

Honoring Carl Lutz: Reflecting on the Memorialization of a Forgotten Hero

Giorgia Ricciardi
University of Victoria

“There are many individuals, unsung heroes, who are trying to make this world a better world by selflessly doing the ‘right thing’. Carl Lutz did just that on a profound scale.”

– Janos Mate.¹

Carl Lutz, a Switzerland-born diplomat who worked in Budapest from 1942 until the end of the war, is an unsung hero at the heart of the largest Jewish rescue operation during the Holocaust. It is estimated that between 1942-1945, Lutz was responsible for saving the lives of 50,000 to 70,000 Jewish people. Yet, notwithstanding this, not many people know who Carl Lutz was, including in Switzerland. How is Carl Lutz remembered today? In Budapest there are two memorials for the diplomat, and a small museum in the former Glass House² which recognize his efforts. The Swiss government has also honored his actions, but how effective is this method of honoring and memorializing Lutz if so few continue to know who he is? What can nations do differently to commemorate Lutz to a greater degree?

When war broke out in 1939, Carl Lutz was working in Palestine representing German interests in the area. He was tasked with the effort to safely evacuate German diplomats from the region, and when this was completed in 1940 he returned home to Switzerland. In January, 1942, Lutz was reassigned as the Swiss vice-consul and head of Foreign Interests in Budapest – possible due to Swiss neutrality in the war. He represented the interests of countries at war with Germany who had closed their embassies in the city, such as Britain and the United States. Because Lutz represented British interests in Budapest, he was able to help arrange for the emigration of local Jews to Palestine – still a British territory at the time.³ When Lutz first arrived in Budapest, the country was still governed by Regent Miklós Horthy, and was still independent from Nazi Germany. Immediately in 1942, Lutz and his staff – approximately 20 strong – began to issue “300 to 400 protective passports to US and British citizens, both Jews and non Jews [...]”⁴ This initiative inspired other diplomats of neutral countries, such as Raoul Wallenberg from Sweden, to establish their own protective passports for Jews.⁵ By March 1942, Lutz was involved in negotiations to help over 10,000 Jewish children and young adults from Hungary emigrate to Palestine – drawing up lists and obtaining the authorizations required for

¹ Agnes Hirschi, and Charlotte Schallié, *Under Swiss Protection: Jewish Eyewitness Accounts from Wartime Budapest* (Stuttgart, Germany: Ibidem-Verlag/Ibidem Press, 2017), 11.

² Where Lutz provided refuge for thousands of Jews.

³ Hirschi and Schallié, *Under Swiss Protection*, 10.

⁴ Ibid, 41. The passports were known as *schutzbriefe* or *schutzpass*.

⁵ In Sweden’s case they were typically issued to Jews with connections to Sweden.

their departure.⁶ However, the German occupation of Hungary in 1944 brought this emigration operation, albeit legal, to a halt. Now, even the Jews with legal certificates had no chance at obtaining the visa still required to leave; in fact, Lutz and his team began facing their own death threats.⁷

The Nazi occupation of 1944 was not full-scale because the Germans no longer had the means or manpower to sustain such an operation. Consequently, the occupation initially kept Horthy as the legal Head of State of Hungary. In reality, Horthy was reduced to a puppet-leader under the Third Reich. With sweeping rapidity the “Final Solution” was being enforced in the country – the last area under Nazi control where deportations had not yet taken place. Approximately 750,000 Jews lived in Hungary at the time of the occupation in early March. On May 15, 1944, the first train left Hungary for Auschwitz – overseen by Adolf Eichmann. In a matter of weeks, over 430,000 Hungarian Jews from the provinces surrounding Budapest were deported.⁸ Under bombs and international pressure, Regent Horthy called for an end to the deportations on July 6, 1944. However, by this point only the Jewish community in Budapest remained.⁹ When on October 15, 1944, Horthy announced that Hungary would “be ceasing all hostilities against the Allies,” the Germans responded by forcing him to “cede power to Ferenc Szálasi, the leader of the Arrow Cross Party (*Nyilas*), the Hungarian equivalent of the National Socialists.”¹⁰ Catastrophic violence followed the establishment of this new regime, with Arrow Cross gangs attacking Jews and executing them on the banks of the Danube. Additionally, the Arrow Cross announced the “government would stop honoring the protective documents which were being issued by the neutral states.”¹¹ However, this was not enforced. The fledgling Hungarian regime hoped to be legitimized by neutral countries, and thus succumbed to their pressure on this matter.¹²

What followed was the establishment of two ghettos in the Pest district in November, 1944. The Central Ghetto was set up near the main synagogue, where more than 60,000 Jews were confined in tight quarters. The International Ghetto, just north of the Central Ghetto, housed 122 safe houses on the banks of the Danube river – placed under the protection of the neutral powers.¹³ The buildings in the International Ghetto were meant to host approximately 20,000 Jews in possession of protective documents issued by the neutral countries.¹⁴ Of the 122 safe houses in the International Ghetto, 76 of them belonged to Switzerland, while the others were split between Sweden, Spain, Portugal, the ICRC¹⁵, and the Swedish Red Cross. Although

⁶ Ibid, 44.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid, 34.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid, 35.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid, 36.

¹⁴ I want to remind the reader that sometimes protective documents used to enter the International Ghetto were forged.

¹⁵ International Committee of the Red Cross.

those who were located in the International Ghetto were allegedly safe, the Arrow Cross still periodically relocated Jews by force to the Central Ghetto.¹⁶

Carl Lutz had to respond quickly to the March occupation by the Germans. By April, he managed to gain exemption from forced labor for all Jewish holders of emigration certificates, as well as provide them with shelter in his offices at the former US legation. It is during this period that he developed a series of operations and strategies to issue protective letters to save Jews: an operation which lasted until February, 1945.¹⁷ Lutz courageously entered into negotiations with the Germans through Adolf Eichmann, requesting authorization to issue protective letters to individuals who had been granted emigration certificates, and to ensure these individuals would be able to leave for Palestine. An agreement was reached on May 26, 1944, and nearly 8000 Jews were, in theory, able to emigrate under Swiss responsibility. The letters used by Lutz and the Swiss consulate in Budapest confirmed the bearers had permission to emigrate, and multiple names appeared on a collective passport – a legal technicality used by Lutz to save more individuals. Agnes Hirschi and Charlotte Schallié note that the production of these protective letters was sent into overdrive following the Arrow Cross rise to power in October, 1944. It is impossible to determine the exact number of protective letters issued by the Swiss in those months, but it is certain that Lutz began to authorize the production of protective letters not covered by Palestinian certificates in order to save more people. The protective letters were numbered, so care was taken to ensure they did not exceed the allotted quota, even if it meant several letters bore the same number.¹⁸ In order to arrange for the salvation of more people, Lutz took on the stance that “the number of emigrations for which he had requested authorization [approximately 7800] and obtained agreement in principle from the Hungarian and German authorities was to be interpreted as applying to families rather than individuals.”¹⁹ Once he reached 7799 he began the process again at number one, hoping the Nazis and the Arrow Cross would not notice the repetition. On this basis, Lutz authorized approximately 50,000 protective letters. Lutz’s hard work and rescue operation was not limited to the arrangement of emigration lists and protective letters. In July 1944, Lutz convinced the Hungarian government to allow the holders of these letters to move into safe houses which “enjoyed [the] diplomatic immunity” of the neutral states.²⁰ The 76 safe houses run by Switzerland harbored roughly 15,000 people, according to Hirschi and Schallié. Unfortunately, the safe houses did not always mean guaranteed protection, and the security of the houses was violated and threatened more than once. Moreover, the growing crowds which began to amass outside of his offices in search of protective documents brought with them risks of reprisals by Germans and Hungarians. An alternative solution was found in the creation of the Glass House in July.²¹

What was to become the Emigration Department of the Swiss legation moved into an empty showroom in a former glass factory, belonging to Arthur Weisz.²² With the establishment of the Arrow Cross regime in October, the factory also became a site of refuge for those being

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid, 45.

¹⁸ Ibid, 46.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid, 47.

²² Arthur Weisz would later perish in an Arrow Cross raid on one of the Swiss Safe houses.

persecuted by *Nyilas* gangs. Between October 15 and 31, 800 people had already taken shelter there. Although the Glass House is the most famous, Lutz did not stop there. He also rented a building across the street from the Glass House, and a third in the same neighbourhood, which together provided shelter to another 4000 people. The weeks leading up to the arrival of the Red Army and consequential liberation of Budapest were dangerous both for Lutz and the remaining Jews of the city – who were nearly all gathered in the two ghettos, the Glass House, and its annexes. Lutz left Peter Zurcher and Ernest Vonrufs to represent him in Pest, while he hid in his residence in the former British legation in Buda.²³

Lutz returned to Switzerland following liberation in January 1945. However, much to his surprise, his arrival back home was not met with a hero's welcome. Lutz later recalled in a 1975 interview that "the huge disappointment was that [...] no one thanked me, they just told me I was lucky to survive the war. No government minister even shook my hand."²⁴ Rather than being commended for bravery, Lutz was reprimanded for overstepping his authority and not respecting Switzerland's neutrality during the war. Today, Carl Lutz has been honored by Israel, Germany, Hungary, and the United States. However, if you mention Carl Lutz to most people in Switzerland, the name will be met with the quizzical "who?" How has the international community honoured what some call the "Swiss Schindler," and what should Switzerland do differently to memorialize the man recognized as a Righteous Among the Nations? What are some contemporary means of memorialization?

Presently, there are two books written in English which commemorate and discuss the courageous efforts of the Swiss diplomat. One of them, *Under Swiss Protection* by Agnes Hirschi and Charlotte Schallié, uses personal testimonies to exhibit the bold achievements and risks taken by Carl Lutz. Commemorative literature has the potential to reach expansive audiences – therefore touching more lives than a physical monument. Personal testimonies, often found in commemorative literature, offer a unique and intimate take on the past, which can be used to draw in an audience and shine light on previously unknown examples of collective wartime memories – even spanning nations. They are certainly considered to be a form of public history, but can personal testimonies be considered a form of memorialization? Does memorialization have to be monumental and decorative, or can it come in the form of a book?

Is fame a form of memorialization? Comparing Carl Lutz to Oskar Schindler or Raoul Wallenberg suggests that perhaps it is. How well would Carl Lutz be known to the world if Steven Spielberg had chosen to do a film on him instead of Schindler? Or if Lutz had been arrested and unduly executed by the Soviets such as Wallenberg?²⁵ According to Sociologist Amy Sodaro, "in response to the many difficulties the past has posed to the present, commemorative forms have been changing as societies struggle to find appropriate ways to remember."²⁶ Scholars have begun debating the memorialization process and 'proper' ways to remember the past. Historically, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, or under totalitarian regimes, monuments were built for the nation state; to celebrate a nation's

²³ Hirschi and Schallié, *Under Swiss Protection*, 48.

²⁴ "The forgotten Swiss diplomat who rescued thousands from Holocaust," *BBC*, 4 January 2018.

²⁵ Karina Vertlib, "Carl Lutz and the Legendary Glass House," *Zachor*, Fall 2014, 2.

²⁶ Amy Sodaro, "Memorial Museums: The Emergence of a New Form," in *Exhibiting Atrocity: Memorial Museums and the Politics of Past Violence* (Rutgers University Press, 2018), 20.

courageous past and heroes in order to emphasize a shared history around a consolidated nation. In other words, nationalism used to play a major role in the creation of a memorial, and in our contemporary western society nationalism is often approached with a sense of trepidation, due to its association with totalitarian regimes. Sodaro writes that “the forms in which memory is embodied are [...] very important in shaping collective memory and its meaning.”²⁷ The world wants to remember the Holocaust as the perfect example of how dangerous unchecked racism, antisemitism, bigotry, xenophobia, and intolerance can be. For this reason, in cities such as Berlin, people may find a memorial on nearly every corner commemorating the lives of the fallen during the Holocaust. The victims are (rightfully) remembered, and in remembering the victims one consequently also remembers the perpetrators who made them victims in the first place.

However, as time passes perhaps it is time to revisit certain aspects of Holocaust memorialization in Europe. When people ask “how is the Holocaust still relevant today,” the efforts and names of those who stood up to Nazi evil should come to mind as a lesson in how to love one another and help one another. Perhaps a form of memory which should be embodied today is that of the heroes, therefore shaping a collective memory which includes a course of action in preventing history from repeating itself. Celebrating bravery and courage serves as a reminder that it makes a difference to take a risk like Carl Lutz, Raoul Wallenberg, Oskar Schindler, or other unknown individuals who compromised their security to save Jewish lives. Franziska Reiniger believes that “at the center of all Holocaust discourse is the duty to be responsible; responsibility is the hard kernel at the heart of every Holocaust representation.”²⁸ How could Europe, more specifically Switzerland, represent Carl Lutz responsibly?

Memorial forms have been changing over the years to “more adequately address the past, contain its memory, and learn from it.”²⁹ Across the world, such as in Uganda, Cambodia, and Mexico, memorial museums are being created. Sodaro explains the purpose of these museums is to “remember and teach the lessons of the horrors of past conflicts, violence, and genocide, to ensure that that which society might most like to forget is never forgotten.”³⁰ Although Switzerland was neutral during the war, addressing past violence and human rights abuses found in the Holocaust is nonetheless fundamental to the country; not only because contemporarily lessons must still be learned on the subject, but also because they were still indirectly involved through various immigration policies employed throughout the Nazi period – as well as directly through the efforts of Carl Lutz.³¹ Sodaro further notes that nearly everywhere memorial museums are being created, they become popular tourist destinations.³² This would lend an

²⁷ Ibid, 21.

²⁸ Franziska Reiniger, “Are There Boundaries to Artistic Representations of the Holocaust?” *Art as Commemoration*, Yad Vashem January 2012.

²⁹ Sodaro, “Memorial Museums,” 13.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ At some points Switzerland practiced a strict immigration policy, at others many Jews were allowed in. Throughout the Nazi era, 300,000 refugees passed through Switzerland; 30,000 of them Jews. Yad Vashem, “Switzerland,” Shoah Resource Center, Accessed 12 July, 2018.

³² Sodaro, “Memorial Museums,” 14.

opportunity not only to academics to learn more about the forgotten Swiss hero, but also the general public and the global community.

“The memory of past violence is considered one of the surest inoculations against future violence,” according to Sodaro. She believes that confronting the past through remembrance leads to a moral obligation to protect human rights. However, this does not offer a solution to what can be done by everyday citizens to protect these rights should they be violated. How do we prevent violations without examples of attempts at prevention? We cannot say “never again” without presenting a solution. The creation of a Swiss memorial museum in remembrance of Carl Lutz would come with multiple benefits. Switzerland could help Europe collectively come to terms with the past in a progressive way. Placing a brighter spotlight on someone such as Carl Lutz gives society the opportunity to do two things: acknowledge the past and its tremendous flaw, as well as teach tolerance and humanitarianism. In the present day, another step forward is required, which involves moving forward but not necessarily moving on. Rather than continuing to give fame to Hitler or Eichmann, both more well-known than Lutz or Wallenberg, contemporary society would benefit greatly by focusing on learning from the past; this means not only noting that a great tragedy took place in the Nazi era, but also discussing the ways to prevent tragedies from repeating themselves.

Switzerland has something to be proud of in Carl Lutz, and he should be a role model for humanitarians across Europe, or the world, who wish to engage in and protect human rights – such as in the European refugee and migration crisis today. It is partially for this reason that a memorial museum honoring Carl Lutz would be significant in Switzerland. One of the principles behind memorial museums is the belief that the world can learn from past wrongs to create a better, more peaceful future.³³ This is another benefit of bringing to light the actions of Carl Lutz. If a memorial museum were to be created for him, sharing his heroic deeds and using the testimonies of his survivors, can we begin to create a more empathetic world?³⁴

Furthermore, memorial museums share a set of common memorial elements – such as eternal flames, walls of names, memorial sculptures, and works of art.³⁵ In this way, the commemorative space offers the information a simple memorial may lack; as well as the creative, emotive, and interactive element a museum may lack. It is possible to embody physical monuments in a museum, as seen in the Jewish Museum in Berlin with the “Fallen Leaves” installation and the Garden of Exile, for example.

Another concern is important to consider: is it possible that in today’s world there are too many physical memorials and monuments? Do statues and obelisks start to lose meaning when produced in high volumes? What happens if/when we run out of space? Should we be finding alternative forms of memorialization? Would a film on Carl Lutz’s efforts, as was done for Oskar Schindler, be adequate? One 87-minute documentary on Carl Lutz has been made: *The Glass House* (2005) by Swiss director Enrico Pasotti. However, the film is in Italian with English subtitles. Aside from film, perhaps Switzerland should consider incorporating Lutz into their

³³ Ibid, 19.

³⁴ Using testimonies may also connect the survivors in one common memory that the world may also share with them in a certain sense.

³⁵ Sodaro, “Memorial Museums,” 26.

education system, curating an exhibit or entire museum in his honour, and publishing books about him. There are a number of streets in Switzerland named after Lutz,³⁶ but this is ineffective if the larger population still does not know or recognize who he is. Is naming a school after Lutz or funding humanitarian work in his name more effective? Not only would this likely lead to more inquiries on his history, but it would also presumably lead to more discussions on Lutz in Swiss classrooms. In order for art, monuments, literature, or street names to work adequately as methods of memorialization, the population needs to know what or who is being commemorated. The root of what needs to be done differently is found in education.

For decades, the Holocaust was not taught extensively in Swiss schools, due to their history as a neutral state during the war. In discussions focused on wars and battles, one can understand why Switzerland may wish to continue upholding a neutral position. However, is it ethical to continue claiming neutrality when the conversation includes crimes against humanity and genocide – including those which took place under the guise of war? Why has the notion of remaining non-partisan taken precedence over recognizing individuals who risked their lives to save others?

Recently, Swiss schools have begun teaching the history and background of the Holocaust “within the wider perspective of human rights education, as an important basis for education concerning democratic citizenship.”³⁷ According to Thomas Schlag and Oliver Wäckerlig, Holocaust education is becoming increasingly important in the context of contemporary Swiss institutional policy and non-governmental initiatives. In other words, the Swiss government is implementing Holocaust education as a tool to create a better understanding of the current political situation in Europe and Switzerland. Carl Lutz should play a major role in Swiss education – especially considering the way in which the topic of the Holocaust is being employed in moralistic education in Switzerland today. Schlag and Wäckerlig ask if Switzerland’s specific role during this era should be addressed more intensely, since many currently see the Holocaust as “far away from their own national and current reality.”³⁸

Undeniably, this history is more closely related to Swiss history than most seem to realize, but perhaps not in the way they think. Rather than outright persecution and gas chambers – symbols which have become synonymous with the Holocaust – recently the connection between Switzerland’s national history and the Holocaust has focused on the old refugee policy – i.e., the admission into Switzerland of some Jewish refugees, and the turning away of others.³⁹ Contemporarily, Switzerland is an important place for debates on human rights – not only because of its connection with the International Red Cross, but also because the offices of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and for Human Rights are located in Geneva. Despite this, there continue to be major debates in Switzerland in relation to the migration policy, and the phenomena of racism and discrimination still existing even now.⁴⁰ In sum, human

³⁶ Dorinda Balchin. “Carl Lutz – Forgotten hero of the Holocaust.” The official website of Dorinda Balchin (blog). Wordpress, 27 January 2018.

³⁷ Thomas Schlag, and Oliver Wäckerlig, “Far away and nearby: Holocaust remembrance and human rights education in Switzerland,” *Prospect* 40, no.2 (June 2010): 223.

³⁸ *Ibid*, 224.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 230.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*.

rights conversations are extensive and essential in Switzerland today. There is an admirable, positive role model from this era in Swiss history, found in Lutz. His actions fit with moral lessons on “democratic citizenship” and social responsibility the Swiss seem to want to focus on today – and yet he is barely a footnote in this narrative.

Like other European Nations, Switzerland has a dedicated Holocaust Remembrance Day annually on 27 January, to teach pupils about the Holocaust and other genocides, as well as reflect on human rights, tolerance, and interreligious/intercultural dialogue.⁴¹ In 2008 the Swiss government, the Hungarian Carl Lutz Foundation, and the Permanent Missions of Switzerland and Hungary sponsored memorial museums and exhibits in New York and Budapest for Holocaust Remembrance Day. However, Switzerland itself does not have a national Holocaust memorial or museum, nor an institute or museum for war documentation.⁴² Not having a Holocaust museum in Switzerland not only suggests the government continues to ignore the efforts of a Swiss hero, but also likely renders it difficult for the Swiss to access physical primary or secondary source information on this era. In 2004, Switzerland became a formal member of the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research. The ITF’s goal is to show political and social leaders the need for Holocaust education, remembrance, and research.⁴³ It seems insincere to claim to take steps in improving Holocaust education, remembrance, and research in Switzerland without mentioning Carl Lutz, or creating a space to learn or commemorate. Further research into Holocaust education in Switzerland has demonstrated there is currently no curriculum which even briefly mentions Carl Lutz.⁴⁴ If the Swiss education system were to make a change to include Lutz in their teachings, it would: open doors to discussions on how to combat xenophobia today, clarify why the Holocaust is a transnational phenomena even to those who seem unaffected by its plague, allow Carl Lutz the opportunity to be memorialized the way in which he deserves to be, and perhaps even pave the way for survivors to be able to share their testimonies and memories more freely with the Swiss – further allowing them to thank and recognize Lutz in a new way.

In the wake of the unprecedented violence that took place during the Second World War and the Holocaust, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was ratified – thus raising the world’s legal and moral standards of tolerance, acceptance, and international human rights. It is imperative to never forget the truth and extent of what happened at the hands of the Nazis and their collaborators, such as the Hungarian *Nyilas*. Additionally, it is important to commemorate the efforts of the humanitarians who risked everything to do good, life-saving deeds. States and nations who declare “never again” without also providing a remedy risk enacting an empty promise.

Placing the spotlight on heroes of the Holocaust era, such as Carl Lutz, inspires acts of acceptance and the protection of human rights everyday and in the face of intolerance. Furthermore, it has the potential to encourage empathy and trans-ethnic solidarity. Lutz’s actions

⁴¹ Ibid, 225.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid, 226.

⁴⁴ As of 2018*. I found this source: “Switzerland and the Holocaust: teaching contested history.” *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 42, no.5 (2010), which does not have one single word on Lutz.

serve as a reminder that love, acceptance, and empathy knows no bounds. Switzerland, Europe, and the world need this reminder today, just as they did in the 1930s. Sodaro believes that “collective remembering of negative pasts can silence alternative narratives and versions of the past, and in this way further disenfranchise individuals and groups.”⁴⁵ It is our moral responsibility to ensure that the tragic evil of the past does not pass out of our national memories, but it is equally important to remember the triumphant resilience of good – which has the power to establish a compassionate connection between individuals and groups.

Scholars in the field of Memory Studies have coined terms such as “transnational memory,” “cosmopolitan memory,” and “travelling memory” to describe the forms, contents, and modes of memories which cross national borders, producing a common link between divergent individuals and nations.⁴⁶ Switzerland is not exempt from this transnational phenomena, despite that the Holocaust appears to be disconnected from Swiss history. Aside from the fact Jewish refugees passed through the country both during and after the Holocaust, Lutz directly connects the country to the genocide through his monumental rescue operation. The Swiss government appears to be making moves to change their approach to Holocaust education, but this cannot be done without the mention of Lutz. While they have sponsored memorials, museums, and exhibits on Lutz internationally, and have named streets after him in their own country, these efforts are inadequate if the intended audience is unaware of who or what it is all for. A memorial museum in Switzerland would be a suitable place to begin memorializing Lutz, as the museum aspect draws crowds in and acts as a legitimizing function for the public. Moreover, memorial museums attempt to “burden their visitors with responsibility – if not for the past, then for the future – and empathy for their fellow human beings.”⁴⁷ This ambition fits well with the Swiss government’s objective to implement Holocaust education to produce a better understanding of human rights and the current political plight in Europe.

Barbara Misztal writes that “without memory, that is, without the checking of, and reflection upon past records of institutions and public activities, we will have no warnings against potential dangers to democratic structures and no opportunity to gain a richer awareness of the repertoire of possible remedies.”⁴⁸ Letting Carl Lutz fall into the darkness of our collective memories does exactly what Misztal warns us of. We owe it to his work, to the 62,000 he saved, and to our future to commemorate him in the best way we can.

Works Cited

Balchin, Dorinda. “Carl Lutz – Forgotten hero of the Holocaust.” The official website of Dorinda Balchin (blog). Wordpress, 27 January 2018.
<https://dorindabalchin.com/2018/01/27/carl-lutz-forgotten-hero-of-the-holocaust/>

Hirschi, Agnes, and Schallié, Charlotte. *Under Swiss Protection: Jewish Eyewitness Accounts*

⁴⁵ Sodaro, “Memorial Museums,” 20.

⁴⁶ Ibid, 19.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 27.

⁴⁸ Ibid, 17.

from Wartime Budapest. Stuttgart, Germany: Ibidem-Verlag/Ibidem Press, 2017.

Reiniger, Franziska. "Are There Boundaries to Artistic Representations of the Holocaust?" *Art as Commemoration*, Yad Vashem January 2012.

Schär, Bernhard C, and Sperisen, Vera. "Switzerland and the Holocaust: teaching contested history." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 42, no.5 (2010): 649-669.

Schlag, Thomas, and Wäckerlig, Oliver. "Far away and nearby: Holocaust remembrance and human rights education in Switzerland." *Prospect* 40, no.2 (June 2010): 223-237.

Sodaro, Amy. "Memorial Museums: The Emergence of a New Form." In *Exhibiting Atrocity: Memorial Museums and the Politics of Past Violence*, 12-29. Rutgers University Press, 2018.

Swiss Films. "La casa di vetro." Accessed 12 July, 2018.
http://www.swissfilms.ch/en/film_search/filmdetails/-/id_film/2146532718

"The forgotten Swiss diplomat who rescued thousands from Holocaust." *BBC*, 4 January 2018.
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-42400765>

Vertlib, Karina. "Carl Lutz and the Legendary Glass House." *Zachor*, Fall 2014.
http://www.vhec.org/images/pdfs/Zachor_Fall2014.pdf

Yad Vashem. "Switzerland." Shoah Resource Center. Accessed 12 July, 2018.
http://www.yadvashem.org/odot_pdf/Microsoft%20Word%20-%206062.pdf