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Résumé : Cet article propose une analyse comparative entre quatre livres pour la jeunesse consacrés à l’Holocauste et les récits traditionnels («mainstream») du Canada; il tente également de préciser leur spécificité par rapport aux ouvrages traitant de la Shoah publiés à l’étranger. L’étude des éléments relatifs à l’identité canadienne dépasse la simple comparaison avec les caractéristiques essentielles des œuvres et des genres dominants. Elle soulève la question du Savoir, c’est-à-dire qu’elle aura chercher à découvrir ce que les enfants canadiens doivent connaître sur l’Holocauste. L’auteure de l’article dévoile les aspects inquiétants que peuvent présenter les livres sur l’Holocauste lorsqu’ils abordent la question de l’identité nationale et s’efforcent de situer les problèmes reliés à la Shoah dans un contexte canadien.

Summary: This essay interrogates the relationship between Holocaust children’s books and “mainstream” Canadian children’s fiction. It considers what Canadian means in Holocaust children’s books and whether Canadian-authored Holocaust children’s books differ in any significant way from Holocaust children’s books published outside Canada. It argues that questions about Canadian identity in Holocaust children’s literature are provoked but not answered by the structural analysis provided by the list of shared characteristics of “mainstream” Canadian children’s novels. Affirming that identity is also a matter of knowledge, the essay investigates what Canadian children are expected to know about the Holocaust. Through an analysis of four recently published books, the essay demonstrates the disturbing implications when children’s books about the Holocaust also take on questions of Canadian identity and locate Holocaust issues in a contemporary Canadian setting. Three of the books are Canadian: Kathy Kacer’s Clara’s War, Sherie Posesorski’s Escape Plans, and Marsha Forchuk Skrypuch’s Hope’s War; one, Jackie French’s Hitler’s Daughter, is Australian.
Perry Nodelman and Mavis Reimer hope that the list of “Shared Characteristics of ‘Mainstream’ Canadian Children’s Novels” generated by their students will “pique the interest and skepticism of other teachers and scholars” (31). My own reaction extends beyond either a piqued interest or an irritated skepticism. The list has made me — the kid who grew up not quite “mainstream” — anxious. It has also driven the professor who did grow up and find her place in the “mainstream” to think about what contemporary Holocaust literature written in Canada tells us about Canadian identity. The list makes me interrogate the place of Holocaust children’s books in “mainstream” Canadian children’s fiction. It also compels me to ask a different yet related question about “shared characteristics of ‘mainstream’ Canadian[s].” By asking what is Canadian about Holocaust children’s literature, I also want to ask who is Canadian in these books.

Many of the characteristics that the list identifies have little relevance to Holocaust children’s books. Not only might this indicate the marginal place of Holocaust children’s books, but, more importantly, the list also occludes other ways of thinking about the meaning of “Canadian” in Holocaust children’s books. I do not object simply that “focusing on... a distinct Canadian-ness... works to exclude the connections of Canadian writing to international literature” (Nodelman and Reimer 27), although the list certainly does that. What concerns me is that such focus minimizes the way Holocaust narratives frequently and productively resist our attempts to locate them as stories about such “Canadian-ness.”

A non-fiction text, Karen Levine’s CBC radio documentary and children’s book Hana’s Suitcase: A True Story, will serve as a good example. The suitcase is all that remains of Hana Brady, a Jewish child from Czechoslovakia who was first deported to Terezín and then to Auschwitz, where she died in 1944. More than 50 years later, the Auschwitz Museum sent her suitcase to the Tokyo Holocaust Education Resource Center. Children’s questions about Hana led the centre’s director, Fumiko Ishioka, on a quest to find out more about the child, a quest that eventually led her to Hana’s brother. Jan Wong focuses on the global parameters of Levine’s project when she ends her Globe and Mail feature on this subject by stating that George Brady, a Holocaust survivor currently living in Toronto, knows that his sister “lives on in the minds of Japanese children, half a world away” (F2). Wong’s conclusion echoes Levine’s introductory reference to a story “that takes place on three continents” (v).

It is difficult to imagine what makes Hana’s Suitcase Canadian other than the citizenship of the writer and the post-World War II citizenship of the protagonist’s brother. Admittedly, Hana’s Suitcase is not fiction. Yet the narrative patterns that characterize it as a children’s book are very similar.
to those we find in children’s fiction, and, in fact, Fumiko’s discovery of
the secret of the suitcase’s ownership helps to make Hana’s Suitcase fit some
of the characteristics of Nodelman and Reimer’s list. Perhaps the way that
Hana’s Suitcase manages to tell the truth about the Holocaust victim’s death
while giving the child reader hope explains why this book, unlike many
other Holocaust children’s books, was a finalist for the 2002 Governor Gen-
eral’s Literary Award for Children’s Literature (Text). Certainly, Holocaust
children’s books that do not readily fit the characteristics identified by
Nodelman and Reimer’s students are rarely nominated for “mainstream”
awards. While I would argue that there is an inherent tension between the
subject matter of the Holocaust and the criteria used in award decisions,
an additional question that I want to ask is whether many Canadian read-
ers even think of Holocaust literature as Canadian.

Think about the status of Carol Matas, Canada’s most prolific author of
Holocaust literature for children. Recognized at home but also highly suc-
cessful in the United States, Matas has an American reputation that speaks
to the strong market for children’s books about the Holocaust in the United
States and to the less firmly established place of Holocaust pedagogy in
Canada. When Matas was commissioned by the United States Holocaust
Memorial Museum to write Daniel’s Story after her earlier Holocaust books
(Lisa and Jesper) were also published in American editions, the Museum
did not likely pay much attention to her citizenship. But if Americans do
not think about Matas as a Canadian writer, of greater significance is how
Canadian readers think of her. If Canadian readers regard her primarily as
a writer of Holocaust historical fiction rather than as a Canadian writer
(and I believe they often do), this construction may be partially attributed
to the European setting of her fiction. The one example of Matas’s non-
Holocaust fiction that Nodelman’s students read, The Primrose Path, is set
in Winnipeg. In contrast, the only Holocaust children’s novel that Reimer’s
students read was Brian Doyle’s Angel Square, a novel that very carefully
locates and comically exorcises its Holocaust themes in a post-war Ottawa
setting (Nodelman and Reimer 20).

Certainly, Matas’s Holocaust fiction only occasionally accords with the
features Nodelman and Reimer identify. Such moments of resemblance may
tell us less about characteristically Canadian features in Matas’s work than
about her reliance on standard features of contemporary North American
children’s literature. Her fiction repeatedly demonstrates how and why
Holocaust children’s books deviate from the narrative patterns found in
“mainstream” fiction. According to the list, for instance, “Resolutions typi-
cally occur when protagonists choose to tell secrets or be told them” (33).
This statement does not recognize the problematic nature of revelations in
recent Holocaust literature, the way that the secret of the past is rarely fully
revealed. Further in the list we read that “Questions about the safety and
comfort of home are central” (34), yet in most of Matas’s Holocaust fiction,
questions about home are deferred while the characters struggle to survive. Even in Matas’s *After the War*, which begins with the heroine being greeted at her former home with the words “I thought you were all dead” (1) and ends with the words “Welcome home” (115), the question about whether Palestine will become home remains unresolved. To say that *After the War* is a variation on the “home/away/home pattern” discussed by Nodelman and Reimer (34) may be true, but this truth diverts us from the history and trauma that are the novel’s central subjects. To regard the child uprooted by the Holocaust as participating in the home/away/home pattern makes Ruth Mendenberg’s story in *After the War* equivalent to L.M. Montgomery’s (Canadian) *Anne of Green Gables* and E.B. White’s (American) *Charlotte’s Web*. This is a universalist reading position that child readers are encouraged to adopt and that the conventions of children’s literature encourage, but it minimizes any authentic recognition of historical difference, a recognition that surely is part of the reason that we read historical fiction.

Whatever examples I choose, Matas’s work doesn’t look particularly “mainstream” Canadian. “[L]ove of nature” (Nodelman and Reimer 35) is rarely relevant when love of breathing seems more to the point, and in *Daniel’s Story*, Daniel’s struggle in Auschwitz and Buchenwald certainly makes the “harshness of the climate or the landscape” (35) more than a feature of Canadian identity. If “mainstream” Canadian children’s fiction has a “prominent concern with health and sickness” (35) and with “main characters [who] are outsiders” (33), these are concerns predictably evident in all Holocaust literature. Certainly, Matas’s “language . . . is generally simple” (35), but that is true of most children’s fiction, as is the “Curiosity and the need or desire to learn” (35) exhibited by her characters. Nodelman and Reimer’s students identify third-person narrative as characteristic of most Canadian “mainstream” children’s fiction; Matas uses a first-person narrative, a technique used in much North American young adult fiction. This narrative technique may have no bearing on the national characteristics of her work, for the young adult novel is likely to use a first-person narrator to permit young readers to identify with horrific history. Children younger than 15 rarely survived selections in the camps. It is not surprising, then, that in order to tell a more comprehensive story of the Holocaust, Matas relies on the conventions of the young adult novel.

Nodelman and Reimer’s list of shared characteristics of “mainstream” Canadian children’s novels identifies narrative patterns that are for the most part neither apparent in Holocaust children’s books nor of particular narrative significance. In doing so, the list unintentionally obscures critical questions about the meaning of Canadian identity that reside in precisely the children’s books on the Holocaust that do not fit within these characteristics. Focusing on these structural features may distract us from other more complex and challenging questions of the relationship between Holo-
caust representation, Canadian children’s literature, and notions of Canadian identity. For example, questions of pedagogy and transmission of accurate information are central to children’s literature about the Holocaust. What is the relationship of these questions to the construct of Canadian identity produced by Canadian children’s books on the Holocaust? Whether we conceive of Canadian identity as singular, multiple, grammatical, or legal (i.e., a Canadian is the subject who holds a Canadian passport), identity is also a matter of knowledge.

The central questions about Canadian children’s literature on the Holocaust are epistemological. They are questions that ask whether a Canadian is expected to know what happened in the Holocaust or whether it is more Canadian to think that the Holocaust was sad and awful but it happened somewhere else so it doesn’t really concern us. They are questions about the concept of Canadian identity produced by the tension inherent in any historical representations that tell us who we are. The children’s books about the Holocaust that also take on questions of Canadian identity and locate Holocaust issues in a contemporary Canadian setting remain the most contentious. This is not surprising, but its implications demand attention.

Nodelman and Reimer draw attention to their students’ insistence that Canadian writers are individuals free to write as they will and wonder if their “repudiation [is] a repudiation of the idea of history itself” (28). This resistance to history has strong similarities to the psychological and universalizing discourse of much Holocaust children’s literature. A universalist discourse keeps readers safe; the very specific details of historical events do not. Children’s literature in general resists representations of painful history; since historians rarely read the children’s books produced in their own time, children’s writers can indulge in versions of history that are rarely detailed and are often inaccurate. The temptation is to endorse these books precisely because they obscure facts. We do so either because we would prefer not to confront those facts or because we are ignorant of them. Yet if “the key point is learning something or acknowledging it” (Nodelman and Reimer 33), we need also to address what it is we learn in Holocaust children’s literature.

Like children elsewhere, Canadian children are positioned in multiple and often conflicting narratives about the past and the present; these narratives complicate any notion of a national identity or national children’s literature. While Matas is the best-known Canadian author of Holocaust children’s literature, she is not the only one. In the rest of this essay, I turn to four recently published children’s books by other authors to clarify the questions about the intersection of Canadian identity and Holocaust representation that are provoked but not answered by Nodelman and Reimer’s list. Three of the books — Kathy Kacer’s Clara’s War, Sherie Posesorski’s Escape Plans, and Marsha Forchuk Skrypuch’s Hope’s War — are Canadian and were published in 2001; the fourth — Jackie French’s Hitler’s Daughter

• CCL, no. 109-110, Spring-Summer / Printemps-été 2003
Survivor Stories, Historical Fiction, and the Child in the Classroom

Primo Levi, the highly regarded Italian author of numerous texts that meditate upon his experience in Auschwitz, calls the first chapter in *The Drowned and the Saved* “The Memory of the Offense,” a title that might mislead us into thinking that Holocaust memory is simple and uniform by the implication of the singular term “The Memory.” In contrast to the abstraction of this title, his opening sentence is more nuanced: “Human memory is a marvelous but fallacious instrument” (23). Always cautious and self-conscious about his own memories and aware that he is writing more than 40 years after the war, Levi is cognizant that memories evoked too often can result in stereotype, yet “ignorance and forgetfulness” (161) increase with time. Repeatedly, Levi frames this dual problem of memory and time as particularly worrisome when communicating with the young.

Levi as writer/survivor enters the classroom and attempts to bridge the difference between his knowledge and children’s ignorance through the power of the personal voice. He describes a classroom visit that fails in that after he talks about his book (presumably *Survival in Auschwitz*), a child asks him, “But how come you didn’t escape?” (157). The child refuses to believe that escape was impossible. He demands that Levi draw a map of the camp, and then the child offers him a plan, advising Levi to keep it in mind: “If it should happen to you again, do as I told you” (157). Levi, who ends *The Drowned and the Saved* with the warning that “It happened, therefore it can happen again” (199), writes at length about the child’s response. He interprets it as emblematic of the ever-widening gap “between things as they were ‘down there’ and things as they are represented by the current imagination” (157).

What happens to this gap when the survivor can no longer enter the classroom or chooses not to speak? The books that I examine give us possible answers to this question. What is particularly striking is how three of
these texts focus on questions of time, historicity, generational transmission, and family secrets to a far greater degree than children’s books about the Holocaust published even a decade earlier. Narratives about familial relationships to this history proliferate. The apostrophe in three of the titles (Clara’s War, Hitler’s Daughter, Hope’s War) indicates that questions about who speaks and whose story we tell continue to be raised. In three of the four children’s books, Holocaust history is a family secret. The child knows little, the grandchild even less: “She wished her grandfather would actually talk to her about the things he’d had to live through. Maybe then she’d be able to understand” (Skrypuch 156).

In this quotation, the adolescent’s grandfather is not a Jewish survivor; in fact, the statement is prompted by her learning that her grandfather has been accused by the RCMP of participating in atrocities in German-occupied Ukraine during World War II. A reader ignorant of the details of Hope’s War but familiar with books about the children of Jewish survivors would easily categorize the quotation as fitting the latter. This perception would accord with the novel’s insistence that Ukrainian citizens were the real victims in World War II.

Although the books I am considering here speak to Levi’s ever-widening gap, they do not follow the lines that Levi anticipates. Levi is concerned that children just don’t get it, that they will want to turn the Holocaust into an adventure story. Some children’s books, like some Hollywood films, continue to represent the Holocaust as an adventure, but the books that I am examining reveal a different pedagogical problem, one which Levi alludes to in his conclusion: “to speak with the young becomes ever more difficult” (199). For Levi, it is a problem linked to time, “the risk of appearing anachronistic” (199). Thinking of children who regard the Holocaust as something experienced by “their grandfathers: distant, blurred, ‘historical’” (198), he acknowledges that those children are “besieged by today’s problems, different, urgent” (198). What might we say today, when those children are themselves parents and the events of September 11, 2001 have shocked us into a terrified attentiveness to today’s problems?

Hitler’s Daughter, Clara’s War, and Hope’s War initially appear to have little in common. However, what Hitler’s Daughter and Hope’s War do share with Escape Plans, the one novel without a possessive form in its title, is a radical distancing in time to a past that precedes the protagonist by at least one generation. In contrast, Clara’s War is far more traditional, a historical novel similar to Carol Matas’s work. Its author is herself the daughter of a hidden child (Kacer’s first book, The Secret of Gabi’s Dresser, tells the story of her mother). Set in Terezin, a concentration camp used by the Nazis as both a “model camp” to deceive the Red Cross and as a point of departure for Jews being sent to the death camps in the east, Clara’s War is the first in a new Canadian series, A Holocaust Remembrance Book for Young Readers, published by Second Story Press. The series title tells us that a young
Canadian reader should know that it is important to remember the Holocaust; in this instance, Kacer’s use of historical fiction safely positions this knowledge. Writing historical fiction, Kacer asserts that the young reader should know about the past, about other children, in another place. The implications for Canadian identity are not contentious except for those who might think that Canadians do not need to know any history located outside Canada.

While a conventional historical novel, *Clara’s War* is innovative in its willingness to ask questions about how child readers respond to the artistic accomplishments of children imprisoned and nearly all killed by the Nazis. In her preface, Kacer carefully explains that of the 15,000 children sent to Terezin, only 132 survived. This statistic is a brutal reminder of the facts regarding child mortality even in so-called model camps. Terezin may have seemed to be an exceptional concentration camp in that the Nazis permitted “Music, art, theatre and other cultural performances” (8). Nevertheless, nearly all the children who performed, painted, or wrote poetry were eventually deported to the death camps in the East. Levi is convinced that the “young above all demand clarity . . . they do not like ambiguity” (37), yet Kacer refuses to simplify. Taking to heart Levi’s concern to “erect a dike” against “simplification and stereotype” (157), Kacer assumes that her child readers can handle the ambiguous. Her child protagonists are highly skeptical and ambivalent about the pleasures provided by art when children perform in plays one day and are deported the next.

The other three novels that I consider deviate sharply from the established pattern of writing the Holocaust as historical fiction. Instead, the authors focus on the meaning of the Holocaust for a third-generation child, either the implied reader or the novel’s protagonist. Questions of Canadian identity become more important and contentious. In these novels, the child’s vague knowledge about the Holocaust and her possible personal relation to it become the central subject. What the three novels also emphasize is that even as the narrative forces the child to take ownership of the story, the child attains only a partial mastery. The family story is told, but never fully; secrets remain. The shape of Holocaust literature for children thus changes as the relation between family narrative and public history, between the child’s place here (Australia, Canada) and the history of the Holocaust, foregrounds dualities that are implicitly linguistic, generational, and temporal.

**Second-Generation Fiction**

Like Kacer, Sherie Posersorski may be a second-generation author: she dedicates *Escape Plans* to her parents. Certainly the story that she tells is unusual in children’s literature in that it focalizes on the experience of a child of Holocaust survivors. Until recently, second-generation narratives have
tended to be restricted to adult fiction (Ben’s story in Anne Michaels’s Fugitive Pieces, for instance), not children’s books. In the latter, we jump from first-generation representations (the memoirs that we deem suitable for children or else children’s historical fiction such as Clara’s War) to third-generation narratives. What causes this leap becomes obvious if we consider the peculiarity of the 1962 setting of Escape Plans. The novel is part of a series published by Coteau Books that promises its readers, according to the preface by Janet Lunn, “up-to-date stories with which . . . children might identify” (i). The oddity of referring to a story published in 2001 but set in 1962 as up-to-date may help to explain why second-generation authors of children’s literature have chosen primarily to write either historical fiction or third-generation stories. By the time that readers became culturally interested in children’s stories about family lives after the Holocaust, the second generation had children of their own. If they felt compelled to tell children about the Holocaust, they rarely felt that their own story about growing up with survivor parents was the story children needed to hear.

As part of the In the Same Boat series, Escape Plans is intended to tell Canadian children whose ancestors are neither French nor English contemporary stories about themselves. The series also includes Hiromi Goto’s The Water of Possibility, Cheryl Foggo’s I Have Been in Danger, Diana Vazquez’s Lost in Sierra, and Ruby Slipperjack’s Little Voice. In this context, the Holocaust becomes just one story of non-threatening multicultural experience through which children are “comforted and bolstered by a shared experience” (Lunn i). Since the series emphatically asserts that Canadian children want to hear about other cultures only through the voices of Canadian children, Escape Plans has a temporal exactness not shared by most of the other novels in the series. For how can a story about the Holocaust be a contemporary story about “us,” focalized through the experience of a Canadian child? The only way that Posesorski can fit a second-generation Holocaust narrative into this scheme is to frame the parents’ Holocaust experience with the 12-year-old daughter’s anxieties about nuclear war and the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. Nodelman and Reimer’s list suggests that many “mainstream” novels “have two stories going on at the same time” (34); in Escape Plans, this feature blurs the nature of the second-generation narrative. Although the 1962 setting is appropriate to a second-generation text, the real child reader of the Coteau series is more likely to be the child or grandchild of someone who was a child in 1962.

Escape Plans opens with the daughter, Becky, reluctant to tell the truth to her parents — a pattern that readers familiar with adult texts will interpret as characteristic of the protective behaviour of the second generation. Posesorski refers to the 1961 Eichmann trial whose televising is often discussed as encouraging North American parents to talk about the Holocaust. Becky’s family, however, does not use the trial as an opportunity to talk further: “Her mother would only say that Eichmann was on trial for
war crimes, but what kind of crimes, she’d refused to say” (133). Elsewhere we learn that Becky regards Polish as “the big secrets language” (104) that her parents use when they do not want the children to understand. But the parental story soon becomes secondary as the novel’s focus shifts to Becky’s anxious response to the school’s lessons about nuclear war.

Posesorski accurately depicts how Canadian schools in the 1960s terrified children regarding nuclear war, giving them vivid lessons about radiation poisoning and then futilely telling them to seek shelter in subway stations should an attack occur. She also recognizes that, in 1962, Canadian classrooms simply did not teach any lessons about the Holocaust. The mother’s Holocaust story is both generalized and hidden from her daughter: “Escape, escape, the story of the world is the story of escape” (262). Although she tells her daughter that “It’s your story now too” (68), Posesorski repeatedly emphasizes how hesitant the mother is to transmit her entire story to her child. The degree to which she gradually tells Becky her own story is balanced by her refusal to reveal her husband’s story: “More I cannot tell you. It is Daddy’s story, and it is his to remember or to forget” (258). Posesorski thus acknowledges that the father’s story may never be told. It will remain private, excluded from the public discourse of history. She also emphasizes that the narrative problem is generational. The Holocaust refers to a specific historical event; how we tell children about that history in the future will be a response to different dilemmas as later generations take possession of the story.

For the most part, however, the mother’s uncertainty about speaking is used to illustrate Becky’s own dilemma — for example, her internal debate about whether she should tell her younger brother about the threat of nuclear war. It is through the relationship to the younger brother that Posesorski inadvertently draws attention to the limited space for a second-generation story in children’s literature as well as the representational challenges of depicting any frightening history in children’s literature. How much do we permit ourselves to tell in a genre that is meant to reassure children? It is also evident that Escape Plans indulges in its own escape mechanism, using the nuclear war that was avoided in 1962 (the Cuban missile crisis) to distance the mass murder that was not avoided in World War II. The end result fits clearly with the expectations of Canadian children’s literature, not just in its Canadian setting but also in its focus on parent-child relationships and the anxiety about the safety of home that Nodelman and Reimer identify. The union between mother and daughter at the end and its precarious happy ending — “If we want to have a happy ending, that next ferry boat, we’d better be on it” (263) — fit Nodelman and Reimer’s reference to “resolutions often valuing letting the past go or moving beyond it” (35). Such resolutions are made possible only by the novel’s limited depiction of the Holocaust.
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The gap discussed by Primo Levi widens even more in Jackie French’s *Hitler’s Daughter* and in Marsha Forchuk Skrypuch’s *Hope’s War*. Moving from second generation to third, both books also move away from a focus on Jewish victims, not in order to universalize but to draw attention to the experience of other victims. Both novels relate the Holocaust to national issues (treatment of Aborigines in Australia, treatment of alleged war criminals in Canada). Both begin with their protagonists waiting for the school bus, a transitional setting that troubles the relationship between official classroom pedagogy about the Holocaust and these novels. These are stories that we do not tell in the classroom; whatever Holocaust education occurs in these books does not take place in the classroom at all.

In different ways, both *Hitler’s Daughter* and *Hope’s War* challenge conventional limits placed upon Holocaust representation in children’s literature. Did Hitler have a daughter? What difference would that make? And if this daughter had a birthmark and limped because one leg was shorter than the other so that she had to be hidden away, and if she was never certain if her father loved her, why should we care? Yet clearly some readers do care — why else did the Children’s Book Council of Australia name *Hitler’s Daughter* the Book of the Year: Younger Readers? In the first chapter of this very successful novel (available worldwide, reprinted five times by 2000), four children waiting for the school bus play a game in which one child makes up a character and then another makes up a story about that character. Anna, the child who introduces the game as one she used to play with her grandmother, suggests that this time the children change the rules slightly and allow her to tell a story about a character of her own choice. Anna then announces that she will tell a story about Hitler’s daughter. Following the suggestion by one of the other children, Anna names the daughter Heidi — a name whose prior fictional connotations foreground the uncertain relationship between truth and fiction in Anna’s own story. How can we understand the story of Hitler’s daughter when our memories of other children’s books affect that understanding?

The initial responses of the three children succinctly indicate the representational issues dominating Holocaust children’s narrative today. The youngest child asks, “Who’s Hitler?” (7). Another child answers her by calling upon the violent clichés found in television movies. Hitler appears to be both unknown and known too well. In this way, French foregrounds both the question of what stories remain to be told and her authorial anxiety. The question of what child readers are to make of this story is always an issue; the characters are themselves uncertain, and it is in this open space that French explores what can and cannot be told.

It is the response of Mark, the child whose obsession with Anna’s story eventually becomes the focus of the novel, that most interests me. Mark
protests a factual matter: “But Hitler didn’t have a daughter” (7). The other listeners do not care; they point out that stories are often about fantasy creatures, and the whole point in telling stories is to be entertaining: “Hitler’s better than fairies and goldfish” (7). Nevertheless, Mark remains troubled about the moral issue: is it right to make up stories about a real historical figure, particularly this one? The other children are not bothered by this dilemma; they just want a story to distract them as they wait for the bus. It is Mark alone who worries about the implications of the story that Anna tells. French thus acknowledges that with the passage of time we face two possibilities: children are likely to respond to the Holocaust as either “just another story” — a phrase that repeatedly occurs in the text — or as one whose details they mistakenly claim to know even as they demonstrate how little they actually know or care.

Setting most of her novel on the school bus, and nesting Anna’s story within adult (parent and teacher) anxiety, ignorance, and indifference about the Holocaust — “It was a long time ago, Mark. I don’t know why you are so interested” (22) — French forces us to confront the future place of Holocaust education in many classrooms. In the final sentence of the novel, she describes the children still on the bus; whatever Holocaust education occurs in Hitler’s Daughter clearly takes place before the children get to school. What is also troubling is the novel’s conclusion, when French implies that what Anna has told is more than “just a story” (11). When Anna confides to Mark that her grandmother told her this story “just before she died” (136), the novel hints that both secretly suspect it is true. The narrative focus on Mark, rather than Anna, now makes sense, for if Anna is indeed Hitler’s great-granddaughter, that distant familial link still has the power to disturb. Although Anna recalls that Heidi loved Hitler and believed that he was her father, French not only minimizes Hitler’s role in the novel but also distances Anna’s grandmother in that readers only hear about her through Anna’s voice and never know the grandmother’s real name. Whatever language she speaks when she tells Anna the story, Anna translates her voice for the other characters and for the readers. The voice of Hitler’s daughter exists only in Anna’s memory; readers never hear it directly. Since Heidi rarely saw Hitler and was hidden away from the events of the war, Hitler’s Daughter can avoid confronting the place of anti-semitism in Nazi discourse or the reasons that Hitler came to power. Certainly these are questions that Mark’s mother cannot answer when she tells Mark that Hitler was “a monster” (22). And if Anna’s story tells Mark more, it is only that this monstrous being was an indifferent father. Holocaust history is set aside as the narrative focuses on a story of family shame. Anna keeps emphasizing that Heidi was so sheltered that she could not know about the camps and mocks Mark’s longing that Heidi might have organized an escape plan to help the camp victims:
“But surely she could have done something else?” demanded Mark. 
“What? Locked herself in her room and said she wasn’t coming out or wouldn’t eat till they shut down the concentration camps?” (99)

Not only is it too late for Anna to ask questions of the grandmother who told her about Hitler’s daughter and then said it was “just a story” (136), but Mark’s attempts to ask questions of his rather obtuse parents get him nowhere. When Mark asks his father, “If you did things like Hitler did — really bad things — what do you think I should do?” (45), French emphasizes how inadequate the parental answers are. She also stresses the tension that emerges as soon as Mark attempts to relate Holocaust history to Australian and world issues: attitudes toward Asian immigrants, radio news about an unnamed genocide, and Aboriginal landrights. Questions about the future (what should I do?) are easier to answer than questions about the past (what did you do?) or the present (what are you doing now?). Highly self-conscious about the story it tells, Hitler’s Daughter raises more questions than it answers.

In contrast, Marsha Forchuk Skrypuch claims to have all the answers in Hope’s War. Unlike Anna’s grandmother in French’s novel — presumably Hitler’s daughter, but long dead before the novel begins — the adolescent protagonist’s grandfather, Danylo Feschuk, is very much alive and central to the story that Skrypuch tells. The granddaughter, Kataryna, knows next to nothing about her elderly grandfather. Her complex subject position is indicated through her multiple names: known as Kat to her Canadian friends, she is “zolota zhabka — or golden frog” (13) to her beloved grandfather. Soon readers know far more than Kat does, since they have access to the traumatic war memories that the grandfather is unwilling to share with his family. In a Catch-22 situation, the grandfather regards Canadians as too young and naive to know what the war was like, an opinion that has a certain truth to it. Skrypuch takes advantage of this presumed ignorance by encouraging her Canadian readers to sympathize with a man who does not want or is unable to tell his granddaughter exactly what he did during that war. Readers have no alternative but to see the grandfather as someone to love and pity, particularly since Skrypuch nearly always calls him by his first name.

Danylo, as readers must think of him, is not only a victim during the war, caught between Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, but he is also recently widowed and grieving over the loss of his beloved Nadiya. How can readers regard Danylo as anything other than a gentle and sweet man who has taught his granddaughter about Ukrainian culture? Admittedly, he has never spoken about his life before he emigrated to Canada, but then his memories are so “painful” (35). In short order, readers learn that Danylo is the ultimate World War II hero/victim. His father was brutally murdered by the Russians (Danylo finds the body). His mother was executed by the
Nazis after they caught her smuggling for the resistance (Danylo buries her). His future wife was sent to Germany as a slave laborer (Danylo meets her in a Displaced Persons camp); and his sister, Kataryna, was a heroine of the Ukrainian resistance. Hope’s War is vague about the circumstances of Kataryna’s death; during Danylo’s deportation hearing, a witness refers to a girl “tortured by the Gestapo” (193), which may be an allusion to Kataryna’s death. However she died, Danylo’s granddaughter, Kat, is named after her. When the officers of the RCMP arrive and announce that Danylo is being investigated by the “Department of Immigration — War Crimes Unit” (34) for allegedly collaborating with the Nazis, Kat is shocked but convinced that her grandfather is innocent. The question explored by French in Hitler’s Daughter — how would a child behave if she knew that a family member had done something wrong? — is quickly foreclosed by Skrypuch: “What would she do if she found out that her grandfather had actually done such a thing? It just couldn’t be” (116). The name of Kat’s dead grandmother, Nadiya, means hope, a hope Skrypuch clearly wants us to think of in relation to Kat’s behaviour.

The novel begins with Kat, a gifted artist, moving to a new Mississauga high school because her sculpture of the Virgin Mary mourning her son was too controversial at her prior school. Although the sculpture is only mentioned at the beginning of the novel, Kat’s feelings as she works on it are clearly intended to foreshadow her protective attitude toward her grandfather: “Was seeing a loved one in pain worse than experiencing the pain itself? What must it have been like for the mother of God to witness her own child nailed to a cross?” (25). Danylo becomes both Christ figure and Holocaust victim. Like other victims of the Holocaust who have trouble explaining what they went through, he is too traumatized to speak and has trouble understanding English. Skrypuch constantly relies on the metaphors that we find in Holocaust memoirs; for example, when Kat listens to a friend play Chopin, the music makes her think of a “death march” (42) and reminds her of her grandfather.

The parallel the novel establishes between Danylo and Christ is extensive. On the morning of Ukrainian Christmas, Kat and her family open the newspapers to articles referring to Danylo as a Nazi war criminal and then discover that their house has been defaced by graffiti that includes a swastika. When the family arrives at church, the priest comments: “What a shameful thing to print on the day of Christ’s birth” (112). But Danylo is not simply a Ukrainian Christ figure about to be crucified by Canadian injustice. On Christmas Eve, a lone woman protester bearing a sign that reads “Nazi lives here” stands outside Kat’s home (103). Right after Danylo explains to his granddaughter’s friends that the extra setting at the table awaits “the wandering stranger” (105), he goes outside to invite the “elderly woman” (105) to dinner. She rebuffs his hospitality: “Each of her words cut him to the quick” (105). Skrypuch does not identify the wandering
stranger as Jewish until much later when we learn that the old woman is Jewish and pointedly named Sarah Goldman.\(^8\) Even without a name that falls back on stereotypes linking Jews and money, the incident parallels another story in which the figure of the Wandering Jew rejects Christ and Jews are supposedly responsible for his crucifixion.

It is obvious from both the novel and the author’s note that Skrypuch has written *Hope’s War* to challenge current Canadian law investigating alleged war criminals. Skrypuch includes an author’s note in which she relates the novel to actual deportation hearings and critiques the Canadian government for using civil procedures to deport people who have not been found guilty of war crimes in a criminal court.\(^9\) In presenting her case, she is highly selective in the information that she gives her readers, an ethical issue since Skrypuch obviously wants them to believe that she gives them access to historical information that they do not have. In contrast, *Hitler’s Daughter* does not aim to correct readers’ view of historical events. It is therefore troubling that Skrypuch does not say that, since 1995, the Canadian government has not successfully deported anyone who contested the proceedings.\(^10\) This information is readily available on the website for Citizenship and Immigration Canada, which posts an annual report for Canada’s War Crimes Program. Skrypuch does not include this website in her list of resources. Instead, she directs her Canadian readers to a website “for all things Ukrainian” (244) and acknowledges the support of the “Ukrainian [sic] Canadian Foundation of Taras Shevchenko” (247). It is also clear from documents posted on the Ukrainian Canadian Civil Liberties Association (UCCLA) website that the novel reflects the perception that the reputation of the entire Ukrainian Canadian community is at stake whenever an alleged war criminal of Ukrainian background is investigated. When the grandfather considers the possibility of not fighting deportation, Skrypuch writes, “if he didn’t fight, he would be branded a war criminal. Worse yet, his family and community would be reviled” (93). Set beside this perception, the premise of the Coteau Series, that children will be “comforted and bolstered” (Lunn i) if they are given stories that acknowledge their ethnic background, seems naive.

In the narrative that Skrypuch presents, the grandfather is resoundingly innocent and profoundly opposed to everything that the Nazis stood for, yet the novel ends with the judge concluding that, on the “balance of probabilities,” “Danylo Feschuk” must have lied during his immigration screening and therefore should be deported (236). Since it is only in the courtroom that Danylo is called by his full name, and since readers have access to the traumatic memories that Danylo cannot share with his family, they are assured that they know him far better than those in the courtroom. Skrypuch summarizes most of his testimony in the courtroom, focussing instead on the granddaughter’s response — “She listened in awe... [H]e had been a patriot all along” (223). This narrative technique encourages
the readers’ sympathy even as it encourages belief that Danylo’s true story cannot be known because he has suffered too much.

Such readers are left with faint hope that the deportation might be averted, for they are told at the conclusion of the novel that “There is no appeal to a deportation and denaturalization hearing” (237). What they are not told is that the process involves several stages, from the judge’s decision to the revocation of citizenship to the actual deportation hearing.11 What they are also not told is how unsuccessful the Canadian government has been in cases where the evidence of collaboration is far more convincing than that presented in Hope’s War. And what they never learn is much about Ukrainian-Jewish relations both before and during World War II. During Danylo’s testimony, he is asked about anti-semitism in the UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army). Danylo’s response is to acknowledge that Jews were sometimes turned away by the UPA: “There was much distrust between Jews and Ukrainians when the Germans first arrived. Ukrainians associated Jews with the Communists, and Jews associated Ukrainians with the Nazis. We were both wrong” (227). Danylo insists, however, that the UPA’s membership did include Jews and other groups who shared “a love of freedom” (226). But when he adds that “Freedom is more precious than gold” (226), I think of Sarah Goldman’s name, and when Danylo equates the errors of Jews and Ukrainians, I recall that he also distinguishes between them, a distinction that we might bear in mind when his lawyer argues that “if a man fights for his country of birth . . . [he] has earned the right to call himself a Canadian” (228).12

Just as Jews in Danylo’s memory are rounded up so quickly by the Nazis that the villagers don’t have time to understand what is happening (216), Jews are not much in evidence anywhere in this novel.13 Not only are Ukrainians thereby innocent of participating in these actions, but Skrypuch rarely directly refers to Jews: Kat looks at a photograph of a Nazi “shooting a child” (54), not a Jew; Mengele experiments on “humans” (78), not Jews. The possibility that some Ukrainians actually endorsed Nazi actions against Jews is only vaguely acknowledged as the work of “criminals” (189). Listening to witnesses give their testimony at her grandfather’s hearing, Kat is appalled by how the people in the courtroom have sympathy for the victims of only one side. Her question — “Was one human [death] not equal to another?” (182) — is a valid one, but Skrypuch follows this question with a more troubling avoidance of history, in Kat’s conclusion that all of these deaths were caused by the “two madmen” (182), Hitler and Stalin. Kat also relies on a racial analysis that is inaccurate: “Whether Jews or Gypsies, Ukrainians or Poles, Russians or Germans, each of these people had been killed because of their race” (182-83). Danylo’s own story contradicts this assertion; neither his mother nor his sister was killed because of her race. When Kat first enters the courtroom, she observes that the people in the courtroom look so similar, yet the witnesses do not resemble each
other. On the one side are the elderly and "rheumy-eyed" (151); on the other are the elegant and distinguished men who speak in Danylo’s defence.

In using the young adult novel to present her argument for revising current Canadian law, Skrypuch avoids confronting uncomfortable history. The most striking instance is demonstrated in her depiction of the grandfather’s role during the war. I have no trouble accepting that the grandfather was secretly in the resistance when he was compelled to act as an auxiliary policeman for the Nazis. I have far more difficulty accepting that when the Nazis order him to punish a group of Jews and several Communists as the "murderers" (89) responsible for a local massacre, he is able to subvert this Nazi order by making them do push-ups. This incident is mentioned repeatedly, once by one of the witnesses. Even if Danylo had been successful in this strategy — a big if — what happened to the prisoners afterwards? Skrypuch has one witness testify that precinct auxiliary police were different from battalion auxiliary police (146), but the narrative simply avoids describing exactly how Danylo spent the rest of his time.

In a novel where exploring anti-Ukrainianism results in minimizing references to anti-semitism, even the elderly Jewish protestor is eventually won over by Danylo’s testimony. When Sarah Goldman tells him of her memory of “being led away at gun point by the Nazis, while the Ukrainians looked on” (228), readers are told that “Danylo understood how her memories could be shaped that way” (229). How are readers meant to interpret that line — shaped, as in distorted? If so, Sarah Goldman’s memory is radically transformed when she, too, comes to accept the novel’s point of view: “the Ukrainians were as helpless as the Jews” (229). So much for Danylo’s earlier acknowledgment that there were “bad police” (115). Sarah Goldman’s memory is wrong; Danylo’s memory is right. It is no longer a story about one man’s possible collaboration; it verges on becoming the story of all Ukrainians. With this tearful acknowledgement, Sarah Goldman becomes one of Danylo’s supporters, invited to supper and defined as a real Canadian — that is, someone who sees that the current Canadian law is a travesty. Despite the invitation, Sarah Goldman and her granddaughter do not attend the meal.

Neither the critique of Canadian law nor the novel’s simplification of the historical circumstances that produced Canada’s current approach to investigating alleged war criminals is the central issue here. And while the representation of Holocaust history in Hope’s War is highly questionable, what really bothers me about the novel is a representational issue about Canadian identity. Setting aside the question of what is Canadian about Holocaust children’s literature, we might ask who is Canadian in that literature. Where are the young Jewish Canadians in Hope’s War? Sarah Goldman’s granddaughter is the only Jewish Canadian who may be young. All other Jews are elderly survivors, with the exception of David.
Green, described as a “man in a business suit” (130), and Sol Littman, the name of a real person and blamed in the novel for single-handedly leading to the establishment of the Deschênes Commission. Neither of the latter is actually named as Jewish. If I err in reading Green as Jewish, it is because his speech on the presence of “thousands of Nazi war criminals” (130) mirrors what the novel presents as the erroneous views of Littman, a man described by Kat’s father as a “self-styled Nazi hunter” (82). My second concern is the implication that genuine Canadians, particularly Canadian immigrants, will all oppose the government’s current approach to investigating alleged war criminals. Where does this leave Canadians such as the Jewish Holocaust survivor/immigrants who have other memories and those who believe that the search for war criminals is not an ethnic witch hunt? They have disappeared from the narrative just as they do when Kat and her friends walk down a Toronto street and Kat mentions that her grandmother once worked in a garment factory that now employs Vietnamese immigrants. That Jewish immigrants also once worked in such garment factories has vanished from the novel, for in the Canada depicted here, there are few Jews other than elderly survivors: “women with permed white hair and oversized eyeglasses, and men who were shrivelled and old” (140). Kat goes to a School for the Arts in Mississauga, a part of Canada that is home to a sizeable Jewish community; if there are Jews in Kat’s school, she never mentions any.21

In Hitler’s Daughter, Jackie French avoids questions of history and responsibility by making her protagonist the grandchild of a child who was protected from knowing too much. Whether the grandmother was Hitler’s daughter or not is ultimately irrelevant in relation to the readers’ understanding of historical events. After all, as French keeps reminding us, what Anna tells is just a story. In contrast, in Hope’s War it is glaringly apparent that history is never just a story, that the stories we tell are intimately grounded in the histories that produce us and the identities that we claim. During the deportation hearing, Kat decides to make Ukrainian Easter eggs because they are symbols of hope. She observes that on one pysanka she has been inspired to draw a motif of crosses and behind it a cross-hatch pattern that is “a classic pattern and symbolic of a fisherman’s net” (170). Noting the pattern, Kat thinks of it as symbolic of what is happening: “the net that was closing in around her grandfather” (170). As in the crucifixion sculpture, the decoration of the pysanka evokes the depiction of Danylo as Ukrainian Christ. When Kat hears that her grandfather has lost the hearing, she smashes the egg. Yet as she sees her community organize against the judgment, she returns to the egg’s “ruins” and begins to glue the pieces back, forming, according to the final words of the novel, “an intricate mosaic” (241). When a pysanka represents the Canadian mosaic, what does “Canadian” mean? Hope’s War accepts the brutality of the Nazis; it never denies
the Holocaust. What it fails to imagine is a youthful Canadian identity that is also Jewish; in Hope's War, none is still too many.22

Learning to Know More

I do not doubt that Nodelman and Reimer are highly conscious of the degree to which ideology affects the patterns identified by the list; I am equally confident that they would be the first to insist that the "values" revealed by the list that the students constructed are not equivalent to the ascribing of "value" to the list as a whole. Nevertheless, I remain concerned about what might happen when others, perhaps less sensitive to those ideological implications, respond to the list. Despite the distinction between the plural "values" and the singular "value," it is very tempting to slide from the one to the other; and what begins as objective analysis often ends in an endorsement of value. Surely that is one reason why we make lists. Perhaps in utopias binaries function outside a discourse of value, but in their call for papers for this present issue of Canadian Children's Literature, Nodelman and Reimer ask if the list tells us something about the culture of the very real place in which we live. The exact wording — "Might the shared characteristics be explained in part or as a whole in terms of Canadian history, geography, government policy, or the material facts of publication in Canada?" — does not foreground ideology. This is also apparent in their account of how they explained the syllabus to their students: "We would also tell [them] of our conjecture that the similarities in the books had something to do with their being Canadian. . . . Through doing so, we hoped to learn something more specific about Canadian identity" (19). If "something more specific about Canadian identity" is located in the "mainstream," can value be far behind? The very fact that many of the books Nodelman and Reimer's students read were award winners further complicates our ability to separate their students' structural analysis from the evaluative award process that contributed to the initial selection of texts.

Nodelman and Reimer admit that the books that they initially chose were "published by a handful of central Canadian publishing houses" (20). In contrast, small presses publish many of the Holocaust children's books I have discussed, and we might conclude that this publication history confirms an inevitable distance between the "mainstream" and Holocaust children's literature. But this conclusion implies a false binary; the distinction between small press culture and larger publishing houses tells us little, since books from small presses also participate in Canadian award culture. As soon as an adult book produced by a small regional press wins the Governor General's Award for fiction — a recent example is Gloria Sawai's A Song for Nettie Johnson — it moves from the small press margins to the "mainstream."23 Thus, it is a question of which books are able to catapult from
small press status to “mainstream” circulation. The children’s books on the Holocaust that win awards or make the shortlist — for example, *Hana’s Suitcase* — may well bear some resemblance to the characteristics of “mainstream” children’s fiction, but this may only mean that they approach their Holocaust subject matter in a manner that reduces the disturbing aspects of this subject. Further, regardless of whether a children’s book on the Holocaust comes from a small press or a central publishing house, its ability to market itself into “mainstream” recognition may have little to do with either its quality or narrative patterns. *Hope’s War* is published by Boardwalk Books, a division of Dundurn Press, which is likely not as recognizable “mainstream” as some others. Nevertheless, I can find copies of Skrypuch’s novel in my university bookstore — a bookstore not exactly celebrated for its wide selection of Canadian children’s books — and Skrypuch was a participant in the TD Canadian Children’s Book Week for 2002. Regardless of whether this marketing achievement demonstrates that *Hope’s War* relies on certain features of “mainstream” Canadian children’s novels, surely it also reveals something equally significant and deserving of critical attention. For I can only conclude that those who market this book are ignorant of Holocaust history or they take advantage of the patterns of children’s fiction in order to keep Canadian child readers ignorant.

The subtitle of Nodelman and Reimer’s article is “Learning to Know More.” One of the key points defining “mainstream” Canadian fiction is “facing a truth, moving past innocence or ignorance or lack of knowledge” (33). Learning to know more in and about recent children’s books about the Holocaust teaches us that knowledge of the Holocaust remains fragile, partial, and, on occasion, misleading. What we learn about ourselves is equally disturbing.

**Notes**

1. In Holocaust writing, fiction often attempts to minimize its difference from non-fiction. *Hana’s Suitcase*, a non-fiction work, is published in the same Second Story Press series as the historical novel *Clara’s War*, discussed later in this essay.

2. In referring to the list as Nodelman and Reimer’s, I recognize that the list was developed by the students in their two classes, but it is very cumbersome to say this or to give the list its full name, “Shared Characteristics of ‘Mainstream’ Canadian Children’s Novels,” every time that I refer to either.

3. I discuss the background to *Daniel’s Story* in chapter five of *My Mother’s Voice: Children, Literature, and the Holocaust*.

4. As a facilitator for the annual Holocaust Educational Symposium hosted by Mount Royal College in Calgary, I have always been impressed by the way that high school students respond to the personal voice of the witness. But what will happen to these pedagogical occasions when the survivors are no longer able to speak?

5. Some examples are Matas’s novels and the other novels that I discussed in *My Mother’s Voice: Children, Literature, and the Holocaust*.

6. The other exception is the 1978 setting of Ruby Slipperjack’s *Little Voice*.
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7. The reluctance of children of survivors to hurt parents who have suffered so much is a dynamic much discussed in both professional writing by psychologists and in the memoirs and fiction written about these children. In a reversal of what we find in many children’s books, although one that also appears in children’s books about immigrant experience, the children of survivors often take on parental roles.

8. Admittedly, Danylo calls Kat “zolota zhabka”; the connotations of the affectionate pet name he gives his granddaughter are very different from naming a Jew Goldman, particularly in a novel that categorizes names based on ethnicity (Skrypuch 146).

9. In 1995, the Canadian government changed its approach to the prosecution of alleged war criminals from criminal proceedings to civil proceedings that focus on revocation of citizenship and deportation. Skrypuch critiques this change but does not give the date of its occurrence. She must have 1995 in mind when she mistakenly refers to the Deschênes Commission of Inquiry on War Criminals as ending “50 years of silence” (78). The Commission began its work in 1985; World War II ended in 1945. The novel continually blurs actions that occur during the 1980s (the Deschênes Commission) and the 1990s.

10. I reach this conclusion after consulting information available from Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s Canada’s War Crimes Program, Annual Report 2000-2001 about “World War II Cases”: “Since 1995, seventeen revocation and deportation cases have been initiated. The Government has been successful in five denaturalization cases before the Federal Court of Canada (Bogutin, Katriuk, Kisluk, Oberlander and Odynsky). In two other cases (Csatary, Maciukas), the respondents did not contest the proceedings. Their citizenship was revoked and they left the country voluntarily. Defendants have been successful in three cases . . . (Vitols, Dueck and Podins). In six cases, suspects passed away during the course of the legal proceedings (Bogutin, Kenstavicius, Tobias, Nemsila, Nebel and Kisluk). Currently the program is awaiting one decision (Baumgartner) from the Federal Court and proceedings are ongoing in two cases (Fast and Obodzinsky).” It is important to recognize that “success” in the five denaturalization cases does not mean deportation or the conclusion of the case. Kisluk and Bogutin, two of the men named as part of this “success,” have died “during the course of legal proceedings.” The remaining three have not been deported. In her author’s note, Skrypuch refers to the latter as “set to be deported and to be stripped of their citizenship” (242), implying that these acts are imminent and inevitable.

11. In her author’s note, Skrypuch comments on the death of “Mr. Kisluk . . . on May 21, 2001” (243). She does not mention that the judge’s initial decision regarding Kisluk was made on 7 June 1999; that his citizenship was revoked on 2 Mar. 2000; that the deportation inquiry began on 6 Oct. 2000; and that it was still in session when Kisluk died (Citizenship and Immigration Canada).

12. Compare the statement by RCMP Superintendent George McClellan, who recommended that the Canadian government not relax the ban on admitting collaborators: “we find it difficult to believe that proposed immigrants who are disloyal to the country of their birth would in fact be any more loyal to the country of their adoption” (qtd. in Margolian 97). Skrypuch also adapts McClellan’s statement when she has a character say, “if a man betrays the country of his birth, what stops him from betraying his country of adoption?” (174).

13. Compare Martin Dean’s thesis that the majority of Ukrainian Jews were killed during what he calls the Second Wave of liquidations in 1942-1943 (78). Dean argues and provides evidence that auxiliary police participated to the extent that they “round[ed] up the Jews and cordon[ed] off the killing sites” (161). He also asserts repeatedly that Ukrainian nationalist partisans killed many of the survivors of the ghetto liquidations (165).

14. Dean acknowledges that “Local participation in the Holocaust in countries such as Lithuania and Ukraine remains a sensitive issue” (xii). Nevertheless, he concludes his book through an allusion to and rejection of Daniel Jonah Goldhagen’s thesis in Hitler’s Willing Executioners: “In Belorussia and Ukraine it was not only Germans who became ‘willing executioners’” (167).
15. The novel initially states that Danylo is accused of participating in atrocities as an auxiliary policeman from 1943-1944 (55) but other references are to 1941-1943. From 1943 on, Danylo is in the resistance as a member of the UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army). The dates matter in light of Dean’s assertion that the auxiliary police did have a role in rounding up Jews during the period that Danylo was in the police (see note 11, above). They also matter because they are part of Skrypuch’s attempt to convince her readers that she gives them a quantity and quality of historical detail that is usually absent in young adult fiction.

16. Another example that undermines Sarah Goldman’s ability to recognize real Nazis occurs when she sees the Goebb attire worn by Kat’s two friends and labels them “punk neo-Nazis” (105).

17. I agree with Skrypuch that individuals should be judged by their acts, not by their group identity. Yet in emphasizing that Ukrainians were not Nazis, she persuades her readers that all Nazis were war criminals. Compare with Margolian: “not all Nazis were war criminals, nor were all war criminals Nazis” (167).

18. The novel subscribes to an archvillain theory of history in which Hitler and Stalin are two madmen and Sol Littman alone is responsible for the Deschênes Commission when he claims that Joseph Mengele had tried to enter Canada. Contrast with the conclusion of Harold Troper and Morton Weinfeld: “concern over the Mengele story was less the cause of the Deschênes Commission than it was the excuse for it” (145). Troper and Weinfeld also state that the public volume Report of the Commission of Inquiry on War Criminals, released by the Deschênes Commission in March 1987, was 966 pages long; in contrast, Skrypuch implies that the “Deschenes Commission report” is only a few pages long (68).

19. The novel is inconsistent; Sarah Goldman introduces Carol as her granddaughter, but another character refers to Carol Goldman as Mrs. Goldman’s daughter (229). This may be just one more example of the inadequate editing of the novel; it may also speak to the novel’s general unwillingness to imagine young Jewish-Canadians.

20. Margolian asserts that, of the nearly 1.5 million people who emigrated to Canada between 1945 and 1955, “according to the best estimates, [there] were about 2,000 Nazi war criminals and collaborators” (3). He gives these figures as part of his argument that Canada’s system of screening, while far from perfect, was effective. As he points out, 2,000 represents “just over one-eighth of 1 per cent of the total number of new Canadians” (3). Margolian also states that, “Of the more than 150,000 European refugees who were admitted to Canada between 1946 and 1951, only 1 per cent were suspected Nazi war criminals” (3). His careful assessment of immigration policy needs to be read beside Skrypuch’s assertion that no one in Canada cared about war criminals until Sol Littman spoke up.

21. Since the Canadian identity of the elderly survivors is not what interests Skrypuch, she never names any of them as Canadian. Some clearly are not Canadian; they are brought to Canada to testify during the hearing. In contrast, in Skrypuch’s author’s note, the three men facing deportation are twice identified as “Canadians” (242).

22. None is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe 1933-1948 is the title of Irving Abella and Harold Troper’s study of Canada’s discriminatory immigration policy prior to World War II. Despite this policy, my father, a Jewish farmer from Czechoslovakia, entered Canada on 28 July 1939. This essay is dedicated to him and to his persistent faith that Canada, unlike Czechoslovakia, was a place where he would always be welcome.

23. Sawai’s book is published by Coteau Books, who are also the publishers of Posesorski’s Escape Plans.

24. Carol Matas’s Daniel’s Story is another example of a Holocaust children’s book shortlisted for the Governor General’s children’s literature award.
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