A few individuals at the risk of their own lives attempted to save others' lives. The Oliners in *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*, basing themselves on testimony of survivors and interviews with rescuers, attribute the heroic behavior to moral values associated with certain psychosocial and developmental factors, emphasizing that this behavior was based on moral values acquired in the context of caring, anti-authoritarian families. "For some rescuers...[it] was a matter of heightened empathy for people in pain....And for a small minority, it was a question of loyalty to overriding autonomous principles rooted in justice or caring (p.249)." Clearly this does not apply to Oskar Schindler, who, by conventional standards was immoral, a womanizer, a black marketeer, and probably an alcoholic. Leon Rappoport and I, in a recent article, "Amoral Rescuers: The Ambiguities of Altruism" *Creative Research Journal* 6 (1-2) pp.129-136 (1993), attempted to examine the psychological sources of his (and also those of Siegfried Jagendorf's) motives for rescuing Jews. As far as Schindler is concerned we find no contradiction between his "immorality" and his willingness to take major risks to save "his" Jews, but perceive the source for his passionate actions in a dynamic of narcissism and grandiosity placed into the service of altruism. Pitting himself against ferociously powerful forces Schindler was able to affirm his superiority on an almost daily basis.

I find some problems in Henry Lawton's analysis of Schindler in the first issue of Clio's Psyche, which completely fails to recognize the conditions prevailing in Poland between 1942 and 1945. Lawton treats the film as if it were fiction rather than an essentially accurate portrayal of historical events. He is correct in noting that Schindler's action permitted him to feel superior to the Nazi's, but to hold that his recruitment of Jewish slave labor "because they will accept exploitation in the hopes of staying alive" is utterly untenable. Schindler did not enslave Jews. He ran an operation which was designed to save their lives. He even requisitioned relatives of his workers from the main camp, where many were dying. When challenged about the children he had included in his list he fobbed off a story that their small fingers were needed in production. At the end when he feared that the SS might kill his Jews he acquired weapons for them, and used his money to bribe Nazi officials. By no stretch of the imagination may we perceive *Schindler's List* as a fantasy apology for capitalism.

Spielberg provides a somewhat sanitized view (probably on the not-necessarily incorrect ground that the American public could not face seeing the reality of what happened) of the death camps. Focusing upon a real Schindler who is not a fictional character, the film shows how this *bon vivant* was overcome with revulsion over the Nazi cultivation of death, and, affirming a love of life and Eros, insisted (to use a phrase of Thomas Mann's) that death shall have no dominion. The psychological sources for his heroism — and his actions properly demand that term — were rooted in his "immoral" life style which made him affirm life.❑

The English "Jew Bill" of 1752 and Laurence Sterne's Fears of Circumcision

Norman Simms
University of Waikato, New Zealand

Recently, I published an article on the Jews in Laurence Sterne's novel *Tristram Shandy*.[1] The novel seemed to be obsessed with circumcision. Sterne was alert to the general mania that accompanied the so-called "Jew Bill" of 1752 to give a select number of Jews naturalization. Newspapers and street speakers stirred up fears that, should Jews gain citizenship, they would force all Englishmen to undergo circumcision. The novelist looked with scorn at the popular anti-Semitism stirred up by the debates,[2] but used the occasion to mix into his novel traditions pertaining to circumcision and castration. Tristram Shandy, whose name alludes to Aristotle's dictum, *post coitu tristam est* (after coitus there is sadness), had his upper nose crushed by forceps at delivery. A few years later the maid allows him to pee out the window; the casement falls and little Tristram has his lower nose crushed.

Sterne identified with Tristram, and

contemporary readers had difficulty separating the man from his works. Arriving from obscurity in Yorkshire to become the talk of London, Sterne played up this confusion. His correspondence, when the novel was appearing, may be indicators of the novelist's unconscious.

In January, 1760, Sterne reacted to criticism that *Tristam Shandy* wantonly encourages female unchastity. He declares his motivation for writing is "not to be *fed*, but to be *famous*."[3] The letter moves into anxiety deriving from fears about masculinity: "An author is not so soon humbled as you may imagine — no, but to make the book better by castrations, that is still *sub judice*, and I can assure you, upon his chapter, that the very passages and descriptions you propose that I should sacrifice in my second edition are what are best relished by men of wit, and some others whom I esteem as sound critics — so that, upon the whole, I am still up, if not above fear, at least above despair, and have seen enough to shew me the folly of an attempt of castrating my book to the prudish humors of particulars. I believe that short cut would be to publish this letter at the beginning of the third volume, as an apology for the first and second."

Resistance turns to defiance, even aggression. Why should Sterne see the charge striking at his maleness? The answer is that the pen/penis runs through literary history, as does the notion that an author's books are his offspring, so threats to them are attacks against maleness.

In April, 1760, in a letter to David Garrick, the pain is displaced from penis to finger. He writes "Dear Sir, — 'Twas for all the world like a cut across my finger with a sharp pen-knife. I saw the blood — give it a suck — wrapt it up — and thought no more about it."[4] Then the associations lead him towards something more ambiguously expressed: "But there is more [that] goes [in]to the healing of a wound than this comes to — a wound (unless it is a wound not worth talking of — but by the bye, mine is) must give some pain after." This threat derives from a sore place where creativity and potency meet, and where the figure of a threatening and protecting father collides with anxieties over criticism.

In this same letter to Garrick, Sterne rejects rumors that he is planning to give Tristram a tutor based on Bishop Warburton: "The report might draw blood from the author of *Tristram Shandy* — but could not harm such a man as the author of the *Divine Legislation*."[5] This passage is tied to what happened when Moses tried to enter Egypt with his uncircumcised son, Gershom. An angel stood in the road; the prophet was stunned, but Moses' wife circumcised the baby; the angel stood aside.[6] In this dream-like text, Warburton becomes the angel, Sterne the infant and Moses, and the public the female-circumciser.

Once Sterne is established with a steady income, the "castration complex" disappears from his letters. But the anxiety is present always, lurking in the last books of the novel, in events such as Tristram's impotent journey through France,[7] Uncle Toby's futile wooing of Widow Wadman, and the "truncated" conclusion, which is nothing but "a cock and bull story."

[1]Norman Simms. "The Missing Jews and Jewishness in Tristram Shandy" *The Shandean* 4 (1992) 135 -152. The background details to the argument put forward here are noted and referred to in this article.

[2]Samuel Richardson, another novelist, for instance, wrote to Elizabeth Carter on 17 August 1753 of "the foolish, the absurd Cry" raised in the past few years against the Jews; cited by T.C. Duncan Eaves and Ben O. Kimpel, *Samuel Richardson: A Biography* (Oxford: The Claredon Press, 1971), p. 549.

[3]The letters are edited by Sterne's daughter, Lydia Sterne de Medallc and published in *The Works of Laurence Sterne* (London: George Rutledge and Sons, n.d.), p.561.

[4]*Works,* p.562

[5]Warburton's *Divine Legislation of Moses* was one of the key texts in trying to accommodate Christianity (the Law of Moses transformed into the New Testament of Jesus) to Deism. Warburton was therefore a controversial figure in the debates over orthodoxy in mid-century.

[6]How Sterne came to know of these rabbinical *midrshim* and *debatos* is explained in my article; see Note 1 above.

[7]Arthur Cash calls *Tristram Shandy* "the first novel in our literature which gives a central place to the theme of impotence" (*Laurence Sterne: The Later Years* (London and New York: Methune, 1986), p.258, n.160).

Norman Simms is director of the Institute for the History of Mentalities and teaches literature at the University of Waikato in Hamilton, New Zealand.❑

Cocaine: The Industry of