to teach young people today to learn from the past. The other two were very actively engaged in military resistance but were incarcerated in the early stages of the war, thus curtailing the possibility to help others. One, an adolescent boy, was released toward the end of the war, and recommenced his sabotage of war machinery while his parents hid Jews.

Another sampling question which presented itself was the religiosity of two of the rescuers. One woman was a Jew according to Jewish law, but did not identify herself as such. While growing up her family was not religious, and she lived disguised as a non-Jew throughout the war,

managing to save family members as well as others. Today she thinks of herself as Jewish, although she is not religious. The other was also legally a Jew but religion was not practiced in his home and his Jewish identity was not in question during the war because he was not operating in his indigenous country. He does not consider himself religious today. A few suspected they had some Jewish blood from a grandparent or their real father. In such cases creative fantasy developed and was absorbed in the evolving rescuer self.

For purposes of examining sociological variables 100 cases of rescuers will comprise this part of the sample.³ The resistance fighters, bystanders, and Jews described above will not be part of the quantitative analysis.

In order to understand this complex rare behavior, numerous sampling variables were included to follow-up on previous research as well as to gain a greater understanding of the rescuers individually and as a group. These will include: sex, age, nationality, religion, political orientation, socioeconomic status, education, occupation, marital status, and offspring. In addition, early formative influences will be specified: siblings and their order,

³The eight interviews which will not be used for the quantitative analysis are included and referred to in the qualitative analysis. Some of the missing data were difficult to recapture because of geographical distance.

early losses, religiosity, political orientation, and altruism of parental role models, as well as their style of discipline, encouragement of independence, competence, tolerance for people who are different, and relations and attitudes toward Jews. The rescuers' personalities will be examined in relation to: altruism, ability to stand up for beliefs, obedience to authority, independence, competence, adventurousness, ability to take responsibility, and sense of belonging.

As for the rescuing behavior itself, how it got started, the degree of activity, how and with whom it was carried out will provide the overview for the qualitative method ultimately used for an in-depth understanding of the process of rescue within each person, in relation to those they helped and their surroundings.

Sociological Variables

This is a group of men and women ranging in age from early fifties to nineties, of European descent who currently reside in North America ($\underline{n}$ = 59), Israel ($\underline{n}$ = 20), and several European countries ($\underline{n}$ = 21) (see Table 2). With the exception of two, they have all been married, only a few got divorced, and a handful did not bear their own children. There are significantly more women than men in this sample ($\underline{n}$ = 67 women; $\underline{n}$ = 33 men). In terms of age, what is interesting is that during the period of rescue, 12 subjects

Table 2

Location of Rescuers in This Sample

Country	Birth	Childhood	War years	Now
Poland	38	37	37	9
Holland	30	30	30	3
Germany	9	9	9	5
France	4	4	4	4
Belgium	3	3	3	0
Czechoslovakia	3	3	3	0
Hungary	2	2	2	0
Ukraine	2	3	3	0
Latvia	2	2	0	0
Bulgaria	2	2	2	0
East Prussia	1	1	0	0
Yugoslavia	1	1	1	0
Switzerland	1	0	1	1
Denmark	1	1	1	0
Algeria	1	0	0	0
United States	0	0	0	52
Israel	0	0	0	20
Canada	0	0	0	7

were children ages 5 to early twenties. A few of the young adults were considered children because their decision to rescue, and their continued role as rescuers, was based on their parents asking for their cooperation. (In one case it was compliance with a spouse.) On the surface they appear to come from all strata of society.

The majority (79%) of rescuers in this sample left Europe after World War II. The main reasons were to escape continued personal persecution, wanting to leave the war years behind, a need to be close to those they rescued, and for some, the pursuit of a better standard of living. Those who emigrated to Israel had their own unique set of motivations. As a group, they were either philo-Semites throughout their lives, or were transformed as a result of the rescuing relationship. They wanted to be with the Jewish people, not just with those they had saved. One of the survivors was so grateful to her rescuer she promised to give her anything she wanted (it should be noted that this had no bearing on the initial motivation). The rescuer asked that she find her a Jewish husband. She had intended to go to Palestine whether she married a Jew or not, but managed to find one on the way, having converted to Judaism shortly after the war. For some, the deep attachment to the Jewish people and land started before the war. One Seventh Day Adventist believed the Old Testament to be the only authentic truth. When he read that Zionists were emigrating

to Palestine in the thirties he wanted to join them. It was not until the seventies that his dream came true.

Going against the norm of their society left some rescuers friendless and isolated after the war. Being with the Jews gave them a new sense of belonging to replace the isolation and alienation they experienced in their own societies after liberation. This search for community went beyond the here and now and extended to the after life, that is, wanting to be buried with the Jews. Some did not necessarily seek a new community but wished to join their loved ones whom they had rescued or befriended after the war. Believing Israel to be the Jewish land, they were instrumental rather than just compliant in the move.

With the fluctuation of borders in Europe before and during the war, one's national identity was not secure. It is beyond the scope of this analysis to elaborate on the changes of boundaries except to say that it is an important factor to take into consideration in understanding individual reactions to the German invasion of their country. Early influences of nationalism could affect one's sense of security and belonging which may or may not have increased tolerance to people who are different. In the sample this factor was a rare occurrence rather than the norm. In one case, a woman living in Czechoslovakia was a Bohemian German and never considered herself Czech. When the Germans invaded she first lost her job, but ironically was later

reclaimed to a higher managerial position because of her Bohemian German background.

Other sociological factors under consideration relate to socioeconomic variables. In general this is a diverse group. What is significant is that during the war the majority were very much affected economically. The few very wealthy people had their property confiscated by the Nazis and later by Communist regimes.

Socialization Variables

The formative developmental years of rescuers have significant commonalities despite differences in education, social class, politics, and religion. The most consistent influence is an altruistic parent or significant other person. Eighty-nine percent of the rescuers vividly described a parental or other role model who was always or often engaged in helping others as a part of their everyday life.

A second major influence is parental teachings of tolerance for people who are different from oneself (81%--adjusting for missing data, the valid percentage is 88).

Analyzing their tolerance more directly toward Jews we observe that 26% of their parental figures had no discussions about Jews, 30% conveyed very positive and exuberant feelings about Jews, and 10% had positive but not necessarily exuberant discussions. Only 2% had some derogatory

remarks regarding Jews, 1% were very hostile, and 5% had mixed reactions both positive and negative. Six percent of the rescuers' parents spoke about Jews favorably in religious terms, about having a positive connection with them through the Bible, rather than through any particular individual.

A different measure which increased tolerance was having a family background of a mixed religious marriage. Approximately 16% came from such families.

There were no significant differences between the religiosity of the mothers and fathers of the rescuers (51% of the mothers being "very religious," compared to 46% of the fathers).

In 28% of the families at least one parent was "very political," i.e., being an active member of a political party and an active participant. Fifty-one percent were not politically active and approximately 47% had no political orientation. Parents who had political views reflect membership in the following parties: religious parties (16%), communist and socialist parties (12%), liberal and democratic parties (9%), nationalist parties (7%), anti-Nazi parties (6%), labor parties (2%), and fascist parties (1%).

A third factor is parental encouragement of independence and competence (74% and 83% respectively). These two factors are significantly correlated ($r = .77$, $p < .001$).

For the most part rescuers experienced "fair" discipline with limited or no physical punishment. Twenty-four percent perceived their fathers as strict disciplinarians with an additional 11% perceiving their fathers as often strict. This was accompanied by constant physical punishment in only a few cases (2% always, 4% often, and 16% sometimes). More efforts were spent on verbal discipline (51% disciplined verbally "always" or "sometimes").

The mothers were somewhat less strict (10% always, 6% often, and 18% sometimes). The mothers' approach to discipline was rarely physical punishment (1% always, 5% often, 11% sometimes). The majority never physically punished their children (73.3% "never"; 8% "rarely"). Approximately 6% of the mothers used verbal discipline.

A formative developmental influence unrelated to direct parental socialization is the experience of a personal significant loss or major illness (76% of the rescuers). These losses were of a parent, sibling, other close relations, or guardians. In a few cases this category reflects loss due to the family moving during childhood. For some, the loss was a temporary separation from fathers serving in the army during World War I. A few of the rescuers lost many siblings and are the only, or among the few siblings to remain alive. Hence, death imagery played a major role in many of their early childhoods.

The birth order data show almost half of the sample were first born (44%) of fairly large families ranging from 1 to 17 children with a mean of 6.4. Also, a similar percentage (49%) had a sibling born after them when they were between 2 and 3 years old. Sixteen percent were an only child.

Personal Characteristics

The following self-report measures show that there was a tendency for rescuers to be independent as adolescents (85% of the sample, always or often), competent (83%), willing to stand up for beliefs (85%), willing to take responsibility (85%), have a sense of belonging (74%), and altruistic (74%). The continuity of helping in childhood and adulthood is true for 66% of the rescuers. Also, the rescuers are fearless (61%) and adventurous (57%), two characteristics which are significantly correlated at .001 level of significance. Even though the rescuers as a group do not appear to have a high level of fearlessness, in the extreme situation they had the ability to transcend their fears and carry out dangerous activities.

Socially, these rescuers are not isolates or loners (29%). A few in this group were forced into isolation because of prolonged illness. The other 61% had a sense of belonging to their community and society. As children they obeyed authority. Those who reported disobeying (31%) were

not necessarily rebellious types. Their disobedience was a reaction to an authority figure whom they did not agree with morally. As in every group a few did rebel more directly against their parents' values about early relationships with the opposite sex or a desire to leave home for more freedom.

Although no systematic effort was made to get a random sample the group is diverse in terms of social class, educational levels, political and religious orientations, etc. Their proportions, however, may not necessarily reflect which group was significantly more involved in aiding Jews. Thus, no definite speculations can be made at this time about sociological variables except as they relate to our different types of rescuers discussed in the next chapter (see Chapter IV, Results).

In summary, rescuers share a role model for tolerance, altruistic behavior consistent with their beliefs, encouragement for independence and competence, fair discipline, formative developmental influences of a significant loss, a sibling born after themselves, and personality characteristics such as independence, competence, ability to stand up for beliefs, altruistic behavior, willingness to take responsibility, and an ability to transcend fears and anxieties.

All of the above are part of the "rescuer self." How this kind of person developed awareness of the impending death of Jews and how they came to take responsibility for

saving lives will be systematically reviewed after the method of interviewing and data analysis are described.

Interview Process

Much preparation was necessary for the main method of data collection, namely semistructured interviews with rescuers and survivors. The method changed several times over the five year period during which interviews were conducted. In order to have uniform and reliable data approximately 60% of the rescuers were interviewed at least twice and 10% more than twice.

In the initial phase, authorities in history, literature, political science, psychological measurements, and methodology were sought for advice on how best to study a psychological phenomenon which occurred over 40 years ago. Case records were read at Yad Vashem which included survivor testimonies, articles, and at times the rescuer's own report. Compilations of rescue stories from Poland and Germany as well as biographies, autobiographies, histories, pioneering psychological studies, and films were reviewed.

In addition several rescued survivors were interviewed. This preliminary work which lasted 8 months set the stage for interviewing the first rescuer using Perry London's pioneering interview schedule as a model. Though I am a trained clinician and have years of experience interviewing Holocaust survivors, I did not know when I undertook this

research what to expect of rescuers, and most important, what would be most useful to ask. In fact, some important aspects of the self and rescuing relationships were not included in initial interviews.

For example, several years into the project the researcher read McWilliams' (1979) study on extreme helpers, which alerted her to the relevance of early losses and sibling(s) being born when the rescuer was 2 to 3 years old. Since these facts were rarely mentioned casually in the interview, the interviewer's direction would be necessary to elicit such information. Thus the initial interview was revised several times. However, the overall structure of the interview remained constant. This included classifying information into pre-war, war-time, and post-war categories, and asking closed-ended questions interspersed with more open-ended inquiries.⁴

The researcher was referred to her first rescuer by the survivor who had been hidden in the small kitchen of the rescuer's one-room apartment. The rescuer prepared for the interview by writing names, dates, and places. She was

⁴During my two-year involvement with the Altruistic Personality Project, the interview schedule was also revised several times to incorporate new ideas and to eliminate ways of asking questions that were frustrating to the rescuers. The final version including psychological scales for locus of control, empathy, self-esteem, and risk-taking scales, in addition to structured questions about childhood, role models, perceptions of personality characters, and a more open-ended narrative of the rescue story.

rather surprised how much she remembered and that she had so much to say.

A warm bond developed between interviewer and rescuer in the course of the interview. I next saw her at the Israeli Consulate when she was recognized as a "Righteous Among the Nations." Not until several years later would I understand her in comparison to the other rescuers and know now what to ask, but in the meantime she had passed away. I can now analyze the interview and know what is missing from my "real" understanding of the rescuer. I also know that one interview session is insufficient to acquire a deep understanding of the person.

Later, after my revisions, the interview process started with an initial contact most often made by telephone, occasionally by letter, and sometimes on the spot and spontaneously. One rescuer had an unlisted number so I took a chance and appeared at her doorstep for the initial encounter. A woman opened the door and said, "How can I help you?"---I knew it was the right address. The researchers⁵ introduced themselves as associated with a university and briefly described the referral source and the nature of the project.

⁵Interviews were mainly conducted by the researcher (75%). Whenever it was physically impossible to meet a rescuer, trained interviewers were assigned the task. Seven interviews were obtained from the Altruistic Personality Project, and these rescuers were unavailable for reinterview.

Most rescuers immediately consented to the interview, but often prefaced their reply by explaining that they had nothing to say. Some were puzzled as to why researchers would be interested in their experiences. In a few instances, rescuers asked the interviewer to call back because of illness in the family or because they had just been bombarded by the media. Of all those contacted, only one continually cancelled appointments and after several years the researchers gave up. A few refused to be interviewed and some did not want to continue with a second interview.

After an appointment was made, the interviewer inquired as to the whereabouts of the rescuer before and during the war, and determined the rescuer's preferred language in which to conduct the interview. Certain interviews required the assistance of a translator, who was provided either by the interviewer or interviewee and was acceptable to both. Interviews were conducted in English, German, Polish, Dutch, French, Greek, Hebrew, Russian, Bulgarian, and Hungarian. Most interviews took place at the home of the rescuer.

The interview began with the usual formalities of introductions, a brief explanation of the study, a request for permission to record the interview on tape, and the obtaining of a signed release form. Although the pattern of the interview (i.e., to ask the interviewee about his or her life before, during, and after the war) was constant, some

specific questions changed over time (for example, most influential person in upbringing, details of loss in early childhood, self perception, and helping after the Holocaust).

Interviewees were asked where and when they were born, what their lives were like while growing up, what they remembered about the origins of the family, and what kind of experiences they had outside the home with school, friends, and neighbors. Questions then focused on mother, father, sibling order, most influential person, losses, personal characteristics, on relationships with peers, Jews, and authority. The interview was then guided to the war years, awareness of events leading up to the extermination of the Jews, and specific involvement in rescuing. This was discussed in great detail, in order to develop a chronology of the rescuing relationship, the motivation, and the exact circumstances which impeded or enhanced the likelihood of taking a risk. The interviewee was then guided to discuss major life events leading to the present, the quality of life, and, if they had left their homeland, the circumstances under which they had departed.

The format of the interview was not rigid, although some structured questions (see Appendix for details) would always be included into the ebb and flow of the interview. Occasionally, the interviewer used this opportunity to uncover feelings not directly related to the interview

schedule. In these cases, the interviewer assessed how much tangential material it was necessary for the person to share in order to continue the interview comfortably.

Given that the behavior being examined occurred more than 40 years ago, we cannot reliably measure personality variables such as locus of control, self-esteem, empathy, and risk-taking and expect them to have remained constant (Messick, personal communication, 1986). Nevertheless, self report of various dimensions were elicited about altruism, independence, competence, obedience to malevolent authority, ability to stand up for beliefs, sense of belonging, and leadership.

Interviews varied in their substance and tone. Differences in educational background meant a myriad of communication levels. Some rescuers were more emotional, others more reserved. Others resorted to being histrionic as a way of avoiding their deeper feelings.

Interviewing rescuers for a second time was extremely beneficial and necessary. The atmosphere was freer and the information acquired often more personal. The initial relationship developed between rescuer and researcher facilitated a deeper level of openness, enabling the rescuer to share secrets, express unresolved feelings about himself, the survivors, or others. Most importantly, the sequence of events was clarified and the interviewer began to visualize and feel what actually happened. There was an alliance

between rescuer and researcher to come to a clear understanding of how the person got started in the rescue and how it proceeded.

Once the rescue story was told, personal details about family of origin were answered with greater ease as opposed to some initial responses of "what do I need to tell you that for?" Rescuers who had been interviewed several times for other purposes remarked how this felt different, that other interviewers did not get to know them in such depth.

Even though few people actually refused to participate in the study, the interviewer was not always welcomed. Rescuers share survivors' struggles of overcoming the death encounter and a traumatic series of events. The survivor constellation of feeling and not feeling, paradoxical guilt, shame, and the struggle for meaning are part of the rescuer in varying degrees (Lifton, 1979). Some are still denying, while others have intense feelings. A smaller group has found meaning in their experience by speaking, political action, emigrating to Israel, and/or continuing altruism in their present day life.

The reaction to the interview process can best be comprehended by an awareness of the rescuers' mode of integrating and coping with the residual pain and trauma of confrontation with death and moral conflicts and dilemmas.

Rescuers who are still denying their life and death struggle resisted having to answer too many personal

questions. For those who were confronting intense feelings the interview provided an opportunity to unburden themselves and start integrating past and present.

For rescuers with unresolved feelings about their activities, be it paradoxical guilt, a feeling of not doing enough, or shame about what they did to save a life, the retelling of events was often out of sequence, and with gaps in the narration. The sequence of events was rather lengthy and disjointed, and/or those they rescued did not come to life as flesh and blood people.

When feelings about the rescue are more or less conflict-free, or when the rescuer has shared his or her conflicting emotions, rescue activities and relationships in particular are more easily understood by the interviewer. If the rescuer has unresolved conflicts, one or two interviews were not sufficient to elicit the quality of the rescue relationship as it existed under life-threatening conditions. For example, Hilde D. talked in detail about a woman she rescued, but avoided discussing in detail the man she loved and tried to save because it was too painful (he killed himself toward the end of the war).

In another case, Kurt S. left his wife and children prior to the war because of political differences; after the war he learned that the children had been told their father was dead. He felt compelled to move to another city and eventually to another country; he never looked for his

children and because of his tremendous guilt did not want it on the interview record that he had been married with children before the war. The interview was done by a family member, who knowing the truth, filled in the gaps of the taped record of the interview. (This fact was not revealed in a second interview with another interviewer.) The omission of parts of such a painful past makes us question whether or not important life events, particularly where guilt and shame are involved, ever became part of the record. In such cases it was especially important to do more than one interview with the person and at times with another interviewer.

In another interview Dieter J. appeared open and revealed rather personal information and feelings. When the interview was over and I was at the door, he said rather directly that I shouldn't think he had revealed everything about himself. I acknowledged how difficult it is to share such intimate details with a complete stranger as I was, and that I did not expect that he should be ready to let me know everything about himself in such a short meeting. Of course, I was specifically curious about the one particular fact that he had a need to conceal from me. Here again we see the necessity for more than one interview.

Those who were actively searching for meaning did not have a uniform response. A few were writing books, one was waiting for movie rights, and they were worried that the

researcher's writing might undermine their own efforts to achieve recognition. Those who had already published books said "read my book" to practically every other question, when in fact the autobiography often omitted pertinent family background and other relevant information.

On the whole, most rescuers were cooperative, which of course goes along with the rescuer's strong desire to help people. In this case, many rescuers felt they were helping me with the research project and the dissertation. At times their desire to assist me was made very clear in the interview. Personally, they didn't want to review their life experiences, but to be helpful they were willing to go through with the interview process.

Problems in Interviewing

One of the most problematic issues during the interview sessions was the interference of a spouse. The complex role of the translator was also problematic in some of the interviews.

At the onset of an interview, when it was not possible to meet with the rescuer alone, the other party inevitably interfered, answering intimate questions for the rescuer. The researcher had therefore to be stern, and often had to ask the rescuer to repeat everything in their own words. Similar problems arose with translators, who told the story in their own words as opposed to hearing what the rescuer

had to say and then translating. Like Milgram's Cyranoids, "repeaters of words" (as reported by Colligan, 1980), translators could not just be mouth pieces and repeat questions with the same inflection, or even accurately relay the researcher's questions. If they thought an inquiry was too personal, or if the rescuer was resisting, then the translator protected the rescuer from confrontation with a painful feeling; if the translator was uncomfortable with intense emotions, they would not continue to probe; if the translator was getting emotional the interview would end prematurely.

A second major problem was other interviewers. Though the majority of the interviews were conducted by the researcher, at times other trained interviewers were called upon. Various problems arose which highlighted the important role of the interviewer.

One of the interviewers was a concentration camp survivor who did not experience the kindness of non-Jews during the Nazi era. He was hesitant about believing the person sitting in front of him. He experienced difficulty listening and answers had to be repeated several times. The interviewee became aware that he was not heard, and became angry because it was annoying to have to repeat oneself several times. After this recurred in a few interviews it became clear that the survivor was not ready to confront the past in such a way.

Another clinically trained interviewer who was eager to assist in the project read a few books on the Holocaust and, with some training, went off to do the first interview. She was overwhelmed with information and feelings, and because she was not immersed enough in the European culture and the sequence of the German invasion, the interviewee proceeded to give her a history lesson in order to feel assured that his story would be understood in its proper context.

In summary, the interviewer had to guide the rescuer to focus very closely and concretely on the sequence of events and experience, what Lifton calls the "narrative sequence" of becoming a rescuer. Questions of feelings and images in relation to that sequence are crucial.

The progression of before, during, and after the Holocaust need not be as rigid. The interview follows more naturally if the researcher allows the rescuer or survivor to navigate the discussion. By being too rigid, as was the case in many of the first interviews, the rescuers' emotions are too controlled by the interviewer. Though it may be more difficult to follow a story from the middle, ultimately it may be more revealing about the rescuer. A balance had to be reached between what the rescuer and survivor wanted to share and what the researcher hoped to gain by the interview approach. As for the structured questions, they could always be added on at the end. They did not need to interfere with a more clinical type of interview.

Data Analysis

A reason analysis procedure (Lazarsfeld, 1953) was applied to explain the motivation for altruistic behavior.

Kadushin (1968) argues that:

reason analysis is the method to be preferred if one or more of the following conditions hold true: a process is being studied; the act is extremely frequent or extremely infrequent; only those performing the act can be conveniently located or followed. (p. 340)

He further elaborates on a design for such study which sets the framework for the analysis of the interview.

Factors are analyzed from the actor's perception; interviewer and/or coder provide clinical assessment; variables are systematically clustered into smaller groups (Kadushin, 1968, p. 341).

The main source of data was the interview with the rescuer and survivor. Each interview was transcribed and those which were done in foreign languages were translated into English.

A preliminary coding sheet was filled out by the interviewer during and after the interview. This coding sheet (see Appendix C) served to standardized responses to open-ended questions such as "On what occasion did you become aware of what the Nazis intended to do to the Jews?"

On the preliminary coding sheet the interviewer distilled long anecdotes into phrases, such as "Rescuer witnessed deportation, beatings, vandalization of Jewish property, dead or emaciated bodies, marches . . ." and so

on. This initial coding sheet standardized questions ranging from social class, religious beliefs, educational level, values learned in childhood, to the rescuer's helping activity after the war. Like the interview schedule this preliminary coding sheet was divided chronologically into three sections; childhood; adolescence; the war years; after the war. Because the interviews took place over a period of five years it was necessary to restandardize the coding before attempting the final reason analysis.

For the final analysis there were two coders for each interview; a small subsample (10 interviews) were coded by a third person. Rather than getting a reliability measure, the two coders would come to a consensus when there was a discrepancy. For the most part it often required an additional interview because the information was not sufficient for a coder to assess sequences and motivation to rescue.

To gain further clarity the preliminary coding sheet which combined 341 variables was further distilled down to 211 variables. We then designed a tandem three-page coding summary sheet (see Appendix D). The first page of this summary, "Motivation for First Rescue," delineated all variables directly related to the analysis of the motivation for the first rescue activity. The coders systematically analyzed these variables from the actor perspective (motivation as described by the rescuer-interviewee in narrative interview) and from the coder's perspective. It had become

clear over the course of the interviews that each rescuer engaged in a first rescue activity which initiated them into rescuing. Sometimes a person was asked for help or they were personally motivated and offered help. But many times the initial rescue had no discernible beginning point and the rescuer neither initiated help nor responded to a request. Therefore, it was often difficult to get a clear picture of the first rescue activity. We therefore began to "draw" a "narrative sequence" of the events that led to the rescue activity, the first rescue act, and a skeletal picture of the rescuers' overall activity during the war years. Finally, we recorded direct quotes from the rescuers concerning motivation to rescue, e.g., "We want everybody to live." On the basis of the motivation variables, the narrative sequence, and the subjects' stated motivation the coder chose an evaluation of either (I) active, (II) reactive, or (III) both active and reactive.

The second page, "Predisposing factors," evaluated the most salient personality characteristics and formative developmental influences of the rescuer.

The final page, "Assessment of Rescuer's Continuity of Self," evaluated helping behavior before, during, and after the war. This summary page also examined how and whether the rescuer integrated the rescuer self into his or her post-war life (e.g., contact with rescuees, giving speeches or writing about the war years, discussion with children and

friends, and so forth). Finally, we determined whether the subject was in a state of denial of the past, a state of unresolved emotional conflicts, or at a point where they could engage in a search for meaningful ways to integrate their rescuer self and rescuing relationships.

In order to form groups or "clusters" of rescuers with similar motivations, a final one-page coding sheet was designed. This one-pager merged information from both the longer 211 variable coding sheet and the three-page motivation and continuity summary (see Appendix D). When transferring information to the final one-pager the two coders came to a consensus on motivational type (active, reactive, or both) and initiation of rescue activity. Precise types of rescuers (e.g., Philo-Semitic, Moral-Emotional, Detached-Professional, etc.) emerged while analyzing the data contained on the one-page coding sheet.

Initially we felt that the degree of rescue and how the rescue act began (e.g., response or initiation) as well as relationship factors would determine the types of rescuers. But these aspects of rescuing behavior did not give us the holistic types that the rescuers' continuities of self seemed to hint at. The two coders separated the one-page summary sheets into groups according to motivation as perceived by the subject and coders. It was at this stage of the coding that the 100 rescuers fell into the five motivational categories delineated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

For some rescuers, the process of transformation from bystander to rescuer was directly related to a gradual but increasing commitment to an anti-Nazi or religious ideology. For others, the rescue act was triggered by a sudden awareness of an imminent death of either a loved one, acquaintance, or total stranger. But when evaluating a rescue story it is often difficult to discern exactly how the rescue activity began. Was the act part of ongoing continuity, or a sudden change in behavior? Rarely had a subject considered exactly how their rescue activity began; in order to locate a starting point each rescuer had to be carefully led by the interviewer to focus specifically on the sequence of events leading to the initial rescue act.

For rescuers, not only how, but why they got started is a troubling question and the interviewer is often faced with discomfort and annoyance. "Why ask such a question?" they parry. "How else should one react when human life is endangered?" For many it was never a question of shall I risk my life? but rather, how can I live with myself if I let these people die? For some, the extreme situation had summoned a response from the core of their being; this

response seems to them instinctual and quite unrelated to any previous experience. Many betrayed embarrassment over not having a set of ready explanations that might please or impress the researcher; others, who, like survivors, felt their experience was impossible to impart or share with anyone who had not lived through the war found the very investigation of motivation ludicrous. Another dimension of this negative response is that a residual self-condemnation is triggered by the question. When motivation is explored, the rescuer self responds by feeling, "I should have done more," often disregarding the limitations which confronted them at the time.

Eliciting the motivation and starting point of rescue is not alone sufficient to deepen our understanding of a complex mode of interaction. An examination of the rescuers' childhood, the pre- and post-war self is also necessary. Rescuing relationships are as psychologically diverse as the rescuers themselves. Developmental similarities emerge when one examines early childhood and socialization factors and distinguishing these similarities from the nuances of an individual rescuer's unique life experience renders a clearer picture of the rescuer self.

In this sample five types of rescuers emerged. From the most prevalent to the least common the types are: Moral rescuers (i.e., those with a very strong sense of right and wrong); Relational Philo-Semites (i.e., those who had

intimate relationships with Jews and/or an affinity for Jewish people, culture, or religion); Ideological-Network rescuers (i.e., those with strong anti-Nazi values, positive attitudes toward Jews, and strong moral convictions); Children (i.e., those who began rescue activity by complying with parents' wishes, and who continued with or without their parents); Concerned-Detached Professionals (i.e., those who instead of belonging to a network, initiated or maintained their rescue activity through their profession, either within or outside the Nazi bureaucracy).

It should be noted that, as with any categorization, the individuals who comprise these five groups are not always pure types. For example, several Moral Rescuers were religiously and/or emotionally motivated. In such cases the most salient rescue characteristic of the subject was used.

What follows is a closer look at each type with cases to illustrate the continuity of self in each of the groups. By viewing motivation in terms of event sequence, variations between the types clearly emerge. The analysis begins with the most predominant group, Moral Rescuers, and moves to the least common type, the Detached Professional.

Moral Rescuers

Morality is derived from a number of sources and finds its expression in different ways according to attitudes, beliefs, and emotions. This category, which accounted for

the highest proportion of rescuers (32%), can be divided into three moral types:

1. Ideological-Moral rescuers: morality based on ethical behavior and justice; moral convictions which maintain a sense of self. (14%)

2. Religious-Moral rescuers: morality that stems from religious beliefs and a sense of moral duty to be "thy neighbor's keeper." Some religiously motivated fundamentalist rescuers believed in the "chosenness" of the Jewish people and felt a spiritual connection with the Jews through the Bible and Jesus. (12%)

3. Emotional-Moral rescuers: feelings of pity and compassion for the victims motivate these rescuers to act humanely. (6%)

Moral rescuers can be distinguished from other types by examining how their helping activity began. Moral rescuers often require a trigger event to precipitate a latent altruistic response. They are asked to help, or they undergo what Lifton refers to as a "transforming moment" which inspires them to actively initiate help. Transforming moments usually involve an encounter with death, which leave a person with indelible images as vivid today as they were 40 years ago.

Of the Emotional-Moral rescuers, 2 out of 6 initiated; of the Ideological-Moral rescuers 4 out of 9 initiated; of the Religious-Moral only 1 out of 11 initiated. In all, 22% of the Moral Rescuers rescued on their own initiative.

Prior relationship with Jews is not a chief motivating force in any of the Moral Rescuers. For moral types, rescue is most often a response to the specter of threatening human life. One such rescuer, who saved many Jews, also carried a wounded Nazi to their headquarters, and described the impulse to help as something which transcended boundaries.

Emotional-Moral and Religious-Moral rescuers were more involved in saving children (66% emotional, 58% religious) than Ideological-Moral rescuers (43% ideological).

Based upon the coder's perception, 50% of the Emotional-Moral types became "professional rescuers," meaning they carried out more than five separate incidents of rescue. Among the Religious-Moral and Ideological-Moral 42% and 43% respectively attributed to the degree of rescue activity. Emotional response did not prevent Emotional-Moral rescuers from engaging in risky or active rescue. Emotional-Moral rescuers were as able as any other group to transcend their fears and anxieties; most went on to carry out more than five incidents of rescue, and to save between 20 to 30 people. "Professional rescuers" in other type groups saved more people--but this could easily be attributed to the fact that fewer Moral Rescuers were members of networks.

Of the Moral Rescuers, those in the Religious-Moral subgroup were more likely to belong to a network, which was usually a part of their church. Religious Moral rescuers

were also more political than other subgroups; these two commitments were often combined in members of religious political parties such as the Anti-Revolutionary and Christian Historical Parties in Holland. Nine out of 12 Religious-Moral rescuers had very religious upbringings, while 7 out of the 12 had parents with strong political commitment as well. Over the years, these rescuers have continued their religious lives, a few even describe an intensification of their religious beliefs. Political involvement, however, tended to diminish somewhat with post-war years.

Political involvement in the Moral Rescuer group was most prevalent among the Ideological-Moral rescuers. Of these, 4 belonged to socialist/communist parties, while 2 belonged to nationalist parties.

As children, Religious-Moral rescuers experienced strict parental discipline, often accompanied by physical punishment. Emotional and Ideological-Moral rescuers experienced milder parental discipline; their parents exhibited a greater degree of willingness to use verbal rather than physical discipline.

Some early developmental influences are consistent in all rescuer types. In particular, parental values such as tolerance for differences and parenting styles which encouraged independence and competence emerge common to all rescuers in this sample. Altruistic parental role models are also prevalent.

Moral rescuers should not be seen as saints. Though some may have a strong identification with and love for Jesus, they emerge as complex human beings who struggled to make the right moral choice. When human lives were endangered by Nazi oppression, their "immediate selves" (Lifton, 1978) emerged.

Ideological-Moral Rescuers

This subgroup of moral rescuers comprises 14% of all rescuers. A congruence between moral beliefs and actions was ingrained in this group of rescuers since early childhood. Ninety-three percent of their parents were altruistic and as children 86% of them were also engaged in altruistic behavior as well. These rescuers had a strong ability to stand up for their beliefs; thus when asked to aid people whose lives were threatened it was egosyntonic for them to respond in the affirmative. Their moral values are an integral part of the self and they act accordingly. However, morality in itself is usually not sufficient to initiate extraordinary help in the extreme situation.

It takes a trigger to transform the person's morality into action. The trigger is either being asked to help by the person in need or a third party, or having a transforming encounter, a deep awareness of impending death to a specific person or group of people. During the Holocaust such experiences, in large cities in particular, could have

been a daily occurrence if one was open to allowing death imagery to penetrate the inner being. Few of the Ideological-Moral rescuers became professional rescuers. For the most part they respond to a need.

After the war 57% continued helping activities in their daily lives. Most said they would risk their lives again were it to become necessary. Those who initiated their rescuing relationships continue to initiate moral acts after the war as well.

For the moral rescuers, the rarest mode of initiation of the rescue activity was the active response. Those few moral rescuers who did initiate rescue acted out of highly developed conscience and sense of responsibility as well as a deep capacity for empathy. These rescuers were not asked for help--they made a conscious decision and an active effort to do something.

A transforming encounter occurs when witness of an event so assaults one's sense of decency and humanity that one is forever transfigured. Rescuers frequently describe witnessing (prior to rescue) scenes of degradation or brutalization of innocent Jewish victims. These scenes vividly demonstrated the inhumanity of Nazi governmental policy; the sight of old people or children being beaten often touched their inner core, activating moral values which had been developed in early life.

The active, altruistic response to a scene of humiliation or violence is a rare behavioral occurrence. Stanley Milgram's obedience studies concluded that while the majority of people state with great certainty that they would not actively harm another human being, people hesitate when asked whether they would risk their own lives to save a stranger, acquaintance, or even a friend. Total affirmatives are almost impossible to find. Most people give much consideration to the danger of the moment, and finally conclude, "I don't think I would do it." Others doubt they would risk their lives, even though they would like to think of themselves as "good people." Though they would ideally like to be able to come to the aid of a helpless victim, deep down, they say, they are not really certain they would risk their own lives.

The degree of empathy with the victim is the operative factor in the potential of a witnessed act of violence to assume transforming power. There are those who give more weight to their own potential danger than to the immediate danger of the victim before them. Those who display a lack of empathy are more concerned with self-preserving behavior. People who have a high ability to project themselves into the situation of the victim, people who can say, "What if that were me, or my mother, or my child?" are much more likely to throw self-preservation behavior to the winds. The empathy that most people block for reasons of survival

is a key characteristic to the rescuer who emerges out of an indifferent populace. It is through empathy that conscience develops. Witness the text of the "golden rule": "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." This teaching implies empathy or identification with the person on the receiving end of any act, good or ill.

Nazi propaganda, like all wartime propaganda, dehumanized the enemy. To dehumanize is to attempt to destroy the natural human capacity for empathy: "How can I, an Aryan, identify with one of an inferior race?" The hierarchical structure of Nazi racism attractively placed the "superior" Aryan race above the base and "defiled" Jews. Nazi propaganda was not brainwashing, but the buttressing of natural self-preserving response; by making it easier not to empathize with the Jewish victims who were presented as less than human, Nazi propaganda became an integral part of the Final Solution. "It is all right as long as it is only Jews," the populace was encouraged to believe. "They don't respond as we do."

At the opposite end of the empathy spectrum, rescuers possess an all-inclusive notion of humanity. The holistic sense that "people are people" is a prerequisite for identification with helpless victims. The conscience includes everyone and does not distinguish between insiders and outsiders--regardless of the frame of reference, be it ethnic, national, religious, or even familial. In a

transforming moment, the conscience of the empathic heroic witness fulfills its all-embracing potential and transcends human-made boundaries.

Paradoxically, a very strong sense of self is necessary for the development of a holistic, all-embracing conscience. When the sense of self develops through antagonistic relationships with people delineated as "outsiders," rather than from consideration of each individual's intrinsic qualities, the self is more likely to become threatened, and to defensively build impenetrable walls.

The following case study of Wanda L., a Polish rescuer, illuminates the salient characteristics of the rare, active response in an Ideological-Moral rescuer.

Wanda L. was an 18-year old nursing student living in a dormitory away from her Polish upper-class Catholic family when Germany began to bomb Poland. On September 1, 1939 she was walking to the hospital for her shift when she saw "a big, heavy group of airplanes." As she looked up she saw something fall from one of the planes and then another, and suddenly a building near her exploded.

Wanda L. was pulled into a ditch. The explosions continued, the entire neighborhood started to burn, some people were screaming for help while others lay silent, killed instantly. She raced straight to the hospital and worked round-the-clock shifts, hardly stopping to think about the destruction she had witnessed.

As the Nazis advanced through Poland, approaching the hospital, some of the senior nurses decided to join the Polish Army. Wanda L. followed suit. But they fled the Nazis only to back into the Russians, who were attacking the sectors which had been allotted to Stalin in his pact with Hitler. Wanda L., an ardent Polish nationalist, was shocked that her army had been defeated so quickly. Soon the medical team had no choice but to head toward the Ukraine to join the Polish Resistance.

Just before Christmas, at the height of the frigid Ukrainian winter, the group arrived in a small village. Wanda was assigned guard duty as the others went into town to barter tobacco and coffee for food. Russians entered the town and captured her friends. Wanda was raped and beaten, then left for dead in the forest outside the village. Luckily she was found and taken to a hospital where a woman doctor helped her overcome her physical and emotional trauma.

Once she had recovered, Wanda L. continued to work as a nurse in the infectious disease unit of a P.O.W. camp. In 1941, she decided to take advantage of an exchange of Polish prisoners between Russia and Germany in order to find her family. When she got into Poland she discovered her home town had been occupied by the Germans, so she boarded a train to Radom, a nearby city.

The train ride to Radom was a nightmare. The train cars were unhooked en route, and the passengers were quarantined. They were stripped, sprayed, and put back in barracks separating men from women, though children were allowed to remain with their mothers. It was in quarantine that Wanda L. first learned of the Nazi deportation of the Jews.

After three weeks, the group was released and Wanda L. made her way to Radom. To her surprise and delight, she discovered that her family had moved there as well and were living in an attic. Everyone was holding down some kind of menial job to help support the family: her father, who had been an architect and chemist and was being chased by the Nazis for his technical expertise, was making shoes. Wanda joined her sister to work in a restaurant.

In September of 1941 the Germans found and took away Wanda L.'s father. Her mother followed him back to their town and instructed Wanda L. and her sister to stay in Radom, warning them to beware of Germans who were looking for blonde, blue-eyed girls and turning them into prostitutes. Wanda was assigned to work in an ammunition factory. Weakened by anemia, she one day fainted on the job. When she regained consciousness she was taken to the ranking German officer in the area. She pleaded with him in German to allow her to continue working. The Major, impressed with her knowledge of German, offered her another

position. She was to report the following day to the hotel in town which served as the Nazi officers' club. There she was to work as a waitress and busgirl. Her direct superior would be the Major. Her first day on the job, Wanda noticed barbed wire and a phalanx of Gestapo guards behind the hotel.

A short time after Wanda began work at the hotel, her sister lost her job. Wanda L. asked the Major to give her sister work. As it happened, a Nazi ball was in preparation, and they were in need of extra help. Wanda's sister joined her at the Nazi club.

Several days before the ball, Wanda L. heard shooting and cries for help from behind the hotel. She ran to the window, wrenched the drapes apart, and saw the Gestapo shooting men, women, and children. The victims were hopelessly attempting to outrun or dodge the bullets. The Major walked into the room and put his hand over Wanda L.'s mouth, warning her to shut the curtains so as not to be thought a Jew-lover. He explained that behind the barbed wire there was a ghetto for vermin and the Gestapo was just moving them out. He said it was not her business, or his for that matter.

So much food was left over from the ball that Wanda L. asked the Major if she could take some home. He agreed, and Wanda and her sister placed the food in the ghetto through a loose spot in the fence. This became a daily ritual; each

day after work, Wanda and her sister brought food to the ghetto.

Soon after, Wanda L. and her sister were given two days off. Upon their return they discovered SS men had removed the barbed wire and were shooting into a mass of people in the ghetto, shepherding people with rifles into a death march. Wanda and her sister were forced to stand and watch from across the street:

If I close my eyes I can still see them. It was a horror. I noticed there a Rabbi. I thought he was a Rabbi because he was an old man with white hair and yarmulke and he held a scroll in his hands. Then I saw a beautiful blonde woman very heavy in her ninth month of pregnancy, and another woman with a wounded leg. She walked slowly, a little girl was holding her skirt, and there were many crippled men, hobbling on crutches. There were young boys, too, like from the Yeshiva with payos, pale, tall, like walking skeletons. One of the women I saw was married to a Polish man and he came running from the street calling her name, and when he reached the line of marchers, he was shot and fell to the ground.

Then I saw another woman with a crying baby in her arms. One of the Gestapo was yelling at the baby, "Shut up! Shut up! Quiet! Stop yelling!" The mother tried to get down the baby. She opened her blouse and tried to breast feed, but her baby was scared, or cold or in pain because it was just crying. Then with one movement of his arm, the Gestapo officer pulled the baby from its mother's arms, took it by the feet and threw it with the head to the ground. The baby was instantly quiet. But you know, I will never forget the inhuman shrilling scream that the mother let out as she jumped to reach her child. With one bullet to her head she was laying next to her child. Old men started to pray and were beaten with revolvers over their head till they bled.

When the German officer ripped the baby from the Jewish mother's arms, Wanda L.'s impulse was to strangle him with

her bare hands. But she was afraid. All she could do at that moment was watch.

When the sisters returned to the Nazi officers club to resume work, the Major (who Wanda L. calls a "good German") noticed their red eyes and let them go home for the day. As they were walking home they could hear shooting, and they decided to follow some Gestapo. When they arrived at the edge of the village, she saw a mass of shallow graves. The Gestapo stood people in front of the graves and opened fire with machine guns. "The ones that were dead were lucky, but many of them were buried alive," she said. Gestapo guards prevented her from getting too close, but even at that distance, "The earth was shaking with the breath of those who had been buried alive."

When Wanda L., a deeply religious person, witnessed these events, she was thrust into a profound crisis of belief. That night she prayed, "'little children. I know we grown ups are sinners how can God allow children to die?' Then I asked God to give me responsibility, to bring me the opportunity to help, even if my own life should be taken. That day, I made a covenant with God and asked him for the opportunity to do something."

In 1942, when the Major was assigned to head an ammunition factory near the Russian border at Tarnopol, he brought Wanda L. and her sister along with him. Wanda L. quickly discovered there were 300 Jews working at the

factory. Eavesdropping on the Major's dinner conversations with the local Gestapo, she learned that young healthy Jews were being picked from the ghetto to work in a labor camp. When Wanda was given the additional responsibility of supervising the laundry, she was thrown into close contact with a dozen Jews who had come there from the ghetto.

At first, the Jews did not trust her. But after some time they became friends. When one woman wanted to visit her parents in the ghetto, Wanda L. managed to procure a pass from the Major. When on the following day, the woman had not returned from her visit, Wanda L. became extremely worried.

She had lied to the Major, telling him that the woman had been sewing dresses for two German secretaries and needed to bring them to the ghetto to make buttonholes. Once the woman was still missing, Wanda L. asked the Major for permission to go and look for her.

It was the day after a raid on the ghetto, and what I saw was unbelievable. . . . It was an unbelievable feeling, first of all to see blood everywhere. Then you feel that people are looking at you, but you cannot look at them. I went to the house of her parents . . . nobody was there. And when I started calling her name I found she was hiding under the stairs. Having heard my voice she came out of her hiding place. I told her that the raid was over, and that she should come with me. But she didn't want to come. Her parents had been taken away and she didn't care anymore. I put all kinds of things in her basket and with the pass we got out. I played a German fraulein at the gate and said she had to carry my things.

After this incident Wanda L. listened in on Gestapo mealtime conversation more carefully. She began to recognize the signs of raid-planning activities and to carry messages or warning to the laundry room. Jews working there would then supply the news to those behind the ghetto walls, thereby saving untold lives.

One day the head of the Gestapo informed the Major that the entire ghetto would be liquidated in June. Wanda L. realized this meant that her friends in the laundry room were about to be deported. They pleaded with her, but Wanda was helpless. She wanted to help but knew no one with enough room to hide a dozen people. She prayed and wracked her brains day and night for a solution.

A few days before the final liquidation of the ghetto, the Major was assigned new living quarters. When Wanda L. saw the villa he was to move into, she rejoiced, feeling that God had sent her a way to save her friends. She asked them to hang on for a short while, until the last remaining families were evacuated from the villa. Six decided not to wait, and fled to the forest.

The remaining Jews had to be kept safely hidden. Wanda L. locked them in the laundry room, a dodge she had used during previous raids, but was still worried for their safety.

When the officers were spending the evening at the theater, Wanda L. found a way to hide her friends in the air

vents of the hotel. The following morning, June 23, 1943, Wanda awoke to explosions, and the sound of gunfire. She left her room to check on the refugees, but a member of the Gestapo stopped her with orders to search the house. Petrified, she continued on her way.

When she reached the hideout, she found her friends in desperation. They had heard the gunfire and were certain they would be taken by the Germans. Wanda L. scolded them for being pessimistic, reminding them how much they had come through already. Today she remembers feeling as if "God was with me even though I still had no idea how I would transport my friends from the house to the villa."

That night, when the Germans were fast asleep after a drinking bout, Wanda L. stole the keys to the villa from the Major and locked his door behind her. One by one she moved them down the coal chute to the villa's cellar.

The next morning the Major asked her if she would mind supervising some painters who were coming to spruce up the villa, and she jumped at the opportunity. When she got to the cellar her friends were gone but there were 12 other Jews, "looking like desperate little children," waiting for her. Without taking time for introductions, Wanda L. moved everyone from the cellar to the attic, because the cellar was scheduled to be painted first.

It was the end of June, and the windowless attic was unbearably hot. Wanda locked the Jews in, promising to

return with food and a chamber pot. She looks back on this day as the most frightening day of her life. "I remember trying to serve lunch while simultaneously manipulating the workers away from where the people were hiding. Then we discovered that the architect, who was Jewish, had known what was coming and had built in a hiding place." Underneath the coal chute was a crawl space from which one could reach a hiding place under the garden. Wanda packed food, water, and a pot and escorted the group to their new hideout.

One night, one of the Gestapo took his fraulein for a romantic rendezvous in the gazebo. Wanda was afraid that the people below would be caught, especially since one of them had a cold and was using a pillow to muffle the sound of her coughing. It was impossible to warn them directly, so Wanda decided to divert the couple with a light snack and drinks. The Gestapo was furious and yelled at her for interrupting them--but his shouts served as a warning to those beneath the gazebo that someone was there. Fortunately, he took his lady to a more secluded area, and the people in hiding were safe.

Aside from providing for the 12 unknown Jews under the gazebo, Wanda L. regularly brought food to the forest where her 6 Jewish friends were hiding out with over 200 others. She had always known there was danger in helping Jews, but one day in September the penalties were made graphically

clear. Wanda L. was shopping in the town when she saw a Polish family, children and all, hung with a Jewish couple and their young child in the center of the marketplace. The public hanging was the Nazis' way of letting the villagers know what would happen to those who befriended Jews.

After witnessing the fate of those "Jew-lovers," Wanda L. was more careful about taking precautions such as locking doors from the inside, so that outsiders would have to ring a bell before entering. The strategem failed at a crucial moment, however, when the Major opened his kitchen door to find four unknown Jews and his "faithful" Polish servant preparing food for the others in hiding.

Wanda L. had no choice but to throw herself at the Major's feet and beg for mercy. "They are my friends," she remembers pleading. "I had to help them. I couldn't let them die. Nobody had a right to kill. If you cannot forgive me I will have to give my life. There is nothing else I can do."

The Major dismissed Wanda L., saying they would discuss everything later. When Wanda L. went back to her friends, she found them ready to commit suicide. She begged them to wait. Later that evening, the Major summoned Wanda to his room. He pulled her onto his lap, and then took her to his bed. Eventually, he promised to let the Jews stay. Wanda never told the people whose lives she had saved what she had done to make their safety possible.

The Major became accustomed to the Jews. He grew to enjoy their cooking and baking, and called them by their first names, while they called him "grandpa." They all lived together in this manner until February 1944, when the Russians were forcing the Third Reich out of Poland. Orders came from Berlin to evacuate the villa.

Though the Major was quite nervous, Wanda L. refused to abandon the Jews in the villa. "In a war you never know how long it will be before rescue comes," she explains today. Wanda was even protective of the life of an unborn baby in her band of refugees. One of the women had gotten pregnant and wanted to abort. Wanda would hear nothing of it. "I saw so many babies killed," she said to the mother-to-be, "so please don't do it. You'll see--you'll be free by the time your time comes. You will be liberated." Wanda L. was right.

For Wanda L., the liberation by the Red Army was not the end of the war, but the beginning of a different kind of survival. She joined the partisans in an attempt to get back her home town. When she had almost reached her destination, the Russians overran the whole country and she was arrested because of her association with the partisans.

Although Wanda L. never reached a position of any real importance in the partisan movement, she nevertheless had been a messenger and knew of a great many other members. She refused to divulge any of their names under Russian

interrogation, and was able to relay a desperate message to the people she had saved. After ten days, she escaped, was provided with false identity papers, and smuggled to Germany. Her mother and sister were arrested because of her escape; her father had long since been killed by the Germans.

Wanda L.'s active response to persecution of Jews endangered her life for several years. She could have simply continued to serve the Nazis breakfast, lunch, and dinner, without having to live with the constant fear of discovery. One might even expect that because she personally had suffered so much and survived, she would be even more inured to the sight of the suffering of others. She could easily avoid her own responsibility to help by rationalizing that she had already paid her dues in the war; others, who were more secure, should take the chances. Instead she chose to risk her own survival so that complete strangers might have a chance to live. The reasons she made this choice seem clearer when one hears the narrative of her early life. Far from being a break with a former self, Wanda L.'s decision to risk death and to help was very much influenced by her upbringing.

Wanda L. has warm memories of growing up as a Catholic in a close, well-to-do family which moved around a great deal due to her father's work as an architect. She began our interview by thanking her parents.

My mother was a wonderful woman who always had an open heart for anybody who needed help. Many gypsies came to her in winter when they were cold and sick. She always helped, and her motto in life was to always be ready to be helpful. My father worked with people of many different nationalities. He never said "he is a Jew" or "she is a gypsy." Some were Jews . . . and we played and grew up together.

One of these youngsters was a sickly Jewish girl whose mother loved Wanda L. and was very appreciative of the time Wanda spent with her daughter. Wanda reported a transforming early experience of witnessing the Black Madonna, a statue which thousands of sick or crippled visitors flocked to every summer in hopes of a miracle cure. Wanda L.'s sensitivity to illness and belief in the healing power of both friendship and faith became even more prominent when Wanda contracted tuberculosis in her early teens. She was bedridden and isolated from peers; worst of all she felt saddened by her stunted social development as she lay in bed, watching her four younger sisters mature ahead of her. Her father's praise and positive regard alleviated her shattered self-esteem. Open communication with her parents enabled Wanda L. to share her dreams and to get the support she needed to become independent.

When I finished high school, I wanted more than anything to be a nurse. That was my life desire. I dreamt to go as a missionary to a foreign country. A year before the war, my father sent me to the best nursing school in Poland. I revealed to him that I wanted to be a nun because when I had volunteered in the Red Cross to prepare for nursing school, I was particularly impressed by one of the nuns, a Mother Superior, who came from nobility. She was so beautiful in looks and in her heart that I wanted to be like her.

Shortly after Wanda L. entered nursing school, her 8-year-old sister suffered from a ruptured appendix which doctors predicted would be fatal. When Wanda walked into her sister's hospital room she heard her declare: "I will not die." She did not, and Wanda L. felt grateful for the miracle she believed had taken place. Even as a child Wanda L. felt a special relationship to God in her private prayers, as opposed to being part of a special group with its own exclusive rituals.

Although she was never the official leader of any group and did not engage in adventurous activities, she had a strong sense of responsibility. As the oldest of five children her mother depended on her to take care of the others. To all intents and purposes, she raised her youngest sister by herself. Her enjoyment of taking on responsibilities led her to volunteer in the hospital.

From an early age, Wanda L. was helpful to others and was spiritually attuned. Her particular vulnerabilities during adolescence because of her protracted illness and resultant darkened self-image became an impetus to mastery rather than an excuse to remain in a helpless state. This positive direction was strongly encouraged by her father who told her that despite her illness, she was beautiful and could do whatever her heart desired. Even though Wanda L. was victimized in the opening stages of the war, her early experiences of overcoming frustration and self-pity helped

give her the emotional strength and resilience to be moved by the pain of others.

Early socialization is not sufficient to account for Wanda L.'s altruistic behavior during World War II. Her strong ability to "let in" the brutality, killings, and dehumanization in her immediate surroundings is crucial to an understanding of what motivated her rescue behavior. Thousands of others heard the same shootings, explosions, and human cries, and thousands saw the same inhumane treatment of human beings. But Wanda L. experienced a transforming moment, which awakened in her a sense of responsibility toward others. The desire to do something could not be actualized in that very moment. So Wanda L. turned to God with a request to provide her with an opportunity to make a difference. Once she had let imminent death into her consciousness there was no turning back. Wanda's empathic feeling overtook every aspect of her being. All previous goals took on a new meaning in light of her changing self. No one came to Wanda L. to ask for her help; she went of her own volition to leave food behind the ghetto wall. She befriended the Jews in the laundry room, and she worked to inspire their trust. Though her intentions were to save their lives she invited and spoke to their need to feel secure before accepting her help.

Wanda L.'s altruistic behavior during the Nazi era was not an aberration but an evolution of her previous self. In

an extreme situation, a self-process evoked by conscience seemed to take over, to become central to the core of Wanda's being. Wanda's witness of Nazi atrocities was not detached, rather it became an all-encompassing, transforming moment which summoned up a deep sense of responsibility. "Letting in" the pain and suffering of others produced an empathic--"this could be me"--reaction which reinforced Wanda L.'s natural tendency to care for others. So began her long-term commitment to complete strangers.

The end of the war did not bring personal liberation for Wanda L. A series of tragic events prevented her from being reunited with her surviving family who were trapped on the German occupied side of the Polish border.

Wanda escaped further persecution by joining a displaced persons camp in Germany. She later emigrated to the United States, where she married and had a family. Wanda developed a strong denial mechanism, an adaptive defense which helped her to go on with her life.

Thirty-five years later, revisionist literature caught Wanda's attention and she was outraged. "How can anyone deny what happened?" she asked. She again felt compelled to "do something" and began by approaching community leaders and speaking about the Holocaust. Whereas during the war years her "immediate self" (Lifton, 1979) was operating, in her generative years it is her "ultimate self" which emerges desiring immortalizing recognition for her humane acts

during the Holocaust. She wants to realize, not deny, the suffering of the victims and hopes that her example will be followed in the face of contemporary evils. She has written her memoirs and, though she is quite ill, is speaking on a regular basis. She also has devoted many years to the care of a blind person, a stranger with whom she developed an intimate relationship and took into her home.

Religious-Moral Rescuers

Religious-Moral rescuers have an inner continuity of strong religious conviction. When faced with morally complex questions, with life and death situations, it is their spiritual worship which comes to the fore. Their sense of "right and wrong" is described in religious rather than in ethical terms. During wartime Religious-Moral rescuers were often confronted with stressful moral dilemmas when their churches and/or religious leaders collaborated with Nazism.

Christina R., a Dutch rescuer from Friesland, was 34 years old and the mother of five when the Nazis invaded Holland. She and her husband Martin were deeply religious, and had joined Holland's Christian Historical party shortly before the war because "They followed the Bible scriptures, and for us, that was enough."

The R.'s lived in a small house in a village outside Amsterdam. Early in 1942, before the inception of her

rescue activities, Christina R. became aware of the Nazis' intentions toward the Jews when a Jewish friend who managed to escape a death camp came to her home and graphically described the gas chambers to her. She also witnessed the mandatory wearing of the Jewish star which deeply upset her.

Her rescue activity began when a friend came to her with a little Jewish girl of 4 years old. The girl's father, she explained, had been shot. Her fleeing mother and brother had crunched the little girl in a closet and instructed her to "Wait. Christians will come and help you, but don't cry." Christina R.'s husband was away at work, so without consulting him she agreed to take the child "on impulse" though she was already the mother of five children, ages newborn to 8.

I plopped her between three kids in a bed. My husband, upon returning from work, was afraid. "Chrissie, Chrissie, what are you doing?" he asked. "Remember this," I answered, "we call ourselves Christians. We cannot put this little girl out on the street. She will be gassed." My husband was not convinced. "I have to take care of my own," he said. Later, when the children were all sleeping, we talked it over. "Remember the story of the Good Samaritan?" I asked. "Martin, do you want to be like the first two who looked away and turned their backs? Or do you want to be like the third, who, no matter the cost said, 'Okay, I will help'?"

That night, they agreed to shelter the little Jewish girl. To transcend their fears, Christina R. and her husband prayed and read the Bible together, especially Psalm 91: "He who dwellest in the secret place are the most high. They shall abide under my wings. Only thou will see it with thine eyes, but it will not come near thee."

By 1942 the Netherlands were full of Jews who had fled the persecutions in Poland and Germany. Christina R. said, "From then on, the door was open. Many entered, many went, many came in the night, fleeing. Many were so disturbed they almost lost their minds. But when you are a Christian, you see the world differently, you see the need. They were His people; His people were in need."

Christina R. was not betrayed by her neighbors during her rescue activity though "it was through town that we had a Jewish girl. They found out because I let her loose to play. I had dyed her hair. I could lie at that time--very well. I did not lie to sin, but I did lie to protect."

Christina R. and her husband went on to save 450 people, mostly Jews, but also Allied pilots and Dutch boys and workers attempting to escape German forced labor camps. Their ability to sustain risk taking was not simply a product of their religious convictions. Eventually, they formed a network, a community of others who sanctioned and encouraged their activities.

We never used our own name. There was an organization that brought people and another that stole food ration cards. We always had at least 18 people in my house. Some stayed until liberation. One little boy was born in my house . . . for me it was an indication that no matter what Hitler did, the Lord was at work. He would not let his people perish. If Hitler killed, the Lord would let new ones come. I said to her, "Your husband planted the seed, but life is from God the Almighty. Hitler tries to destroy the Jewish people, but the Lord lets new ones come up. I shall call you 'Blessed mother.'"

Christina R. was also a witness to many atrocities.

I never saw a gas chamber, Praise the Lord I didn't. But I saw them killed. In Amsterdam they rounded up Jews, opened the bridges and drove them into the channels to drown. I saw with my own eyes one hundred and twenty Jews killed. . . . I was with my sister on an open field. We saw the Jews forced to kneel and put their hands up. As one by one they lost their balance--ping--they were shot. One gone, two gone, three gone, one hundred and twenty gone. And they left them there. . . . And mothers cried for their babies . . . it brings tears to my eyes . . . I was a mother, I had kids . . . and there were times when a mother would not hand over her infant. . . . Do you know what they did? They threw the baby against a wall. There was the baby, bruised and dead. Killing was Hitler's only motive. But we went on and on, no matter the dangers.

Near the end of the war, 20 Germans surrounded Christina R.'s house, and threatened her and her husband with death. "Where is your ammunition?" one of the officers commanded. "They are the folded hands and bended knees of the Netherlands," Christina defiantly replied, adding, "And you have lost the war. You may shoot me--but I am not afraid. You will shoot only the body, while my spirit goes straight to heaven." While the Nazis continued to search the house in which 10 people were hidden, Christina managed to burn the false identification cards which would betray their network activity.

Her husband and one of their charges were handcuffed and brought to prison. Under threat of execution, Christina's husband admitted, proudly, that he had helped Jews. "Because I have to obey God over Hitler. Your war is an unrighteous war. I took in people who were oppressed and in need, and for Christ's sake, they are my neighbors."

The German SS officer, afraid for his own life as the British bombs were nearing, asked Christina's husband, "What will you do for me when the war is over? I am afraid." "Sir," her husband replied, "if you come bearing weapons, you are my enemy. If you come empty handed, then for Christ's sake--you are my neighbor. I would protect you from the people but not from justice."

While factors such as community support and awareness and empathy for the plight of the Jews contributed to Christina R. and her husband's ability to sustain rescue, their most salient motivation was a morality based on deep religious convictions. In Christina R.'s words, "The Jewish people were so badly mistreated and Hitler wanted to kill, kill, kill. We wanted to save, save, save, in the name of Jesus. And not one [of our charges] perished. You must write that down."

Raised in an apolitical, religious Protestant family, Christina R.'s father, a fisherman who had frequent contact with Jews, taught her that "People see things on the outside, while the Lord sees the inside." Christina R., a housewife and mother of five, had earlier trained as a nurse in a mental institution. She chose to pursue nursing because, "I wanted to be of help. Jesus was such a big part of my life that I was striving to be like him. If it came to making decisions--spiritually speaking, my question was, and still is, 'What would Jesus do?'"

Like many Moral-Religious rescuers, Christina R. had a strict upbringing, but she was never physically punished. Christina R.'s moral and religious values during the war were consistent with the values she had learned in childhood. Her parents were also active anti-Nazis.

While some people sustained their long-term commitment to rescue through unconscious gratifying forces, Christina R. was sustained by a religious conviction and a strong desire to fight against the imminent murder of innocent human beings. Her early awareness of the Nazis' intentions, as well as her "death immersion" (Lifton) enabled her to perceive the magnitude of the Nazis' threats. Her ultimate goal to sustain life came to fruition with the birth of a Jewish child in her home, and she embodies Lifton's motive of a life-enhancement in the face of death. It should also be noted that rescuers working in total isolation could only save in small numbers. If Christina R. and her husband had not initiated or joined a rescue network they could never have saved 450 people.

Forty years later, Christina R. lectures to audiences in the United States and Holland because, she says, "The Holocaust should never be forgotten." Still an avid Christian believer, she does volunteer work for blood banks and for the Red Cross. She sees that her "Children have the same trait--when they see need, they help. They are seeing and doing in different ways than we did, but they are involved in community activities and in their churches."

Religious-Pacifist-Moral Rescuers

Spiritual religious feeling is not limited to those affiliated with traditional religions. A deep, spiritual conviction and dedication to the principles and practices of nonviolent action motivated pacifist individuals and communities to rescue in several European countries.

John S. was 28 years old when the Germans invaded Holland. He owned a small farm which produced dairy products, fruit, vegetables, and grain, and was engaged to marry Wilma P., a psychiatric nurse at one of the largest Psychiatric Jewish hospitals in Europe. John S. and Wilma were attracted to one another because they shared similar values. As John S., who had registered as a conscientious objector well before the invasion, described, "We are not baptised, nor are we members of a church, but that does not mean that we are not religious. The contrary is true. To us, all life is sacred, we are pacifists, for nonviolent action. Our heroes were Gandhi, Albert Schweitzer, and later Martin Luther King, Mother Theresa, and thousands of unknown others." In 1940, John and Wilma S. were married.

In 1942, Hitler began to round up the Jews of Holland. Soon after, a friend from John S.'s home town visited, asking if the S.'s would be willing to hide a Jewish doctor and his wife.

There was no difficult decision to make. Of course we would help--there were only a few practical problems to solve, like a suitable room, food coupons, and a

modest fee for room and board. At that time we had just started out in life and had very meager financial means. But we had a large farmhouse, the neighbors were not too close and we could grow some of our own food--so we got by.

Soon after, one of Wilma's friends, a Jewish nurse from the psychiatric hospital, asked the S.'s to harbor her and her twin brother.

If we could have two, John S. said, we could have four or six. The risks were the same, there were only practical limits. Later, through acquaintances, we came into contact with the Dutch underground in Amsterdam and began to take in even more people.

John S. and his wife Wilma S. saved 20 people, but not without some "agonizing moments . . . when we had to say no because it was too dangerous."

As John S. pointed out in the interview, some of their decisions to turn away new people were based on the fact that nobody knew how long the war would last. Taking in too many people could have endangered those they were already successfully hiding.

What we may have done had we known everything ahead of time is of course a hypothetical question. But I can say that one grew stronger with the challenge. We were not prepared for underground work and did some stupid things. When everything came to a good end, it was not always because of our actions, but in spite of it.

John S. vividly described the ways in which rescuing transformed their daily lives.

Our whole life changed. We could not have our friends visit . . . even our parents did not know, yet we could not stop them from visiting for three years time. Whenever someone came to the door, a scare went through the house. We lived under constant pressure, day and night, 365 days a year. With our Jewish friends we shared fears, doubts, and hopes.

The S.'s had several narrow escapes from the Nazis. In the fall of 1944 when the Germans attempted to evacuate the entire city of Arnheim, they were forced by the Germans to accommodate a Dutch family of four. Unbeknownst to the Germans, they already had five Jewish people in hiding. Luckily, the relocated family did not inform on them. John S. repeatedly emphasized how much bystanders were an integral factor in their rescue operation.

The rule was that if you help Jews, you will be treated as one and sent directly to a concentration camp. . . . The whole environment of the country helped us to rescue. This is not something you do alone. The underground provided false identity papers and food coupons. For three years our neighbors put up a protective shield around us by acting as if they did not notice anything. We were only the tip of the iceberg.

John S. still harbors guilt over those he turned away. "Everyone who stayed in our house survived, but some of their relatives, whom we had turned away, did not." Though the S.'s did not have to risk their own children, Wilma S. did give birth to stillborn twins during the war. "Four months before the liberation, we had a son of our own. Before that, we lost twins who died at birth. Perhaps it was partly caused by the war."

When asked about his motivation, John S. said it was difficult to summarize, except to say, "We feel life is sacred. We are nonviolent. We are against war. We would have refused to go to war."

At a follow-up interview John S. emphasized that in some ways he feels lucky to have been given the chance to risk his own life to save others. "Our actions during the war infused my life with meaning. Now we are working very hard to prevent a much bigger holocaust--a nuclear holocaust. We are very concerned, and are active in the peace movement. We still act out of the same principles."

John S., his parents, and his grandparents had many Jewish friends. "My own connection with Jews was a very special one. My grandparents had many Jewish friends and after retirement shared a duplex with a Jewish family . . . we did not know any fundamental differences, except that they ate dry matzohs at Easter. We ate the matzoh they gave us with butter and sugar and felt quite privileged."

Prominent Jews in the community attended and participated in the funeral of John S.'s grandfather whom they had loved and respected. John and Wilma S. have maintained a relationship with the Jewish people they rescued during the war and recently they traveled to Israel for their ceremony at Yad Vashem.

Christina R.'s ability to sustain rescuing activities grew out of her transformative awareness of the impending death of the Jews, as well as her mystical connectedness to Jesus. In a similar way, John's pacifist convictions were amplified through his philo-Semitic sentiment and "lifelong

association with Jewish friends." Despite his connectedness to Jews, John S. still finds Jews and Judaism "a puzzle. The more we know, the greater we find the puzzle. We stayed on a kibbutz in Naon while we were in Israel--and it was quite an experience. We were very much impressed by life on the kibbutz and even would not mind living there. It is amazing how kibbutz life has succeeded and survived for so many years . . . another part of the puzzle."

John S. is still dedicated to pacifist nonviolence. At 75, he is an active member of his community anti-nuclear peace group. He and his wife have written articles about their rescue activities, and John is presently at work on a book about the liquidation of the Jewish psychiatric hospital where his wife was employed before the Nazi invasion.

Emotional-Moral Rescuers

The rarest forms of rescuers are found in this group (6%). They responded to the rescue situation out of compassion and pity. It is not just an ideological sense of right and wrong but a social responsibility which they responded to. Among the Emotional-Moral rescuers 66% were engaged in rescuing children, which is a higher percentage as compared to the other rescuer groups. This may somewhat explain the salience of the emotional component of morality. Their parental altruism as a role model and tolerance are very strong influences in the rescuers' early childhood.

Several rescuers from this subgroup were diagnosed as having post-traumatic stress disorder in recent years. This condition is characterized by nightmares, anxiety, depression, guilt, etc. During the interview they were more prone to emotional outbursts of tears and had difficulty talking. They were usually protected from showing emotions by a spouse who tended to talk for them whenever possible. The emotions that led to moral behavior during the war were now incapacitating them in their daily lives.

Dutch rescuer Henry M., a divorced father of one, went to Germany in 1939 to visit friends. During his stay, he realized that one of his friend's sons was out every night and never mentioned where he was going.

I asked his mother what the boy was doing every night and she said, "It is better not to speak of it." After a few more evenings, I could not help but ask her again. At my insistence, she revealed that her son was in the Hitler Youth movement. "In the evening," she explained, "the boys catch animals--rabbits, pigs, mice or rats--and they learn to kill, to see blood." Her story made an enormous impression on me, and with this haunted feeling, I returned to Holland.

Soon after, Henry M., who owned a small farm outside Amsterdam, began living with Sophie, a writer/journalist with two young sons. They married in 1941. The Germans invaded Holland in May 1940 and both Henry M. and Sophie M. were appalled by the Nazis' treatment of Dutch Jews. Their concern and solidarity with the Jews was first expressed by wearing the yellow star the Nazis had decreed would mark all Jewish citizens. Then they took in a Jewish child. When

ghettos were established and deportation began, the M.'s converted their home into a haven, joined the underground, and saved over 50 people.

Asked about his motivation Henry M. said, "It is like a tidal wave. When it comes over a village you are lucky you are alive and can save people. You do it. You do not sit and ask yourself, 'Will I do it?' It is part of your body, the will is part of your body. You do it. You feel and you do it."

At one point, the M.'s had 36 people hidden in their farmhouse.

My wife tried to keep people laughing, to give them hope. She would say, "I hear the Germans are losing," and she said that to keep the boat floating. When you sit together--15 or more people--you see all their deaths before you. You cannot just sit. It became our work, and it was very intensive and hard work.

Henry M.'s emotional impulse to help others transcended all boundaries. He recounts,

I was very anti-German. But once I saw a man lying in the road--a soldier bleeding. I put him on my bicycle and carried him, with all my energy, to a house. I asked that someone take care of him. Later, a friend said, "How could you have done that? If you are anti-Hitler, that man is your enemy." It is very difficult to explain my action. You see, he was not a German soldier--he became a wounded human being.

Now in their seventies, the M.'s continue to help others through their local meals-on-wheels service. They have a deep commitment to rescue work and are active members of an anti-nuclear group. As Sophie M. said,

It is very important to teach people about what happened, but we need also to teach others how to look at the future, at what hangs over our heads. At the moment, I would much rather work against the dangers of the future than keep my mind on dangers that have already passed. It is more important to use all of our energy to fight against the possibility of a [nuclear] holocaust than to delve endlessly into the past.

Mary B. attended nursing school and worked in a Polish hospital for 15 years before she married a man who owned a factory which produced medical instruments. As newlyweds the B.'s lived in an apartment in Warsaw, traveled often, and lived comfortably. When the Germans occupied Poland, Mary B.'s husband, who had worked in government engineering experiments, was forced to move them to the countryside.

Mary B. suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder. As a result, her story is often discontinuous, her speech breaking off at the recollection of painful memories. As best as can be assessed, her first rescue involved a Jewish baby girl of 8 months old whom she later adopted. The infant's parents had been killed by Nazis, and the child had been found, hidden in a bunker in the forest. When Mary heard what had happened, she went to the forest and took the child home.

In regard to her motivation, Mary B. said, "I took this girl out of mercy. I had to take her, because I commiserated with the Jews. I did it out of compassion." It should also be noted that Mary B. lost two of her own children, ages 6 and 7, before the war. She refused to answer any questions concerning this loss.

Having taken in the Jewish infant, and despite her neighbors' harassment, Mary began to further her rescue activities. She learned to bake bread and brought it regularly to the partisans in the woods. "Up in the country, I was setting up bombs, grenades. I gave the Jews in the forest bread. I gave messages and injections to the wounded and ill. But please, Madame, such things, why remember it all? Please, Madame, what for?"

After two years, Mary B. returned to Warsaw with the child. She was arrested and sent to Majdanek, a concentration camp, with the child.

Relational Philo-Semitic Rescuers

Non-Jewish/Jewish relationships, whether with relatives, intimate others, or acquaintances, took on a different meaning when Nazi racial laws prohibiting any sexual, social, and/or business contacts with Jews were passed. Disobedience and noncompliance with those laws was for many the first act of resistance. Those who had a profound awareness of such human rights violations advised friends to immediately leave the country and began to help them transport money and possessions to other countries. This early awareness helped particularly in Germany where persecution evolved slowly over a 10 year period before German Jews were finally deported.

The Relational Philo-Semitic rescuers all had relationships with Jews, whether spouses, relatives, close friends, or acquaintance or colleagues. In addition, these rescuers had a particular affinity toward Jews for a myriad of reasons. Some suspected they had Jewish blood, others possessed warm memories of having been a shabbos goy. Some had a Jewish role model in childhood, others felt a sense of religious connectedness to Jesus, a Jew, or to the "chosen-ness" of Jews. Many had had positive relationships with Jewish partners or colleagues. These early philo-Semitic feelings were later actualized after the war when many of these rescuers married Jews, converted to Judaism, and/or moved to Israel.

As with the Moral Rescuers, Relational Philo-Semitic rescuers had altruistic parents. Their continuity of altruism is high, and their relationships with Jews are at the core of their altruistic behavior. Their rescuing relationships continued after the war. The bonds and ties some felt toward whom they rescued sometimes led to marriage. Some devoted their whole lives to the Jews they rescued. For example, one Christian rescuer left his homeland to be with a Jewish friend, and in one case, a rescuer moved to Israel to be near a rescued child.

The Relational Philo-Semites who comprise 28% of this sample are mostly from middle-class business families. Eighty-two percent suffered a loss in childhood; 71% had

close contact with Jews in childhood; 51% had an altruistic role model; and 50% continued to be helpers after the war.

Educational level ranged from no schooling to a completion of high school. The more educated Relational Philo-Semites tended to join networks that reflected their political ideology and their strong anti-Nazi and moral convictions.

Parental value of tolerance for differentness was very much an influential factor in 89% of this subgroup. Altruistic behavior was attributed to 75% of their parents. Eighty-two percent of the Relational Philo-Semites came from apolitical families, another aspect which differentiates this group from the Ideological-Network type, 54% of whom grew up in political families.

Seventy-one percent of Relational Philo-Semites rescued more than a few times. They often began by helping people they already knew; later their rescuer selves took over and they rescued strangers and acquaintances as well. Twenty-nine percent came from mixed-marriages, which perhaps explains the greater religious tolerance found in this group.

During their rescue activities 29% sometimes worked with networks. A connection with or affinity toward Jewishness was found in 27 out of 28 of the Relational Philo-Semites, whereas the Ideological-Network types felt a connection to Jewishness only 27% of the time. The

following case study exemplifies the Relational Philo-Semitic rescuer.

When the Russians occupied the Ukraine in 1940, Maria Z., a single Ukrainian Catholic in her early twenties, was living in a small village. She shared a two-room house, with her recently widowed mother. Several of her siblings were married and lived nearby. She suffered two significant losses that year. Her father died of natural causes and one of her brothers was snatched into the Russian army never to be seen again. Maria Z. taught sewing privately and assisted with farm and household matters.

Although there were only a few Jewish families in her village, Maria Z. had a very close relationship with a Jewish classmate, a dear friend. When a German labor camp was erected in front of her house Maria Z. immediately began to bring food to her friend and the other inmates there. On one trip to the camp, she was shot in the leg by a Gestapo guard, but luckily the bullet exited her leg. She managed to keep the injury a secret from her mother whom she did not want to worry.

When the area was invaded by the Germans the Ukrainians felt victimized. "We had a very tough time. We couldn't travel by train, we couldn't buy goods--because everything was for the German Army. The farmers who raised cattle and chickens for themselves and their friends had to be very secretive. If you were caught raising animals for yourself

you could be killed." Maria Z. further said that her aunt was put in a concentration camp for disobeying such orders, and "sixteen weeks later, only her clothes were sent back . . . she was in the gas chamber. Nine children she left."

The Germans assigned young able-bodied men from the concentration camp to build a labor camp next door to Maria Z.'s house. And she describes,

Every morning there were two Germans in front of my house. One was named Wagner and he was very nice, the other Frey, he was terrible. He would push the young people into a truck which took them towards the highway they were building. From our window, my mother and I watched those poor men, and boys jump on this truck. Frey had a metal pointer, and he would beat them, every morning. He didn't care, he beat them on the nose, the eyes, the feet.

When Maria Z. would ask her mother how people could behave so cruelly her mother would reply, "All humans are the same. Life was given to everyone by God; and only God, not man, has a right to take a life." Sometimes as the men marched back from work they would jump into Maria Z.'s house. "My mother or I would give them a piece of bread or something and they would jump back in line. It was as dangerous for them as it was for us."

Maria Z.'s mother became ill and required medical attention which was scarce in the village. One of the Jews interned in the labor camp was a doctor. Maria Z.'s oldest brother, the village secretary, asked one of the Germans to permit the doctor to visit. The Germans allowed the doctor to examine Maria Z.'s mother, but did not give him permis-

sion to sign prescription forms because he was a Jew. The Z.'s also requested that Dr. F. be allowed to come daily and he came every lunch hour. Once the work on the road was completed the men would be transported elsewhere. One day Dr. F. asked Maria Z.'s brother if he would be willing to provide refuge should the situation worsen. As Maria Z.'s brother had four small children he was reluctant to say yes. He asked his mother and sister if they would agree to help Dr. F. and they immediately agreed.

Shortly after this request, the German Wagner let the women know the workers were to be transported elsewhere the following day. Late that night, somebody knocked on the window.

Because my mother was a midwife, my first response was oh my goodness, somebody must be having a baby. I opened the door, and there was Dr. F. He came into the room and grabbed my mother and started to kiss and cry. . . . Please help he kept saying. Please save my life. All I could say was, What can I do? So I went to my brother's house and we all agreed to save his life. My brother had an idea. He called my sister's husband, and they built a double wall inside the house because everything had to be confidential.

Maria Z. and her mother lived in a tiny two-room house with an attic and a backyard. Toilet facilities were outside, and water was procured from a neighbor's well. When Dr. F. arrived the following night, they had a bunker ready for him. A few minutes later somebody knocked on the window. Apparently Dr. F. had not kept their offer to help him a secret and many others in fear came to her little

house for help. Maria Z. ran over to her sister's house and convinced her brother-in-law to take a few people at a time into his house. Maria Z. and her mother kept 5 people. Her sister and brother-in-law had two small boys, 4 and 9 years old; they ignored the risk and took in a total of 14 people.

For the next two years the Z. family lived in constant danger. Their charges had arrived with lice, which Mrs. Z. unsuccessfully tried to wipe out by washing their clothes in boiling water. Neighbors became suspicious of the constant smoke from the chimney. Maria Z. also had four students who came to the house daily to learn to sew. Every lunch hour she sent them away so that she could go to the attic, feed the five hidden people, and empty their excrement into the yard. When Dr. F. contracted diarrhea his constant bowel movements were heard by the sewing students. Her mother came into the room and commented upon how "the cats in the attic make love all year long." No one suspected differently. Eventually, Maria Z. kept only two students, not trusting the others to keep a secret about any surprise or suspicious occurrences in her house.

Maria Z.'s sister had many life-threatening moments, particularly the time they were saved by her clever 9-year-old son. One day a neighbor sent the Gestapo to check up on the household. When the little boy saw men in uniform approaching the house, he warned the people in hiding who

immediately escaped to the double-built wall, plates in hand. The Gestapo climbed the step ladder to the attic, where they found a small table with a dirty ash tray and cards. The Gestapo began to make comments, joking about how they had found a "restaurant." The boy said, "You know, my cousin was just here, we played cards and smoked cigarettes up here so my mother wouldn't catch us." The Gestapo believed the boy's tale. As they left the house the boy said to them, "Please don't tell my mommy we smoke cigarettes, because she will spank me."

The daily chore of finding food and other basic necessities for so many people was a full-time occupation. Maria Z. had to go to a neighboring town to buy even an extra bar of soap, so that the merchant of the local general store would not become suspicious. Maria Z. often visited an elderly lady who gave her breakfast and an extra piece of bread which kept her full for the day. When her mother delivered babies, she often returned with extra goodies.

Maria Z. also had to provide for a 3-year-old child of one of the couples in hiding. She hid the girl in her aunt's house in a different city without revealing the whereabouts of her parents. Once a month she travelled on a freight train to visit the child and to bring food, which was in limited supply, to her aunt. The train would make overnight stops and would sometimes take days to arrive.

Maria Z.'s worried thoughts were with the people back home. The Gestapo often made house-to-house searches for Jews in hiding with German shepherds. Maria Z.'s brother taught her a little trick. If she spread paprika over the house, the dogs would sniff it and run away. The nights were the worst. At every moment one could expect the Nazis to enter. "We had to position the bed in such a way that if we heard the slightest noise outside we could see who was coming." Maria Z.'s mother would carry buckets of water in at night to wash peoples' clothes which she would dry by the stove. This method avoided neighbors who might suspect upon seeing a loaded laundry line that the Z.'s were hiding Jews.

One of the most frightening moments for Maria Z. was when she arrived home one day to find her mother gone. She walked around to her back yard and saw that her mother was hiding in the wheat, crying. Her mother explained she had been scared to death when the Gestapo came by car and had stopped in front of their house. She had been certain that they came for her. As it turned out, one of the neighbors had left horse manure in the middle of the road, and they were looking for the culprits.

Conflicts which arose between the Jews in hiding created an unbearable situation in Maria Z.'s house. A love triangle developed between a married woman, her husband, and one of the men in hiding. The two men got into a fight and were bleeding. This was after the others heard them making

love behind the wall. One night, Maria Z. became very angry at their fight and threatened to throw them all out. Dr. F. began to cry and to beg Maria Z. to let them stay. In moments like these Maria Z. would turn to God to give her strength. She warned her charges to stop their fighting and, of course, she let them stay.

Shortly before liberation, Maria Z. received a telegram from her aunt. The little girl whom she had left had been telling people that she was Jewish and Maria Z.'s aunt wanted her to fetch the child immediately. Feeling helpless, Maria Z. went to discuss the matter with the child's parents who were in hiding. The parents decided Maria Z. should bring the child to the woods and "Get rid of her." Maria Z. found this an unthinkable and crazy solution. Instead she managed to place the child with her sister, and so the little girl survived the war.

Despite their meager possessions and personal hardships, and at great personal risk, the Z. family acted humanely toward Dr. F. and 18 strangers. The Z. family's relationship to people of different religions and nationalities had always been respectful, and, even before the war, they had helped those less fortunate than they were. The rescue of 19 people required the cooperative effort of several households which shared skills and resources.

At 6 years old Maria Z. fell and broke her spine; her growth was stunted as a result of the accident and she remained a midget for life. For three days she was unconscious. When doctors failed to revive her, her mother carried her to the local church and prayed. Soon Maria Z. opened her eyes and said, "Mommy I'm hungry." Doctors put her in a cast for six months, but nothing improved her condition. Maria Z. recalls that her father protected her from her mother's impatient scolding and that he encouraged her to find a way to make a living so that she could support herself after they died. Her life-long dream had been to be a teacher like her older sister, but her father felt dress-making would be a more secure profession which would give her financial independence. In adolescence, Maria Z. began to despair over her stunted growth. "Why didn't you just let me die?" she would ask her mother. Her parents felt helpless in the face of her depression but encouraged her all the same. In late adolescence Maria Z. became engaged. Her fiance took off to study in Austria, and was unable to return until World War II ended.

Maria Z.'s parents were from different Catholic denominations. Her mother was Roman Catholic, her father Ukrainian Catholic, but unlike many mixed marriages the children were taught there was no difference. Maria Z.'s mother had been a nurse, and later, a midwife. Her mother had ten children but four had died before Maria Z. was born.

Because Mr. Z. worked as a train conductor the family moved frequently. When Maria Z. was 8 years old they bought land and settled in a small village, where her father acted as mayor until his death in Maria Z.'s late adolescence. Her father was so respected that despite his desire to terminate his position he remained mayor for three terms. His advice was sought by many people. Maria Z. described how a woman "with bruised eyes as a result of her husband's beatings" came to see her father. "Father was a quiet, gentle man, but he called on the husband, and gave him a smack across the face, saying, 'This is from your wife.'"

Maria Z.'s mother was also helpful and often cooked extra food to provide for the poor family with six children who lived next door. One of the children in that family, a 4-year-old boy, treated Mrs. Z. as if she were his own mother. Each year Maria Z. sang Christmas carols to raise money for the poor.

Maria Z. had very special warm feelings toward her Jewish neighbors and friends.

We were very close, I loved them. . . . I was crazy for Jewish matzoh. Oh, I loved the matzoh. . . . And when the Jewish Easter came, she brought me matzoh, I loved it so much. Her name was Lubka. She was killed. They all were killed except one son who hid out in a horse stable of one of the farmers. They were a very poor family with lots of children. I don't know how he supported them all. The other Jewish family in town owned the general store, and when Christmas or some other holiday came the owner always brought my father a bottle of whiskey or some fish.

The symbolic Passover matzoh represented an anti-Semitic myth in which the Jews made the matzoh with the blood of Christian children. Maria Z.'s love of the Passover matzoh is connected to her love of Jews and to her ability, even as a youngster, to transcend prevalent negative myths about the Jews as killers. One can still detect the grief Maria Z. feels over the senseless murder of her beloved Jewish neighbors.

As a child Maria Z. was spoiled and physically, emotionally, and spiritually well-provided for. However, her physical condition detracted from the self-confidence she might otherwise have developed. Because of her education she was different from many of the peasants in the village, but she did not view them as inferior. She had the courage to stand up for her beliefs among peers but does not recall any incidents where she had to disobey an authority or influence others when an injustice was perpetrated. Her father prepared her for independence by insisting that she have a career in which she would be likely to succeed.

Maria Z. exhibited ego strength and resilience as a young woman. She completed a four-year training program in sewing, supported herself financially by teaching, and developed an intimate relationship before the war began. The family suffered tremendous losses during the Russian occupation, and their situation only worsened when the Germans invaded. The family was quite aware of the risks

involved in disobeying Nazi orders. One aunt was deported to a concentration camp for selling meat rather than handing it over to German soldiers. But Maria Z. and her mother continued to give food to the workers of the neighboring labor camp. It hadn't occurred to them that they might give people shelter because their living quarters were so tiny. Maria Z.'s lack of initiative in offering her home as refuge was not based on a lack of empathy, but on realistic situational factors. But she was not numb to the persecution of Jews. Her philo-Semitic orientation enabled her to empathize with them daily. As they marched by her window she experienced a transforming encounter in which she "let in" their ultimate fate. Once asked, her strong empathy with the persecuted awakened feelings of responsibility and she was able to find solutions to the practical limitations of rescuing 19 people. She did not have the resources to provide a safe hiding place for 19 people, but she was able to make the necessary quick decision, to run to her brother to seek his assistance. Her reaction grew out of her feeling that she could not turn the people away. She knew if she did not help them they would be killed.

The Z. family's humanistic feelings toward the Jews transcended anti-Semitic attitudes which were prevalent in the Ukraine even before the German invasion. The family's ability to befriend their Jewish neighbors must be seen in the context of such hostile attitudes. Maria Z.'s father

had friendships with Jews, and as mayor his positive feelings toward Jews must have had impact on the community. As shown, the Z. family was extremely altruistic. Their altruism and philo-Semitism combined in the extreme situation enabled them to transcend their own suffering and losses. One might think that these losses would be incapacitating, but the Z. family demonstrates how personal pain can serve to heighten empathy and to strengthen the continuity of basic values.

The philo-Semitic continuity is often expressed by continued relations with Jews. Many Philo-Semitic Rescuers married Jews after the war. Some moved to Israel and many continued friendships and maintained intimate contact with those they rescued.

At the end of the war one of the men Maria Z. rescued asked her to marry him. Although she had intended to marry her old fiance, who had returned to betroth her, Maria Z. married the Jewish survivor.

After World War II Maria Z. got an anonymous letter that said "because you were saving Jews if you do not leave the country you could expect the same thing to happen to you." For this reason she was forced to leave her mother and her entire family to confront physical survival once again.

She fled the village leaving her nurturing family and her husband behind. After much hardship, she came to the

United States and once settled helped her husband gain entrance as well. Shortly after his arrival her husband left her. She was alone, with nothing but a small room and her ability to sew. She suffered years of hard labor and isolation, but still retained her selfless character. She would walk an hour each way to work to save 5¢ to send to her family in Russia. In her spare time she also volunteered for the Heart Association.

The betrayal did not shatter Maria Z.'s philo-Semitic continuity. She made numerous efforts to reconnect with the others she had saved who were now living in Israel. She particularly longed to be reunited with the child she had rescued, but she met with resistance from the child's mother who had since remarried. A Jewish friend finally wrote to the child's mother on Maria Z.'s behalf. The letter was so forceful that the child's mother was moved to carry out her obligation to have Maria Z. recognized as a "Righteous Among the Nations" at Yad Vashem. The Jews in her community paid for her trip to Israel and some of them joined her for the ceremony.

After 40 years, she was honored by Yad Vashem and received a warm reception from the Jewish community in Israel. She was deeply touched but had difficulty accepting praise and adulation. She was united with the child she rescued and still maintains contact with her.

Maria Z.'s visit to Israel revealed to her the underlying reasons for the survivor mother's resistance toward a reunion. The girl child Maria Z. had rescued had been told that she must never reveal to her younger sister that they had different fathers. The adult survivor never discussed the war years with her child survivor. The mother was afraid that a reunion with the rescuer would open up a Pandora's box.

The interview was painful for her because of the guilt she still feels over having put her mother through so much. Getting in touch with painful feelings about her life after the war was very difficult for her. But in a characteristic altruistic response, she said, "I am only doing it for you because I know you need it for your study." Maria Z. is known by her Jewish friends for her love of Challah.

Ideological-Network Rescuers

Twenty-two percent of this sample strongly identified with an anti-Nazi ideology which they bolstered with moral convictions and a philo-Semitic attitude toward Jews. These three distinct elements of Ideological-Network rescuers is what united them with others in a social movement. Ideological-Network rescuers are in this study differentiated from those underground affiliates whose only task was to act as a third party in locating hiding places for strangers. Ideological-Network rescuers were whole-heartedly immersed

in anti-Nazi activities well before they ever aided Jews. These included: forming strikes and attending underground schools, leafletting anti-Nazi press, harboring and supporting resistance workers, and recruiting members into the movement and sabotage.

Ideological-Network types came from business and professional family backgrounds and were highly educated; the majority had attended college (36%) and/or graduate school (27%). Every Ideological-Network rescuer had at least some high school education.

Over 90% of rescuers in this group were involved in more than five incidents of rescue, incidents which usually involved helping 15 persons or more. Forty-one percent rescued 100-2,500 people; 23% rescued 15-50 people, and 18% helped 1-7 people. Over 90% were "professional rescuers," that meant engagement in rescue activities on a constant basis. They had no occupation other than rescuer activity during the war.

What we hear from the Ideological-Network rescuers is a high level of commitment to an ideology that is based on morality. Individuals transformed their entire lives and being in order to do what they considered to be "the right thing." Their anti-Nazi ideology was ego-syntonic. Approximately 60% of these rescuers had been altruistic as children, and after the war their altruistic acts actually increased in degree to 82%. In this group at least one

parent was altruistic 82% of the time. Many in the networks were young adults in their late teens and early twenties. The network often became an extension of their families of origin. In 82% of their families of origin parents encouraged the value of tolerance for differentness. Many of the parents of Ideological-Network rescuers were also involved in rescue.

Fifty percent of the Ideological-Network rescuers were religious as well as politically ideological. The motivation stemmed not only from political engagements but also from a morality based on religious convictions.

Whereas some people began to rescue only after having been asked for help, others personally initiated an altruistic gesture at great risk to themselves. Yet another process of becoming immersed in rescue activity involved the expression of a continuity of personal and political principles, which well before rescue was an integral part of the person. Rescue acts escalated to meet the demands of the gradually worsening inhumane situations. But early on, the Ideological-Network rescuers' actions reflected their anti-Nazi ideology. They continued intimate and/or business relations with Jews or other ostracized groups and engaged in political acts of disobedience to a malevolent authority. These rescuers did not need to be asked to help, nor did they have to seek out people who needed help. The interpersonal and the political were already intertwined and inseparable from their being.

The rescuers themselves felt victimized, even as early as 1933 when the Nazis rose to power and then instituted racial laws. Ideological-Network rescuer types did not need to experience a transforming moment--their commitments already reflected an ideology that opposed inhumane treatment to people, regardless of race, religion, or nationality.

For an overview of the Ideological-Network response, a closer look at a Bohemian German rescuer follows.

In the late 1930s, Hans K., a young man in his twenties, was completing a Master's Degree in engineering at a German Technical school in Prague. He graduated with his college sweetheart, a Jewess from a distinguished family. Before the invasion of Czechoslovakia, they were involved in anti-Nazi student demonstrations in Prague. In the summer of 1938, despite laws declaring it illegal for Aryans to marry Jews, Hans K. married Rachel C., his fiancée of nine years, knowing full well that his "marriage was considered a crime against the race." Because few Aryans married Jews at that time, Hans K.'s case was considered a legal marriage. Shortly after German troops crossed the Czechoslovakian borders (March 15, 1939), an agreement was signed creating the so-called Protectorate for Bohemia and Moravia. For Hans K. and his friends this unconditional surrender was worse than the Treaty of Versailles. Jewish communities were immediately placed under supervision of the Gestapo and

so were many industries, particularly in armament. Hans K. was fired from his job as a diesel engine designer because the Germans rightfully considered him politically unreliable. In no time, he was gainfully employed in a new plant. Then he was approached by a Jewish colleague from his previous factory who made him an offer he could not refuse. The company, which was now owned by Germans, did not have a single German employed there and a search was on to change the quota. Hans K., who had been born in Bohemia, was offered a top managerial position with a substantially high salary. This became very important because he had money for all the illegal activities which were to follow. He also reclaimed his friend, a Jew, saying he was important to the war effort, an act which saved his friend from transports for nine months until a police order arrived and the SS simply arrested his entire family. Before anyone could intervene, they were transported to the East.

Hans K. was living in a rather luxurious apartment with his wife and parents-in-law who were deported in 1941. At that time no one realized what deportation meant. For example, Hans K.'s father, an avid hunter and camper, gave Rachel C.'s parents his best camping equipment for the trip. Twenty-one people from her family never returned. The real intent of the deportations was kept from the public. But in 1942, Hans K. became privy to information about the Final Solution.

Hans K. was introduced to a Czech resistance group, Obrana Aroba, by a very good friend, a famous radio reporter from his army days. Through him, Hans met very interesting resistance people who were transporting Jews out of Czechoslovakia via Slovakia to England. As director of a coal factory, Hans met Gestapo officers from the coal trade organization. He figured out that some of these officers were ardent anti-Nazis, despite their position, and decided upon who could be bribed to get information and who could be counted on to get information to help get people out. Understanding that people are not black and white was important for the rescue effort. Many Czech Jews perished because there was no place to hide them. Obrana Aroba proved to be rather chauvinistic and suffered many losses after the assassination in May, 1942, of one of their leaders, Reinhard Heydrich.

For Hans K. and his family, the liberation of Czechoslovakia brought with it a new oppressive regime, to which they were emphatically opposed. Once again, Hans K. was immersed in anti-authoritarian activities which were fraught with danger, secrecy, suspense, and risks. Moral decisions were based on political ideology and inner convictions. As in the war, his life was not completely his own, he was a valuable person to a cause. Ultimately, the only way Hans K. could be safe was to flee his homeland with the help of the American government.

The life history of this Ideological-Network rescuer illustrates several striking characteristics common to others like him. Though these rescuers are a diverse group with enormous individual differences, their personal and ideological development does follow a pattern. Hans K. did not need to be asked why he joined the resistance against Hitler and later the British intelligence. For him "it was a question of conscience." Even his non-Nazi friends who were more concerned with winning the war than saving lives considered him a traitor.

Hans K. didn't have to defend his position. He felt he was right, and thus acted out of a strong personal conviction. A complex set of personal characteristics served him well in his rescue of 15 people directly, and of dozens more through network and sabotage work. These characteristics include: self-confidence, ability to take responsibility, to take chances, and to transcend fears. Hans was also adventurous, disobedient to authority, and compassionate. The role he played in individual and network rescue operations was shaped by his personal skills and immediate circumstances. His leadership capability enabled him to avail himself of his newly-acquired position of power at the factory where he had access to large sums of money and information. An unrelated asset was his ability to speak Czech without an accent, which enabled him to pass in many situations. Hans K. had already, as a young man in his

twenties, possessed personal characteristics and skills which he would later channel to rescue Jews and other victims of Nazism. Hans K. had a rather privileged upbringing in Prague, Czechoslovakia. His mother was an heiress and his father was a doctor and medical professor who taught surgery at the medical school in Prague. As the only and the oldest of three children he was rather spoiled. His parents supported the Lutheran church but were not very religious. His father was agnostic and Hans K. followed suit by refusing to be confirmed during his adolescence. His mother's dearest friend was Jewish, and many of his father's students and friends were Jews. Both parents were helpful to those less fortunate; his father in his role as teacher was kind to his students, and his mother was generous with the servants. Hans K. recalls:

Mother treated them as if they were members of the family. When a servant who had been in our house for many years married, the marriage was conducted in our house and so was the feast for their family. She had very much of a social conscience.

It was not until many years later that Hans K. benefited from his father's generosity toward his students. He received free medical help several times in the United States from his father's former students.

His mother's fortune had been lost in the mid-twenties, and Hans K. recalls his father joking that he truly married for love, not money. But his father was rather adventurous and spent summer vacations hunting and on rendezvous with a

mistress, a Russian countess nurse from his hospital whom he married off to a baron as a front. Hans K. fulfilled his sense of adventure by hunting with his father. However, when it came to sexual matters his father was rather authoritarian. He once accused Hans K. of devirginizing a girl and warned him: "Don't take what you cannot return."

The K. family became Royal Czechoslovakians in the late twenties but basically opposed nationalism. Hans K. was brought up in multinational Austria. He did not identify with the nationalism of the Germans in his class. As a child he was on better terms with Jewish friends and even went on trips with the Blue and White Club.

The K. family supported Hans' marriage to Rachel C. and were involved in her survival during the Nazi occupation. Hans K.'s father was absolutely anti-Nazi from the very beginning of Hitler's rise to power. "This was the ultimate evil for my father. But we understood many people got jobs and therefore were inclined to bless Hitler." He cleverly rescued children of resistance workers and Jews in the hospital.

In one case, a Czech resistance hero was arrested and the Gestapo was waiting for the wife to come home. As she approached her house neighbors warned her that the Gestapo were waiting. She took her two small children and ran to the hospital to see Dr. K. who put them in a room behind a door with a note that read "scarlet fever." The children

were kept there until relatives could take them. This procedure was repeated for Jewish children whose parents had been deported.

These brief highlights of Hans K.'s developmental influences reveal a continuity of compassion and egalitarianism toward people who are different. The family had particularly close relationships with Jews, and Hans K. had an affinity to them in particular. In high school he was even accused by a teacher of being too close to Jews. National Socialism was the antithesis of the important values with which Hans K. was imbued. It is almost no surprise that he reacted so vehemently to the rise of Nazism.

Hans K. married a Jewess when it was against the law, matrimony an extreme example of intimacy with Jews. What is interesting is that Hans does not consider rescuing his wife as his first rescue activity.

As with other Ideological-Network relational rescuers, Hans K.'s activities do not have a discernible beginning point. His rescue grew out of an early daily effort to combat the rise of Nazism. His friends and family reacted as vehemently as he did to totalitarianism.

In recent years Hans K. suffered from a post-traumatic stress disorder which he is now attempting to overcome by writing his memoirs. His status entering the United States after the war necessitated that he refrain from direct

political involvement or activity. Hence, he devoted his life to his wife and children.

As demonstrated in the previous rescuer groups, the types are not pure. In Hans K.'s case his moral indignation is quite emotional, and like some of the other emotionally motivated rescuers, Hans cried during the interview and exposed deep remorse over his inability to save his wife's parents.

Most of the Ideological-Network types continued to be politically active. Their post-war political selves manifest in peace work and in anti-nuclear movements. Those who had been in religious political parties have not had the same continuity.

Children As Rescuers

Under extreme duress of Nazi occupation, parents, supposed protectors of the young and innocent, were faced with a difficult moral dilemma. Should they risk the lives of their own children to save the lives of friends, acquaintances, or strangers? Many rescuer parents still harbor guilt over having sacrificed their own children's safety during the war. The following is an example of the kind of impossible situation parents were suddenly faced with.

A Dutchman received warning from the underground that the Gestapo was searching houses in his neighborhood.

Quickly he moved the 30 people who had been hiding in his house into a built-in underground tunnel. Once his charges were hidden, it dawned on him that he had neglected to hide their identity cards, all of which were in plain sight on the table. The man heard approaching footsteps, and then noticed his son nearby. This father quickly put the papers in his child's sweater, and told the boy to go play outside. Looking back at the event, the father is astounded by the facility with which he put his child's life in jeopardy. But at that moment he had felt he had no other choice.

The children of these rescuers were in essence passive rescuers. Their lives were endangered daily by their parents' rescue activity, and they were taught to lie and to maintain life or death secrets outside their home.

Some children of rescuers were asked to play a more active role, and actually assisted their parents in their rescue activities. For example, it was often safer for children to pass messages into ghettos; by maintaining an innocent playful air while performing dangerous courier work, and by feigning naivete when caught, children made effective messengers and guides. Child resuers were motivated by the wish to comply with their parents' requests; in essence they did not make their own initial decisions. But once immersed in the process of rescuing, a "rescuer self" developed, which enabled them to rescue on their own initiative with or without a direct, parental request.

In this sample of rescuers, 12% were children between the ages of 5 and 20. In addition, 26% of the rescuers in this sample risked the lives of their own youngsters to save others. In a few cases, we were able to interview both parent and child.

Bojena W. was a 9-year-old girl living comfortably with her parents, her twin brothers, and a younger sister when the Germans invaded Warsaw. She had been attending second grade when "the war broke out . . . and everything changed." Bojena's mother, a housewife, was very religious; her father, a baker, was less so, though he attended church regularly. Bojena remembers the rumor of war before the invasion, and she witnessed both the proclamations of war and the armament of youth frantically registering for the military.

The younger children were impatient, interested but fearful awaiting the war. . . . Naturally, the fear of the grown-ups was transmitted to the children. We knew something terrible was coming. Then, sure enough, my father was called to military duty and we all cried. What desperation. I was possessed by one question only: Would he come back?

Bojena's father fought on the barricades defending Warsaw, while she, her mother, and sister remained alone in their apartment basement trying to shelter themselves from frequent bombings. Bojena often ran through open fire to get water for her mother and sister. Like many rescuers, Bojena was accustomed to taking care of her younger sister.

"I wasn't afraid but she was hysterical at the sound of every siren. I held her by the hand all the time and feared she wouldn't endure it. I always held her to me tightly so she wouldn't cry."

When her father returned, unwounded but defeated, he vividly described to his family the surrender of Warsaw. "Two days later," Bojena remarked, "the Germans began to catch Jews and force them to wear white armbands with the star of Zion." Bojena, who had grown up with Jewish neighbors, witnessed their humiliation as they were forced to:

clean the grass and streets and to dig ditches. . . . Of course these actions brought with them terror. Our Jewish friends suddenly realized that the Nazis, Fascism, and Hitler was the machine that would destroy them. The adults said that the Germans wanted to conquer the world . . . that the war would not stop with Poland. I didn't have any special feeling of condemnation. I just watched and listened to what was going on.

Bojena's much-loved sister was sent to a nearby village for safety. Bojena's father joined the Polish opposition movement AK. Working as a baker allowed him to cover up his activities as well as to smuggle precious bread into the Warsaw ghetto. Bojena attended an underground classroom run by an anti-Fascist female teacher whom she deeply admired. "Her husband had been taken prisoner yet she dared to give us lessons in small groups, even knowing that the punishment for teaching secretly was death."

While Bojena's father worked in the underground, her mother took in Jews and others needing refuge from the Nazi persecutions. "In our house were women with children, women without husbands, workers, children, the unemployed as well as the intelligentsia. Everybody in this house was equal. We created a 'commune' well before the sixties."

Soon Bojena's father found ways for her to assist him in the resistance.

It began because the adults were afraid to read the announcements, the lists of those whom the Nazis were after which were posted around the city. Everybody had at least one relative or friend in the resistance--so we were often sent to find out whether or not they had been discovered and therefore listed. My mother and father made it clear that we--every one of us children--had certain functions to fulfill. Soon I began to deliver letters and news. You see, children played an important role in the anti-Nazi conspiracy. I was constantly alert. My whole attention was concentrated on the movements of the Germans: how they behaved, what their intentions toward people were . . . and I told father and mother everything.

Bojena also delivered bread, medicine, and bandages to rebels via the underground canal systems in Warsaw. "But my real function was taking Jews out of the ghetto and locating hiding places for them. My father had many contacts with the ghetto. When Jews came out to perform a special mission, I would escort them to a prearranged address."

Just before the Warsaw uprising Bojena took out two men and two women, one of whom was pregnant. Once she transferred an entire Jewish family: two girls 12 and 10, and their parents.

I was a small girl and my head and eyes were always inclined to one side. This came from always having to watch for Germans. . . . People knew my function but no one betrayed me. I would make believe I lived close to the spot I had to bring the Jews, stopping every now and then in front of a window pane to make sure I was not followed.

Well before Bojena's father requested her help, she had what Lifton has described as a death immersion, resulting in a transforming moment. At 9 years old, while her father was on the barricade,

I saw Polish soldiers killed . . . at first I thought they were asleep and would not get up, then I saw their glassy eyes and I was speechless . . . and ran home to tell my mother. This terrible sight worked revolt in me. I began to hate. . . . I, too, would be rebellious and strong. While executing dangerous functions, a person matures and there is a fast understanding of the adult world. One blink of the eye made it possible to grasp the whole event.

Bojena's father and mother were active in the Warsaw ghetto uprising. One of her brothers perished in the fight. She, her surviving brother, and mother were sent to Auschwitz. There Bojena bonded together with other female children--"We helped one another"--and she tried to keep her sick and despairing mother alive. After liberation, Bojena returned to Warsaw with her mother and was reunited with her sister and surviving brother. She received a scholarship at the university, married, had children, and now works at the Institute of Pediatrics at the Academy of Medicine in Poland. Bojena, a specialist in education, has devoted 30 years of her life to sick children and the chronically ill.

Bojena W. is representative of many child rescuer-survivors whose wartime experience has greatly affected their adult lives. Like Bojena, several other child rescuers pursued health care or other helping professions. Transcending fears and anxieties during the extreme situation has caused post-traumatic syndrome in several child rescuers who, long after the war, suffer from nightmares, stuttering, phobias, and an inability to sustain love relationships.

Mietek B. was 14 when the Germans occupied Warsaw. His father, a chemist, and mother, a clerk, were both employed in a tanning factory owned by Jews. Mietek and his 12-year-old sister had many Jewish friends and were especially close to their parents' employers, the Zaks. Mietek's father taught him "to be proud . . . to tell the truth, to help others, and to be completely independent." Before the invasion, Mietek's father was not at all political; after the occupation, he became a vehement anti-Nazi and joined the underground organization K.K.A.J.O.W.A. By 1940, Mietek had witnessed:

killings and beatings . . . dying . . . on a daily basis from sickness and disease. I saw Nazis kill people for nothing, and I saw them rape young girls to death. They were animals. I felt very bad. They started to bring old Jewish people from the neighboring towns into the center of Warsaw. Everybody knew they were establishing a ghetto.

When asked what was the most stressful event he witnessed, Mietek described a street execution in Warsaw, adding, "Then I felt I wanted to make revenge." Witness of meaningless deaths was more traumatic for Mietek than was Dachau because, "I was not put into a camp for nothing. [He was sent there for his resistance work.] What bothers me still are the people who died for nothing."

Mietek functioned as a messenger boy for the underground, but unlike Bojena, the young Mietek was required by his father to carry a gun. "Don't wait. Shoot . . ." his father advised, concerning the German soldiers and SS men he might encounter. From 1941 until 1944 he "killed them, shot them . . . we had to. How would you react if Germans came along and established a Jewish ghetto? If on the first day of occupation they took everyone out from their houses and you had to watch?"

Mietek brought food and messages into the Warsaw ghetto for several years. He describes how to enter the heavily guarded ghetto. He often had to jump from a speeding tramway. His main charges were the beloved Mr. Zak and his wife who were trapped in the ghetto.

I wanted to transport Mr. Zak to Polish soil [meaning safety] but it was impossible to take out his family. So he remained in the ghetto. I tried to convince my father I could get them out, but he told me Mr. Zak had refused. It seems to me Mr. Zak was a very proud man. He knew he was going to die soon.

Because he was forbidden to rescue the Zaks from the burning Warsaw ghetto, Mietek is still traumatized by survivor guilt. "He was too old to be a freedom fighter. My father knew if I went, the Germans would shoot me . . . it was too risky . . . at best [my death] would be nothing but an exchange, me for Mr. Zak, and my father wouldn't let me go over to the ghetto any more. Mr. Zak had always treated me like his own son . . . then, we lost contact. . . ."

In 1944 Mietek was sent to Dachau with his father; his mother and sister were sent to Auschwitz. Both of his parents perished in the death camps. From 1945 until 1946 he tried, unsuccessfully, to locate Mr. Zak's son-in-law, who had been interned in a camp in Salzburg.

Mietek still harbors much guilt over what he views as his failure to save the Zaks. "Even today, though I have a wife and daughter, I would help Mr. Zak again in a minute . . . for him, of course, for him."

Mietek's continuity of helping and sublimation of mourning is less complete than Bojena's, and operates mainly through his desire to bear witness. Perhaps this is due to his extreme loss and the resulting survivor guilt. Perhaps it is related to his own direct participation in killing--even though it was in self-defense. Mietek testified in the prosecution of Nazi war criminals. He feels adamantly that the Holocaust should not be denied or forgotten and has thus imparted his war experiences to his teenage daughter.

Mietek B. began rescuing as an adolescent, under his father's orders and direction. Though his beginning rescue activity was in compliance with his father, whom he deeply loved, the fact that he sustained his rescuing activity for several years at high personal risk belies the emergence of an anti-Nazi, philo-Semitic, moral rescuer self.

Because there are no survivors to provide witness on his behalf, Mietek has not been honored by Yad Vashem. Rewarding his goodness and his righteous acts through the process of memorialization would perhaps help transform Mietek's trauma and free his energies from the oppressive stagnation of survivor guilt.

Concerned-Detached Professionals

"Concerned-Detached Professionals," a term coined by Katz (cited in Lief & Fox, 1963), is quite appropriate for the proportionally smallest group of rescuers (5%). Their altruistic behavior was related to their jobs, either within the Nazi bureaucracy or within a helping profession; they had careers such as psychologist, social worker, policeman, translator, doctor, and minister. Their initial rescue began either by being asked, or personally initiating or just getting started with a group of others. For example, those in the mental health professions were asked by the network to take people in and they acknowledged it was the morally right thing to do. They are not necessarily philo-

Semitic but they were ideologically anti-Nazi. They did not need a network to support their ideology; they had their profession.

What is different in this group is the quality of their rescue relationships. These rescuers seem to have a distant professional relationship, much like the doctor-patient relationship, with their rescuees. In some of these cases Jews who were being harbored left their safe haven to go elsewhere in the middle of the war. They did not feel at home and were not accepted as part of the family. The emotional distance created by the rescuer may have even contributed to a suspiciousness on the part of the helpless person being protected.

Concerned professionals felt a sense of independence, an ability to stand up for their beliefs. A few had strict parental upbringing accompanied by physical punishment. Their parents gave them independence, competence about their abilities, and high tolerance for people who are different. More than half had losses in early childhood. They had a real sense of belonging to their society. During the war none of them rescued children (one transported a child). Those who were harboring Jews at home rescued only a few while those in the network rescued hundreds. With the exception of one, they did not maintain relationships with those they rescued, and their names were not submitted for recognition at Yad Vashem.

Jopie D. was a 40-year-old divorced single mother of two adolescent daughters when the Nazis invaded Holland. A psychoanalyst and teacher who had studied under Jung and Adler, Jopie was thrown out of her university position when she refused to take an oath to Hitler. Though she had lost her position, she continued to maintain a small private practice of psychotherapy in her home throughout the war. Feeling that the war would probably last some time, Jopie rented a piece of land next to her house and "bought seeds and vegetables, especially those which would keep in winter. That way, I could feed people who were hidden or who could not use their coupons for fear of being identified and sent to work in Germany."

Her first rescue began after she had advertised for a maid in a local paper. A stranger soon telephoned asking if she would be willing to:

adopt a dog. I had a dog and thought, "Well, another would be okay." It was not until I asked the sex of the dog, and heard "female," that it began to dawn on me that we had been talking about a human being. Soon after, an 18-year-old Jewish girl arrived at my house. She wanted to tell me her story, but I said, "No. I don't want my fingernails pulled off." That's what the Germans did to get confessions. I also let her know that if I were to be threatened, or if my daughters were threatened, I could not guarantee my response.

The young woman, who had false identity papers, then was allowed to stay. Hannie, as Jopie agreed to call the young Jewish woman, lived and worked as a maid in Jopie's house for several years. The SS and the SA had headquarters

across the street from Jopie's house. Only once was Jopie's house searched by German soldiers; and once, while on vacation with Jopie and her daughters, Hannie was recognized by collaborationists.

I gave Hannie money for a train ticket and told her to go home. The people who had recognized her came to me and said, "That girl is a Jew." I said, "I don't know what you are talking about. That girl is my maid and her mother took ill and so she went back home." They never said anything more.

Jopie also transported one of her youngest daughter's classmates.

She lived in Amsterdam with her grandmother. When I arrived, I saw the little girl had the Star of David on her coat. But the Jews were not permitted to go on the streetcars or on trains. I told her, "We are going to ride the streetcar and we are going on a train. You do exactly as I do. I will carry the luggage. You sit with me but not as if you know me." Then we took the Star of David off, went to the streetcar, and oh! She was frightened. I bought the train tickets, we boarded, and at the last minute, a German soldier sat across from us. She did not look very Jewish, which helped, and we made it to our destination. She followed me out of the station. I delivered her to the address I'd been given. She was smuggled to Denmark, and later, the United States. But I never heard from her again.

Despite her rescue activities, and the obvious risks involved, Jopie D. maintained a cool emotional distance from those she helped. She never formed a real relationship with Hannie, whom she still describes as "the Jewish girl" or more often, "my maid." Nor did she ever allow the young and vulnerable Hannie to share the story of how she had lost her family before finding Jopie through the underground. Jopie's need to distance herself from Hannie is revealed by

her behavior at the end of the war. She states, "I had Hannie all during the war. Later, when the Eastern part of Holland was rumored to be on the verge of liberation, I told Hannie I had relatives in that area. I told her to get her bicycle together and I showed her where to go. She went. She was liberated even before we were."

Jopie returned to this moment several times during the interview. It was as if it was necessary for her to justify her decision to ask Hannie to leave. It must be realized that what Jopie told Hannie to do--that is, ride her bicycle for several days through the occupied zone alone, with false papers--was in fact very dangerous. Jopie's second return to this incident during the interview is revealing. She states, "She [Hannie] was blonde, which helped a great deal. And she had the guts to go on her bicycle all the way to the East." Here Jopie is able to admit to the danger of going East, but she still does not acknowledge that she told Hannie to go. Here she makes it seem that it was Hannie's decision, and not her order, that sent Hannie alone to the East. In a third reference to the incident, Jopie revealed still another level of her reasons for sending Hannie East. "She would be liberated sooner, and don't forget, we had practically no food."

It must be kept in mind that throughout the interview food is very important to Jopie. She describes many meals in childhood, as well as helping her mother cook and shop.

Describing her first experience of meeting a Jew, she recounts how her mother sent her for special foods. The minute she begins to describe the war years she speaks of buying land to grow a garden so there will be enough food to make it through the war and to feed the Dutch boys who were in hiding to escape from forced labor. She even ends the interview with a remark about how the war was not so difficult to live through, except for the shortage of food.

If food symbolizes safety and survival to Jopie, it is perhaps correct to infer that in the last, quite stressful and chaotic moments of the war, Jopie felt compelled to send Hannie, another mouth to feed, away to the East. To coldly turn her out without anywhere to go would be too cruel an act for Jopie to perform--it would present too much of a conflict--so she tells Hannie "where to go," and repeatedly lets the interviewer know that she "was right" to send her away, because the East was "liberated well before us, just as I predicted."

Hannie's refusal to maintain contact with Jopie after the war is perhaps further evidence of the fact that a trusting, loving bond was never formed in this rescue relationship. Even Jopie's description of her motivation is more detached than our previous types, who speak strongly about their compassion for the plight of the Jews, or about their passionate hatred of the Nazi invaders. "I felt it was the right thing to do. I wanted to do something against

the unjust actions of the Nazis. It was a conviction to help other people . . . and do as much damage to the Nazis as I could."

One of three siblings, Jopie was raised in a liberal and cosmopolitan Dutch family from Friesland. She was extremely close to her father, a famous art dealer, who had frequent contact with the Jewish artists he represented. In her family, Jopie says, "Values were lived, not taught." Her parents were intellectuals, and she recalls taking many walks with her father, who taught her from a young age about aesthetics, and often took her along to art exhibits. She attended a girls' school for "quick learners" where she studied many languages as well as literature. Raised with a high value placed on tolerance, she said, "It didn't make any difference what religion someone was when choosing a friend." At age 4, she lost one of her twin sisters, and recalls, "I said goodbye to her and didn't understand why I had to say goodbye." Politics were important to her, though religion was not.

We read the paper and were familiar with all the parties. As the youngest of the family, I got more of that education at an early age. I took it all in. We were expected to form our own opinions. There was a lot of conversation going on all the time. I would say if there were ever a family with equal rights, my family was certainly such. We children had just as much right to talk as my mother or father had.

Jopie's father was helpful to his clients and to others through the Freemasons. Her mother, who had some Jewish

friends, was also "there whenever anyone needed help." A high value was placed on education, and one family saying was, "You have to eat, you have to learn." Jopie was quite adventurous and independent in childhood and as a young adult, traits she traces back to her Friesland descent. "Independence was as natural as breathing in my family . . . perhaps because Friesland is a very independent, open-minded province." Her strong spirit of independence is reflected in her refusal to take the oath to Hitler and in her description of her motivation to rescue Hannie and her daughter's young classmate.

After the war, Jopie moved to the United States with her two daughters. She never remarried. She continues to teach and to practice psychotherapy. She supports some social causes by giving money, is apolitical, and is not a churchgoer, though she has some personal religious beliefs.

Summary

The five different psychological types of rescuers are formulated in relation to the continuity of the self in the extreme situation. The unique combination of the visible influential variants contributes to the evolving integration between the person's confrontation or awareness of the death and inhumaneness around him and the personal need to take action against these injustices.

In emphasizing continuity, the distinction between how people come to perform an act can be observed from the point where rescuer, victim, and situation are intertwined. The differences in degree, who and how, and the form of the rescue act cannot be understood as the determining factors in the overall process of becoming a rescuer. Rather, it is the interaction between all these variables that are observable once the sequence of events is reviewed through reason analysis and the psychohistorical process.

The rescuer avoids cognitive dissonance and seeks congruity between identity, feelings, attitudes, and behavior. For example, individuals risked their lives to uphold and maintain basic beliefs whether they stemmed from their nationality, their religion, their morality, politics, or profession.

Further, they were striving to keep cherished values about human life and relationships alive. For example, the Polish nationalists' strong desire to transform national identities (e.g., Poles as killers of Jews) motivated some Poles of Zegota underground to rescue (M. Kestenberg, personal communication, 1987).

The rescue activity takes the form of and mirrors the rescuer's core self. For example, the detached professionals maintain professional distance in their relationships. Of those who were adventurous in childhood the form of rescue tended to be toward adventurous scenarios

transporting people across mountains to free zones, sabotage, highly dangerous resistance work, etc. The Relational-Philo-Semitic rescuer tended to take people into their home and emphasized close ties to people they were rescuing. The emotional compassionate rescuer did not differentiate between a wounded Nazi and a Jewish child. He was moved at the pain and suffering of a human being.

The Ideological-Network people were already members of intelligentsia and regarded themselves as very political beings so rescue started with political activities. Helping people was more anonymous and more ideological.

The children maintained their child role, respectfully and obediently carrying out the wishes of their parents.

The religious people imaged themselves in Biblical terms like the Good Samaritan, Jesus, or like the Black Madonna. The initiators in the moral category identified with a dominant, nurturing role model.

Those who had a transforming encounter had an empathic sense of "one-ness" and image themselves into the victims' situations.

The rescuers' self-constellation and the form that their rescue acts took also stemmed from formative developmental influences which were maintained and expressed even in the extreme situation.

What has been observed is that the Moral Rescuers act upon the values ingrained in them as children. The capacity to perceive the other person as human is intertwined with

strong convictions of right and wrong. Prior relationships with Jews were not necessary to evoke an empathic response from the rescuers to their victimization. Parental role models of altruistic behavior and personal involvement in such acts made it all the more natural to respond affirmatively when these rescuers were asked to save lives. The few rescuers who initiated extraordinary help had personal role models for such action. The ability to initiate rather than just respond humanely may be directly linked to the leadership qualities of one's caretakers. This appears to be the case for rescuers who fall into this category. For example, Wanda L.'s father was a dominant, caring, and task-oriented man in his work environment as well as in the family. He represented a democratic type leadership as described in Systematic Multiple Level Observation of Groups (SYMLOG) (Bales & Cohen, 1979). His initiation at caring and nurturing family members, colleagues, and even strangers is eventually continued in Wanda L., who personally experienced those aspects of her father.

Post-War Continuity

The Ideological-Moral rescuers who responded with the immediate self are still ready to risk their lives again if necessary. They don't necessarily seek out risk-filled situations, but when they are presented with a situation that requires responsiveness, their humaneness comes to the fore.

The Religious-Moral rescuers had strong religious upbringings and continue a religious life. They serve God and will also help man when necessary. The continuity for them is their religious beliefs.

The Emotional-Moral rescuers continue to react emotionally to situations. A few have even experienced post-traumatic stress syndromes in recent years. They internalize the pain and suffering of others, not just in the extreme situation, but at other times as well.

The Relational Philo-Semites continue their affinity to Jews. Their sense of self is not necessarily derived from their moral acts. Rather it is the relationship and connectedness to Jews that is the meaningful aspect of rescue experience. It is the relationship not only to a person but to a community. Many have had a loss in childhood and positive relations with Jews as: "Shabbos goys" (non-Jews who for religious purposes turned on lights for observant Jews); classmates; working relationships; family acquaintances and friends. Some developed these close ties before the war. Perhaps the close family ties in Jewish families and the feeling of community is what attracts people who have lost a sense of family and community. The Jewish connection not only to a person but also a family is so central to the grounding of the person that some go as far as converting to Judaism, emigrating to Israel, marrying Jews, or maintaining close ties with the Jews they saved or others. Rescuers also report wanting to be buried with the

Jews. Continuity of philo-Semitism and relationships with specific Jews is what remains stable as opposed to altruism per se. Again, risking their lives to save Jews signified an integration of attitudes and feelings with direct aid that is congruent with these aspects of self. Ideological-Network rescuers came from families who belonged to political parties and imparted the importance of the political historical process to their children. Some of this political ideology was intertwined with religious beliefs. Some were raised in less religious homes but religion was still understood as a belief system. It was not a laissez-faire attitude in either case. A high value was also placed on education and most of these rescuers came from professional and business backgrounds.

For the Ideological rescuers, the post-Holocaust continuity varied. First, they all experienced a loss of individual and communal identity previously comprised of anti-Nazi attitudes, morality, and Relational Philo-Semitism. Rescuers who belonged to a network had to redefine themselves and continue these aspects which were most salient to them. For example, those whose initial involvement with the network was strong anti-Nazi ideology but no close ties to Jews continue to change their ideological focus to fit the new environment.

Those who remained in Eastern Europe sacrificed their lives again to fight against new oppressive regimes. For example, one Polish rescuer is very involved in the

Solidarity movements and runs an underground school in her home. A few rescuers are ideologically opposed to nuclear weapons and have become active in the movement to prevent a nuclear war.

Those who were active politically in religious parties lost this political grounding. Though the specific content of the ideology has changed, the feelings behind it and a continued need to integrate ideology with behavior are constant.

The children who were solicited to risk their lives to help experienced some adjustment difficulties in their post-traumatic childhoods. Those who were emotionally able devoted their lives to helping people and continue to derive meaning from their wartime experience.

Like the Ideological-Network rescuers, the Concerned-Detached Professionals were brought up in families where a high value was placed on education and professional life. After the war, they continued their professional careers. Some were so transformed by their rescue acts that their professional role now continues to also be related to their experience during the Holocaust; for example, one man began to help victims of post-traumatic stress disorder of World War II. Others continue their professional role but are not necessarily altruistic beyond what is required by their helping profession.

Though the different motivational types appear distinct and some are mutually exclusive (e.g., a moral rescuer who has never known a Jew nor has had any particular attitudes toward them is not a Relational Philo-Semitic rescuer) in certain people there may be overlapping patterns. The distinctions between the three kinds of morality are not always clear cut. A Relational Philo-Semitic rescuer can also be an Ideological-Network type. The fluidity between some of the types also has to do with the fact that rescue was not a one-time act. Rather, it was a process which lasted anywhere from a minute interaction to over six years. Thus, a person may start out as one motivational type and then continue to rescue as a different motivational type. For example, a person instinctively involved with a Jew starts out as a Relational Philo-Semitic type and then gets involved in a network to reflect his newly developed ideology and is now an Ideological-Network rescuer for the duration of the war.

When such changes occurred during the rescue period the continuity before and after the war was the determining factor in deciding which motivational category to assign to an individual case.

Because rescue was not a one-time act, the behavior needs to be understood in greater depth by looking more closely at the rescuer self and the rescuer relationship. This will be the focus of the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The complexity of altruistic behavior in an extreme situation requires integration of several disciplines. Combined fields fostered a more holistic approach to individual rescuers, as well as to rescuers as a group with an identifiable "historical role and reaction" (Keniston, 1968).

In the Nazi era, the majority of people were bystanders. Historically speaking, their passivity was crucial to the success of the Final Solution and their non-action ultimately implicates them in the Nazi machinery of death. Because of this truth it is difficult (especially for survivors) to accept that some people were not merely bystanders, but rescuers who risked their lives to save others. As this study shows, rescuers were not mystical angels or saints, nor were they mythical heroes. They were complex, often conflicted, but quite ordinary human beings. Demythologizing the rescuers helps to restore their credibility, and therefore reveals their potential to serve as much-needed role models for humane behavior.

As demonstrated, these rescuers acted humanely for a myriad of reasons. Some were motivated by religious

and/or political ideology, some felt an intimate sense of connectedness to Jews. Some combined a professional concern for the welfare of innocent victims with a cool, professional distance while others acted out of a deep-felt compassion, born of a transforming encounter with death. Some pledged allegiance to an ideological movement, while others, younger than they, obeyed the difficult orders of their desperate, but committed rescuer parents. All possessed deep, unconscious needs which, when gratified through rescue acts and nourished by fantasy, helped to motivate and to reinforce their high-risk rescuing behavior. Rescuers were not, therefore, "selfless," but rather human beings with inner needs that were met and satisfied by their altruistic behavior. Whether the rescue act was fueled by fantasies of mystical connectedness to Jesus, or to a lost parent, whether the rescue of children was motivated by a deep inner need to nurture or parent a child, and so on, the rescue act functioned to gratify some unconscious part of the self. What was basic to all rescuers, however, was a real awareness, a tremendous capacity to "let in" the reality of the extreme situation, as well as an ability to realize their own responsibility and to admit to themselves, "These human beings will die if I do not intervene."

Rarely in this sample did a single, immediately apprehensible motivation to rescue emerge. For example, individuals who were strongly anti-Nazi were also sometimes

married to Jews; people motivated by compassion for the plight of victims also expressed motivation based on moral values which were learned in childhood; Christian fundamentalist rescuers could be philo-Semitic; religious rescuers could engage in destructive sabotage work for a network, and so on.

Keniston (1968) warned researchers against the artificiality of attempting to freeze motivations in monolithic terms. According to Keniston's study of young radicals involved in anti-war protests during the "Vietnam Summer," the interviewer who poses the question, "How did you come to be what you are?" will elicit answers that artificially integrate and sum up motivational factors which are an ongoing process. Such summations of motivations must be seen as provisional and preliminary descriptions of what is in essence a nonstatic nonlinear process. Thus, any attempt to isolate a single, all-encompassing motivational factor to explain rescuers' decisions or conduct in extreme, high-risk situations is doomed to oversimplify a complex, multifaceted behavior.

The uniqueness of each rescuer cannot be undermined, but patterns which reveal how people became involved in rescue acts do emerge, and can give us useful clues as to how to nurture and promote humane behavior.

Sociological Factors

Once a group is identified (e.g., Vietnam veterans, Holocaust survivors), myths emerge based on subjective impressions rather than on systematic data. As the rescuers of Jews during the Nazi era become a more visible entity, their previously hidden role becomes part of the ongoing dialogue in the transmission of historical information.

Sociological variables which can define the parameters of an identifiable group are especially important to the analysis of samples that are not random. They also can shed light on who was excluded from the sample. Although this sample was not randomly selected in terms of sociological variables of age, sex, education, social class, politics, religion, and relations with Jews, the group turned out to be diverse and representative of a wide spectrum.

Age

In terms of age, the least representative group as would be expected in a study taking place 40 years after the war was those who were elderly during the war years. The variable of age also identified child rescuers (between the ages of 5 to late adolescence) as a distinguishable group. As in similar studies, sociological variables serve as descriptions of the sample group.

Sex Differences

From the evidence of this sample, motivation to help others in extreme situations is not gender-based. Men and women share similar rescue motivations based on similar constellations of situational, moral, and emotional factors.

This study confirms Gilligan's (1981) notion of morality based on ideology and morality stemming from compassion and social responsibility. However, the sex differentiation she makes, that men will behave morally for abstract reasons while women make moral decisions based on feelings of "social responsibility," is not confirmed. Many women in the rescuer sample cited strong anti-Nazi feelings as their primary motivation. Women also spoke of a belief system in which rescue was a morally correct response to injustice and to the inhumane treatment of Jews and other victims of Nazism.

More men than women were emotionally motivated rescuers and post-traumatic stress disorder developed in a few of the rescuers whose motivation was more emotionally based. These rescuers described compassion, pity, and an inner need as the reasons they helped the victim. An emotional response is perhaps too fragile to combat totalitarianism. Perhaps an ideological movement can best be combatted by an individual through relational, moral, and ideological convictions that transcend a morality based on feelings. Gilligan's "different voice" is heard in less than 10% of the rescuers,

and it was evenly distributed between men and women. Finally, both men and women were motivated by and spoke in terms of deep emotional attachment to the people they saved.

Religion and Politics

The rescuers in this sample came from varied religious denominations; the majority were Catholic and the second largest group was Protestant. However, it was interesting to come across members of the fundamentalist anti-Revolutionary church party in Holland which formed a religious rescue network (similar to Confession churches in Germany and Huguenots in France) whose rescue activity has not been sufficiently documented. Although this sample is composed of more Catholics than Protestants, we cannot conclude that Catholics were more prone to rescue than Protestants.

Contrary to Ringelblum's (1975) belief that Christians rescued Jews solely for the purpose of converting them, very few rescuers in the study claimed to have such intentions. In fact, our finding that across the spectrum of rescuers, regardless of religious background tolerance for differentness was a learned value in childhood regardless of religious background directly contradicts Ringelblum's findings.

In terms of politics most of the rescuers who were peasants had no political orientation. What is striking is

that the sample reveals a wide range of political orientations with the highest percent belonging to religious political parties (16%). Only one rescuer had belonged to the National Socialist Party in Germany, but had left the party prior to rescue. It is possible that there were other Nazi party members who eventually aided Jews; however, due to the sample's dependence on Yad Vashem criteria, these people may have been eliminated.

Relation with Jews

Prior relationships with Jews were not an absolute precursor to rescue. As this study has shown, more people rescued Jews having had no previous experience with Jewish people. However, we have also observed how a philo-Semitic orientation can be one component of a motivational constellation. Those rescuers who had positive experiences in childhood with Jews did not form ambivalent rescue relationships. Very few rescuers in this sample had mixed or negative experiences with Jews in childhood.

Social Class, Education, and Profession

These variables revealed several interesting trends. For example, the Ideological-Network rescuers tended to be more highly educated than the other rescuer types. The majority of Ideological-Network rescuers had completed college and possessed or went on to earn higher graduate degrees. One does not need to be politically astute to

develop a morality based on compassion, religious values, or a deep felt sense of right and wrong. But in this study, higher education correlates directly with rescuer motivation that grew out of anti-Fascist ideologies.

Before World War II, social class was more rigid from one generation to the next. The more highly educated rescuers, therefore, tended to have parents in businesses or in professions. Lastly, the socioeconomic status of wealthy rescuers fluctuated during and after the war more dramatically than those in other groups. Very wealthy people became somewhat poor, rarely recouping their pre-war economic status in post-war years.

From the evidence of the nonrandom sample it is erroneous to assume that rescue was more prevalent in any one social class.

Nursing is possibly the most altruistic of the helping professions, as the rewards of remuneration and prestige are less than those accorded doctors and professors. It is therefore interesting to note that a disproportionate number of nurses appeared in the "initiating rescue activity" category of the study. Three of the nurses in the sample did not report having been altruistic as children. However, they had all had losses in childhood, a common experience among those who initiated rescue.

Other helping professionals such as social workers, psychologists, and some doctors were more detached in their

rescue relationships. When rescuers had skills such as printing, translating, carpentry, and even skiing their rescue activities reflected their skill.

Formative Developmental Influences

Altruistic Parents

In this sample of rescuers the universal formative-developmental influence was that of an altruistic parent or other altruistic adult role model. Clearly imitation of parental behavior in childhood is a crucial element in the development of an altruistic self. This is intuitively correct: we expect that children would learn basic values such as helping others from their parents.

Other studies have also found an altruistic role model to be consistent with selfless, committed people. Rosenhan (1970) found highly committed civil rights activists had parents who were moralistic and whose behavior was consistent with their values. Partially committed civil rights workers, however, had parents who were not as consistent in their values and in their actions. Similarly, Keniston (1968) in his study of anti-Vietnam war protest organizers, discovered that:

the most impressive feature of the radical commitment in these young men and women is the sense of continuity most of them feel with their pasts. . . . Becoming a radical, as seen in this group, involves no fundamental change in core values [emphasis added]. To be sure, the formal political beliefs of parents and children invariably differ even in the children of radical families. But each of those interviewed was brought up

in a family whose core values are fully congruent with his present radical activities. (p. 113)

Parental influence alone is probably not sufficient to create a rescuer self. Only when society at large is altruistic will high ethical action be perpetuated on a broad scale. This is not to say that altruistic behavior would necessarily be widespread under a malevolent authority, nor would national policies undergo a transformation. There are many other contributing factors to developing an altruistic self, although they are eclipsed by parental influence.

Tolerance for Differentness

Most of the rescuers reported learning the value of a high tolerance for other people's beliefs and practices at home. Rescuers who heard anti-Semitic remarks at home (either quite derogatory statements or simply stereotypes about Jews having money, strange religious practices, and so on) did not risk their lives to save a Jew. They tended, rather, to get involved in resistance groups or to oppose the Nazis by sabotage and leafletting. Rescuers who heard anti-Semitic remarks at home rarely actively helped Jews; not one initiated helping activities without extraordinary outside circumstances or outside prompting.

A greater proportion of the rescuers were exposed to anti-Semitic remarks outside of the home. However, when asked if they had seen evidence of anti-Semitism at school,

they could not remember specific details. These extra-familial attitudes were not as influential on the rescuers in developing the value of tolerance as the opinions expressed within the family.

Christianity teaches the love of one's neighbor. Few of the rescuers, however, recalled learning the value of tolerance of one's neighbor's differences in church. Instead, they remember being taught that the Jews killed Christ, or that Jews would drink the blood of Christian babies for Passover.

There are a few Protestant Fundamentalist sects that teach that the Jews are God's Chosen People. This is not quite the same as learning the religious value of tolerance, but it is interesting to note that many of the Dutch rescuers who were members of the anti-Revolutionary Church Party were taught about the Jews in similar positive religious terms.

Religion's professed purpose is to transmit an ultimate, hence exclusionary, truth. It is not surprising, therefore, that throughout history, religious institutions have--in practical terms--tended to emphasize the parochial, rather than the universal. As demonstrated, parochial, exclusionary values are not conducive to altruism.

There is a dearth of studies, either sociological or psychological, which explore the impact of church teachings on behavior. Historians, philosophers, and theologians have

begun to look at the church and church leaders in terms of their values and philosophies (e.g., Hallie, 1979, and Littell, 1974), but it is equally necessary to examine the social impact of these teachings.

McWilliams (1976, 1984) has found that among extreme helpers, there is a tendency to describe very different religious backgrounds in strikingly similar terms:

I was fascinated to find, in talking to these subjects, how central to their humanitarian work their belief systems were . . . considering that there were four different denominational affiliations represented, it was striking to me that they all described their religious orientation in virtually identical terms. All [were] strongly religious, and all [were] observant of religious practices, but not in an empty or rigid ritualized way. All describe[d] the feeling of awareness of the presence of God in the world, and in their own good works. All [felt] that their humanitarian efforts somehow help[ed] to strengthen their faith. All tend[ed] to make certain distinctions between truly holy, and superficially observant worshippers.

Birth Order

In this sample, a majority of rescuers had siblings born two to three years after them. This finding confirms McWilliams' study (1976, 1984) of extreme helpers. Gaylin's (1970) finding that Vietnam war resisters tended to be first-born children is also similar to our finding that over 50% of the rescuers in this sample were first-born children.

Value of Independence

Another important value rescuers learned in the home was a parentally encouraged sense of independence. This

sense of self-sufficiency was probably one of the most important factors in the rescuer's ability to disobey a malevolent authority. Children who were not taught independence by their parents considered themselves to be "loners." This sense of themselves as separate from group influence must also have helped them to ignore group pressure.

Lifton (1973), in Home from the War, found this identification of oneself as a loner in a Vietnam soldier who refused to take part in the My Lai massacre:

While it is difficult to know exactly why he was able to join the handful of men who stepped out of the norm and did not participate in the firing, three long-standing psychological patterns seemed significant . . . his lifelong inclination to be a loner, to engage in activities that kept him both physically and psychically separated from others, helped him to maintain a certain degree of autonomy from group influence and from the atrocity-producing situation itself. (p. 58)

A sense of independence is related to a feeling of one's own self-confidence and competence. This feeling of confidence often helped the rescuer overcome his fear of the real danger he confronted while illegally helping Jews. A belief in one's ability to handle any situation on one's own may be considered a prerequisite for undertaking life-threatening rescue activities.

In his early study of rescuers, Coopersmith (cited in Oliner, 1982) found that rescuers had a sense of competence and independence. Much of the literature speaks of the correlation between high self-esteem and altruism.

Losses in Childhood

Most of the rescuers in this sample suffered a loss or major separation during their developmental years. Many rescuers were young during the First World War, and were therefore likely to experience separation from fathers. As medicine was not as advanced as today, many children lost siblings to illnesses. This was true not only of our rescuer sample, but of the entire contemporary European population. Early loss is not necessarily a major factor in developing a propensity to help others. But the nurturance of a significant adult, who is also a role model for ethical behavior, encourages the sublimation of grief into a desire to ease the pain of others. For instance, McWilliams (1976, 1984) has found that the double influence of loss and an altruistic role model is characteristic of extreme helpers.

In the development of a stable identity as a helper, including an effective and consistent ego-ideal, the following sequence may pertain: a) the experience of a major loss roughly between the ages of two and three (i.e., during the stage identified in Erikson's 1959 summary as the phase of "autonomy vs. shame and doubt"); b) the simultaneous or immediately subsequent exposure to a person who models consistent altruistic behavior. (1976, p. 357)

Some of the leaders who emerged after the bombing of Hiroshima, interviewed by Lifton (Death in Life, 1967), also experienced losses in early childhood. Lifton describes a mystical healer whose mother had died when she was a child, and whose father had had a profound spiritual influence on her:

Her father was an unusually devout Buddhist who exhorted her to always live wholeheartedly, a characteristic Japanese plea for sincerity and dedication. She thought of this encounter as "the greatest event in my life," the stimulus for her religious immersion. She came to look upon herself as a mystical healer who had been put through what was "not a common human experience" which invested her with supernatural qualities. She emerged as a leader through an ordeal of illness in which she seemed to enter the realm of the dead and return from it. (p. 218)

The "A-Bomb Zealot Saint," a leader described by Lifton in the same book, follows a similar pattern. In this case, however, the father was dead and so the father's ghost serves as the significant altruistic adult:

His father died when he was two years old, leaving him with a mixture of guilt (I was born, and he died) and mythologized imagery of a near-martyr who, in serving as an assistant to a Catholic priest, spent his last penny on the poor. (p. 238)

Throughout a deprived childhood, this young man sustained himself by believing that he, like Jesus, could "rescue others from death--could provide life." This identification with supreme altruism and self-sacrifice, according to Lifton, "contributed greatly to his lifelong inclination toward pity and nurturance for all those he felt to be oppressed."

Early losses can be a catalyzing force which awakens one's sensitivity to the need for life-enhancing actions. This response will not be universal, but seems dependent on the example of self-sacrifice or giving aid to others observed by the child in an early role model. It is,

however, equally important that one is taught the value of tolerance. Otherwise, help might not be given to those who are different from oneself.

Comparative Findings

Social psychological research on prosocial behavior has mostly been conducted in the laboratory or in simulated emergency intervention field studies (Latané & Darley, 1970). But a social-psychological study of extraordinary help in a historical context cannot be easily compared to a bystander intervention helping paradigm. Rescue during World War II was not a one-time act. In the historical context of Nazism, direct intervention in the face of a malevolent authority would have meant immediate death. The five stage model of Darley and Latané (awareness of the event; interpreting it; determining personal responsibility; choosing a form of assistance; implementing that assistance) is relevant but not sufficient to explain a rescuing relationship that extends over time. In addition, the stage of "awareness" was not always dependent on a direct witnessing of an emergency situation. Finally, bystander intervention studies do not explore disobedience to authority or the complex moral dilemmas created by behaving in ways which are contrary to social norms. Findings in this study are also contrary to the laboratory studies of Rosenhan, Salovey, and Horgis (1981), which found that people who are in a positive

mood are more likely to help those in distress. In the extreme situation, positive affect is obviously not a prerequisite to an individual's ability to respond to a life and death situation. In fact, those who were affected by the persecution of the Nazis and who felt that they were also potential victims were able to transcend their own suffering and fears and to respond humanely to the plight of the Jewish victims.

Several myths about the rescuers have been disproven by this study. Characteristics that are extreme in a group are often attributed to the group as a whole. In relation to the rescuers, two such attributes stand out. The first is the notion that altruistic individuals possess a sense of marginality and of adventurousness (Huneke, 1980; Oliner, 1982; Tec, 1985). It is true that some rescuers felt marginal (29% in this sample) and that many identified themselves as adventurous (57%), but these numerical values are not high percentages compared to other more salient characteristics of the rescuer self, such as independence, competence, and willingness to stand up for beliefs. The quality of adventurousness may, however, have influenced the style in which adventurous people carried out their rescue activities. In a few cases the prospect of adventure was cited as the initial motivation to join network activities. In terms of "belongingness," even those rescuers who felt they did not belong (because they were physically

handicapped, of a minority religion or nationality) did not attribute their motivation to alienation. The majority in this sample felt a sense of belonging (71%), a finding which indicated that rescuers were very much ingrained in the societies in which they were living.

Comparing this study to previous research on rescuers, Huneke's (1980) types bear some resemblances to three of the motivational types described here. Huneke categorizes rescue as an end in itself by highlighting three motivating forces. These are (a) Ideological rescues, influenced by ideological beliefs which are based on religious or moral values; (b) Communal rescues, which involved a network functioning under a strong leader; and (c) Friendship rescues, which involved saving individuals who were already friends or acquaintances of the rescuer. Huneke's social-psychological conceptualization distinguishes self-motivating factors, relationships, and external forces of group involvement. His interesting ideas are further developed and précised in this study.

Coopersmith's profile of the rescuers' family patterns of socialization, ego development, and belief system provided some clues about motivations that were confirmed by findings in this study. According to Coopersmith, the rescuers felt accepted and loved as children, even if their parents were harsh and rigid. They were brought up to believe in their competence and to persevere in achieving

goals. They often had a fantasy model (parent, friend, religious figure) of someone who performed heroically.

Most significantly, Coopersmith stresses the congruence between moral beliefs and action as a primary component of the rescuer's personality. The rescuers gained satisfaction by affirming abstract principles through action. But they also felt a genuine human concern for specific people in the immediate situation. They were not heroes, but were able to work through their anxiety: rescuing represented a moment of truth.

Tec's study of Polish rescuers (1986) is more sociological-historical than social-psychological. This social-psychological study bears out her finding that rescuers have independence and an ability to stand up for their beliefs, as well as her observation that sociological factors of religion and social class are not sufficient to explain the propensity toward helping Jews during World War II. Her observation that "the tendency to perceive aid to Jews in a matter-of-fact unassuming way, which comes together with constantly strong denials of any heroic or extraordinary qualities" is relevant to rescuers in this sample. However, it is my assessment that rescuers do feel a sense of integrity which has arisen out of the congruence between their beliefs and behavior under duress.

The Altruistic Response and Continuity

There is a high correlation between the acceptance of values of altruism and tolerance for differentness among the rescuers studied here. This solid correlation of values is inconsistent with Lifton's idea of Protean man who takes on and sheds values as easily as an actor dons and doffs costumes. Although the rescuers were responding to an immediate situation, their humanitarian responses derived from an inner core of self and were not one-time reactions. Unlike Protean man, rescuers do not take up causes and ideas as they arise. Rescuers have a consistency in values, these values are consistent with their backgrounds, and they tend to reassert themselves--though in less dramatic ways--even after the cessation of the extreme situation. The rescuers may appear Protean because they have risked their lives for others only during the Holocaust. But what has disappeared is the immediate need for rescuing, not the rescuer's values. Asked would they rescue again, most said they would "definitely." Not one said, "Oh no, that was my rescuing phase."

The notion of continuity is similar to what Keniston (1968) discovered about young radicals and their commitment to the Vietnam Summer. He observed a continuous process of concern rather than a unique one-time, one-cause involvement.

The Rescuer Self and Rescuing Relationships

This study suggests a unique psychodynamic within the individual which is also expressed in the relationships they formed. The following questions arise out of the examination of the "rescuer self" and "rescuing relationship."

Is the rescuer self part of an ongoing, core self-process, a psychoformation grounded in previous experience? Or is the rescuer self formed only through participating in the act of rescue? Does the rescue act function to "decenter" (Lifton, 1983) a sufficiently grounded core self; does this destabilization of the self cause the rescuer to undergo a symbolic transformation which in turn gives rise to a recentered, newly evolved rescuer self? And finally, what is the crucial psychological difference between Lifton's "doubled" Nazi doctors and the rescuers who also frequently performed acts which were "morally incongruent"? Rescuers often lied, stole, and sometimes even murdered to save the lives of those they had vowed to protect.

As Lifton points out in The Life of the Self (1983), centering and decentering are part of a common dialectic, each dependent on the capacity for grounding. In a more recent essay, he furthers this concept to include the human capacity to embrace a "species self," a self which, though grounded in its own history, is capable of integrating a human identity which goes far beyond concepts of nationalism and race. Crucial to planetary survival, this "species

self" enables people to connect to a larger ecosystematic identity.

The concept of grounding, and the centering-decentering dialectic, is relevant to the rescuer self. It would account for the fact that in this sample, some people were transformed instantaneously into rescuers, while other rescuers evolved over a long period of time. It could be said that most rescuers were sufficiently grounded to withstand the decentering necessary to make symbolic transformations and assimilate new experience. The act of rescue often entailed anxiety and great risk; rescue acts could also unleash strong feelings of guilt (at not being able to do more, at risking one's own family in the service of others), rage (at the oppressors), terror and sadness (at the witness of atrocities and dehumanization), all of which ostensibly could induce a general sense of inner chaos. But it is apparent from this sample that rescuers have a strong equilibrium and are therefore able to withstand intense decentering experiences and the accompanying pain and confusion, which in grounded individuals, as Lifton points out, can be experienced in the service of recentering, achieving a new mode of still-flexible psychoformative ordering. This would account for the "developmental spiral" that Wundheiler (1986) observed was set in motion in the rescuer Oskar Schindler.

The definition [of Schindler] by others as compassionate and kind made him see himself that way. As a result, he acted more in line with that definition and that, in turn, enhanced the view others had of him, as well as his self definition.

As Schindler became more self-defined (or grounded) as a rescuer, his rescue acts and the risks he took to save others both increased and intensified.

Role Playing

An important part of the rescuer self was the ability to engage in situational role playing (Goffman, 1959). During the Holocaust, the rescuer had to maintain a secret life, and many even took on double identities. Whether hiding Jews in their homes, or working with the underground, rescuers had daily to cover up their activities, always maintaining a semblance of normalcy. One rescuer had to publicly feign pregnancy for nine months to camouflage the real pregnancy of one of her hidden charges. Such role play was obviously not a simple one-time act. Individuals had often to pretend normalcy to neighbors, co-workers, and family for years. For example, a young girl who worked in a Nazi bureaucracy for several years permitted illegal correspondence and supplied political prisoners with vitamins, medicines, books, and writing supplies. She said of her activities,

It was a continuous game. I was like an actor playing a part. The part included saying, "Heil Hitler!" to every Nazi official I encountered. So I would raise my hand and mumble a similar sounding phrase, "Drei

liter!," in English, "Three liters!" An insignificant point, but at the time it made me feel better.

Further study and analysis of the dynamics of the rescuing relationship is necessary to fully understand the rescuer self. Rescue support systems (sympathetic family, friends, neighbors, as well as formal networks) are also important to investigate to assess precisely how they function to sustain rescuing behavior.

Moral Models

The phenomenon being addressed is the ability to act humanely and to resist a malevolent authority. Just as the survivor's morality was questioned (Bettleheim, 1943) so have there been echoes of disbelief regarding the rescuers' motivations. Hopefully, this study will dispel suspiciousness about rescuers, who should rather be accorded the dignity they deserve. We should realize the potential of rescuers to serve as moral models. As Shulweis (1987) has pointed out, "Morality needs evidence, hard data, facts . . . to nourish our faith in man's capacity for decency. Villainy has ample empirical evidence on its side." Villainy has, unfortunately, perpetuated itself in the post-Holocaust period. Society has built on the evil of the not-so-distant past, by creating more sophisticated weaponry and sanitized technology. By "letting in" (Lifton, 1979) humaneness as we have evil, perhaps the imminent death around us could be reverted to enhance life.

Memorialization

Society does not perpetuate altruistic behavior because it is not rewarded. Particularly this kind of rescue, which was often performed in secret, is liable to remain private.

The rescuers were ignored in post-war society. They were not exonerated or rewarded in meaningful ways which could have made them feel important. Some felt a strong need to tell their story and so wrote memoirs; others have been waiting to be heard. The very process of the interview, which demonstrated outside interest and concern, changed the rescuers' self-perception. Now, more are speaking out and more ceremonies to honor rescuers are being conducted in various communities.

We will never be able to solve the historical question of how many rescuers there were in all. To this day, many rescuers are reluctant to discuss their altruistic acts, because they rightly fear that by boasting, they will be accused of merely seeking opportunistic reward. Others hesitate because they fear someone will hurt them, or persecute them for being a "Jew lover." Rescuers also feel that what they did was simply a natural part of themselves; the very thought that they would receive praise for their acts goes against who they are.

Some have unresolved feelings and conflicts concerning those rescuees with whom they have lost contact, either because of estrangement or because the rescuees remained anonymous.

Today's societal continuity is not altruism but an immorality perpetuated through continued genocide. It is not in the interest of American society to promote altruistic behavior, because it would threaten the national standard of living. The government as a whole has ambivalent antagonistic attitudes toward those who defy the government by rescue or by rallying for humanitarian causes, such as the sanctuary for Central American refugees which the government deems a conflict of "security interest."

Further Research

The understanding of the rescuer self and the rescuing relationship is in its embryonic stages. Leading a secret life, having to resort to immoral activity to save lives, and role playing to keep a facade of normalcy are aspects of rescuing that need to be further examined.

The analysis done in the study was a reason analysis based on clinical interviews and clinical impressions and investigation of a psychohistorical sequence. This method set the ground for doing a more comprehensive cross-cultural study as well as a control study. The few cases of resistance and bystanders are a good case in point. Other content analysis methods such as SYMLOG (Bales & Cohen, 1979) need to be applied to the data to get at different dimensions of the rescuer self. On two occasions I had an opportunity to interview a rescuer in a group situation.

The group situation highlighted common values which in this group stemmed from a shared working class intellectual background. Although these rescuers grew up in poor families, education, ideas, and humanity were stressed in the home and they gravitated toward an intellectual community as young adults. Research on their similarities and differences would be an invaluable way to understand disobedience and altruism.

This is a retrospective study. However, this interdisciplinary model utilizing a social-psychological approach could be applied to the study of contemporary altruistic behavior in the context of genocide. For example, one could study Caucasians who are presently risking their lives to save Blacks in South Africa.

An in-depth examination of the continuity of the rescuer self after liberation is already underway. Once the rescuing situation ended, did rescuers maintain an identification with and how did they integrate the rescuer self? Why did some rescuers continue to keep the war years and their altruistic acts a secret from family and friends? Why did some suffer from post-traumatic stress syndrome while others went on to write about their experiences? Do the Child rescuers have a different post-war adjustment? How are rescuers similar to Jewish Holocaust survivors, and how do they differ? Do they harbor a similar "survivor guilt"? And how does the process of mourning relate to the rescuer and self process?

Finally I would like to make a further comparative study of bystanders and examine in depth the psychoformative process of empathetic identification, the ability to "let in" (Lifton) others' suffering as well as the ability to "take the same pains in meeting another person's needs that we take or would take if we could, in meeting our own" (Wundheiler, 1986).

Although Yad Vashem defined the parameters of whom to include and whom to exclude as a rescuer, several troubling questions need to be addressed:

1. Who is a non-Jew?
2. What is considered above and beyond altruistic motivation?
3. Is someone who harmed people and saved them simultaneously deserving of the title "Righteous Among the Nations"?

In an age where religious identity is in transition and laws have not yet caught up with changing social norms, perhaps it is best in these rare instances to allow the rescuer to have the final word. To have a false positive is perhaps worse than a false negative. By acknowledging an act of goodness we may be doing more good than the ill feeling we create by excluding someone who in fact risked his life to save a Jew.

The question of motivation is perhaps best defined by the survivor who was rescued. Some who paid a fee for food and lodging report that it was not done for monetary profit but out of necessity in the situation.

The person who was harming Jews while at the same time saving lives, however, has crossed moral boundaries that are unacceptable as role models of humaneness. Lifton's (1986) concept of "doubling" whereby one part of the self is morally incongruent with another part is a difficult notion for people to accept. While this idea is instructive in understanding human behavior, it is not fathomable to include such people among those who had the courage to disobey a malevolent authority.

Making those who rescued during the Nazi era more visible as well as teaching about their acts will arouse in each of us a sense of moral responsibility in our own day and age.

Like the rescuers we all have the potential to actively preserve human life. These five motivational types have shown us how people in everyday life can be drawn into or can initiate extraordinary help. It would be misleading to perceive in these rescuers a historical role and reaction that is obsolete today. Inhumanity is pervasive in society, and risky altruistic acts are not beyond the realm of what is called for in many contemporary situations. Modern rescue behavior can be seen in those harboring Blacks in

South Africa, or in those risking their lives to provide medical aid in war-torn Central America (Clements, 1984).

But for the most part we do not get too close. We protect ourselves with shields of distance and separate ourselves from needy others because we fear it may be too costly to get involved. We have seen that a strong sense of self, an ability to embrace others as equals, enables individuals to respond humanely in a morally complex situation. We have also seen that the ability to "let in" the suffering of others is also essential. One thing is clear--no one acts unless they are aware of the need to help. It would seem, then, that the cultivation of the ability to perceive inhumanity and injustice--despite its widespread legal and social acceptance--is crucial to the development of individuals with the courage and capacity to resist inhumanity when it is sanctioned and implemented by a malevolent authority.

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM

I understand that I will be interviewed on videotape, and that I do not have to answer any questions that I do not want to answer. Also, I can withdraw from participating at any time.

I have been told, and I understand that the videotape will be stored in the National Holocaust Archives Museum, Washington, D.C., and will be available for public viewing.

Persons who have access to the videotape may view it for educational purposes only, and may not cite, paraphrase, reproduce, or quote therefrom without written permission from the participant(s) in the segment involved, the Rescuer Project of the City University of New York, and/or the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

The Project staff member has explained that there is a committee at the City University of New York which is concerned with research that involves people. They have told me that I can contact that committee should I have any question after I take part in videotaping. The address is:

Office of Sponsored Research
Graduate Center, City University of New York
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

I and my heirs release the City University of New York and individuals and/or assignees from any claims for damage, libel, slander, and invasion of rights of privacy or any other claims based on the disposition and use of the material I have provided.

I agree to participate in the project. I have been given a copy of this statement.

Signature of Participant

Printed Name of Participant

Address of Participant

Date

APPENDIX B
INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS

Setting Up the Interview

Your relationship with the interviewee begins with your first conversation on the telephone. Please give a simple and concise explanation of who you are and what you would like; and set a date and time to meet. Feel free to use your own words and whatever works best for you. Here is a sample of an initial telephone call:

Interviewer (Q): Hello, my name is Eva Fogelman, and I am from a university in New York. I am interviewing people who helped Jews and would very much like to have an opportunity to come and talk to you.

Interviewee (A): I don't speak Hebrew.

Q: What language do you speak?

A: Polish.

Q: I would like to come Tuesday at 10:00 and I will bring a translator; or would you rather have someone you know there who translates for you?

A: Tuesday, 10:00. I have a son who speaks Hebrew; he'll be there.

Q: Good. See you Tuesday at 10:00.

Another typical conversation:

Q: Hello, my name is Eva Fogelman, and I am from a university in New York. I am interviewing people who helped Jews and would very much like to have an opportunity to come and talk to you.

A: Where did you get my name?

Q: I got your name from Yad Vashem.

© 1985 by Eva Fogelman

A: I am old, I don't feel so well. I have to take medication. I don't like to talk about the past.

Q: I understand that it is difficult to talk about what happened, but it would help me very much if I could speak with you. And sometimes it helps to talk a little.

A: Okay, when do you want to come?

Q: Tomorrow at 2:00.

A: Okay, see you tomorrow.

When you make the initial contact, be sure of one or two times which are convenient for you. Do not go into lengthy explanations about the research. Your aims are to (1) set up an interview, (2) determine in what language the interview will be conducted, (3) whether they have a translator or you need to provide one, and (4) which country they were in during the war. Keep in mind that an interview will take 3-4 hours. If the interviewee sets a time constraint of two hours, don't worry, just get your foot in the door. If an interviewee is reluctant, say that you understand their reluctance and that you will call back next week.

Preparation for the Interview

1. Know exactly how to get there and be on time. Dress professionally.
2. Have the tape recorder ready with a tape inside and the name of the interviewee on the tape.
3. Have a blank questionnaire and also a blank pad of paper to make notes.

4. At home, practice the mechanics of starting the technical sections of the interview smoothly and unobtrusively.

Be familiar with major historical facts of the particular country in which the person lived, so that you have a context of dates, places, and important events.

You may also want to visit Yad Vashem. Mina Iancu is the Assistant Director of the Department for the Righteous and she can give you information on some of the rescuers. She may also let you look at their file.

The Interview

Your initial task is to put the interviewee at ease. Shake hands, repeat your name, look around for a place to sit where you can write and record. Feel free to accept drinks if they are offered (it helps some people relax with a stranger).

Briefly explain that you are doing interviews for a research project at a university in New York and that you will be asking them about experiences when they were growing up, during the Nazi era, and after the war. If they don't want their names used, assure them that their answers will remain confidential.

Q: Please start by telling me where and when you were born. Who else was in your family? What was your life like in the family, as you were growing up the first few years and then in school with friends and neighbors?

A: I don't want to talk about my childhood. That is not important to what I did during the war years.

Q: I know it is difficult to think about those years, but we have found it is helpful to talk about the past.

A: I'll tell you how I started saving people but not about my childhood.

Q: Where were you when the war started in your country and who were you living with?

When the person is reluctant to speak about their childhood, ask a few direct questions: where were you born? city, country? number of siblings? Do not push at this point. Let the person talk about the things with which they are comfortable. In interviewing about rescue efforts, it is most important to assess which was the first activity (who initiated it? whom did they help?). Come back to family background later. Keep in mind that you want to leave the interview with a sense of their family of origin and their character, attitudes, and relationships growing up. After they tell you their war experiences they will most likely be less reluctant to answer questions about their past. Often they want to hide a negative attitude toward a parent, or perhaps a sibling became a Nazi, or they were mistreated or experienced a painful early loss of a parent. The point is not to get disheartened if the interviewee is somewhat reluctant in the beginning. You are developing a relationship, even though it is brief, and over time you will develop the trust necessary to complete the interview.

Although you are responsible for getting answers to specific questions, we have found that a semi-structured

approach yields a richer interview, one which is more rewarding for both the interviewer and the interviewee. Refer to the questionnaire to see which questions require a more structured approach. The major topic areas are:

1. Early Socialization

- Where and when born?
- Where they lived longest as a child?
- Did they grow up in a city (large or small?) or village?
- Where were they in the sibling order?
- If they had a younger sibling, how many years separated them?
- Did others live with them (maids, aunts, boarders)?
- Did they lose anyone at an early age?
- What was the socioeconomic standing of the family?
- Characteristics of each parent, esp.:
 - level of education
 - occupation
 - religion
 - politics
 - personality (altruistic? approach to discipline? disciplined on what issues?)

First get an impression of each parent as to whether they were authoritarian or democratic in discipline; whether they were shy, quiet types or gregarious, fun-loving, and entertaining types. What were the values they learned from each parent? You may want to ask them to describe a typical incident which would portray their mother, father, or other person who raised them.

After you have a good sense of each parent, ask what person influenced them the most. If it is not the mother or father, ask details of that person as you did about each parent. If the person says no one was most influential, probe a little.

2. Self Growing Up

The next phase of questions has to do with the interviewee's own personal characteristics as they were growing up:

- education
- politics
- religious beliefs and behavior
- friendships (many or few friends? were they leader or follower in their social circle?)
- relationships with Jews in school and elsewhere
- personality, esp.:
 - self-confident?
 - independent?
 - able to take responsibility?
 - willing to take chances?
 - able to make decisions?
 - adventurous?
 - helpful to others?
 - honest?
 - willing to stand up for beliefs?
 - patriotic?
 - fearless?
 - obedient to authority?

You may find that these specific questions may be difficult to ascertain if there is a language barrier. Try your best, and on some of these you may have to use your own judgment.

3. The War Years

The next phase starts with a few questions setting the scene for their rescue activities:

- Where were they living when the Nazis invaded their country? (If interviewing German rescuers, begin with 1933.)
- Who were they living with?
- What were they doing?
- Was anyone in their family affected by the war (going into the army, captured, died)?
- Any losses (parent, child, sibling) from natural causes?
- Relations to Jews?

If they were living with a spouse or lover, ask details about that person (country of origin, education, politics, religious beliefs and practices, attitudes toward Jews).

They may want to start talking immediately about their rescue activities, but you want to begin by assessing their level of awareness of persecution of Jews:

What did they see happening to Jews?
Do they remember the first time they saw a Jew wearing the yellow Star of David?
How did they feel and how did they react?
Any feelings or reactions to seeing persecution of Jews or others?

4. Rescue Activities

The rescue activities should be told, and then you can ask more specific questions about first rescue activities. It is useful to try to get a physical description of where it took place (what kind of house? how big was it? did it have an attic/cellar? how many people lived there? etc.). Then go on to ask more specific questions:

How did they help?
Who initiated the activity?
Who were the rescuees?
Any prior relationship to them?
How did the relationship end?
Why did they rescue?
How did they cope with the risk and fear involved?
Were they caught at any point?
Were they asked to do things with which they could not comply?
Did they rescue on their own, with a network, or with members of their family?
If they were married, what were characteristics of spouse, and was spouse involved in rescue activity?
If they had children, what was role of children?
Did they share their rescue activities with anyone?
After the first incident, did they help other people?
How many incidents of rescue were there? Describe the others.

How many people rescued?
 Were any of rescuees children?
 If there were children, how did they feel toward the
 children and the relationship which developed
 between them?
 Was there additional motivation for the rescue of
 children?
 Any effort to convert?
 Were they given money to take care of them?
 Did any of the rescuees do anything special while being
 helped (cook, sew, teach)?
 Were they encouraged or discouraged to help by those
 close to them?
 Was anyone in their family sympathetic to the Nazis?

5. After the War

After liberation, what happened in their lives?
 Did the war years create any anxieties or any other
 aftermath?
 Did they continue to fear neighbors' retaliation for
 helping Jews?
 What were their religious beliefs and behavior after
 the war?
 Any altruistic behavior after the war?
 What has been their political involvement?
 Would they do it again?
 Have any of their rescuing relationships continued?
 Do they feel they have been compensated for the risks
 they took?
 Do they speak publicly or have they been witnesses in
 any Nazi trials?

6. In Israel

For interviews being conducted in Israel, add a section
 at the end about their settling in Israel:

Why did they settle in Israel?
 When?
 With whom?
 Do they feel they have been accepted in Israeli
 society?
 Have they experienced any discrimination as non-Jews?

Assess their physical, emotional, and social status in
 their current environment.

An interview lasts approximately four hours. If the interviewee needs to talk about something which is not pertinent to the interview schedule, let the person speak about it for a while. They may need to get it off their chests before they are emotionally ready to go on with other questions.

If at any point the interviewee would like you to turn off the tape recorder for something confidential, please do so, then turn the tape on again. Upon leaving, jot down what was said off the record. Remember that only what is on tape or written can ultimately be used. Any impressions you had should be added as notes. Any interesting nonverbal cues which cannot be picked up for analysis from an audio tape should also be noted. Either during or after the interview, get the correct spellings of names and places which are not familiar to you.

In filling out the interview form, circle the appropriate number for numbered answers and fill in the blanks for others. Please do not write on the right side of the page, where the answers will be coded.

Best of luck in a challenging and rewarding process of interviewing unique people who are a hope for humanity to us all.

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW

THE RESCUER PROJECT
Rescuing During the Nazi Era

Interview

Eva Fogelman
Project Director

(212) 790-4213

Department of Social and Personality Psychology
The Graduate School and University Center
The City University of New York

33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

© 1985, Eva Fogelman. All rights reserved. This document is not to be quoted, copied, or reproduced by any means, in whole or in part, without the express written permission of the author.

THE RESCUER PROJECT
Rescue During the Nazi Era

Interview

Coding
(Do not write in
these spaces.)

1. Name

1. _____
(1 - 3)

First

Last

2. Address

2. _____
(4 - 5)

Phone _____

3. Name of Interviewer

3. _____
(6 - 7)

Date of Interview

4. Sex

4. _____
(8)

1. female

2. male

5. Present religion

5. _____
(9)

1. Protestant

2. Catholic

3. Jewish

4. Other (specify) _____

5. No religion

9. No answer

6. Birth

Year _____

#6a. _____
(10 - 13)

- City _____
- Country _____
- #6b. _____
(14 - 15)
7. Birth order
- #7a. _____
(16 - 17)
- a. How many children in your family of origin (including yourself)?
- _____
- b. Where were you in the order?
- _____
- #7b. _____
(18 - 19)
- c. If you had younger sibling(s), how many years separated you from the one following you?
- _____
- #7c. _____
(20 - 21)
8. Where did you live longest as a child?
- #8a. _____
(22)
- a. 1. large city
2. medium-size city
3. small city
4. village
5. isolated farm
9. no answer
- b. Country _____
- #8b. _____
(23 - 24)
9. When you were growing up, what was the financial situation of your family?
- # 9. _____
(25)
1. very well off
2. somewhat well off
3. neither rich nor poor
4. somewhat poor
5. very poor
9. no answer
10. Early losses
- a. Did anyone very close to you die during your childhood?
- #10a. _____
(26)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

- b. If yes, who was it? #10b. _____
(ment.1) (27)
#10b. _____
(ment.2) (28)
1. mother
 2. father
 3. sibling
 4. other relative
 5. friend or neighbor
 6. caretaker
 7. other
 9. no answer
- c. How old were you when that person died? (If more than one, first death.) #10c. _____
(29 - 30)
-
- d. Did anyone very close to you leave? (e.g., parents separating) #10d. _____
(31)
1. yes
 2. no
 9. no answer
- e. If yes, who was it? #10e. _____
(ment.1) (32)
#10e. _____
(ment.2) (33)
1. mother
 2. father
 3. sibling
 4. other relative
 5. friend or neighbor
 6. caretaker
 7. other
 9. no answer
- f. How old were you when that person left? (If more than one, first loss.) #10f. _____
(34 - 35)
-

Characteristics of Mother

11. In what country was your mother born? #11. _____
(37 - 39)
-

12. Religion

- a. Mother's religious affiliation #12a. _____
(40)
1. Protestant
 2. Catholic
 3. Jewish
 4. Other (specify) _____
 5. No religion
 9. No answer
- b. How religious was your mother? #12b. _____
(41)
1. very
 2. somewhat
 3. not very
 4. not at all
 9. no answer
- c. How often did she attend church? #12c. _____
(42)
1. daily
 2. weekly
 3. a few times a month
 4. on holidays
 5. never
 9. no answer
- d. Did she teach you religious values? #12d. _____
(43)
1. often
 2. sometimes
 3. rarely
 4. never
 9. no answer

13. Politics

- a. When you were growing up, how important was politics to your mother? #13a. _____
(44)
1. very
 2. somewhat
 3. not very
 4. not at all
 9. no answer

- b. Did your mother belong to a political party? #13b. _____
(45)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer
- c. If yes, what was the name of the party? #13c. _____
(46)
-
- d. Was your mother politically active when you were growing up? #13d. _____
(47)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer
- e. Did she teach you political values? #13e. _____
(48)
1. often
2. sometimes
3. rarely
4. never
9. no answer
- f. Regardless of level of political activity, which political philosophy would you say your mother endorsed (e.g., communism, socialism)? #13f. _____
(49)
-
8. not applicable
9. no answer
14. What was your mother's highest educational background? #14. _____
(50)
1. none or a few years of elementary school
2. finished elementary school
3. some high school
4. finished high school
5. some trade school
6. completed trade school
7. some college
8. college graduate
9. no answer

15a. What was your mother's employment while you were growing up?

#15a. _____
(51)

1. employed
2. military
3. retired
4. disabled
5. student
6. housewife
7. other (specify) _____
8. unemployed
9. no answer

15b. If employed, record job title, nature of work, and place of employment.

#15b. _____
(52)

16a. Did your mother have any contact with Jews when you were growing up?

#16a. _____
(53)

1. frequently
2. occasionally
4. rarely
5. never
9. no answer

16b. How did she describe the nature of her interactions?

#16b. _____
(54)

1. pleasant
2. neutral
3. both pleasant and unpleasant
4. unpleasant
5. no discussion
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

17. How would you describe your mother in terms of the following characteristics?

			Some-		No	
Always	Often	times	Rarely	Never	ans.	
1	2	3	4	5	9	

a. active, dominant, talks a lot

#17a. _____
(55)

1	2	3	4	5	9

- b. friendly, egalitarian #17b. _____
(56)
1 2 3 4 5 9
- c. task-oriented, problem-solving #17c. _____
(57)
1 2 3 4 5 9
- d. unfriendly, negativistic #17d. _____
(58)
1 2 3 4 5 9
- e. shows feelings and emotions #17e. _____
(59)
1 2 3 4 5 9
- f. passive, introverted, says little #17f. _____
(60)
1 2 3 4 5 9
- g. helpful to others #17g. _____
(61)
1 2 3 4 5 9

18. Discipline

- a. How often was your mother's discipline strict? #18a. _____
(62)
1 2 3 4 5 9
- b. How often did she use physical punishment, such as hitting or spanking? #18b. _____
(63)
1 2 3 4 5 9
- c. How often did she discipline you by explaining matters? #18c. _____
(64)
1 2 3 4 5 9
- d. For what kind of things did she discipline you? #18d. _____
(65)

19a. Did your mother want you to be independent?

#19a. _____
(66)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

19b. How did she show it?

#19b. _____
(ment.1) (67)
#19b. _____
(ment.2) (68)

20. What kind of values did your mother teach you?

#20. _____
(ment.1) (69)
#20. _____
(ment.2) (70)
#20. _____
(ment.3) (71)

21. How close did you feel toward your mother when you were growing up?

#21. _____
(72)

- 1. very
- 2. somewhat
- 3. not very
- 4. not at all
- 5. no answer

Characteristics of Father

22. In what country was your father born?

#22. _____
(73 - 74)

23. Religion

a. father's religious affiliation

#23a. _____
(75)

- 1. Protestant
- 2. Catholic
- 3. Jewish
- 4. Other (specify) _____
- 5. No religion
- 9. No answer

b. How religious was your father? #23b. _____
(76)

1. very
2. somewhat
3. not very
4. not at all
9. no answer

c. How often did he attend church? #23c. _____
(77)

1. daily
2. weekly
3. a few times a month
4. on holidays
5. never
9. no answer

d. Did he teach you religious values? #23d. _____
(78)

1. often
2. sometimes
3. rarely
4. never
9. no answer

24. Politics

a. When you were growing up, how important was politics to your father? #24a. _____
(79)

1. very
2. somewhat
3. not very
4. not at all
9. no answer

b. Did your father belong to a political party? #24b. _____
(80)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

[Card II]
(1-3: Code)

c. If yes, what was the name of the party? #24c. _____
(4 - 5)

d. Was your father politically active when you were growing up? #24d. _____
(6)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

e. Did he teach you political values? #24e. _____
(7)

- 1. often
- 2. sometimes
- 3. rarely
- 4. never
- 9. no answer

f. Regardless of level of political activity, which political philosophy would you say your father endorsed (e.g., communism, anarchism)? #24f. _____
(8)

-
- 8. not applicable
 - 9. no answer

25. What was your father's highest educational background? #25. _____
(9)

- 1. none or a few years of elementary school
- 2. finished elementary school
- 3. some high school
- 4. finished high school
- 5. some trade school
- 6. completed trade school
- 7. some college
- 8. college graduate
- 9. no answer

26a. What was your father's employment status while you were growing up? #26a. _____
(10)

- 1. employed
- 2. military
- 3. retired
- 4. disabled
- 5. student
- 6. housewife
- 7. other (specify) _____
- 8. unemployed
- 9. no answer

26b. If employed, record job title, nature of work, and place of employment.

#26b. _____
(11)

27a. Did your father have any contact with Jews when you were growing up?

#27a. _____
(12)

1. frequently
2. occasionally
4. rarely
5. never
9. no answer

27b. How did he describe the nature of his interactions?

#27b. _____
(13)

1. pleasant
2. neutral
3. both pleasant and unpleasant
4. unpleasant
5. no discussion
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

28. How would you describe your father in terms of the following characteristics?

	Always	Often	Some- times	Rarely	Never	No ans.	
	1	2	3	4	5	9	
a. active, dominant, talks a lot							#28a. _____ (14)
	1	2	3	4	5	9	
b. friendly, egalitarian							#28b. _____ (15)
	1	2	3	4	5	9	
c. task-oriented, problem-solving							#28c. _____ (16)
	1	2	3	4	5	9	
d. unfriendly, negativistic							#28d. _____ (17)
	1	2	3	4	5	9	

e. shows feelings and emotions #28e. _____
(18)

1 2 3 4 5 9

f. passive, introverted, says little #28f. _____
(19)

1 2 3 4 5 9

g. helpful to others #28g. _____
(20)

1 2 3 4 5 9

29. Discipline

a. How often was your father's discipline strict? #29a. _____
(21)

1 2 3 4 5 9

b. How often did he use physical punishment, such as hitting or spanking? #29b. _____
(22)

1 2 3 4 5 9

c. How often did he discipline you by explaining matters? #29c. _____
(23)

1 2 3 4 5 9

d. For what kind of things did he discipline you? #29d. _____
(24)

30a. Did your father want you to be independent? #30a. _____
(25)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

30b. How did he show it? #30b. _____
(ment.1) (26)

#30b. _____
(ment.2) (27)

31. What kind of values did your father teach you?

#31. _____
(ment.1) (28)

#31. _____
(ment.2) (29)

#31. _____
(ment.3) (30)

32. How close did you feel toward your father when you were growing up?

#32. _____
(31)

1. very
2. somewhat
3. not very
4. not at all
5. no answer

Characteristics of Most Influential Person

33. Who is the person who influenced you the most when you were growing up?

#33. _____
(32)

1. mother
2. father
3. sibling
4. other relative
5. friend/peer
6. adult friend
7. other (specify) _____
8. teacher
9. no answer

IF ANSWER IS "MOTHER" OR "FATHER" GO ON TO QUESTION #45.
OTHERWISE, ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

34. In what country was this person born?

#34. _____
(33)

35. Religion

a. religious affiliation

#35a. _____
(34)

1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. Other (specify) _____
5. No religion
9. No answer

b. How religious was this person? #35b. _____
(35)

1. very
2. somewhat
3. not very
4. not at all
9. no answer

c. How often did this person attend church? #35c. _____
(36)

1. daily
2. weekly
3. a few times a month
4. on holidays
5. never
9. no answer

d. Did this person teach you religious values? #35d. _____
(37)

1. often
2. sometimes
3. rarely
4. never
9. no answer

36. Politics

a. When you were growing up, how important was politics to this person? #36a. _____
(38)

1. very
2. somewhat
3. not very
4. not at all
9. no answer

b. Did this person belong to a political party? #36b. _____
(39)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

c. If yes, what was the name of the party? #36c. _____
(40)

d. Was this person politically active when you were growing up? #36d. _____
(41)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

e. Did this person teach you political values? #36e. _____
(42)

- 1. often
- 2. sometimes
- 3. rarely
- 4. never
- 9. no answer

f. Regardless of level of political activity, which political philosophy would you say this person endorsed (e.g., communism, anarchism)? #36f. _____
(43)

-
- 8. not applicable
 - 9. no answer

37. What was this person's highest educational background? #37. _____
(44)

- 1. none or a few years of elementary school
- 2. finished elementary school
- 3. some high school
- 4. finished high school
- 5. some trade school
- 6. completed trade school
- 7. some college
- 8. college graduate
- 9. no answer

38a. What was this person's employment status while you were growing up? #38a. _____
(45)

- 1. employed
- 2. military
- 3. retired
- 4. disabled
- 5. student
- 6. housewife
- 7. other (specify) _____
- 8. unemployed
- 9. no answer

38b. If employed, record job title, nature of work, and place of employment.

#38b. _____
(46)

39a. Did this person have any contact with Jews when you were growing up?

#39a. _____
(47)

1. frequently
2. occasionally
4. rarely
5. never
9. no answer

39b. How did this person describe the quality of his interactions?

#39b. _____
(48)

1. pleasant
2. neutral
3. both pleasant and unpleasant
4. unpleasant
5. no discussion
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

40. How would you describe this person in terms of the following characteristics?

	Always	Often	Some- times	Rarely	Never	No ans.	
	1	2	3	4	5	9	
a. active, dominant, talks a lot							#40a. _____ (49)
	1	2	3	4	5	9	
b. friendly, egalitarian							#40b. _____ (50)
	1	2	3	4	5	9	
c. task-oriented, problem-solving							#40c. _____ (51)
	1	2	3	4	5	9	
d. unfriendly, negativistic							#40d. _____ (52)
	1	2	3	4	5	9	

e. shows feelings and emotions #40e. _____
(53)

1 2 3 4 5 9

f. passive, introverted, says little #40f. _____
(54)

1 2 3 4 5 9

g. helpful to others #40g. _____
(55)

1 2 3 4 5 9

41. Discipline

a. How often was this person's discipline strict? #41a. _____
(56)

1 2 3 4 5 9

b. How often did this person use physical punishment, such as hitting or spanking? #41b. _____
(57)

1 2 3 4 5 9

c. How often did this person discipline you by explaining matters? #41c. _____
(58)

1 2 3 4 5 9

d. For what kind of things did this person discipline you? #41d. _____
(59)

42a. Did this person want you to be independent? #42a. _____
(60)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

42b. How did this person show it? #42b. _____
(ment.1) (61)

#42b. _____
(ment.2) (62)

43. What kind of values did this person teach you? #43. _____
 (ment.1) (63)
 #43. _____
 (ment.2) (64)
 #43. _____
 (ment.3) (65)
44. How close did you feel toward this person when you were growing up? #44. _____
 (66)
1. very
 2. somewhat
 3. not very
 4. not at all
 5. no answer

Self Growing Up

45. Religious affiliation
- a. What was your religion while growing up? #45a. _____
 (67)
1. Protestant
 2. Catholic
 3. Jewish
 4. Other (specify) _____
 5. No religion
 9. No answer
- b. How religious were you during childhood? #45b. _____
 (68)
1. very
 2. somewhat
 3. not very
 4. not at all
 9. no answer
46. How much schooling did you have before you were under Nazi occupation? #46. _____
 (69)
1. none or a few years of elementary school
 2. finished elementary school
 3. some high school
 4. finished high school
 5. some trade school
 6. completed trade school
 7. some college
 8. college graduate
 9. no answer

47. Elementary school years

- a. If you attended elementary school,
what kind of school was it? #47a. _____
(70)
0. not applicable
1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Non-sectarian
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer
- b. What kind of contact did you have
with Jews during your elementary
school years? #47b. _____
(71)
1. frequent
2. occasional
4. rare
5. none
9. no answer
- c. How would you describe your contacts
with Jews? #47c. _____
(72)
1. pleasant
2. neutral
3. both pleasant and unpleasant
4. unpleasant
9. no answer
- d. Were any of your close friends Jewish
at that time? #47d. _____
(73)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer
- e. Did any of your teachers or other
authority figures talk about Jews
during that time? #47e. _____
(74)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer
- f. If yes, what did you learn from them
about Jews? #47f. _____
(ment.1) (75)
#47f. _____
(ment.2) (76)
- _____

47. Adolescence

a. If you attended high school,
what kind of school was it? #48a. _____
(77)

- 0. not applicable
- 1. Protestant
- 2. Catholic
- 3. Non-sectarian
- 7. other (specify) _____
- 9. no answer

b. What kind of contact did you have
with Jews during your adolescence? #48b. _____
(78)

- 1. frequent
- 2. occasional
- 4. rare
- 5. none
- 9. no answer

c. How would you describe your contacts
with Jews? #48c. _____
(79)

- 1. pleasant
- 2. neutral
- 3. both pleasant and unpleasant
- 4. unpleasant
- 9. no answer

d. Were any of your close friends Jewish
at that time? #48d. _____
(80)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

[Card III]
(1-3: Code)

e. Did any of your teachers or other
authority figures talk about Jews
during that time? #48e. _____
(4)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

f. If yes, what did you learn from them about Jews? #48f. _____
 (ment.1) (5)
 #48f. _____
 (ment.2) (6)

g. How many friends did you have as an adolescent? #48g. _____
 (7)

1. many
2. some
4. few
5. none
9. no answer

h. Was there ever a time you objected to what your peers were doing or saying? #48h. _____
 (8)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

i. Were any of your close friends different from you religiously at that time? #48i. _____
 (9)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

j. Were any of your close friends different from you in social class? #48j. _____
 (10)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

49. How would you describe yourself in terms of the following characteristics?

	Always	Often	Some- times	Rarely	Never	No ans.
	1	2	3	4	5	9
a. self confident						#49a. _____ (11)
	1	2	3	4	5	9

b. independent						#49b.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(12)
c. able to take responsibility						#49c.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(13)
d. willing to take chances						#49d.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(14)
e. able to make decisions						#49e.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(15)
f. adventurous						#49f.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(16)
g. helpful to others						#49g.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(17)
h. honest						#49h.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(18)
i. willing to stand up for beliefs						#49i.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(19)
j. patriotic						#49j.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(20)
k. fearless						#49k.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(21)
l. obedient to authority						#49l.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(22)
m. leader						#49m.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(23)
n. follower						#49n.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(24)

o. outsider						#49o.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(25)
p. active, dominant, talks a lot						#49p.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(26)
q. friendly, egalitarian						#49q.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(27)
r. task-oriented, problem-solving						#49r.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(28)
s. unfriendly, negativistic						#49s.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(29)
t. shows feelings and emotions						#49t.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(30)
u. passive, introverted, says little						#49u.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(31)
v. helpful to others						#49v.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(32)

50. While growing up, did you in any way feel as if you were a member of a minority in terms of:

a. religion						#50a.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(33)
b. social class						#50b.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(34)
c. nationality						#50c.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(35)
d. politics						#50d.	_____
	1	2	3	4	5	9	(36)

- e. physical appearance #50e. _____
 (37)
 1 2 3 4 5 9
- f. education #50f. _____
 (38)
 1 2 3 4 5 9

The War Years

51. When the war started, where were you living?

a. City _____ #51a. _____
 (39)

1. large city
2. medium-size city
3. small city
4. village
5. isolated farm
9. no answer

b. Country _____ #51b. _____
 (40 - 41)

c. What were you doing at the time? #51c. _____
 (42)

1. employed
2. military
3. retired
4. disabled
5. student
6. housewife
7. other (specify) _____
8. unemployed
9. no answer

d. If employed, record job title, nature of work, and place of employment. #51d. _____
 (43)

52a. What was your marital status? #52a. _____
 (44)

1. married
2. divorced
3. separated
4. widowed
5. living with partner, unmarried
6. single
9. no answer

52b. Did your marital status change during the war years?

#52b. _____
(45)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

52c. If it did change, in what way?

#52c. _____
(46)

1. married
2. divorced
3. separated
4. widowed
5. living with partner, unmarried
6. single
7. no answer

IF YOU WERE MARRIED OR LIVING WITH AN ADULT PARTNER, ANSWER THE QUESTIONS # 53-57 ABOUT YOUR SPOUSE/PARTNER. OTHERWISE, GO ON TO QUESTION # 58.

53. In what country was this person born?

#53. _____
(47 - 48)

54. Religion

a. religious affiliation

#54a. _____
(49)

1. Protestant
2. Catholic
3. Jewish
4. Other (specify) _____
5. No religion
9. No answer

b. How religious was this person?

#54b. _____
(50)

1. very
2. somewhat
3. not very
4. not at all
9. no answer

55. Politics

a. How important was politics to this person? #55a. _____
(51)

1. very
2. somewhat
3. not very
4. not at all
9. no answer

b. Did this person belong to a political party? #55b. _____
(52)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

c. If yes, what was the name of the party? #55c. _____
(53)

d. Was this person politically active? #55d. _____
(54)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

e. Did this person teach you political values? #55e. _____
(55)

1. often
2. sometimes
3. rarely
4. never
9. no answer

f. Regardless of level of political activity, which political philosophy would you say this person endorsed (e.g., communism, anarchism)? #55f. _____
(56)

-
8. not applicable
 9. no answer

56. What was this person's highest educational background?

#56. _____
(57)

1. none or a few years of elementary school
2. finished elementary school
3. some high school
4. finished high school
5. some trade school
6. completed trade school
7. some college
8. college graduate
9. no answer

57a. What was this person's employment status?

#57a. _____
(58)

1. employed
2. military
3. retired
4. disabled
5. student
6. housewife
7. other (specify) _____
8. unemployed
9. no answer

57b. If employed, record job title, nature of work, and place of employment.

#57b. _____
(59)

58a. How many children did you have before the war started?

#58a. _____
(60)

58b. How many children did you have when the war ended?

#58b. _____
(61 - 62)

59a. Did anyone in your family die or disappear shortly before or during the war but before your rescue activities?

#59a. _____
(63)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

59b. If yes, who was it?

#59b. _____
(ment.1) (64)

#59b. _____
(ment.2) (65)

1. mother
2. father
3. sibling
4. child
5. spouse
6. other relative
7. other (specify) _____
8. adult partner/lover
9. no answer

60. When the war started, how many Jews lived in your neighborhood? #60. _____
(66)

1. none
2. 1-10% of the population
3. 11-30% of the population
4. 31-60% of the population
5. over 60% of the population
9. no answer

61. On what occasion did you become aware of what the Nazis intended to do to the Jews? #61. _____
(67)

62. How did you feel the first time you saw a Jew wearing a Star of David? (Possible answers might include: helpless, anger, guilt, shame.) #62. _____
(ment.1) (68)
#62. _____
(ment.2) (69)

63a. Did you ever see a Jew being beaten up or deported? #63a. _____
(70)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

63b. If yes, how did you feel? #63b. _____
(ment.1) (71)
#63b. _____
(ment.2) (72)

64a. Did you see such action taken against
a Jewish child or children?

#64a. _____
(73)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

64b. If yes, how did you feel?

#64b. _____
(ment.1) (74)
#64b. _____
(ment.2) (75)

Rescue Activities

[Card IV]
(1-3: Code)

65. a. How many people did you rescue?

#65a. _____
(4 - 7)

b. Is this an exact number?

#65b. _____
(8)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

66. How many separate times did you rescue
people?

#66. _____
(9)

- 1. one or two incidents of rescuing a
person, couple, or family
- 2. 3-5 incidents
- 3. more than five incidents

67. Did you become a "professional" rescuer,
i.e., did rescuing become virtually a
full-time occupation?

#67. _____
(10)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

68. Of those you rescued, how many were:

many	some	few	none	no ans.
1	2	3	4	9

a. close friends or relatives

#68a. _____
(11)

1	2	3	4	9

b. acquaintances #68b. _____
(12)

1 2 3 4 9

c. strangers #68c. _____
(13)

1 2 3 4 9

67. How did your first rescue activity begin? #67. _____
(14)

1. person(s) asked me directly for help
2. I initiated the help
3. an intermediary asked me on behalf of the person(s)
4. mutual decision
5. spouse/partner or other family member started helping
6. "it just happened"
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

68. Where were you at that time?

a. City _____ #68a. _____
(15)

1. large city
2. medium-size city
3. small city
4. village
5. isolated farm
9. no answer

b. Country _____ #68b. _____
(16)

c. Type of housing #68c. _____
(17)

1. apartment
2. house
3. convent/monastery
4. living at place of work (e.g., hospital)
5. military barracks
6. moving from place to place
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

69. Who was/were the first person(s) you helped? #69. _____
(18)

1. close friend(s)
2. acquaintance(s)
3. stranger(s)
9. no answer

70. Was a child under the age of 12 involved in your first rescue? #70. _____
(19)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

**** NOTE TO INTERVIEWER:** If yes, get as much detail about the child as possible.

71. How long did it take you to make your first decision to rescue? #71. _____
(20)

1. a few minutes
2. a few hours
3. a day or so
4. several weeks
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

72. Did you consult with anyone before making the decision? #72. _____
(21)

1. other family members
2. friends
3. made own decision
7. other _____
9. no answer

73a. Did any of your decisions to rescue confront you with a moral dilemma or conflict? #73a. _____
(22)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

73b. If yes, please explain. #73b. _____
(23)

74. What was the main reason you chose to help in the first case? #74. _____
(24)

75. How much were each of the following a factor in your decision to rescue?

very much	some- what	not really	not at all	no ans.
1	2	4	5	9

a. You cannot say "no" to a friend who is in danger or asks for help. #75a. _____
(25)

1	2	4	5	9

b. I wanted to make up for what the Nazis did to a member of my own family. #75b. _____
(26)

1	2	4	5	9

c. I felt I needed to make up for a tragedy in my family. #75c. _____
(27)

1	2	4	5	9

d. I wanted a little child. #75d. _____
(28)

1	2	4	5	9

e. I was lonely. #75e. _____
(29)

1	2	4	5	9

f. I felt it was the right thing to do. #75f. _____
(30)

1	2	4	5	9

g. It was my religious duty to help. #75g. _____
(31)

1	2	4	5	9

h. It was my way of fighting against the Nazis. #75h. _____
(32)

1	2	4	5	9

- i. I thought I'd have an opportunity to save a Jewish soul for Jesus. #75i. _____
(33)
- 1 2 4 5 9
- j. Other _____ #75j. _____
(34)
- 1 2 4 5 9
76. Were you afraid when you were rescuing? #76. _____
(35)
1. always
2. often
3. sometimes
4. rarely
5. never
9. no answer
77. If you did feel afraid, what did you do to overcome your fear? #77. _____
(36)
1. I trusted in my own abilities or strength.
2. I believed in God or some supernatural force.
3. I was naive.
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer
78. With whom did you do most of your rescue activities? #78. _____
(ment.1) (37)
#78. _____
(ment.2) (38)
1. alone
2. with spouse/partner
3. with family of origin
4. with a network (specify) _____
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer
79. Did you have to put your own children at risk to do your rescue activities? #79. _____
(39)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer
80. Was there a time you gave help to someone and later regretted it? #80. _____
(40)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

81a. Was there ever a time someone asked you for help and you had to refuse? #81a. _____
(41)

- 1. yes
- 2. no
- 9. no answer

81b. If yes, please describe the incident. #81b. _____
(42)

82. How much were each of the following a factor in your having to refuse the person?

very much	some- what	not really	not at all	no ans.
1	2	4	5	9

a. I thought it would endanger others whom I was helping or responsible for. #82a. _____
(43)

1	2	4	5	9

b. I did not have any more room or supplies (food, ration cards, false i.d.) #82b. _____
(44)

1	2	4	5	9

c. I did not trust the person. #82c. _____
(45)

1	2	4	5	9

d. I did not like the person. #82d. _____
(46)

1	2	4	5	9

e. I was asked to do something I did not believe in or personally could not do. #82e. _____
(47)

1	2	4	5	9

f. other: _____ #82f. _____
(48)

1	2	4	5	9

83a. Were you ever caught, interrogated, or imprisoned for your rescue activities? #83a. _____
(49)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

83b. If yes, please describe. #83b. _____
(50)

84. How did your first rescue relationship terminate? #84. _____
(51)

1. liberation
2. We all decided it was not safe.
3. The victim left on their own.
4. We were caught.
5. I had to ask the victim to leave, or had to stop the aid for other personal reasons (e.g., some family member was against it).
6. They left when the underground decided to move them.
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

85a. Was anyone in your family sympathetic to the Nazis? #85a. _____
(52)

1. yes
2. no
3. uncertain
4. doesn't want to discuss
9. no answer

85b. If yes, what person(s)? #85b. _____
(ment.1) (53)

#85b. _____
(ment.2) (54)

1. mother
2. father
3. sibling
4. child
5. spouse
6. other relative
7. other (specify) _____
8. adult partner/lover
9. no answer

85c. If yes, what did you know of their activities?

#85c. _____
(ment.1) (55)
#85c. _____
(ment.2) (56)

85d. If yes, what did they know of your activities?

#85d. _____
(ment.1) (57)
#85d. _____
(ment.2) (58)

**** NOTE TO INTERVIEWER:** Particularly probe if a sibling was a sympathizer. Why is the sibling different from them and how else are they different?

After the War

86a. Since the war, have you ever done anything as risky as your rescue activities?

#86a. _____
(60)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

86b. If yes, what was it?

#86b. _____
(61)

87. Since the war, have you been involved in any helping activities?

Often	Some-	Rarely	Never	No
1	times	3	4	ans.
1	2	3	4	9

a. assist in political or social causes

#87a. _____
(62)

1	2	3	4	9

b. help elderly people

#87b. _____
(63)

1	2	3	4	9

c. help take care of children #87c. _____
(64)

1 2 3 4 9

d. give money or other material goods #87d. _____
(65)

1 2 3 4 9

e. help in the church #87e. _____
(66)

1 2 3 4 9

f. entered helping profession (doctor, nurse, etc.) #87f. _____
(67)

1 2 3 4 9

g. other _____ #87g. _____
(68)

1 2 3 4 9

88a. How religious are you? #88a. _____
(69)

1. very
2. somewhat
3. not very
4. not at all
9. no answer

88b. If religion is different now from what it was in childhood, please explain your reasons for changing. #88b. _____
(ment.1) (70)
#88b. _____
(ment.2) (71)

89. Have your efforts during the Nazi era been recognized? #89. _____
(72)

1. Yad Vashem
2. medal of honor in another country
3. not really
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

- 90a. Have you spoken in public about your activities? #90a. _____
(73)
1. often
2. occasionally
4. rarely
5. never
9. no answer
- 90b. If yes, did you start speaking about them only recently? #90b. _____
(74)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer
91. Were you a witness at any Nazi trials? #91. _____
(75)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer
- 92a. After the war, did you have any contact with people you rescued? #92a. _____
(76)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer
- 92b. If yes, please describe. #92b. _____
(77)
- _____
- _____
- 92c. After the war, how many survivors expressed gratitude to you? #92c. _____
(78)
1. all
2. many
3. some
4. few
5. none
9. no answer
93. After the war, were you in any way made to feel that you did something wrong by rescuing? #93. _____
(79)
1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

94. Would you do it again?

#94. _____
(80)

1. definitely
2. maybe
4. with some hesitation
5. definitely not
7. other (specify) _____
9. no answer

[Card V]
(1-3: Code)

95. Have you had any physical or emotional symptoms which may be related to your experiences?

#95. _____
(4)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

96. If yes, which of the following apply?

a. anxiety

#96a. _____
(5)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

b. nightmares

#96b. _____
(6)

1. yes
2. no
3. no answer

c. insomnia

#96c. _____
(7)

1. yes
2. no
3. no answer

d. stuttering

#96d. _____
(8)

1. yes
2. no
3. no answer

e. phobias

#96e. _____
(9)

1. yes
2. no
3. no answer

f. depression

#96f. _____
(10)

1. yes
2. no
3. no answer

g. other (specify) _____

#96b. _____
(11)

1. yes
2. no
3. no answer

97a. After the war, did you at any time find yourself in need of help (e.g., needing money or assistance)?

#97a. _____
(12)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

97b. If yes, how did you feel about asking for help?

#97b. _____
(13)

97c. Did you get the help you needed?

#97c. _____
(14)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

98. After the war, did any of the people you rescued ever help or offer to help you?

#98. _____
(15)

1. all
2. many
3. some
4. few
5. none
9. no answer

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ONLY APPLY TO RESCUERS NOW LIVING IN ISRAEL.

99. In what year did you come to Israel?

#99. _____
(16)

100. Why did you come to Israel?

#100. _____
(17)

101. Do you think it was the right decision?

#101. _____
(18)

1. yes
2. no
3. no answer

102. Do you feel accepted in Israeli society?

#102. _____
(19)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

103a. Have you experienced any discrimination
as a non-Jew in Israel?

#103a. _____
(20)

1. yes
2. no
9. no answer

103b. If yes, please describe.

#103b. _____
(21)

104. Please describe any message you may have
for young people today if you were faced
with a similar Nazi regime.

APPENDIX D
SUMMARY FOR CODER

CODE _____

SEX _____

MOTIVATION FOR FIRST RESCUE

minimal→great minimal→great

SUBJECT		0	1	2	3	9	CODER	0	1	2	3	9
1a. Emotional attachment to adult	1a.											
b. Emotional attachment to child	b.											
2. Personal effect of persecution	2.											
3. Ideological/political	3.											
4. Personal morality	4.											
5a. Religious morality	5a.											
b. to save a soul for Jesus	b.											
6. Opportunistic either monetary/help/companionship desire for child	6.											
7. Other _____	7.											
8. PERSONAL EVENT WITNESS												
a. of atrocities/death/dehumanization (visual/oral/olfactory)	8a.											
b. Heard via others/media about atrocities/death/dehumanization	b.											

CODE ASSESSMENT

- I - ACTIVE Rescuer
- II - REACTIVE Rescuer
- III - Both ACTIVE & REACTIVE
- IV - Insufficient data to assess

****HOW DOES RESCUER DESCRIBE MOTIVATION?** _____

****CODERS PERCEPTION of degree of thinking rescuer has done
about his/her motivation?**

1.great deal 2.some 3.none at all 4.can't assess

CODE _____
SEX _____

PREDISPOSING FACTORS TO RESCUE

1. Did rescuer have at least one helpful parental figure?
1.____ 2.____ 9.____ 1.____
yes no na
2. Did rescuer have any early losses or illness of significant other?
1.____ 2.____ 9.____ 2.____
yes no na
3. Did rescuer have any prolonged illness in childhood?
1.____ 2.____ 9.____ 3.____
yes no na
4. Did rescuer have a sibling born after them (around age 3)?
1.____ 2.____ 9.____ 4.____
yes no na
5. Was rescuer a loner?
1.____ 2.____ 9.____ 5.____
yes no na
6. Which of the following qualities did rescuer possess prior to rescue activity?
 - a. self-confidence/competence a.1.____ 2.____ 9.____ a.()
yes no na
 - b. independence b.1.____ 2.____ 9.____ b.()
yes no na
 - c. adventurousness c.1.____ 2.____ 9.____ c.()
yes no na
 - d. willing to stand up for beliefs d.1.____ 2.____ 9.____ d.()
yes no na
 - e. fearlessness e.1.____ 2.____ 9.____ e.()
yes no na
 - f. follower f.1.____ 2.____ 9.____ f.()
yes no na
 - g. leader g.1.____ 2.____ 9.____ g.()
yes no na
7. Did rescuer question authority? 1.____ 2.____ 9.____ 7.____
yes no na ()
8. Did rescuer feel he/she had a sense of belonging?
1.____ 2.____ 9.____ 8.____
yes no na ()

9. In general, what kind of exposure to Jews did rescuer have prior to war?
 1.great deal 2.some 3.limited 4.none 9.no answer
 9.
 ()
10. In general, what was the quality of contact?
 1.intimate 2.casual 3.distant 4.none 9.no answer
 10.
 ()
11. What kind of discussions transpired about Jews at home?
 0.no discussion 1.very positive remarks 2. Positive but not exuberant 3.neutral 4.some derogatory remarks about Jews and money, appearance, strange religious practices, etc. 5.Hostile feelings toward Jews 6.mixed
 9.no answer 11.
 ()
12. Was rescuer exposed to any anti-Semitic instruction in school or in church?
 1. 2. 9. 12.
 yes no na ()
13. Tolerance for differentness at home?
 1. 2. 9. 13.
 yes no na ()

RESCUER'S ASSESSMENT OF SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. Was rescuer a helper prior to war?
 1. 2. 9. 1. ()
 yes no na
2. During war, how many people did rescuer assist?
 (QUESTION 119)
 3.a great deal 2.some 1.few 9.no answer 2. ()
3. Was rescuer a professional rescuer?
 1. 2. 9. 3. ()
 yes no na
- 3a. Rescue adventurous?
 1. 2. 9. 3a. ()
 yes no na
4. After the war, did rescuer continue to help people?
 1. 2. 9. 4. ()
 yes no na

If so, degree: 1.very much 2.somewhat 3.rarely

4a.Helping profession? 1. 2. 9. 4a. ()
yes no na

5. Prior to having been interviewed concerning rescue activity, how much has rescuer thought about the experience and/or why they rescued?
1.a great deal 2.sometimes 3.rarely 4.not at all
5.difficult to determine 5. ()

6. In recent years, how much of rescuer's self has been identified with rescue activities?
1.a great deal 2.some 3.none 4.none until interview
9.can't assess 6. ()

7. Does rescuer have any discussion of rescue experiences with family/friends?
1.a great deal 2.some 3.no discussion 9.can't assess
7. ()

8. Has rescuer spoken in public/written about his/her experience?
1. 2. 9. 8. ()
yes no na

9. Do current neighbors know about rescuer's experience/activities during war?
1. 2. 9. 9. ()
yes no na

10. Degree of contact with rescuees over the years?
1.great deal 2.some 3.none 9.no answer 10. ()

11. Degree of recent contact with rescuees?
1.great deal 2.some 3.none 9.no answer 11. ()

12. If change in degree of intensity of rescuer's identification of his/her self with rescue activity is this an effect of? 12. ()

1. interview yes no
2. news/media yes no
3. political event yes no
4. response to denial of Holocaust yes no
5. desire to leave legacy for one's children yes no
7. other yes no
9. no answer

12a. Coder's perception of which of the above was the most significant factor? 12a. ()

13. Survivor constellation: 13.
1.denial 2.feelings 3.search for meaning ()

APPENDIX E
FINAL CODING SHEET

Name: _____

Code: _____

Sex: M F

Motivational Assessment: _____

Type: I II III

Loner: 0 1

Self-Illness: 0 1

Early Loss: 0 1

Sibling Born After: 0 1

Birth Order: _____

Siblings: _____

Country of Birth: _____

Country of Childhood: _____

Country of Rescue: _____

Independence: 1 2 3 4 5

Competence: 1 2 3 4 5

Disobedience to Authority: 1 2 3 4 5

Stand Up for Belief: 1 2 3 4 5

Risk Taking/Fearless: 1 2 3 4 5

Belonging: 1 2 3 4 5

DISCIPLINE:

Discipline Degree/Father: 1 2 3 4 5

Discipline Physical/Father: 1 2 3 4 5

Discipline Verbal/Father: 1 2 3 4 5

Discipline Degree/Mother: 1 2 3 4 5

Discipline Physical/Mother: 1 2 3 4 5

Discipline Verbal/Mother: 1 2 3 4 5

PARENTAL VALUES:

Independence: 0 1

Competence: 0 1

Tolerance: 0 1

Altruistic Parent: 0 1

Religiosity/Mother: 1 2 3 4 5

Religiosity/Father: 1 2 3 4 5

Degree of Politics/Family: 1 2 3

Political Orientation/Family: _____

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS:

SES during Childhood: 1 2 3 4 5

Father's Occupation:

- Farm
- Working Class
- Business
- Politics
- Artist
- Military

Education: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

OCCUPATION OF RESCUER:

Before: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 During: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 After: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF RESCUER:

During: 1 2 3 4 5
 After: 1 2 3 4 5

MOTIVATION:Subject:

Emotional Attachment to Adult and/or Child
 Ideological Morality
 Religious Morality
 Emotional Morality
 Political
 Save a Soul
 Witness
 Awareness
 Parental Influence

Coder:

Personal Persecution
 Emotional Attachment to Adult and/or Child
 Loss Not Related
 Opportunistic
 Witness
 Transforming Moment

FIRST RESCUE:How Did Person Help:

Network
 Hiding
 False ID
 Food
 Intermediary
 Sabotage Transport
 Money/Employment

Who:

Spouse/Lover:	1	2	3	4
Intimate Other:	1	2	3	4
Acquaintance:	1	2	3	4
Stranger:	1	2	3	4

ADDITIONAL RESCUE(S):How:

Network
 Hiding
 False ID
 Food
 Intermediary
 Sabotage
 Transport
 Money/Employment

Who:

Spouse/Lover:	1	2	3	4
Intimate Other:	1	2	3	4
Acquaintance:	1	2	3	4
Stranger:	1	2	3	4

TOTAL NUMBER RESCUED: _____

Professional Rescuer: 0 1

Rescued Children: 0 1

Risked Own Children: 0 1

HELPFUL:

Before: 1 2 3

During: 1 2 3

After: 1 2 3

Helping Occupation: _____

POLITICS:

Before: 1 2 3

During: 1 2 3

After: 1 2 3

Political Orientation: _____

RELIGION:

Before: 1 2 3 4 5

During: 1 2 3 4 5

After: 1 2 3 4 5

Religious Orientation: _____

CONTACT WITH JEWS:

Before: 1 2 3

During: 1 2 3

After: 1 2 3

Parental Contact with Jews: 1 2 3

Parental Discussion about Jews: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Jewishness: 0 1

ADVENTUROUS:

Before: 1 2 3

During: 1 2 3

After: 1 2 3

CURRENT STATUS:

Country Now Resides: _____

Religion: _____

Politics: 1 2 3

Recognized by Yad Vashem: 0 1

Another Medal: 0 1

Degree of Contact with Rescues: 1 2 3

Unresolved Feelings: 0 1

MOURNING PROCESS:

Denial: 0 1

Feelings: 0 1

Sublimation: 0 1

Write: 1 2 3

Speak: 1 2 3

Discussion: 1 2 3

Recent Identification as Rescuer: 0 1

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS
WHO WERE RESCUEDI. IntroductionGoals for Interviewer:

1. To introduce self and affiliation;
2. To establish rapport in the relationship;
3. To describe purpose of project;
4. To put person at ease regarding use of tape recorder and/or videotape.
5. Obtain signed release form.

Every interviewer has an individual style of presenting him/herself; the following may serve as a guideline for what the initial introduction should consist of:

As you may know, I am working on a project for the Graduate Center of CUNY. We are interested in understanding what motivated non-Jews and Jews to risk their lives in order to help Jewish victims. Although you have had many experiences during those traumatic times, my interview today will focus mainly on your relationships with people who helped you and/or your family during the war.

We believe this is important for a number of reasons: First, we want to have a historical record, to make sure that anyone studying the Holocaust will learn that there were people who tried to help the Jews. Second, perhaps by understanding what motivated some people to help Jews under threat to their own lives, we will be able to cultivate these qualities in educating our children and grandchildren.

II. Identifying Information and Life Before the War

Goals: To obtain factual, biographical, geographical information about interviewee.

Copyright © 1982 by Eva Fogelman/Valerie Wiener, Graduate Center of the City University of New York. This interview schedule may not be used or reproduced without written permission of the authors.

Interviewer:

Why don't you begin by telling me about your life before the war--where you were born, who was in your family, what kind of school you attended, your religious and political activities, friends, any anti-Semitic experiences.

Information to be Included:

1. Place of birth
2. Age:
 - a. Year born
 - b. When war began in your country
3. Sex
4. How many sisters do (or did) you have?
5. How many brothers do (or did) you have?
6. Birth order in family
7. Marital status when war started in your country
- 8a. Highest educational level
 - b. Did you attend a secular/Jewish school--or both?
- 9a. Occupation before the war
 - b. Economic/social status before the war
10. Religious beliefs and behavior before the war
11. Political beliefs and behavior before the war (i.e., Zionist)
12. Nature and extent of contact with non-Jews prior to the war
 - a. Social relations with non-Jews
 - b. Work relations with non-Jews
 - c. Anti-Semitic incidents or encounters
- 13a. Where living before the war began in your country
 - b. Were you living in an area populated by many or few Jews?
 - c. Religious composition of your town or city
14. Who were you living with before the war began in your country?

15. How many children did you have before the war?
16. What were their ages and year of birth?
17. Did you make any attempt to leave your country before war began?
18. How well did you speak the language of the country you lived in?
- 19a. Did your appearance enable you to pass for an Aryan?
 - b. Did you have Aryan papers?
 - c. If so, how did you obtain them?
 - d. Did you or anyone else pay for your Aryan papers?

III. Rescuing Relationships and Life During the War

Goals: To focus on the survivor's life during the war, especially those experiences related to receiving aid from non-Jews and Jews. Each rescue relationships should be highlighted separately, elaborating on the following: Who initiated the relationship; how did it evolve and terminate? What kind of person(s) gave the help (religion, political beliefs, social status, etc.)? What motivated them?

Interviewer:

Where were you living when the war started and with whom? Tell me what happened...

Information/Questions to be Included:

A. Non-Jews as Rescuers

1. How many different incidents of non-Jews rescuing you and your family did you experience?

Note to Interviewer: Repeat Questions 2-17 for each rescue experience separately.

- 2a. Who was (were) the person(s) who rescued you in Case #1? (Entire family, couple, or child?)
 - b. Male or female?
 - c. Age while rescuing you?
 - d. Religious affiliation?
 - e. Political affiliation?
 - f. How did you know the person who rescued you?
 - g. If you knew the person, was s/he a friend, neighbor, relative, or colleague?

3. How did they help you in this case?
4. For how long (if food or shelter)?
5. Who initiated the helping?
6. Was there a verbal agreement?
7. Was the help given in confines of a concentration camp?
8. Was the person(s) acting as part of a network of rescuers?
9. Are you aware of any other people that s/he rescued?
10. Did you have any emotional or physical feelings for the person who helped you? (e.g., were you in love with the person? Were you afraid of the person?)
11. Why do you believe the rescuer helped you and/or your family? What do you think his/her motives were?
- 12a. Did you pay for any of the help you received?
 - b. If yes, what was the nature of the remuneration? (e.g., tutoring, caring for children, working the farmland, etc.)
13. Did you feel that the rescuer was taking a big risk in rescuing you?
14. What would have happened if the rescuer's activities had become known?
15. Were either you or the person who rescued you discovered?
16. If yes, what were the consequences?
17. How did the rescuing relationship terminate in this case?
18. Were there any times in the course of this relationship when you felt distrust toward the rescuer?

B. Jewish Victim as Rescuer of Other Victims

In extreme situations, people often act in ways that may be alien to them under ordinary circumstances. Our behavior toward others when we are under conditions of stress or threat to our own survival may be either harmful or helpful. We are trying to gain some understanding about human behavior under extreme conditions.

1. How many incidents of Jews helping you and/or your family did you experience?

Note to Interviewer: Repeat Questions 2-18 from Section III-A (Non-Jews as Rescuers) for each rescue experience.

19. Did you help other Jews during the war?
- 20a. If yes, what were the circumstances of these relationships?
 - b. What kind of help were you able to offer?
 - c. What motivated you to help?
 - d. Who were the people you helped? (e.g., adults or children)*
(*If you helped children, include responses to questions in Addendum for Adults Who Cared for Children.)
21. Were you asked to do anything you could not comply with?
- 22a. What was the most difficult decision you had to make during the War?
 - b. How do you feel about it now?
23. Do you know of any situations in which Jews acted in an unhelpful or harmful manner toward other Jews? If yes, please explain.

In your perception, how many Jews received help from non-Jews during the War?

IV. Life and Values after the War

Goals: To obtain information about the influence of having been rescued on the survivor's current life. How has it influenced his/her values after the war?

1. What has your life been like since the war?
 - a. Family
 - b. Occupation
 - c. Education
 - d. Health
2. Have your war experiences affected your religious beliefs and involvement?
3. Have your war experiences influenced your political beliefs and affiliations?
4. Has any contact been maintained with person(s) who rescued you?
5. Do you believe you have adequately compensated your rescuer(s) for the risks they took?
6. Have you had opportunities to help people since the war?
- 7a. Was there ever a time you wanted to help someone after the war but felt you could not?
 - b. Explain.
8. How would you describe yourself in terms of trusting others? Can you describe an experience since the war in which you trusted or distrusted someone?
- 9a. What have you told your children about your experiences during the war?
 - b. Do you believe that your children have been influenced in any way by what you have told them of your war experiences? Explain.
 - c. Have you spoken about your war experiences in any public forum?
- 10a. What did you learn about yourself, others, or human nature in general as a result of your experiences during the Holocaust?
 - b. What is the lesson that should be conveyed to young people today about the Holocaust?
11. Is there anything else you would like to share with us today?

ADDENDUMTHESE QUESTIONS ARE FOR SURVIVORS WHO HELPED OR TOOK CARE
OF CHILDREN

1. Obtain personal history and allow In. to unburden himself or herself. S/he may have doubts whether the way s/he treated the children was helpful to them or perhaps unwittingly harmful to them. Unearth the positive aspects of their influence on children and bolster his/her pride in their parenting endeavors under extreme situations.
2. Discuss the difficulties in dealing with children under adverse circumstances, and in remembering iniquities done to children (e.g., was In. responsible to persecutors or directed by persecutors to treat children a certain way?). Were measures necessary to assure safety, which may have involved restricting the children (e.g., closing their mouth so that they could not talk or cry)? Was In. so busy with daily chores that observation of children had to be reduced to a minimum and there was no playing or talking time?
3. Direct the In.'s attention to children, and ask about specific children who stood out, their ages, groups, behavior, vis-à-vis food (e.g., hoarding, snatching), sleeping, toilet habits, cleanliness, self-comforting, manner of reacting to adults and children, playing with toys alone or together, or other activities, perhaps even

work. Ask about their attachment to certain children, adults, groups, special objects. What were group moods, fears, phobias, nightmares, mores? Did children obey, were they provocative or compliant? Did they behave destructively, steal, lie, shout, or were they mute? Was their concentration impaired? Did they help in chores? Hide? Clutch on to others? How did they study (languages, math, arts)?

4. Ask about individual children and try to cover their histories. If data are not forthcoming, ask for anecdotes. Were children ill? Did they require nursing care? How did they behave during illness, convalescence? What did In. have to do for them medically?
5. Was any psychological help available or was there a chance of listening and having the children unburden themselves individually or in groups?
6. Does In. remember a favored child or one whom she secretly disliked? Can she speak freely about the children or are certain items not to be spoken about? Did In. feel that children should not know all the details of what happened to them in order to protect them from distress? Do these children appear in her dreams or suddenly come to her mind during an ordinary day? Does In. think about one or all of them when dealing with her or his own children and grandchildren? Does she feel that the world should make up to these children and give

them preferential treatment? Or does In. expect these children to be special, have a mission in life?

7. Is In. in touch with any of the children and do they feel close to her? Can she provide their addresses or write them to ask whether they want to participate in this project? Does she want to give us guidelines as to how to approach them?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, K. (1955). The rescue and murder of the father in neurotic fantasy formations. Clinical papers and essays on psychoanalysis (Vol. 2). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1922)
- Abramowicz, M., & Hoffenberg, E. (Producers and Co-directors). (1980). As if it were yesterday [Film documentary]. New York: Almi Pictures.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Agar, H. (1961, May 7-11). Christians who dared death to save Jews. Jewish Digest.
- Alexander, L. (1948). War crimes: Their social psychological aspects. American Journal of Psychiatry, 39(3), 170-177.
- Allen, W. S. The Nazi seizure of power: The experience of a single German town 1930-1935. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 432-443.
- Andreas-Friedrich, R. (1947). Berlin underground. New York: H. Holt.
- Anger, P. (1981). With Raoul Wallenberg in Budapest. New York: Holocaust Library.
- Arendt, H. (1963). Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil. New York: Penguin Books.
- Aronfreed, J. (1970). The socialization of altruistic and sympathetic behavior: Some theoretical and experimental analyses. In J. Macaulay & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior (pp. 103-126). New York: Academic Press.
- Arthur, B. (1976, February 2). Germans who saved Jews from Nazis. Jerusalem Post.

- Asch, S. E. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity: A minority of one against a unanimous majority. Psychological Monographs, 70(9).
- Atwood, G. (1974). The loss of a loved parent and the origin of salvation fantasies. Psychotherapy: Theory, research and practice, 11(3), 256-258.
- Atwood, G. (1978). On the origins and dynamics of messianic salvation fantasies. International Review of Psycho-Analysis, 5(1), 85-96.
- Bales, F. R., & Cohen, S. P. (1979). Systematic multiple level observation of groups. New York: Free Press.
- Barnett, M. A., Feighny, K., & Esper, J. A. (1983). Effects of anticipated victim responsiveness and empathy upon volunteering. The Journal of Social Psychology, 119, 211-218.
- Baron, L. (1984, September 7). Restoring faith in humankind. Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility, pp. 124-128.
- Baron, L. (1985a, May 2). The dynamics of decency: Dutch rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust. Paper presented for Frank P. Pinskor Faculty Lecture, St. Lawrence University, Canton, NY.
- Baron, L. (1985b, June 19). Historical and psycho-social theories of why Gentiles helped Jews during the Holocaust. Paper presented at the International Society of Political Psychology Conference, Washington, DC.
- Baroszewski, W., & Lewinowna, Z. (1970). The Samaritans: Heroes of the Holocaust. New York: Twayne Publishers Inc.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1976). Prosocial behavior: Theory and research. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1984). American study of helping behavior: What? why? and where? In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior (pp. 5-21). New York: Plenum Press.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1985). Altruistic motivation to help: Definition, utility and operationalization. Unpublished manuscript, School of Education, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel.
- Bartlett, I. H. (1961). Wendell Phillips, Brahmin radical. Boston: Boston Press.

- Barton, A. H. (1969). Communities in disaster. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.
- Bauer, Y. (1977). Negotiations between Saly Mayer and the SS. In Y. Gutman & E. Zuroff (Eds.), Rescue attempts during the Holocaust: Proceedings of the Second Yad Vashem International Historical Conference April 1974. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Bauer, Y. (1978). The Holocaust in historical perspective. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Bauminger, A. L. (1969). The righteous. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Beardslee, W. R. (1983). Commitment and endurance: Common themes in the life histories of civil rights workers who stayed. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 53(1), 34-42.
- Becker, E. (1975). Escape from evil. New York: Free Press.
- Bejski, M. (1977). The Righteous Among the Nations and their part in the rescue of Jews. In Y. Gutman & E. Zuroff (Eds.), Rescue attempts during the Holocaust: Proceedings of the Second Yad Vashem International Historical Conference April 1974 (pp. 627-647). Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Berenstein, T., & Rutkoowski, A. (1963). Assistance to the Jews in Poland. Warsaw: Polonia Foreign Languages Publishing House.
- Berkowitz, L., & Conner, W. H. (1966). Success, failure and social responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 664-669.
- Berkowitz, L. (1972). Social norms, feelings, and other factors affecting helping and altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press.
- Bethge, E. (1967). Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Man of vision, man of courage. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bettleheim, B. (1943). Individual and mass behavior in extreme situations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38, 417-452.
- Bierman, J. (1981). Righteous Gentile: The story of Raoul Wallenberg. New York: Viking Press.

- Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 88(1), 1-45.
- Blasi, A. (1982). Moral cognition and moral action: A theoretical perspective. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts, Boston.
- Block, J., & Block, J. H. (1973, January). Ego development and the provenance of thought: A longitudinal study of ego and cognitive development in young children (Grant No. MH 16080). Washington, DC: National Institute of Mental Health.
- Bond, N. D., & Phillips, B. N. (1971). Personality traits associated with altruistic behavior of children. Journal of School Psychology, 9, 24-34.
- Boyer, A. (1982, June). The World Council of Churches, its attitude to National-Socialism and its activities on behalf of the persecuted Jews. In Papers presented to the International Symposium on Judaism and Christianity under the Impact of National-Socialism (1919-1945) (pp. 377-404). Israel: The Historical Society of Israel.
- Bryan, J. H. (1972). Why children help: A review. Journal of Social Issues, 28(3), 87-104.
- Bryan, J. H., & Test, M. A. (1967). Models of helping: Naturalistic studies in aiding behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, 400-407.
- Bryan, J. H., & Walbek, N. H. (1970). Preaching and practicing generosity: Children's actions and reactions. Child Development, 41, 329-353.
- Burley, P. (1977). A model for the prediction of altruistic behavior. Unpublished manuscript, University of Oxford.
- Carpi, D. (1977). The rescue of Jews in the Italian zone of occupied Croatia. In Y. Gutman & E. Zuroff (Eds.), Rescue attempts during the Holocaust: Proceedings of the Second Yad Vashem International Historical Conference April 1974 (pp. 465-507). Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Chciuk, A. (Ed.). (1969). Saving Jews in wartime Poland. Melbourne, Australia: Wilkie Co. Ltd.
- Clary, E. G. (1986). Socialization and situational influences on sustained altruism. Child Development, 57(6), 1358-1369.

- Clements, C. (1984). Witness to war: An American doctor in El Salvador. New York: Bantam Books.
- Coke, J., Batson, C., & McDavis, K. (1978). Empathic mediation of helping: A two-stage model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 752-766.
- Coles, R. (1977). Children of crisis. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Colligen, D. (1980, March). High priest of guerrilla psychology. Omni, pp. 108-115.
- Comte, A. (1967). System of positive policy (Vol. 1). New York: Burt Franklin. (Original work published 1875)
- Conway, J. (1968). The Nazi persecution of the churches, 1933-1945. New York: Basic Books.
- Conway, J. S. (1982, June). Catholicism and the Jewish people during the Nazi period and afterwards. In Papers presented to the International Symposium on Judaism and Christianity under the Impact of National-Socialism (1919-1945) (pp. 347-375). Israel: The Historical Society of Israel.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). Antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.
- Damico, A. J. (1982). The sociology of justice: Kohlberg and Milgram. Political Theory, 10(3), 409-434.
- Darley, J., & Batson, C. (1973). From Jerusalem to Jericho: A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27(1), 100-108.
- Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 377-383.
- Darlington, R., & Macker, C. (1966). Displacement of guilt-produced behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 442-443.
- Davis, M. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10, 85.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(1), 113-126.

- De Jong, L. (1965, Spring). Help to people in hiding: A review of arts, life, and thought in the Netherlands 1940-1941. Delta, 8(19), 37-79.
- Des Pres, T. (1979, May). Goodness incarnate: Sheltering Jews in Vichy France. Harpers, pp. 83-86.
- Edwards, M. (1984, Fall). What's moral about Huckleberry Finn. American Educator, 30-33.
- Ehlert, J., Ehlert, N., & Merrens, M. (1973). The influence of ideological affiliation on helping behavior. The Journal of Social Psychology, 89, 315-316.
- Eisenberg, A. (1982). The lost generation: Children in the Holocaust. New York: Pilgrim Press.
- Erikson, E. H. (1958). Young man Luther: A study in psychoanalysis and history. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1969). Gandhi's truth. New York: Norton.
- Fabian, B. (1949, September 24). An undelivered eulogy. America, pp. 667-668.
- Fein, H. (1979). Accounting for genocide: National responses and Jewish victimization during the Holocaust. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fischman, W. I. (1964, December 1). The friar who saved 5,000 Jews. Look, pp. 66-71.
- Fladeland, B. (1955). James Gillespie Birney: Slaveholder to abolitionist. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Flender, H. (1964). Rescue in Denmark. New York: Holocaust Library.
- Fogelman, E. (1984, September). Social psychological study of the rescuers. Martyrdom and Resistance, p. 8.
- Fogelman, E. (1986, April). [Review of When light pierced the darkness by Nechama Tec]. Jewish Telegraphic Agency.
- Fogelman, E., & Wiener, V. L. (1983). Report and evaluation of Tendency to Help Profile (Form A). Unpublished manuscript.

- Fogelman, E., & Wiener, V. L. (1985). The few, the brave, the noble. Psychology Today, 19(8), pp. 60-65.
- Ford, H. (1966). Flee the captor. Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association.
- Form, W., & Nosow, S. (1968). Community in disaster. New York: Harper and Row.
- Frank, A. (1970). The diary of a young girl. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Freud, A. (1946). A form of altruism. The ego and the mechanism of defense (pp. 132-148). New York: International Universities Press.
- Freud, S. (1961). Civilization and its discontents. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 21, pp. 64-145). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1930)
- Freud, S. (1971). A special type of choice of object made by men. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 11, pp. 163-175). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1910)
- Friedlander, S. (1979). When memory comes. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Friedlander, S. (1980). Pius XII and the Third Reich: A documentation. New York: Octagon.
- Friedlander, S. (1984). From anti-Semitism to extermination: A historiographical study of Nazi policies toward the Jews and an essay in interpretation. In Yad Vashem Studies XVI (pp. 1-50). Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Friedman, P. (1955). Khadisry umoy's ho'oylom in the Nazi period. Yiddisher Kemfer, 36, 54-58.
- Friedman, P. (1957). Their brothers' keepers. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Friedman, P. (1980a). Righteous Gentiles in the Nazi era. In A. J. Friedman (Ed.), Roads to extinction: Essays on the Holocaust (pp. 409-421). Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.

- Friedman, P. (1980b). Was there an "other Germany" during the Nazi period. In A. J. Friedman (Ed.), Roads to extinction: Essays on the Holocaust (pp. 422-464). Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Gardner, R. (1985). The courage to care [film documentary]. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
- Gaylin, W. (1970). In the service of their country: War resisters in prison. New York: The Viking Press.
- Geis, M., with Gold, A. (1987). Ann Frank remembered: The story of the woman who helped to hide the Frank family. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Gergen, K. H., Gergen, M. M., & Meter, K. (1972). Individual orientations to prosocial behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 28(3), 105-130.
- Gibbons, F. X., & Wicklund, R. A. (1982). Self-focused attention and helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(3), 462-474.
- Gilbert, M. (1985). The Holocaust: A history of the Jews during the Second World War. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conception of the self and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 481-517.
- Gilligan, C. (1981). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goleman, D. (1985, March 5). Great altruists: Science ponders soul of goodness. New York Times, pp. C1-C2.
- Gordon, S. (1980). German opposition to Nazi anti-Semitism 1933-1945. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Buffalo.
- Gordon, S. (1984). Hitler, Germans and the Jewish question. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Grinspoon, L. (Ed.). (1986). The long darkness. New Haven, CT: York University Press.
- Gross, L. (1982). The last Jews of Berlin. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Grossman, F. (1982, July 22). Righteous Gentiles. Scarsdale Enquirer. (Also appeared June 17, 1982, Greenberg Enquirer, p. 7.)
- Grossman, F. (1984). Psychological study of Gentiles who saved Jews. In I. Charney (Ed.), Toward the understanding of Holocaust and prevention of genocide (pp. 202-216). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Grossman, K. D. (1958). Die unbesungenen Helden: Menschen in Deutschlands dunklen Tagen. Berlin: Arani Verlag.
- Grossman, K. R. (1959, September). The humanitarian that cheated Hitler. Coronet, pp. 66-71.
- Gruber, R. M. (1968, December). The Pole who saved 32 Jews. Hadassah Magazine, pp. 21, 36.
- Gutteridge, R. (1982, June). German Protestantism and the Jews in the Third Reich. In Papers presented to the International Symposium on Judaism and Christianity under the Impact of National-Socialism (1919-1945). Israel: The Historical Society of Israel.
- Haan, N. (1977). Coping and defending: New York: Academy Press.
- Haan, N. (1978). Two moralities in action contexts: Relationships to thought, ego regulation, and development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 286-305.
- Hallie, P. (1979). Lest innocent blood be shed: The story of the village of Le Chambon and how goodness happened there. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hamerow, T. S. (1985, March). The hidden Holocaust. Commentary, pp. 32-42.
- Hardin, G. (1977). The limits of altruism: An ecologist's view of survival. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Harris, M. B. (1972). The effects of performing one altruistic act on the likelihood of performing another. Journal of Social Psychology, 88(1), 65-73.
- Hartshorne, H., & May, M. A. (1928). Studies in the nature of character: Vol. 1. Studies in deceit. New York: Macmillan.

- Hatfield, E., Walster, G. W., & Piliavin, J. (1978). Equity theory and helping relationships. In L. Wispé (Ed.), Altruism, sympathy and helping: Psychological and sociological principles (pp. 115-140). New York: Academic Press.
- Hellman, P. (1980). Avenue of the righteous: Portraits in uncommon courage of Christians and the Jews they saved from Hitler. New York: Atheneum.
- Henry, F. (1984). Victims and neighbors: A small town in Nazi Germany remembered. South Hadley: Bergin and Garvey.
- Henry, F. (1985). Notes on the bystander issue in Nazi Germany. Dimensions: A Journal of Holocaust Studies, 1(2), 7-10.
- Herzer, I. (1983, June-July). How Italians rescued Jews. Midstream, pp. 36-38.
- Hilberg, R. (1961). The destruction of the European Jews. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Hochhuth, R. (1964). The deputy. New York: Grove Press.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1963). Parent discipline and the child's consideration for others. Child Development, 34, 573-588.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1975). Altruistic behavior and the parent-child relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 937-943.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1976). Empathy, role taking, guilt, and development of altruistic motives. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Empathy, its development and prosocial implications. In C. B. Keasey (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 25). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Hoffman, M. (1980). Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg-Berg (Ed.), Development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Hoffman, M. (1984). Discipline, moral internalization, and prosocial motivation. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior (pp. 117-132). New York: Plenum.

- Hogan, R. (1969). Development of an empathy scale. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 307-316.
- Horbach, M. (1967). Out of the night. New York: Frederick Fell Inc.
- Huneke, D. K. (1980). In the darkness . . . glimpses of light: A study of Nazi era rescuers. Report to the Oregon Committee for the Humanities.
- Huneke, D. K. (1981-1982). A study of Christians who rescued Jews during the Nazi era. Humboldt Journal of Social Relations, 9(1), 144-149.
- Huneke, D. K. (1985). The Moses of Rovno. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.
- Huston, T. L., Geis, G., & Wright, W. (1976, June). The angry Samaritans. Psychology Today, pp. 61-85.
- Huston, T. L., Ruggiero, M., Conner, R., & Geis, G. (1981). Bystander intervention into crime: A study based on naturally-occurring episodes. Social Psychology Quarterly, 44(1), 14-23.
- Iranek-Osmecki, K. (1971). He who saves one life. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.
- James, W. (1952). The varieties of religious experience: A study in human nature. New York: Collier.
- Jones, E. (1964). The God complex. Essays in applied psychoanalysis (Vol. 2, pp. 244-265). New York: International Universities Press. (Original work published 1913)
- Kadushin, C. (1968). Reason analysis. International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (pp. 338-343). New York: The Macmillan Company and The Free Press.
- Kanabus, F. (1973). Address at the J. N. F. September 20, 1965. In J. Glatstein, I. Knox, & S. Margoshes (Eds.), Anthology of Holocaust literature. New York: Atheneum.
- Karpe, R. (1961). The rescue complex in Anna O's final identity. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 30, 1-27.
- Karski, J. (1944). Story of a secret state. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

- Kedward, H. R. (1978). Resistance to Vichy France: A study of ideas and motivation in the southern zone, 1940-1942. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kelman, H. (1975). Violence without moral restraint: Reflections on the dehumanization of victims and victimizers. Journal of Social Issues, 29(4), 25-61.
- Kelman, H. C., & Laurence, H. C. (1972). Assignment of responsibility in the case of Lieutenant Calley: Preliminary report on a national survey. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 177-212.
- Keneally, T. (1982). Schindler's list. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Keniston, K. (1968). Young radicals: Notes on committed youth. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc.
- Kermish, J. (1977). The activities of the Council for Aid to Jews (Zegota) in Occupied Poland. In Y. Gutman & E. Zuroff (Eds.), Rescue attempts during the Holocaust (pp. 367-398). Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Kersten, F., & Briffault, H. (1947). The memoirs of Dr. Felix Kersten. New York: Doubleday.
- Kestenberg, J. (1984). The response of the child to the rescuer. Paper presented at the Acts of Humankind: Rescuers of Jews During the Holocaust Conference, Washington, DC.
- Kestenberg, M. (1985). Poland without Jews. Newsletter of Jerome Riker International Study of Organized Persecution of Children, 1(2), 1-2.
- Kieval, H. J. (1980, October). Legality and assistance in Vichy France: The rescue of Jewish children. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 124, 339-366.
- Klingemann, V. (1985, June). The study of rescuers of Jews in Berlin: A progress report. Paper presented to the eighth annual Scientific Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Washington, DC.
- Kogan, N., & Wallach, M. A. (1964). Risk-taking: A study in cognition and personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kohlberg, L. (1964). Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 1, pp. 383-431). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (Chapter 6). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Kohut, H. (1971). The analysis of the self. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. (1977). The restoration of self. New York: International Universities Press.
- Korbanski, S. (1968). Fighting Warsaw. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Krebs, D. L. (1975). Empathy and altruism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 1134-1146.
- Kren, G. M., & Rappaport, L. (1980). The Holocaust and the crisis of human behavior. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kulka, O. D. (1982, June). Popular Christian attitudes in the Third Reich to National-Socialist policies towards the Jews. In Papers presented to the International Symposium on Judaism and Christianity under the Impact of National-Socialism (1919-1945) (pp. 227-251). Israel: The Historical Society of Israel.
- Kulka, O. D., & Rodrique, A. (1984). The German population and the Jews in the Third Reich: Recent publication and trends in research on German society and the "Jewish question." In A. Weiss (Ed.), Yad Vashem Studies (Vol. 16). Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Kuypers, J. (1972). Internal-external locus of control, ego functioning and personality characteristics in old age. The Gerontologist, 12, 168-173.
- Lachman, F., & Shamah, I. (Eds.). (1971). Righteous Among the Nations. In Encyclopedia Judaica (Vol. 14, p. 184). Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, Ltd.
- Lader, L. (1961). The bold Brahmins. New York: Dutton.
- Langer, S. K. (1972). Mind: An essay on human feeling (Vol. 3). Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Latour, A. (1981). The Jewish resistance in France. New York: Holocaust Library.
- Lazarfeld, P. F. (1942). The statistical analysis of reasons as research operation. Sociometry, 5, 29-47.
- Lazarfeld, P. F. (1954). The art of asking why: Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. In D. Katz et al. (Eds.), Public opinion and propaganda (pp. 675-686). New York: Dryden. (Original work published 1935)
- Lerner, M. (1975). The justice motive in social behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 31(3), 1-19.
- Lerner, M. J. (1980). The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lerner, M. J., & Lerner, S. C. (1981). The justice motive in social behavior. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lester, E. (1984). Wallenberg: The man in the iron web. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Leuner, H. D. (1966). When compassion was a crime: Germany's silent heroes 1933-1945. London: Wolf.
- Levy, D. M. (1946). The German anti-Nazi. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 16, 507-515.
- Levy, D. M. (1948). Anti-Nazi's criteria of differentiation. Psychiatry, 11, 125-167.
- Lief, L. H., & Fox, R. (1963). Training for detached concern in medical students. In Psychological basis of medical practice (pp. 12-35). New York: Harper & Row.
- Lifton, R. J. (1961). Thought reform and the psychology of totalism: A study of "brainwashing" in China. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Lifton, R. J. (1970). Protean man. In History and human survival (pp. 311-331). New York: Random House.
- Lifton, R. J. (1973). Home from the war--Vietnam veterans: Neither victims nor executioners. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Lifton, R. J. (1976). The life of the self: Toward a new psychology. New York: Touchstone.
- Lifton, R. J. (1979). The broken connection: On death and the continuity of life. New York: Basic Books.
- Lifton, R. J. (1982a). Death in life: Survivors of Hiroshima. New York: Basic Books.
- Lifton, R. J. (1982b). Medicalized killing in Auschwitz. Psychiatry, 45, 283-297.
- Lifton, R. J. (1985, July 21). What made this man? Mengele. The New York Times Magazine, pp. 16-25.
- Lifton, R. J. (1986). The Nazi doctors. New York: Basic Books.
- Lifton, R. J. (1987a). The future of immortality and other essays for a nuclear age. New York: Basic Books.
- Lifton, R. J. (1987b). New psychology of human survival: Images of doom and hope. Occasional paper, No. 1, Center on Human Violence and Human Survival, John Jay College, City University of New York.
- Littell, F., & Locke, H. (Eds.) (1974). The German church struggle and the Holocaust. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Loevinger, J. (1970). Measuring ego development. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- London, P. (1970). The rescuers: Motivational hypotheses about Christians who saved Jews from the Nazis. In J. Macauley & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior (pp. 241-250). New York: Academic Press.
- Lowe, R., & Richter, G. (1973). Relation of altruism to age, social class and ethnic identity. Psychological Reports, 33, 567-572.
- Lowrie, D. (1963). The hunted children. New York: Norton.
- Lykken, D. T. (1982, September). Fearlessness: It's carefree charm and deadly risks. Psychology Today, pp. 20-28.
- Mahler, E. (1962). How Granny saved Helenka from the Germans. In Y. Shilhav & S. Feinstein (Eds.), Flame and fury. New York: Jewish Education Committee Press.

- Marrus, M. K. (1982, June). Churches and the persecution of Jews in France, 1940-1944. In Papers presented to the International Symposium on Judaism and Christianity under the Impact of National-Socialism (1919-1945). Israel: The Historical Society of Israel.
- Marrus, M. R., & Paxton, R. O. (1983). Vichy France and the Jews. New York: Schocken Books.
- Mason, H. L. (1984, Summer). Testing human bonds within nations: Jews in the occupied Netherlands. Political Science Quarterly, 99, 2.
- McWilliams, N. (1976). Helpers: A study in normal personality. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University.
- McWilliams, N. (1984). The psychology of the altruist. Psychoanalytic Psychology, 1(3), 193-213.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meed, V. (1972). On both sides of the wall: Memoirs from the Warsaw ghetto. Beit Lohamei Haghettaot: Ghetto Fighters' House and Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House.
- Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. Journal of Personality, 40, 525-543.
- Meyer, E. (1974, December). A German who saved Jews: Oskar Schindler. The Jewish Digest, pp. 32-35.
- Michaelis, M. (1982, June). Christians and Jews in Facist Italy. In Papers presented to the International Symposium on Judaism and Christianity under the Impact of National-Socialism (1919-1945). Israel: The Historical Society of Israel.
- Midlarsky, E. (1971). Aiding under stress. Journal of Personality, 39, 132-149.
- Midlarsky, E. (1984). Competence and helping: Notes toward a model. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior: International perspectives on positive morality (pp. 291-308). New York: Plenum Press.
- Milgram, S. (1970, July 7). [Review of In the service of their country: War resisters in prison by Willard Gaylin]. The Nation, p. 1.

- Milgram, S. (1974). Obedience to authority: An experimental view. New York: Harper & Row.
- Miller, A. G. (1986). The obedience experiments: A case study of controversy in social science. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Milson, S. (1983). The righteous who helped Jews. In A. Grobman & D. Landes (Eds.), Genocide: Critical issues of the Holocaust. Los Angeles: Simon Wisenthal Publication.
- A Moment interview with Marion Prichard. (1983, December 1). Moment, pp. 26-33.
- Mussen, P. H., Harris, S., Rutherford, E., & Keasey, C. B. (1970). Honesty and altruism among preadolescents. Developmental Psychology, 3, 169-194.
- Neshamit, S. (1977). Rescue in Lithuania during the Nazi occupation. In Y. Gutman & E. Zuroff (Eds.), Rescue attempts during the Holocaust: Proceedings of the Second Yad Vashem International Historical Conference April 1974 (pp. 289-331). Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Oliner, S. P. (1982, June). The need to recognize heroes of the Nazi era. Reconstructionist, 7-14.
- Oliner, S. P. (1984). The unsung heroes in Nazi occupied Europe: The antidote to evil. Nationalities Papers, 12(1), 130.
- Piaget, J. (1932). The moral judgement of the child. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Piliavin, I. M., Piliavin, J. A., & Rodin, J. (1975). Good Samaritanism: An underground phenomenon? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 429-438.
- Poliakov, L. (1950, August). Human morality and the Nazi terror. Commentary, pp. 111-116.
- Poliakov, L., & Sabille, J. (1954). Jews under the Italian occupation. Paris: Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine.
- Poulos, R. W., & Liebert, R. M. (1972). Influence of modeling, exhortative verbalization, and surveillance on children's sharing. Developmental Psychology, 6, 402-408.
- Presser, J. (1969). The destruction of the Dutch Jews. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co. Inc.

- Prichard, M. (1984, April 27). It came to pass in those days. Sh'ma, pp. 97-102.
- Pshenitse, Y. (1983). Wanderings of a child. In J. Kugelmass & J. Boyorin (Eds.), From a ruined garden: The memorial books of Polish Jewry (pp. 177-179). New York: Schocken Books.
- Radke-Yarrow, M., Scott, P. M., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (1973). Learning concern for others. Developmental Psychology, 8(2), 240-260.
- Radke-Yarrow, M., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (1986). The role of familial factors in the development of prosocial behavior: Research findings and questions. In D. Olweus, J. Block, & M. Radke-Yarrow (Eds.), Development of antisocial and prosocial behavior: Research, theories and issues (pp. 207-233). New York: Academic Press.
- Ramati, A. (1978). The Assisi underground: The priests who rescued Jews. New York: Stein and Day Publishers.
- Rank, O. (1941). Beyond psychology. New York: Dover.
- Rest, J. R. (1976). New approaches in the assessment of moral judgement. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Reykowski, J. (1984). Spatial organization of a cognitive system and intrinsic prosocial motivation. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior (pp. 51-74). New York: Plenum Press.
- Ringelblum, E. (1975). Notes from the Warsaw Ghetto. New York: Schocken Books.
- Rings, W. (1982). Life with the enemy: Collaboration and resistance in Hitler's Europe 1939-1945. New York: Doubleday.
- Rittner, C., & Myers, S. (Eds.). (1986). The courage to care. New York: New York University Press.
- Rochman, L. (1983). The pit and the trap: A chronicle of survival. New York: Holocaust Library.
- Rodnick, D. (1948). Postwar Germans. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1964). The three Christs of Ypsilanti. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Rose, L. (1978). The tulips are red. New York: A.S. Barnes and Co.
- Rosenfeld, H. (1982). The Swedish angel of rescue: The heroism and torment of Raoul Wallenberg. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Rosenhan, D. (1970). The natural socialization of altruistic autonomy. In J. Macauley & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and helping behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Rosenhan, D. L. (1978). Toward resolving the altruism paradox. In L. Wispé (Ed.), Altruism, sympathy and helping: Psychological and sociological principles (pp. 101-113). New York: Academic Press.
- Rosenhan, D. L., Moore, B. S., & Underwood, B. (1976). The social psychology of moral behavior. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues (pp. 241-252). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rosenhan, D. L., Salovey, P., & Hargis, K. (1981). The joys of helping: Focus of attention mediated the impact of positive affect on altruism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40(5), 899-905.
- Rosenhan, D. L., Underwood, B., & Moore, B. S. (1974). Affect moderates altruism and self gratification. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 546-552.
- Rosenhan, D., & White, G. M. (1967). Observation and rehearsal as determinants of prosocial behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 424-431.
- Rothfels, H. (1962). The German opposition to Hitler. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press Publishers.
- Rothkirchen, L. (1982, June). The stand of the churches vis-à-vis the persecution of the Jews of Slovakia. In Papers presented to the International Symposium on Judaism and Christianity under the Impact of National-Socialism (1919-1945) (pp. 273-286). Israel: The Historical Society of Israel.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external locus of control of reinforcement. Psychological Monograph, 80(609).
- Ruchames, L. (1963). The abolitionists. New York: Putnam.

- Rutkowski, G. K., Gruder, C. L., & Romer, D. (1983). Group cohesiveness, social norms, and bystander intervention. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(3), 545-552.
- Sabini, J. P., & Silver, M. (1980). Destroying the innocent with a clear conscience: A sociopsychology of the Holocaust. In J. Dimsdale (Ed.), Survivors, victims, and perpetrators. Washington: Hemisphere Publishing Co.
- Sauvage, P. (1983, October). A most persistent haven: Le Chambone-sur-Lignon. Moment, 8(9), 30-35.
- Sauvage, P. (1987). Weapon of the spirit [documentary film].
- Sawyer, J. (1966). The altruism scale: A measure of cooperative, individualistic and competitive interpersonal orientation. American Journal of Sociology, 71(4), 407-416.
- Scholl, I. (1970). Students against tyranny: The resistance of the White Rose, Munich 1942-1943. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Schulweis, H. (1962). The bias against man. Paper presented at the Rabbinical Assembly, Kiamisha, New York.
- Schulweis, H. (1981). The eternal light [NBC radio network]. A conversation with Rabbi Harold Schulweis.
- Schulweis, H. M. (1984). Evil and the morality of God. New York: Hebrew College Union Press.
- Schulweis, H. (1986a, May). They were our brothers' keepers. Moment, pp. 47-50.
- Schulweis, H. M. (1986b, Spring). The Sh'ma feature review of When light pierced the darkness. Sh'ma, pp. 70-71.
- Schwartz, S. (1970). Elicitation of moral obligation and self-sacrificing behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15, 283-293.
- Schwartz, S. (1975). The justice of need and the activation of humanitarian norms. Journal of Social Issues, 31(3), 111-135.
- Severy, L. J. (1975). Individual differences in helping dispositions. Journal of Personality Assessment, 39(3), 282-292.

- Sherif, M. (1936). The psychology of social norms. New York: Harper.
- Sherwin, B. (1979). Philosophical and moral implications of the Holocaust. In B. Sherwin & S. Ament (Eds.), Encountering the Holocaust: An interdisciplinary study. Chicago: Impact Press.
- Sinha, D. (1984). Community as target: A new perspective to research on prosocial behavior. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior. New York: Plenum.
- Sloan, J. (Ed.). (1974). Notes from the Warsaw Ghetto: The journal of Emmanuel Ringelblum. New York: Schocken.
- Sobczak, S. (1983). How I hid twelve Jews. In J. Kugelmass & J. Boyorin (Eds.), The memorial books of Polish Jewry (pp. 175-176). New York: Schocken Books.
- Staub, E. (1970). A child in distress: The effects of focusing responsibility on children on their attempts to help. Developmental Psychology, 2, 152-154.
- Staub, E. (1978). Positive social behavior and morality: Social and personal influences. New York: Academic Press.
- Staub, E. (1984). Notes toward an interactionist-motivational theory of the determinants and development of (pro) social behavior. In E. Staub, D. Bar-Tal, J. Karylowski, & J. Reykowski (Eds.), Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior (pp. 29-49). New York: Plenum Press.
- Staub, E., Bar-Tal, D., Karylowski, J., & Reykowski, J. (Eds.). (1984). Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior: International perspectives on positive morality. New York: Plenum Press.
- Steinberg, L. (1974). Not as a lamb: The Jews against Hitler. Glasgow: The University Press.
- Steinberg, L. (1977). Jewish rescue activities in Belgium and France in rescue attempts during the Holocaust. In Y. Gutman & E. Zuroff (Eds.), Proceedings of the Second Yad Vashem International Historical Conference April 1974 (pp. 603-615). Jerusalem: Yad Vashem.
- Stix, H. (1978, June 23). A German who really cared. Los Angeles Times, part 4.

- Strickland, B. R. (1965). The prediction of social action from a dimension of internal-external control. Journal of Social Psychology, 66, 353-358.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1970). The psychiatric interview. New York: Norton.
- Tec, N. (1982a). Dry tears. Westport: Wildcat Publishing Company.
- Tec, N. (1982b). Righteous Christians--Who are they? Book of Proceedings, Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies (pp. 167-172). Jerusalem: World Congress of Jewish Studies.
- Tec, N. (1983, Winter). Righteous Christians in Poland. International Social Science Review, 58(1), 15-17.
- Tec, N. (1984, March). Sex distinctions and passing as Christians during the Holocaust. East European Quarterly, 18(1), 113-123.
- Tec, N. (1985). The rescuer-rescued relationship: How did it begin. Dimensions: A Journal of Holocaust Studies, 1(2), 4-7.
- Tec, N. (1986). When light pierced the darkness: Righteous Christians and the Jewish Poles. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ten Boom, C., with Sherrill, J., & Sherrill, E. (1971). The hiding place. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Co.
- Thomas, B. P. (1950). Theodore Weld: Crusader for freedom. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Toi, M., & Batson, C. D. (1982). More evidence that empathy is a source of altruistic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(2), 281-292.
- Tomkins, S. (1965). The psychology of commitment. In S. Tomkins & C. Izard (Eds.), Affect, cognition and personality: Empirical studies (pp. 148-171). New York: Springer.
- Valentin, H. (1953). Rescue and relief activities in behalf of Jewish victims of Nazism in Scandinavia. YIVO Annual of Social Sciences, 8, 224-251.
- Vlcko, P. (1973). In the shadow of tyranny: A history in novel form. New York: Vantage Press.

- von Staden, W. (1981). Darkness over the valley. New Haven and New York: Ticknor & Fields.
- Vos, J. (1952). Like a cedar on the Lebanon. Leiden: A.W. Sythoff Vitgeversmaatschabpy M.V.
- Weigler, Z. (1957). Two villages razed for extending help to Jews. Yad Vashem Bulletin, 1, 18-20.
- Weinstein, F. S. (1985). A hidden childhood: A Jewish girl's sanctuary in a French convent, 1942-1945. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Werbell, F. E., & Clarke, T. (1982). Lost hero: The mystery of Raoul Wallenberg. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- White, R. W. (1972). The enterprise of living. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Whiting, B., & Whiting, J. W. M. (1975). Children of six cultures. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Whiting, J. W. M., & Whiting, B. B. (1973). Altruistic and egoistic behavior in six cultures. In L. Nader & T. W. Maretzki (Eds.), Cultural illness and health: Essays in human adaptation. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Wiener, V. L., Fogelman, E., & Cohen, S. P. (1985). Why righteous Gentiles risked their lives to save Jews. Jewish Monthly, The B'nai B'rith International, 99(5), 16-19.
- Wiesel, E. (1966). The gates of the forest. New York: Avon Books.
- Wilson, E. O. (1975). Sociobiology: The new synthesis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wispé, L. (1978). Toward an integration. In L. Wispé (Ed.), Altruism, sympathy and helping: Psychological and sociological principles (pp. 303-327). New York: Academic Press.
- Wolfe, J. (1981). Take care of Josette: A memoir in defense of occupied France. New York: Franklin Watts.
- Wolfson, M. (1970, April). The subculture of freedom: Some people will not. Paper presented to the regional meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Sacramento, CA.

- Wolfson, M. (1975). Zum widerstand gegen Hitler: Umriss eines Gruppenportrats deutscher retter von Juden. Tradition und Neubeginn, pp. 391-407.
- Wrightsman, L. (1964). Measurement of philosophies of human nature scale. Psychological Reports, 14, 743-751.
- Wundheiler, L. N. (1985, September). Oskar Schindler's moral development during the Holocaust. Paper presented at the Social Science Research Council, New York.
- Wundheiler, L. N. (1986). The psycho-dynamics of rescue behavior with special emphasis on its creative aspects. Paper presented at the Brooklyn Institute of Psychotherapy, Brooklyn, NY.
- Yahil, L. (1969). The rescue of Danish Jewry: Test of a democracy. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Zahn, G. (1964). In solitary witness: The life and death of Franz Jagerstaetter. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., & Radke-Yarrow, M. (1982). The development of altruism: Alternative research strategies. In N. Eisenberg-Berg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic Press.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Radke-Yarrow, M., & King, R. (1979). Child rearing and children's prosocial initiations toward victims of distress. Child Development, 50, 319-330.
- Zassenhaus, H. (1974). Walls resisting the Third Reich: One woman's story. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Zimbardo, P. (1971). The Stanford prison experiment: A simulation study of the psychology of imprisonment. Script of slideshow.
- Zuccotti, S. (1987). The Italians and the Holocaust: Persecution, rescue, survival. New York: Basic Books.