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Precis – Allen Krumm

If you travel to Munich and visit the university there, you will come to the Geschwister Scholl Platz, a public space dedicated to the memory of Hans and Sophie Scholl and the resistance group to which they belonged, known as the White Rose. The White Rose wrote and distributed tracts which condemned the Nazi government. The goal was to spread anti-war and anti-Nazi convictions among the general populace. They hoped that the growth of such convictions would lead to an erosion of public support and the loss of power by the Nazis. In retrospect, perhaps this was a naive sentiment, although the Nazis apparently didn’t think so, judging by their reaction.

The White Rose group was taken seriously by the Nazis because of the relationship tyranny has with numbers. A dictatorship can endure the slow increase of critics through addition, but multiplication can be fatal. Anyone who says “no” to tyranny must be stopped before that “no” begins to multiply. Perhaps the Nazis had read Thomas Jefferson: “When the people fear the government, there is tyranny. When the government fears the people, there is liberty.”

The 4th flyer written and distributed by the White Rose group concluded with a bold and eloquent assertion: “Wir schweigen nicht. Wir sind Euer böses Gewissen. Die Weisse Rose lässt Euch keine Ruhe...” Then, seemingly as an afterthought, came the words which epitomized the type of arithmetic that the Nazis feared: “Bitte, vervielfältigen und weiter senden.” To condemn the Nazis made a German a criminal. To seek to duplicate and distribute this condemnation virtually guaranteed a death sentence. Sophie Scholl, Hans Scholl and Christoph Probst were
beheaded on February 22, 1943.

The tale of the White Rose has intrigued people ever since. It is not difficult to see why this should be so. The story is quintessential Erzählstoff. At the most elemental level, the group serves as an irreducible archetype of the way we wish we all were, or could be. If some humans can behave with bravery and moral integrity, at least it is possible to think that the rest of us can. However, since bravery is usually difficult, messy and sometimes even deadly, most of us would prefer to avoid it most of the time. So it is gratifying to behold courage in someone else as a vicarious validation of our own characters.

Rothemund's direction conveys a sense of the overwhelming power of the state and the utter frailty of the individual in the grip of state power. Julia Jentsch (as Sophie Scholl) exudes a convincing equilibrium of inner spiritual strength and bewildered vulnerability. Alexander Held portrays Robert Mohr with a blend of moral integrity, at least it is possible to think that the rest of us can. However, since bravery is usually difficult, messy and sometimes even deadly, most of us would prefer to avoid it most of the time. So it is gratifying to behold courage in someone else as a vicarious validation of our own characters.

The image of the White Rose group, and in particular of Sophie and Hans Scholl has run the gamut from unabashed hagiography to a more recent form of insistent demythologizing. The hagiographers insist the Scholls were essentially unadulterated heroes, driven by the purist of motives. Over the years this has been the most privileged, albeit implausible version of the tale. The demythologizers tend to adopt a "warts and all" perspective. Some among them contend that the members of the White Rose were merely unsophisticated and somewhat idealistic young people, not aware of what they were getting into. Others take the deconstruction a step further, insisting they were far from perfect, burdened with their own assortment of imperfections and limitations, having less than impeccable credentials as heroes.

So who is right...the petty Wart Verfolgers or the delusive Maskenbildner? Which camp has the lens to bring this particular episode of history into proper focus? Or is this a false dichotomy? Do we even have to choose? Perhaps it is most prudent to render a ringing verdict of unproven against both sides. Those who would glorify the members of the White Rose and transform them into absurd plastic saints certainly do us a disservice, not to mention a disservice to the memory of the White Rose.

It is naive to want to believe that they could only demonstrate such courage because they were models of virtue and moral probity. Yet demythologizers can be subject to their own peculiar form of naivety, falling prey to a self congratulatory conviction that they alone perceive the real truth, succumbing to a need to behold mythical feet of clay wherever they look. Sometimes demythologizers need demythologizing. Myths are always myths, but sometimes in essence they are true.

It is probably fair to return a verdict of justifiable hagiography in the case of Marc Rothemund's "Sophie Scholl: The Final Days". We expect movie makers to invoke their cosmetological artistic license when they serve up the past, and we are often charmed by the manner in which they apply the makeup. Herr Rothemund is no exception, and he does a commendable job. His powerfully understated movie consists principally of dialogues between Sophie Scholl and Robert Mohr, the police interrogator, and between Sophie and Else Gebel, another female prisoner.

Rothemund's direction conveys a sense of the overwhelming power of the state and the utter frailty of the individual in the grip of state power. Julia Jentsch (as Sophie Scholl) exudes a convincing equilibrium of inner spiritual strength and bewildered vulnerability. Alexander Held portrays Robert Mohr with a blend of moral integrity, at least it is possible to think that the rest of us can. However, since bravery is usually difficult, messy and sometimes even deadly, most of us would prefer to avoid it most of the time. So it is gratifying to behold courage in someone else as a vicarious validation of our own characters.
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