The Diary of Anne Frank Study Guide

The Diary of Anne Frank by Albert Hackett

Contents

Introduction

The Diary of Anne Frank, the play adapted from Anne Frank's famous diary, made its theater debut in 1956. Since then, it has been reproduced countless times on stages across the country and abroad (the playscript, with extensive notes, is readily available from Dramatists Play Service). Collaborators Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett, longtime Hollywood writers, had little experience with such a story as that of the Frank family. Previous scripts included sophisticated comedies such as *The Thin Man* or lively musicals such as *Easter Parade*. However, Goodrich and Hackett researched the play meticulously, drawing not only on Anne's diary but also on the experience of visiting Otto Frank and the attic hideout. As Evelyn Ehrlich noted in *Dictionary of Literary Biography,* Hackett in 1956 said, "We all felt we were working for a cause, not just a play."

The Diary of Anne Frank was an immediate critical and popular success, with reviewers particularly enthusiastic about Anne's spirit, optimism, and nobility. The play represented the pinnacle of Goodrich and Hackett's career. However, over the years, criticism mounted against the play for inaccurately representing Anne's own words as well as the Jewish experience of the Holocaust. Wendy Kesselman revised the script and mounted a production in 1997, but the commentary brought about by this new version of Anne's life in hiding contributes to the reader's understanding of the monumental task that faced Goodrich and Hackett in the 1950s, as they attempted to bring together the contradictory aspects of Anne Frank.

Author Biography

Goodrich was born in New Jersey in 1890. After graduating from Vassar College in 1912, she went to New York where she studied for a year at the New York School of Social Work. Her first acting experience was with a Massachusetts stock company, but in 1916 she made her Broadway debut.

Hackett was born in New York in 1900, the son of professional actors. He made his stage debut when he was six years old. He performed in silent films and on stage before becoming a writer.

Goodrich and Hackett met in 1927, when both were performing with a Denver stock company. They soon began working as a writing team. The first collaborative effort was the play *Up Pops the Devil*, which opened in New York in 1930 and was made into a film the following year. Also in 1931, the couple married.

By 1932, Hollywood's MGM studio was contracting their writing services; between 1933 and 1939, they wrote thirteen films, many of them box office successes. Their work, such as 1934's *The Thin Man* and its sequels, was characterized by its literate and sophisticated dialogue. After a brief return to New York to write plays and act, in 1941 Goodrich and Hackett signed on with Paramount but found few rewarding assignments there. In 1946, they moved to RKO to work on *It's a Wonderful Life*. In the 1940s, Goodrich and Hackett wrote several more award-winning scripts, including *Easter Parade* (1948), *Father of the Bride* (1950), and *Seven Brides for Seven Brothers* (1954).

By the 1950s, however, Goodrich and Hackett had become interested in a different sort of project: an adaptation of *The Diary of Anne Frank*. They worked on this script for two years, even meeting with Otto Frank and visiting the attic where the Franks and four other Jews hid from the Nazis. The play opened on Broadway in 1955, and it was the high point of their careers, earning a Tony Award and the Pulitzer Prize. In 1959, they adapted the play into a film, but though it was a critical success, it did not gain popularity at the box office.

Goodrich and Hackett's final film was 1962's *Five Finger Exercise*. After its failure, they returned to New York and ceased writing screenplays. Goodrich died of cancer on January 19, 1984, in New York. Hackett died of pneumonia on March 16, 1995, in New York.

Plot Summary

Act 1

The play *The Diary of Anne Frank* opens in November 1945 with Otto Frank's return to the attic rooms where he, his family, the Van Daans, and Mr. Dussell lived in hiding during the Nazi occupation of Holland. He enters the upstairs rooms carrying a rucksack. He moves slowly around the room and picks up a scarf, which he puts around his neck. As he bends down to pick up a glove, he breaks down. Hearing his cries, Miep Gies comes up the stairs, asking if he is all right and begging him not to stay up in the rooms. Mr. Frank says that he has come to say goodbye, that he is leaving Amsterdam though he doesn't yet know where he is going. As he is about to leave, Miep gives him a pile of papers that were left behind after the Gestapo came and took everyone away. Mr. Frank tells her to burn them, but Miep insists that he look at the papers. She puts Anne's diary in his hand. Mr. Frank opens the diary and begins to read the first entry, dated July 6, 1942, aloud. Gradually, Anne's voice joins his and then Mr. Frank's voice subsides. Anne describes how bad the situation got for the Jews in Holland after the German conquest. Her diary recounts the Franks' final morning at home, as they tried to make it appear they had fled the country. Instead, they went to the building where Mr. Frank had his business to go into hiding.

The next scene takes place in July 1942 in the attic where the families will hide. The Van Daans are waiting for the Franks. When they arrive, accompanied by Miep and Mr. Kraler, introductions are made between the two families; with the exception of the men, no one knows each other. After Miep and Mr. Kraler leave to get ready for work, Mr. Frank explains the rules: during the day, when the workers are downstairs, they cannot move around, speak above a whisper, or run any water. Then all of them begin to settle down and unpack their meager belongings before the workday begins. Anne tries to get acquainted with Peter and manages to find out that they attended the same school, but she immediately recognizes how shy he is. On this first day in hiding, Mr. Frank gives Anne the diary.

It is now two months later. Six o'clock has come, so everyone can move around. Anne has taken Peter's shoes, and in his attempt to get them back, they scuffle. Peter flees to his room, leaving Anne to wish that he were more fun. Dancing around the room, Anne spills milk on Mrs. Van Daan's fur coat, which causes the woman to storm angrily from the room. Mr. Van Daan follows, and Mrs. Frank warns Anne to be more courteous to their guests and reminds her that everyone is under great strain. She asks Anne to be more like Margot, who is more distant. Anne runs to her room.

Alone, Mrs. Frank and Margot begin to prepare supper. Mrs. Frank confides that she had asked Mr. Frank not to invite the Van Daans to share their hiding place, but he had insisted. At that moment, the buzzer sounds, signaling Mr. Kraler or Miep. Mr. Kraler arrives with a question: Miep's boyfriend has a Jewish friend who has no place to hide. Can Mr. Dussel stay with them for a few nights? Mr. Frank immediately tells Mr. Kraler to bring Mr. Dussel upstairs. He will share Anne's room. Mr. Frank serves cognac as a welcome. Mr. Dussel tells them what has been taking place in Amsterdam since they went into hiding. The first news is good, that people believe the Franks escaped to Switzerland. But he also tells them that hundreds of Jews are sent to death camps each day, including Anne's friends. Mr. Frank puts a stop to the conversation. Anne shows Mr. Dussel to the room they will share.

In the next scene, Anne's screams from a nightmare wake everyone up. Her parents rush into the room, but Anne sends her mother away and asks her father to stay with her. Anne tells her father that he is the only person she loves. Mr. Frank tells her that her rejection of her mother is very hurtful. Anne believes that she cannot help how she acts, but she immediately feels regretful and asks her father what is wrong with her.

It is the first night of Hanukkah, 1942. Anne has prepared presents for everyone (including the scarf Mr. Frank finds in the play's opening scene), and everyone is amazed at her ingenuity and touched by her thoughtfulness. However, the good mood is broken when Mr. Van Daan and Peter start arguing about his cat. The argument is brought to a swift halt by a crashing sound in the offices below. Everyone immediately quiets down and takes off their shoes. While standing on a chair to extinguish the overhead light, Peter falls down. From below comes the sound of feet running. In the attic above, everyone is frightened, wondering if it is the police come to take them away. Mr. Frank goes downstairs to investigate and returns with the news that it was a thief. While he says that the danger has passed, Mr. Dussel points out that now someone knows that there are people living above the offices. To restore everyone's courage in the face of a new anxiety, Mr. Frank asks Anne to sing the Hanukkah song, and soon the rest join in.

Act 2

Act 2 opens in January 1944; the families have been in hiding close to a year and a half. Miep and Mr. Kraler have arrived with a New Year's cake. Over his wife's protests, Mr. Van Daan gives her fur coat to Miep to sell. Mr. Kraler asks Mr. Frank to come downstairs with him to go over some contracts, but Mr. Frank realizes that Mr. Kraler really wants to speak to him in private. He tells Mr. Kraler that he must say whatever he has to say in front of everyone, and so they find out that one of the workers in the office is blackmailing Mr. Kraler in exchange for his silence about the upstairs room, which he remembers as existing. Scared and angry, Anne lashes out at her mother and then runs into her room. Peter follows her, telling her that he thinks she is just fine. For the first time since they've been in hiding, Peter and Anne talk, forging a friendship.

Anne and Peter's burgeoning friendship causes tensions between their mothers; Mrs. Van Daan has been making insinuations about what is going on when Anne visits Peter in his room after dinner. Alone, Anne and Peter talk about all sorts of things, and they share their first kiss. Tensions also are growing in the cramped attic in general. One night, these tensions erupt when Mrs. Frank catches Mr. Van Daan stealing food. Mrs. Frank snaps, demanding that Mr. Van Daan leave the attic. Mr. Frank tries to calm his wife down, but she refuses to listen to reason. However, the crisis comes to an end with Miep's arrival and her welcome news that the Allied invasion of the European continent has begun.

A few weeks later finds everyone gathered in the center room, sitting tensely. The office phone downstairs rings, apparently for the third time. Mr. Dussel insists that it is a warning from Miep, who hasn't been to see them for three days. No one has come into work downstairs, either, another ominous sign. Mr. Dussel, seconded by Mr. Van Daan, begs Mr. Frank to go downstairs and answer the phone, but Mr. Frank refuses. Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan begin to argue, driving Peter into his room. Anne follows him. She is telling him about what they will do when they are free again when a car pulls up in front of the building. The outside bell rings again and again, and then comes the sound of the door being battered in. They hear heavy footsteps and another door being battered in. It is the Nazis. "For the past two years we have lived in fear," Mr. Frank says. "Now we can live in hope." They hear the door to their stairwell crash in and the sound of German voices.

The play's final scene again returns to November 1945. Mr. Kraler has joined Miep and Mr. Frank in the upstairs rooms. Mr. Frank closes Anne's diary. Mr. Kraler tells him that it was the thief who reported them. Mr. Frank tells them that Anne was happy at the concentration camp, happy to be outside in the fresh air. Of the eight who lived in the attic, Mr. Frank is the only survivor. After Auschwitz was liberated in January, Mr. Frank traveled back to Holland, learning of everyone's death along the way. Only the day before, he had learned of Anne's death at Bergen-Belsen. Anne's voice, reading from her diary, closes the play: "In spite of everything, I still believe that people are really good at heart."

Act 1 Scene 1

Act 1 Scene 1 Summary

The events take place in Amsterdam, Holland, during the years of World War II and immediately thereafter. The scenery remains the same throughout the play. It is the top floor of a warehouse and office building in Amsterdam. There are three rooms on the top floor and a small attic space, accessed by a narrow flight of stairs up the back. The rooms are sparsely furnished, and the windows are blacked out. There is a small, steep stairwell leading down to the building below that has been concealed from view on the lower floor by a bookcase.

Mr. Frank enters the upper floor through the small stairwell. Looking around he sees and picks up a woman's white glove and begins to cry. Miep Gies, a Dutch girl of about 22 and pregnant, comes to find Mr. Frank and urges him to go home. She comforts him and tells him not to torture himself over the memories. He tells her he is leaving the city because there are too many memories. Miep argues--Amsterdam is his home; his business is here waiting for him. He is needed now that the war is over, but he can't face the memories. He thanks her for all that she and Mr. Kraler did for them and for their suffering as a result of it.

Miep tells him they found a pile of papers after he left: letters, notes, and a notebook. Mr. Frank tells her to burn them until he sees the notebook. It is Anne's diary and he begins to read on Monday, July 6, 1942. He can't believe it was only 3 years ago. Anne was a girl of 13 when she started writing in her diary. Her family is Jewish and emigrated to Holland when Hitler came to power. He continues to read from the diary.

Her father started a spice-and-herb importing business, which did well until the war came and then the Dutch capitulation. After the Germans arrived, things got very bad for the Jews. They forced her father out of business and made all Jews wear yellow stars. Anne had to give up her bike and couldn't go to school or the movies or ride in a car or the streetcar. Many other things were forbidden to them, as well.

Anne starts the diary the day after they go into hiding. She recounts how that day began. Her mother woke her early and told her to dress in as many clothes as possible. They were going into hiding upstairs in the building where Father had his business. Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan and their son, Peter, were coming with them.

Act 1 Scene 1 Analysis

Scene 1 sets the time and location of the story. Anne Frank is a 13-year-old Jewish girl who has just gone into hiding from the German secret police, the Gestapo, in Amsterdam, Holland. Three other Jews are joining them in hiding in the upper floor of Mr. Frank's old business warehouse.

We meet Mr. Frank, the protagonist, espouses the values of holding firm to your faith and living according to your moral principles. He will come to be the solid example of moral faithfulness to his family and the others in the hiding place.

We know at the opening of the story that Mr. Frank is returning to where he and his family spent their hiding; he is bitter and sad, and he survived the Nazi ordeal. He tells us that Miep and Mr. Kraler helped them tremendously at great peril and suffering to their own lives. We don't know yet what happened to Anne or Mrs. Frank, but Mr. Frank's sorrow makes it plain that he survived and the others did not.

Act 1 Scene 2

Act 1 Scene 2 Summary

Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan and their son, Peter, are waiting for Mr. Frank to arrive. They are dressed for traveling and have a small collection of their possessions with them. Peter, a shy, awkward boy of 16, has his cat carrier with him. Mrs. Van Daan is agitated and worried something has happened to them; perhaps they have been picked up on the way.

Mr. Frank arrives and explains there were too many green police on the streets, and they had to take the long way around. Mrs. Edith Frank, Margo Frank, Anne Frank, Miep, and Mr. Kraler also arrive and are carrying baggage. All are wearing the conspicuous yellow Star of David. Mrs. Frank is a young mother, reserved and gently bred. Margo Frank is 18, beautiful and quiet. Anne Frank is 13, a school girl.

They are in their hideout, and Miep shows Mrs. Frank where the medicine, food, soap, linens, etc., are stored. These items were sent ahead. Miep is in a hurry to get the ration books for everyone. Mrs. Van Daan is worried their names will appear on the books, and then the authorities will know where they are. Mr. Kraler tells them this is the white market, helping the hundreds who are hiding out in Amsterdam.

The workmen are arriving and Mr. Kraler admonishes them to be quiet and tells them either he or Miep will check in on them each day to see what they need. Everyone removes the multiple layers of clothing they put on for their escape into hiding.

Mr. Frank tells everyone that when the workmen are in the building below they must be completely quiet. Sounds travel to the offices and workrooms so they will have to be quiet from 8 in the morning until 6 in the evening. They must not speak above a whisper, walk in stocking feet, not run water, not use the sink or toilet, and burn all trash in the stove each night. This is the way they will live until the occupation is over.

Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan are grateful for being allowed to hide with the Franks. Mr. Frank tells them he owes Mr. Van Daan a great deal for helping him when he first came to the country.

Anne and Peter get acquainted. Ann was popular at school. Peter was a lone wolf and shy. Anne tells him they left their home looking as if they had been suddenly called away. Peter and Anne take off the yellow Star of David labels and Peter throws his into the stove. Anne cannot bring herself to do this; it is the Star of David after all.

Anne and her father start to settle into their new surroundings. Anne declares she will think of it as a very peculiar summer boarding house. Anne looks through a box her father has given her. It contains, among other things, a diary. She is thrilled and runs to the stairs to go down to the office for a pencil. Her father admonishes her that she may never go beyond the door; not on Sundays, in the evening or any other time.

Her father reminds her that there are no walls or locks on her mind. He plans to read history, poetry, and mythology books with her.

Anne begins to write in her diary. The silence in the night frightens her the most. Every sound outside makes her think they are coming for her. Miep and Mr. Kraler, "our protectors," comfort her. Anne dates the diary Friday, August 21, 1942.

Act 1 Scene 2 Analysis

Scene II provides the audience with some history as to what is happening in Amsterdam in August of 1942. The Germans have occupied the city and required all Jews to wear yellow Star of David patches to identify them as Jews and open them to abuse and arrest. Everyone is afraid and knows that helping or hiding Jews is punishable by arrest. Miep and Mr. Kraler are the "protectors" of those in hiding above in the warehouse. They are the only lifeline the Franks and Van Daans have now that they are hiding from the Nazi police. Their lives are in the hands of these two loyal friends who are also part of an underground movement committed to helping Jews hide from the Gestapo in Amsterdam.

Miep and Mr. Kraler represent moral right in the story. They are the face of the resistance, the underground movement trying to counteract the evil being done to Jewish people by the Germans. They serve as a reminder that there are good-hearted people fighting to combat evil and protect those who are unjustly persecuted. Anne will come to recognize that these people will eventually win over evil. These two give her hope and help to form the basis for her maturing spiritual growth.

We are given a look at the extremely restrictive rules Anne and the rest must follow. No sound and very little movement from 8am until 6pm during the day. This will be extremely difficult for a young girl and boy to endure, and we can feel only doubt that the adults can manage to live in peace within these confining spaces for the duration of the war. The family thinks it will be for only a few months. The reality is that it will be much longer. Anne immediately experiences fear in this place, and this will be the atmosphere in which she will live from now on.

We also meet Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan. They represent the peace and harmony that Mr. and Mrs. Frank are trying to foster during the family's confinement. They will also appear juxtaposed against the good-hearted Miep and Mr. Kraler as the time passes and their moral values disintegrate and their baser drives emerge to the foreground.

We will come to see that Mr. Frank, Miep, and Mr. Kraler are constant in their representation of good and decency. The Van Daans will change, as will others in the family as the strain of their fear and confinement breaks down their spirits.

Act 1 Scene 3

Act 1 Scene 3 Summary

The scene is 2 months later. The family is sitting in the main room; Margot, Anne, and Peter are doing their lessons. Mrs. Van Daan is sewing the lining of her fur coat, her prized possession, given to her by her father. Mr. Frank is watching through the window to make sure the last of the workers leaves the building before announcing, "school's over," and releasing everyone from their silence and inactivity. They all put on their shoes and start to move about the apartment.

Anne is playing a trick on Peter by hiding his shoes. Peter and Anne wrestle over the shoes, and Peter gets embarrassed and runs off to his room to feed his cat. Anne pouts that she needs some fun after sitting quietly all day. She needs someone to dance with her. She warns they all will forget how to dance by the time they get out of there. "When we get out we won't remember a thing."

Peter's mother pursues Peter and scolds him out of the bedroom. She teases Peter about Anne's being his little girlfriend. This embarrasses Peter, and he keeps trying to retreat to his bedroom. Mrs. Frank wonders why Miep isn't there yet; she is usually very prompt.

Anne dresses up in Peter's clothes and bursts into his room, play-acting that she is Peter with a friend named Tom Cat. Her brief skit makes fun of the fuzz on Peter's chin, compared to the beautiful whiskers of his friend, Tom Cat. The others enjoy the skit. Peter retaliates by recalling when Anne had to write a composition for talking too much in class, "'Quack, quack,' said Mrs. Quack Quack." Now it is Anne's turn to be outraged, and she and Peter argue and exchange harsh words.

Mrs. Frank is a little concerned Anne might be coming down with an illness; she feels a little warm. They cannot call a doctor if any one of them gets sick. It is announced that they are to have beans again for dinner; this is all Miep has brought them. Mr. Van Daan is irritated, and Anne breaks into a commentary on beans for dinner, poking fun.

Mr. Frank reports to Anne on her grades. She is doing well in history and Latin. She has caught up with him on Algebra; Margot will have to correct her Algebra from now on.

Anne converses with Mrs. Van Daan, asking her whether she had many boyfriends before she got married to Mr. Van Daan. Mrs. Van Daan describes the fun and boys that used to hang around her house. She had great legs, and still does, she says. She challenges Mr. Frank on this, and Mr. Van Daan and Peter tell her to stop.

There is a sound of bombing in the distance. Anne puts her ear to the floor and comments she thinks Miep is listening to the radio.

Mrs. Van Daan asks Mr. Frank to tutor Peter, as he does his girls. She is scornful of Mr. Van Daan. Mr. Van Daan is scornful of Peter's lack of cooperation with him. Mr. Frank agrees to tutor Peter, and Mrs. Van Daan kisses Mr. Frank as she says she wished she'd met him before her husband. Mrs. Frank wipes the lipstick off Mr. Frank's lips before he and Peter enter Peter's bedroom.

Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan argue over his smoking. All but Anne are keeping their eyes averted from the scene, except Anne, who comments that she has never seen grownups quarrel before, only children. Mr. Van Daan calls Anne rude and before Anne rises to the challenge, Mrs. Frank diverts Anne on an errand to the other room to retrieve her knitting.

Anne reports that Miep is engaged and is worried the Germans will send her fiancy to Germany to work in a plant; they are picking up young Dutchmen off the streets and shipping them off to work. Mr. Van Daan scolds her to stop her incessant talking.

Mr. Van Daan complains again about the quarreling, and then he looks for his pipe and asks Anne whether she has seen it. Anne sarcastically responds, and Mr. Van Daan follows by scolding her for being spoiled and needing a spanking. Anne retorts by mimicking what Mrs. Van Daan told her to tell the boys when they get fresh, "Remember, Mr. So-and-So, remember I'm a lady." Mr. Van Daan barely controls his temper and tells Anne boys want girls who will listen to them, keep the house shining, and love to cook and sew. Anne explodes dramatically by insisting that she would cut her throat--open her veins! She announces her plans to grow up to be remarkable, to study music or art in Paris, as she accidentally sweeps her glass of milk onto Mrs. Van Daan's fur coat. Mrs. Van Daan becomes enraged and says she could kill Anne as she and Mr. Van Daan storm out of the room.

Mrs. Frank scolds Anne for talking back to the Van Daans. She wants her to be more like Margot. She does not want her taking such familiarities with the Van Daans. Anne explodes at her mother and storms off to her bed. Mrs. Frank talks to Margot about her concerns about living in such close quarters with the Van Daans. She predicted to Mr. Frank that it wouldn't work out, and now they have to endure the Van Daans' quarrelling and bickering.

Mr. Kraler arrives unexpectedly with a serious problem and request. A friend of Miep's fiancy, Jan Dussel, needs a place to hide temporarily. Mr. Frank offers to take him in. Mr. Van Daan complains that there is little enough food for them. Peter is ashamed of his father. The group discusses where Mr. Dussel will sleep and how they will redo the sleeping arrangements.

Mr. Dussel, a Jewish dentist, is introduced around. He recognizes Mr. Frank and tells them everyone thinks they escaped to Switzerland. They all drink a welcome toast of cognac. Mr. Van Daan asks Mr. Dussel if he realizes they have only three ration books among seven of them, now eight. Peter is humiliated again.

Mr. Dussel chastises Mr. Van Daan by telling him that he wouldn't complain if he knew the situation outside. Every day hundreds of Jews are disappearing. They surround a block and search house by house. Children come home from school, and their parents are gone. They are being deported. People get a call-up notice, and if they don't come, they are arrested and sent to a death camp. Anne asks after the family of her friend, Jopie, and finds out they are all gone.

Mr. Dussel thanks them for taking him in. He is in shock. His grandfather and his parents were born in Holland, and he can't believe what is happening. Anne leads him to her bedroom where Margot is moving out, and she and Mr. Dussel are to share a room. She tells Mr. Dussel she hopes she doesn't get on his nerves like she does the others. He replies that he gets along well with children; children were always a part of his dental practice.

The scene ends with an excerpt from Anne's diary. She is complaining about Mr. Dussel always criticizing her. She comments that grownups who never raised children always think they know how to bring up children. She also comments that Mrs. Van Daan's attempts to flirt with her father are getting her nowhere.

Act 1 Scene 3 Analysis

Two months into their hiding, the group is having trouble living in such close quarters. Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan are bickering and quarreling. Mrs. Van Daan is looking at Mr. Frank and wishing she were married to him and flirting with him. It is to Mr. Frank's credit that he "won't play" as Anne puts it in her diary.

The Van Daans' moral underpinnings are already breaking down. Mrs. Van Daan talks indiscreetly about former boyfriends and openly flirts with Mr. Frank. The indecency of this is not lost on her son, Peter, who is rightly embarrassed. Mr. Van Daan is already starting to worry about himself more than the others. The prospect of one more mouth to feed will mean less for him, and his open whining about his own food, which discloses his lack of concern for others, humiliates Peter. Mr. Dussel rightly reminds them that hundreds in their town are dying and being sent to death camps. Mr. Van Daan is not concerned about anyone but himself, and this corrosive selfishness will continue as the confinement drags on.

Anne and Peter are also getting on each other's nerves. However, Peter, 16, is having sexual responses to Anne's wrestling adventures with him that he is trying to keep secret from everyone. Anne is so young she doesn't have any idea of Peter's dilemma over his puberty issues and how her playfulness with him is aggravating the situation.

Anne acts as an antagonist in these early months of confinement. She fuels the conflicts with her wit and pranks out of boredom. She is playing childish games with the others' patience because of her own childish self-centeredness.

We see that Anne has dreams for her future. She wants to study art or music in Paris. She dreams that she will something "remarkable" when she grows up.

Anne is also the protagonist in this true-life story. She is 13, a little older than a child, a little too young yet to be affected by the pubescent attractions among boys and girls, and very precocious when it comes to dialogue and interaction with the adults. She is fearless and boldly candid in the face of the horrors taking place outside their self-imposed prison. She voices the fears of the adults when she worries they will have forgotten everything by the time they come out of there. She forces the others to realize they must live life as normally as possible in this impossibly confining situation.

Anne thus exists in a perfect position to chronicle in her diary her bold and candid observations of life in hiding, living with the fear of discovery and arrest, and facing the future when the horrors of this war and genocide are over. Anne's observations and innocent opinions are frequently prophetic, and we will see more of this as the story progresses.

Act 1 Scene 4

Act 1 Scene 4 Summary

It is several months later. Anne wakes the house with her screams during a nightmare. She has been sleeping very restlessly, keeping Mr. Dussel awake for weeks. Mr. Dussel complains bitterly about her and worries she will alert someone outside to their whereabouts. Mrs. Frank tells Anne she will sit with her until she goes back to sleep. Anne rejects her mother's love and offers of comfort and asks instead for her father. Her mother is very hurt. Margot comforts her mother telling her it is a phase Anne will outgrow.

Anne's father comforts her. In his arms she confesses she is so afraid the Green Police will come to drag her away like they did her friend Jopie. She thinks she is grown up and then cries like a baby wanting her father. She loves her father; he is the only one she loves.

Anne is terrified of the out-of-control person she has become. She can be a nice person but does horrible things daily to those around her. She put a wet mop in Mr. Dussel's bed, and now she cruelly rejected her mother. She is afraid the others will laugh at her if she is serious, so the mean Anne comes to the surface, and the nice Anne goes inside. If only she could switch and have the nice Anne on the outside.

Anne writes in her diary that the air raids take place day and night; the noise is terrifying. Mr. Frank says it means the war will end sooner. Mrs. Van Daan is a fatalist, but she is the most terrified when the air raids start.

It is November 19, 1942; the Allies have landed in Africa. They all hope for an early end to the war. Mr. Frank asks his fellow inmates what they will do when they get out of the room. Mrs. Van Daan wants to be back with her things, including the expensive piano her father bought her. Peter wants to see a movie. Mr. Dussel wants to get back to his dentist's drill. Anne wants so many things--to ride her bike, laugh till her belly aches, have new clothes from the skin out, wallow in a hot tub for hours, and go to school with her friends.

Act 1 Scene 4 Analysis

Anne's love and affections are focused on her father. She is emotionally rejecting everyone else. The strain of the living situation, the fear of discovery and arrest, and the horrors of what will happen if they are arrested are causing her to retreat from everyone but the one person whom she thinks can keep her safe. Her father has created this hideout in an effort to save his family from the Nazi horrors. This is not lost on Anne, and she desperately clings to him as her savior.

Her other method of defense is putting up a mean front. If she goes on the offensive and creates a mean person, no one can get to the real Anne and make her feel any worse than her fears already do. She doesn't feel safe within these walls, and the people with whom she shares the apartment are so wrapped up in their own fears and coping mechanisms that she is left on her own to develop her own defenses.

This is a time of war, and Anne is living in a prison. The members of her family and group share the same conditions, but they all share the horrors going on outside their apartment through their imagination and fears.

Act 1 Scene 5

Act 1 Scene 5 Summary

This scene opens with a Hanukkah celebration. They have a menorah and Shanos (?) servant candle, and all are dressed in good clothes. Mr. Frank intones the prayers of praise commemorating the fight their early Jewish brothers fought against tyranny and oppression, reminding everyone they should ever look to God, "whence cometh our help." Mrs. Frank reads the next prayer of certitude in God's protection from evil.

Mr. Dussel is not familiar with Hanukkah and likens it to the St. Nicholas celebration. Mrs. Van Daan challenges him on what kind of Jew doesn't know Hanukkah. Everyone recalls his or her favorite part of the celebration. Margot loves the 8 days of gift giving. Mrs. Frank says that is not for this year, but they are all alive and that is gift enough.

Anne brings in a satchel full of presents for everyone. They are all surprised. The first is for Margot. Anne has written a poem for her and given her a crossword puzzle book. Margot finds out that it is the one she has already done; Anne has rubbed out all the answers, so she can start over again.

Next is hair shampoo for Mrs. Van Daan. Anne has taken all the odds and ends of soap and mixed them with the last of her toilet water. Anne's gift to Mr. Van Daan is a box of handmade cigarettes. Mr. Frank found some old pipe tobacco in the pocket lining of his coat, and they made it into cigarettes for him.

Anne has made an I.O.U. for her mother offering 10 hours of doing whatever she says. Mr. Dussel jokes he might like to buy that from Mrs. Frank. Anne's gift to her father is a muffler she knitted in the dark from odds and ends.

Anne has made a ball tied to a string for Peter's cat. Her gift to Peter is a second-hand razor that Miep picked up for her. Mr. Dussel teases Peter and makes him angry. Peter takes the ball to his cat.

Anne's gift to Mr. Dussel is a pair of homemade earplugs she made out of cotton and candle wax, so that he won't hear her thrashing around at night.

Everyone is pleased with his or her gifts. They want to sing the song, but Mr. Frank cautions it is a song that tends to get too loud and exuberant. Peter comes out pretending to have his cat under his coat. Mr. Dussel is allergic and starts an attack. It is only a towel and everyone laughs at the joke. Mr. Van Daan threatens to make Peter put the cat outside that night because it eats some of their food. Anne cries that he can't do that because Peter loves his cat.

Just then they hear a crash downstairs and in their haste to turn off lights Peter knocks over an iron lamp, which crashes into the floor. They hear steps running down the stairs and Anne faints. Mr. Frank breaks the rule of safety and goes downstairs to investigate what has happened. It is Saturday, and they can't wait for Monday to find out from Mr. Kraler or Miep.

Anne is revived and begs Mr. Van Daan to go get her father and bring him back upstairs to safety. Peter volunteers to go, but his father roughly pushes him back and yells that he's done enough. Mrs. Van Daan begs her husband to get his money to buy off whoever has found them. Mrs. Frank softly prays the prayer she has read earlier in the night.

Mr. Frank returns to report it was a thief who stole the cash box and a radio. They all speculate that he will tell the Green Police if caught as a bargain for his freedom. They speculate on whether there is anywhere else they can go to hide.

Mr. Frank challenges their faith. They are still safe and alive. He begins to pray a prayer of thanksgiving and then encourages Anne to lead them in the Hanukkah song, ". . . Together, we'll weather whatever tomorrow may bring."

Act 1 Scene 5 Analysis

In this scene, the predicament of the Frank family and the others is compared and contrasted to the traditional Hanukkah celebration of the Jews' triumph over their oppressors. It is a celebration full of praise and thanksgiving to God for their deliverance and protection. Just as the Maccabees fought against tyranny thousands of years ago and overcame through their faith and God's protection, so, too, the Jews are suffering Nazi tyranny and genocide and challenges to their faith once again.

God's love for his people is symbolized through Anne's goodness. She makes gifts for each of the members of her group. She thoughtfully created each gift and/or picked each one especially for each person and gave each with love. Anne knows she has been a trial to everyone and tries to make amends and bring balance and harmony back to the family group she has so disrupted. She hopes to please everyone because her inner goodness is finally ready to be exposed to everyone. In this way she also conquers more of her fear and her human spirit, made in the likeness of God, makes a greater mark on the world starting with the other seven people in her room.

The events memorialized through the Hanukkah celebration are a symbol of the hope the Jewish people in this time of evil. The ancient celebration had a joyous ending for the Jewish people of that time as shown by the words of the song Anne leads them in. Mr. and Mrs. Frank keep this hope alive through the traditional keeping of the memorial. This celebration reminds them of their hope in God's protection. Anne brings them a reminder of God's love through her thoughtful presents. The spirits of the whole group are raised because of the love brought by Anne and hope brought by their faith. They hope for a safe and good ending to this nightmare they are living. They hope to escape the fate that was threatening all Jews within reach of the Nazi terror.

This night, however, all hopes of a happy ending for the Frank family and guests are crushed by the events involving a thief in the building. Mr. Frank challenges them to hold tight to their faith, and it will get them through this ordeal. This time, however, the odds are seriously against their hope that the thief, who has discovered the Jews hiding in the upper rooms, will keep his secret and not betray them to the Green Police as a bargaining chip in exchange for his own freedom.

The reality is that survival is primary for everyone under Nazi rule, and this scramble for survival has turned many a man against his brother. This is contrasted with the goodness and generosity of Mr. Frank and his family. Mr. Frank invited the Van Daan family to hide with his family. Mr. Frank felt he owed this to Mr. Van Daan in return for the help he was given when first in the country when did not know the language and had nothing to live on. Mr. Frank did not forget he owes his prosperity to the goodness of Mr. Van Daan, so he happily shared the relative safety within his power as a thank you. Later in the story, Mr. Frank welcomes another refugee in, Mr. Dussel, even though food is very scarce for the seven lives in the upper apartment. He agrees to take Mr. Dussel in without a second thought because it is the right thing to do.

Something very decent is taking place in the hideaway of the Frank family that starkly contrasts with the horrors going on around them, just outside. In juxtaposition to this goodness, something not so decent is developing with the Van Daans and their selfishness.

Act 2 Scene 1

Act 2 Scene 1 Summary

January 19, 1944, and they are still in their hiding place. They have been there 1 year, 5 months, and 25 days. Anne is writing in her diary, and the others are bundled against the cold, lying down, reading or in their own rooms.

Anne writes that the Van Daans' "discussions" are as violent as ever. She and her mother still don't understand each other. Anne is especially pleased with the change she has experienced within her own body. She refers to the changes in her body, both internal and external, are wonderful and her "sweet secret."

The buzzer sounds, and it is Miep and Mr. Kraler bringing them New Year's greetings. Anne can smell the wind and cold on Miep's coat. Miep asks Margot whether she is feeling better; she has been sick with a bad cough, which they have been trying to keep quiet. Peter asks Miep whether she has seen his cat in the neighborhood lately; she hasn't. Miep has brought a cake for celebration and has used a month's worth of sugar rations to make it.

Mr. Van Daan is very excited to have the cake and counts out seven pieces for them. He is deliberately leaving Margot out of the count so that he might get a little more. Mr. Dussel starts the bickering. He wants Mrs. Frank to divide the cake because she always makes the serving portions equal. Mrs. Van Daan takes offense at the accusation she doesn't give everybody exactly the same amount. Mr. Dussel tells her she gives everyone the same, except that she gives Mr. Van Daan a little more. Mr. Van Daan denies this as a lie.

Peter is worried about his cat and wonders whether it went back to their old house. Mr. Dussel says it has been gone a week, and he is sure someone has eaten it for a nice, fat meal. Peter is enraged at the taunt.

Miep starts to leave, and Mr. Van Daan asks her to wait while he gets something from his room. Mrs. Van Daan follows him upstairs and becomes hysterical when she realizes he is getting her fur coat to give to Miep to sell. She cries, begs, and collapses on the floor crying over losing the coat her father gave her. Mr. Van Daan tells Miep they shouldn't be so selfish by keeping a fur coat when people outside are freezing from want for warm clothing. He tells her to please buy all the cigarettes she can with the money from the sale.

Mr. Kraler tells them a problem is developing with one of the workers, Carl. He thinks Carl knows about them hiding upstairs and has asked for an increase in pay. It could be blackmail or maybe he just wants more money. Mr. Frank tells him to offer him half of what he asks, and if it is blackmail, they will find out soon from that.

Mr. Dussel accuses Peter again of being to blame if they are found out. Margot wants it to end and be over. An argument develops when Mrs. Frank tells Margot and Anne to look at the suffering and death in the concentration camps to know how lucky they are to be where they are. Anne argues that she and Margot and Peter are young people trying to hold onto their ideals when everything around them is being destroyed. The world is a mess, and they weren't even around when it started. Anne storms off to her room.

Mr. Van Daan spies her cake and tries to take it for himself, but Peter heads him off and brings the cake to Anne. Anne and Peter quietly reassure each other. Peter tells her that he admires how well she stands up to everyone and that she makes the situation more bearable for him.

Anne tells Peter how hard it is for her. The grownups have formed their opinions, but she and Peter are still trying to find out for themselves. She comments that she and Peter have problems that no other people their age have ever had. She can't talk with her Mother. Her father gives her credit for having sense, but he won't talk about Mother, and so Anne is frustrated that she can't talk about really intimate thoughts with him if he is holding back. She misses her school and friends her own age. She comments how important it is to have someone to talk to. Now, after a year and a half she and Peter are finally really talking. They agree to talk more often.

Mr. Dussel watches Peter leave Anne and his room and tries to enter; Anne shuts the door on him. He then tries to go back to Peter's room, but Peter shuts the door on him there, leaving him standing alone and forelorn.

Anne writes in her diary that the people from whom Miep was getting their ration books have been arrested. It is March 6, 1944, and Mr. Kraler is in the hospital with ulcers. Miep has to run the business and their lives, too. The Americans have landed in Italy, and Mr. Frank hopes for a quick finish to the war. Anne longs for friends and someone to talk to who understands, someone young.

Act 2 Scene 1 Analysis

What everyone hoped would be a short term of hiding has turned into a year and a half with little end in sight. Anne is growing up in the most restrictive of environments, isolated from friends her own age. Teenaged girls often find themselves estranged from their mothers, and Anne is no exception. However, these times and situations are extreme and taxing on everyone's nerves. Anne admits that neither she nor her mother understand each other. What Anne doesn't realize is how difficult it must be for her mother to try to keep some semblance of order and calm in a situation thick with fear and anxiety. Anne still favors her father as her best confidant for her feelings but feels he is keeping things from her, and this is discouraging her in their relationship.

Anne is following the rules of their hiding but longs to escape them. Margot longs for the conflict to be over and is almost willing for them to be caught by the police to end the tortuous waiting. Mrs. Frank tries to remind them of the horrors of the concentration camps and how lucky they are they are still alive. Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan continue with their violent fights.

The story places the images of the Frank's hiding place and the other Jews in the city, in juxtaposition to the images of the concentration camps. First, there is the condition for the Jews in Amsterdam at this time, indeed for all Jews over all the lands under Nazi control. There are three scenarios for them. There is living in fear in the city, hoping to evade the arrests that are taking place methodically and daily now. There are the Jews who are in hiding within the city, like our Frank family group. There are also the Jews who have been sent to the concentration camps, suffering the fate of the horrors taking place there.

There is also another group in the background: the non-Jews trying to protect the Jews from genocide. This group has placed their lives in much the same peril as that of their Jewish neighbors. We see this by the report that the couple who were providing ration books for the Frank family have been arrested for their efforts. We know they, too, will be sent to the concentration camps.

The comparison shows us that no place is safe for Jews during this war, and the scramble for survival is getting more intense. This is also evidenced by the conflicts taking place in the Frank family hideout. The Frank family hideout is an example, or microcosm, of life for Jews everywhere living under the Nazi occupation. They are prisoners hoping against hope for an end to the genocide taking place, holding on to their Jewish faith, scrambling for survival, and pitting them against the best and worst of human nature in the struggle.

Mrs. Frank is acutely aware of this reality, as is everyone in the story, and she is trying to keep some hope alive in her children. They all react differently to the situation. Anne is rebelling; Peter is becoming more aggressive to his father's humiliating and selfish behavior; Margot is losing hope and starting to give up; Mrs. Frank is still fighting for her family's survival; Mrs. Van Daan is fighting her husband, still wrapped up in her own petty self-absorption; and Mr. Van Daan is turning into a self-centered scavenger and letting the worst of human nature creep into his behavior.

The Van Daans' behavior toward their son, each other, the Frank family members, and to the hiding situation in general is another microcosm of what is happening in the concentration camps. The people in the camps are pitted against each other for survival. Food, clothing, and comforts are scarce to non-existent. People are turning against each other for psychological survival and physical survival. Base human instincts are rising to the surface and becoming the driving force for those in captivity. This especially raw in the case of Mr. Van Daan's selfish attempts to hoard food and cigarettes at everyone else's expense.

The hideout of our play is also a prison, and those inside are faced with fighting off the same inclinations and challenges to human nature as those that are found in the concentration camps. It would be so much easier for the Frank family to face this if they did not have to live with the Van Daans and Mr. Dussel in their prison, but they are forced to cohabitate in close quarters with strangers. Mr. Frank was driven by his sense of decency and admitted the others into his home. Of course, prisoners cannot choose those with whom they are incarcerated, and the conflicts are the same, as we see here, no matter how small the group dynamic.

The images of good and evil are seen in Mr. Frank, as the good, versus Mr. Van Daan. As mentioned above, Mr. Frank is driven by his sense of what is right and decent. He cannot bring himself to turn away others in need of help and feels a duty, especially to Mr. Van Daan. The Frank family comfort and safety is severely compromised by the presence of the Van Daans and Mr. Dussel, but Mr. Frank could not have lived with his conscience or faced his family if he violated the moral lessons he has been teaching them all their lives.

Anne and Peter are getting a harsh lesson in human nature at a time in their lives when normally they would only have to deal with puberty issues, the start of menstruation, and the growth of facial hair and raging hormones. These experiences are hard enough to face without the severe pressures under which they are living in the hideout. Anne condenses it down to wishing for someone her own age with whom she can talk. She recognizes the sad impact loneliness and isolation can have on a person.

The last image we see in the scene is of Mr. Dussel, one of the antagonists in the group dynamic. He has been taunting Peter and Anne throughout the year with cruel jokes and brutal judgments. He is a Jew by birth, but not by culture, and he doesn't really fit in with the religious fabric of the group. He thinks of himself as Dutch and not Jewish. He does not feel a kinship with the other Jews in this conflict. He is isolated by his lack of cultural identity to the other Jews and resents being made to suffer alongside them. The last image of him, standing in the hallway outside the closed doors of Anne and Peter's bedrooms and looking forlorn, accentuates the condition of his loneliness and isolation.

Finally, we see that Mr. Kraler is in the hospital with ulcers, and the food ration couple has been arrested. The Frank family's lives and safety are in the hands of Miep now, and they are now just one person away from total isolation and starving.

Act 2 Scene 2

Act 2 Scene 2 Summary

The scene opens with Peter in his room dressing for a visit from Anne. Anne is in her room with Margot getting dressed as well. Mr. Dussel is impatiently waiting for his turn in the bedroom. Mrs. Frank speaks with Anne about visiting Peter's room so often. Mrs. Van Daan is making nasty remarks about it, and it is making things more difficult for Mrs. Frank. She asks Anne to leave the door open during the visits.

Anne asks Margot whether she is jealous of her visits with Peter. Margot's reply is that she is very jealous of the fact Anne has something to get up for in the morning; but she is not jealous of Anne and Peter. Anne finishes dressing, puts on white gloves, and invites Margot to visit with Peter with her; Margot declines.

Mrs. Van Daan complains about Anne and Peter's visiting and tells Peter not to stay up late. Mrs. Frank reminds Anne to be in bed by 9. Mrs. Frank explains to Mrs. Van Daan that Peter's room is the only place where they can talk and have secrets.

In Peter's room, Anne and Peter scoff at how their parents are treating them like children. They feel they are much more advanced than their parents were at their ages. Anne reminisces, as she looks at the pictures of movie stars she has loaned Peter for his room. She recalls happy times with her friends getting ice cream at the stores where Jews were allowed. There would always be a lot of boys, and they'd all laugh and joke. Anne thinks she is much more grown up and serious about life now. She wants to be a journalist; she loves to write.

Peter says he would like to work on a farm or something that doesn't take much brains. Anne encourages him and tells him how smart he is in math. Then Anne asks him point blank if he likes Margot because she is beautiful and Anne is not. Peter tells Anne he thinks she is pretty and quieter than when they first went into hiding. Anne starts talking about never having kissed a boy and asks Peter if he has kissed a girl. He has; it was a kissing game at a party. Anne wonders whether it would be all right to kiss a boy if you are not engaged, given that the whole world is falling apart; you never know what will happen tomorrow. Peter says it depends on the girl. The clock strikes 9, and Anne starts to go. Peter asks her not to let them stop her from coming to see him. Anne promises to bring her diary sometime; there are so many things in it she wants to talk over with him. Peter awkwardly kisses her on the cheek.

Anne says good night to each person in the room and gives Mrs. Van Daan a kiss. Mrs. Van Daan's suspicions are confirmed as she utters, "Ah hah!"

Anne is reading from her diary. April 20, 1944. They are having to cut down on meals more; the rats have carried off some of their food. The talk is about invasion. Anne is happier now that she visits with Peter; she's not in love, but life is more bearable. She longs to have a darling boy in her arms.

Act 2 Scene 2 Analysis

Anne and Peter are in puppy love. They are trying to have dates, with each of them dressing for the date. Mrs. Van Daan is jealous of Peter's attraction to Anne and giving Mrs. Frank, the only one who listens to her, a hard time about their "visits." Mrs. Frank understands the young people's need for privacy and "secrets." This contrasts with Anne's lack of understanding of her mother's motivations and behavior.

Margot's comment is well taken that Anne and Peter have something to get up for in the morning. People need each other to help give meaning to life. Margot is having a very hard time facing her life with the pressure of arrest looming over them, and she really has no one, except her family, to talk with about her fears. Margot has no one her age with whom she can commiserate and is feeling isolated as well.

Anne is also finding meaning to her life by planning for her future. She wants to be a journalist and writer. The irony is not lost on the fact that now over 60 years later, millions of people have read her diary since the war and the fact that her diary has become a very important commentary on life for Jews during the Nazi genocide campaign.

Act 2 Scene 3

Act 2 Scene 3 Summary

A few weeks later, Mr. Van Daan is caught by Mrs. Frank stealing food from the food safe in the middle of the night. He complains he is hungry. Mrs. Frank loses her calm and screams at him that everyone is hungry, and she is watching the children, his own child, getting thinner; this food should have gone to them. Mr. Dussel attacks him and has to be pulled away. Mrs. Van Daan tries to justify his stealing by saying he is a bigger man and needs more. Mrs. Frank turns on Mrs. Van Daan, telling her she is worse than her husband, sacrificing her child to this man. She has watched, holding her tongue, as Mrs. Van Daan saves and gives the choicest morsels to her husband. Now it will stop, and she wants them to pack their bags and leave.

Mr. Frank tries to intervene. They have lived in peace for 2 years. He is sure Mr. Van Daan won't do it again. Mr. Van Daan agrees. But Mrs. Frank won't be appeased; she wants them to leave at once. Mrs. Van Daan argues they have no money to buy a hiding place and that Mr. Frank said he owed her husband for helping him years ago. Mrs. Frank offers to pay them from her own money and retorts that any debt to them has been paid over and over. Mr. Frank is shocked and doesn't recognize his wife's temper. Mrs. Frank says she should have spoken out long ago.

Mr. Dussel says you can't be nice to some people. Mrs. Van Daan retorts they would have had enough food if Dussel had not come to stay with them. Mr. Frank tries to calm everyone. "We don't need the Nazis to destroy us. We're destroying ourselves."

Mrs. Frank gives Mrs. Van Daan some money and tells her to give it to Miep, who will find them a place to hide. Anne can't believe her mother would put Peter out. Mrs. Frank replies that when she says she must protect the children, she means Peter, too. Peter says he would have to go if his father leaves. Mrs. Frank tells him Mr. Van Daan has been no father to him. Peter says he will go with his family. They can stay until Miep finds them a hiding place. In the meantime, Mr. Van Daan is no longer allowed in the main room; he has to stay in his room. Mrs. Van Daan can cook for him and bring the food up to him.

Mr. Dussel begins to divide a sack of potatoes, laying a potato out in a pile for each person as he counts their names. Margot is shocked that they would fight over a handful of rotten potatoes.

The doorbell rings, and Miep is there with good news. The invasion has begun--D-Day, the allied invasion of Normandy. The group becomes ecstatic, and Mrs. Frank hugs Mr. Van Daan. Mr. Van Daan begins to sob in shame for stealing food from the children. Mrs. Frank says it doesn't matter now. Anne apologizes to her mother for being so horrible to her. Mrs. Frank begins to cry with remorse for the things she said to Mr. Van Daan. Mr. Van Daan tells her she was right in what she said.

Anne is writing in her diary: July 2, 1944. Everyone's spirits are good these days. Anne laughs that they are paying the warehouseman that extra money, and he doesn't know a thing. Mr. Kraler has to have an operation. The Gestapo found the radio, and they fear it will be traced back to the thief and then the warehouse. The realization depresses everyone in the group. Anne questions whether she will ever be able to write well. "I want to go on living even after my death." She is 15 now; she knows what she wants; she has a goal and an opinion.

Act 2 Scene 3 Analysis

Mr. Van Daan has finally sunk to the lowest--stealing food from the children in the group. That Mrs. Van Daan has been catering to her husband with special food bits, but not her own son, is also a low for motherhood. Both of them represent the lowest level to which humankind can sink as a result of such life-threatening conditions--stealing food from their own child. The play of good and evil continues with the Franks versus the Van Daans. Mr. Dussel continues as the antagonist, jumping in to condemn Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan; this is contrasted with Mr. Frank's attempt to mollify his wife's demand that they leave immediately, calling for moderation and peace.

Mr. Frank has been willing to put up with the horrible fights between the Van Daans and the bickering of Mrs. Van Daan to Mrs. Frank to keep peace and live civilly. Mrs. Frank has been trying to live this way, too, and has taken the brunt of Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan's misbehavior. She has seen everything but kept quiet. The revelation of Mr. Van Daan's stealing from the children forces her to act. She finally stands up for the survival of the children and tries to remove the evil influence of Mr. Van Daan from their lives. She wants Peter to stay to protect him, but the parents must go.

The news of the Allied invasion shakes everyone out of their fight and reminds them that the war and these horrid conditions may end soon. Everyone becomes contrite for the way they treated each other. Anne apologizes to her mother. Mr. Van Daan is ashamed of his behavior. Mrs. Frank is ashamed for treating her friends and guests that way. Only Mr. Frank has remained constant in his morals and religious convictions, treating all men with respect.

Anne's writing is prophetic. She wants to go on living after her death, and her diary has done that for her. It has become a truly important piece of literature. It is still revered as chronicling a microcosm of human interaction and dynamics in the face of confinement, food shortages, fear, and threats of torture and death.

Act 2 Scene 4

Act 2 Scene 4 Summary

The scene opens a few weeks later. Everyone is worried because they haven't seen Miep in 3 days. They think Mr. Kraler may be dead. To add to their fears, it is Friday, and there are no workers in the building. The phone downstairs in the office has been ringing in bursts of three, and Mr. Dussel is getting hysterical, thinking it's a signal from Miep. He is frantically urging Mr. Frank to answer the phone. Mr. Frank refuses, fearful of exposing their hiding place. Mr. Van Daan is urging Mr. Frank to pick up the phone and just listen. He chastises Peter for taking Mr. Frank's side.

Mr. Van Daan makes the dramatic statement that they will wait there until they die. Mrs. Van Daan becomes hysterical, screaming that she will kill herself. Mr. Van Daan blames Mrs. Van Daan for getting them into this situation because she wouldn't leave her precious things when he wanted to escape the country in the beginning.

Peter goes to his bed and is despondent. Anne tries to comfort him with her positive outlook. She wishes Peter had religion to give him something in which to believe. She tries to get him to "think himself out" of the hiding place. She tries to get him to imagine himself in a lovely outdoor place to take his mind off the horrible conditions under which they have been living for the past 2 years. Peter is on the verge of going crazy, too, with the waiting.

Anne tells him to look at the good round them and to look outside at the beauty of nature and the goodness of the people who have helped them: Mr. Kraler, Miep, Dirk, the vegetable man, all risking their lives to help them every day. Anne tells him that when she is afraid, she thinks of these things and is not afraid anymore. She finds herself and God in the goodness around her.

Anne reminds Peter that they are not the only people to have suffered in the world. Sometimes it's one race, sometimes another. She thinks the world is going through a phase, and it might not pass for hundreds of years, but someday, in spite of everything, people who are really good at heart will prevail. She tells Peter to look at their lives as a little minute in the life of a great pattern.

Suddenly, there is a screech of brakes, and cars pull up outside the building. Men pound on the street door. They all retreat to their rooms to prepare. Mr. Frank tells them, "For the past two years we have lived in fear. Now we can live in hope."

Mr. Frank gets bags and hands them to Margot and Anne. Peter kisses Anne goodbye and goes to his room to get his things. Mr. Frank brings Mrs. Frank her bag, and they stand together waiting as the lower door is broken down. Anne stands looking at her mother and father with a reassuring smile. She is no longer a child, but a woman with courage to meet what lies ahead.

Anne writes in her diary that they are waiting for them to get their things; they can each take a bag of clothing only, and so Anne must leave her diary behind. Her last entry is, "P.S., Please, please, Miep or Mr. Kraler, or anyone else. If you should find this diary, will you please keep it safe for me, because some day I hope . . ."

Act 2 Scene 4 Analysis

The waiting and hiding are about to be over for the Frank family and guests. Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan go down to the end bickering and blaming each other for their troubles. They have learned nothing from their ordeal, which has served only to harden their hearts and make them worse human beings toward each other and their son. They have failed in this ordeal, and the reader is left with little hope that they will meet the trials of the concentration camp any closer in likeness to their God.

Mr. Frank, in contrast, is steadfast to his faith in God and deliverance from this evil to the end. His statement, "Now we can live in hope," is a testament to the faith of man. Mr. Frank is a man of faith. Just as Anne wishes for Peter to have something to believe in, Mr. Frank is an example of living this faith. The Creator in Mr. Frank and Anne's life offers hope, hope for more to life than the misery life can bring, and raising one's spirits above life's misery is one of man's challenges in this life. Mr. Frank and Anne have come to understand this.

Mr. Frank and Anne met this challenge well in their 2-year ordeal. Anne struggled as she matured, bringing turmoil to those around her, including her mother, Mr. Dussel, and the Van Daans. Eventually, the effort and growth that came from it brought her to offer hope to Peter and her parents as she tried valiantly to bolster Peter's despondency and give him something to hold onto in the coming terrible ordeal of captivity. She also offered it to her parents with her reassuring smile at them as she bravely faced the unknown, but undoubtedly horrible, future at the hands of the Gestapo.

Anne correctly imagines that their lives at that moment in history are but a little minute in the great pattern. Anne's last words epitomize the triumph of her spirit over the evil controlling the world: "... because some day I hope ..."

Act 2 Scene 5

Act 2 Scene 5 Summary

It is again November, 1945, returning to the first setting with Mr. Frank, Mr. Kraler, and Miep. The bitterness is gone from Mr. Frank after finishing his reading of Anne's diary. Miep tells Mr. Frank that she had gone to the country to look for food, and when she returned, she found the block surrounded. It was the thief that told on them.

Mr. Frank tells them that Anne was happy in the concentration camp in Holland where they were first sent. She loved being outside after 2 years of indoor confinement. The news was good with the Americans and British sweeping through France. They hoped they would get to them in time, but in September, they were shipped to Poland: the men to Auschwitz and the women to Belsen. They were freed in January, but the war was not quite over, and they were shuffled around. At each stop they would ask around whether anyone knew his wife, Margot, or Anne, the Van Daans, or Mr. Dussel, and eventually he found out they were dead.

Mr. Frank turns to the last pages of Anne's diary and reads: "In spite of everything, I still believe that people are really good at heart."

Mr. Frank: "She puts me to shame." They are silent and the play ends.

Act 2 Scene 5 Analysis

Mr. Frank has circled the full spectrum from bitterness to the calm of acceptance. The power of Anne's spirit of hope has calmed him. Anne came through the worst of life's horrible experiences: through the twisting of human spirits, through the despondency of hopelessness, and through the excruciating pressure of living in constant, daily fear for her life. She witnessed the Van Daans' deterioration. She witnessed the nobleness of her father in the face of pressure to give up his religious morals in the scramble for self-preservation, and through all of this, Anne was the one to triumph over the human spirit and become the one most like her God.

Anne was forgiving in her last days in her belief that people are really good at heart. She reached out to those who were hurting. She comforted and encouraged Peter to bear his humiliation over his father's greedy and selfish behavior and later tried to show him how to raise his spirit out of the prison and hope for the future of mankind. She showed her love for everyone in the group when she gave personal individual presents during Hanukkah in an effort to make everyone smile a little at a time when all were saddened by the loss of the lives they had left behind. She tried to convince them all to love life each day and find the beauty in the trees and sky. She admitted to Peter that this was where she met God and derived her strength. Her faith was a simple, but profound, one that matured through adversity, hardship, pain, and fear.

Anne's spirit endured as a testimony to the goodness of people's hearts. She aspired to doing something great with her life, to become a writer and write things that would live on after she was gone. This, too, she accomplished, and the first person to be touched and calmed by her simple faith and hope was her father. Sixty years later, she still impresses her hope upon those who experience her simple faith through the reading of her diary.

Characters

Jan Dussel

Mr. Dussel is the dentist who comes to live with the Franks and the Van Daans after they have been in hiding about two months. He is a neighbor of Miep's boyfriend, and when the Nazis begin rounding up and deporting the Jews, he has nowhere to go. Originally supposed to stay only for a few days, Mr. Dussel remains in the attic until the Gestapo take everyone away.

In his fifties and set in his ways, Mr. Dussel is difficult to get along with. He refuses to adjust to the reality of so little space shared by so many people. He also stirs up worry, for example, by making everyone fearful that the thief will report them. He also makes his dislike of Anne clear. For instance, when Mr. Van Daan says in reaction to Anne's nightmare screams, "I thought someone was murdering her," Mr. Dussel answers, "Unfortunately, no."

Anne Frank

Anne is thirteen years old when her family goes into hiding. She is a rambunctious, precocious, friendly, talkative girl. In the Franks' life in Amsterdam, Anne had many friends at school, and now, lonely in the attic, she turns to her diary as the confidante with whom she can share her thoughts. She tells her diary about her family, her past, her feelings, and her hopes for the future.

Anne's boisterousness and her determination to act as she feels and not as others believe she should pose a challenge; Mrs. Frank and the Van Daans think she should act more like a young lady, but Anne refuses to change her personality to their wishes. She rebels against societal restrictions and the values of an older generation. However, while Anne's imagination, enthusiasm, and will cannot be subdued, at times, as when Anne makes Hanukkah presents for everyone, this quality is greatly appreciated.

Although carefree on the exterior, Anne has many serious concerns that she keeps hidden. She worries about her relationship with her mother and her inability to control herself, particularly with regard to acting hurtful toward others. Another major concern is her writing; she has decided that her goal in life is to become a famous writer, but she does not know if she will be able to write well enough to "go on living even after my death." Anne also spends her time thinking about the events that have shaken the world. She knows about the concentration camps, but she still insists on believing that the world will be a better place someday. Her last words in the play are hopeful ones: "I think the world may be going through a phase, the way I was with Mother. It'll pass, maybe not for hundreds of years, but some day . . . I still believe, in spite of everything, that people are really good at heart." Anne dies in the concentration camp when she is fifteen years old.

Edith Frank

Mrs. Frank is a reserved woman, and she believes that her daughters should be the same way. Her lack of understanding regarding Anne's personality makes it impossible for the two to share a sustained emotional connection; nevertheless, she is hurt by Anne's continual rejection of her ideals and her affection. Mrs. Frank takes on the role of conciliator, trying to keep things calm in the attic; for example, she is willing that Anne should give up her one friend—Peter—to appease Mrs. Van Daan. Though she rarely argues—as Margot points out to Anne, "She can't talk back. . . . It's just not in her nature to fight back"—the night she catches Mr. Van Daan stealing food is the last straw. She adamantly demands that Mr. Van Daan leave the attic. Only Miep's arrival with good news deters her from making him leave. Mrs. Frank dies in the concentration camps.

Margot Frank

Margot, Anne's older sister, is eighteen years old when they first go into hiding. She is a reserved young woman. Margot is in every way a well-brought-up young lady. She is obedient and respectful. She does her studies with her father and helps her mother with the chores of the house. She loans her high heels to her younger sister. She rarely disagrees, but one notable exception, which shocks her mother, occurs when Margot declares, "Sometimes I wish the end would come . . . whatever it is." Margot dies in the concentration camps.

Otto Frank

Mr. Frank and his family immigrated to Holland in the 1930s, when Adolf Hitler came into power in Germany. Mr. Frank started an import business, but the business was taken from him when the Germans conquered Holland in 1940. The family lived under increasingly repressive circumstances for a few years, but afraid of what would happen to the Jews, Mr. Frank arranged for his family to go into hiding in the attic above his former business. He invited the Van Daans as well, out of gratitude for Mr. Van Daan's help when he first arrived in Holland.

Mr. Frank is the head of the "attic" family, but he willingly shares any information regarding their safety with everyone else. His calmness and patience lead him to try to work out the difficulties that arise between members of the household. Mr. Frank is also a loving, helpful father. He teaches the girls so they do not fall behind in their studies, and he invites Peter to take part in these lessons as well. He and Anne share a special bond; Anne turns to him with her fears and nightmares, not to her mother.

Of the eight occupants in the attic, only Mr. Frank survives the concentration camps. He returns to Amsterdam in November 1945, but the memories are too painful for him, and he decides he must leave, though he doesn't yet know where he will go.

Miep Gies

Miep Gies, a Christian, is about twenty years old when the Franks go into hiding. She was a secretary in Mr. Frank's business, and now, along with Mr. Kraler, she becomes the lifeline to the attic occupants, bringing them food, other necessities, and luxuries such as books. Miep is also the person who finds and saves Anne's diary, which she gives to Mr. Frank when he returns to Amsterdam.

Kraler

Mr. Kraler, a Dutchman, worked for Mr. Frank before the Nazis took away his business. Now, Mr. Kraler runs the business. He willingly risks his life to help his friend and former employer. Either he or Miep visit the attic every day to bring food for the families. Mr. Kraler's health suffers as a result of this strain; at one point, he is hospitalized for ulcers and eventually undergoes an operation.

Peter Van Dann

Peter Van Daan is about sixteen when the families go into hiding. He is a shy, socially awkward boy with an inferiority complex. His closest friend has been his cat, whom he brings to the attic with him. As he tells Anne, he is a "lone wolf." At first hostile toward Anne, eventually he realizes that she is a "fine person," and the two become close friends. With Anne, Peter is able to share his private thoughts. Peter dies in the concentration camps.

Petronella Van Daan

Mrs. Van Daan is vain, flirtatious, and difficult to get along with. She has a high regard for material objects. According to her husband, it was her refusal to give up her possessions that prevented them from leaving Holland earlier and resettling in Switzerland and America. In the attic, she can be found constantly caressing the fur coat that her father once gave her. She places this coat above all else; she gets upset when her husband insists on selling it so that they can buy food and other necessities, and she doesn't spare Anne's feelings when the girl spills milk on the coat by accident. Mrs. Van Daan and her husband continually argue, but she still looks out for him, for example, by giving him the largest servings of food. Mrs. Van Daan dies in the concentration camps.

Putti Van Daan

Mr. Van Daan helped Mr. Frank when the German man first moved to Holland, which is why Mr. Frank invited the Van Daans to share their hiding place. However, Mr. Van Daan is a selfish man, and this quality introduces problems into the attic. He protests allowing Mr. Dussel to move in with them because it will mean less food for everyone else. It turns out, Mr. Van Daan has been stealing the household's food. Mr. Van Daan is also openly critical of Anne, for example, saying to her, "Why aren't you nice and quiet like your sister Margot? Why do you have to show off all the time?" Mr. Van Daan dies in the concentration camps.

Themes

Repression

The Franks, the Van Daans, and Mr. Dussel are all forced into hiding by the Nazi occupation of Holland. In her diary, Anne chronicles how the Nazis began to take away the rights of the Jews. Mr. Frank lost his business. Jews could not attend schools with non-Jews, go to the movies, or ride on the streetcars. After they go into hiding, the Franks and Van Daans learn from Mr. Dussel that the Nazis have sent all the Jews in Amsterdam to concentration camps. The families' greatest hope for freedom comes from the Allied invasion of the continent, which is led by the Americans.

The rigor of living under such repressive circumstances is seen on a regular basis. The atmosphere in the cramped, crowded attic rooms grows increasingly tense. They cannot set foot aside or breathe fresh air. Anne cannot run, shout, or jump. Giving in to these natural impulses only gets her into trouble, as when she spills milk on Mrs. Van Daan's coat while dancing around the room. Anne's budding friendship with Peter is also repressed by the unnatural situation. When she wants to spend time alone with Peter, she may do so only under six sets of watchful eyes, which follow her as she crosses the room to Peter's door. The effects of such living conditions strain everyone. In act 2, scene 4, when tensions come to a head with Mrs. Frank's insistence that Mr. Van Daan quit the attic, Mr. Frank tells them, "We don't need the Nazis to destroy us. We're doing it ourselves."

Adolescence

Anne is a precocious thirteen-year-old when her family goes into hiding, but she becomes a young woman while living in the attic. Despite the unnatural, frightening circumstances in which she lives, Anne experiences normal adolescent problems, developments, and thrills. Like many teenagers, Anne has a difficult relationship with her mother. Anne believes that her mother does not respect her opinions and makes little effort to understand her. "Whenever I try to explain my views on life to her," Anne tells her father, "she asks me if I'm constipated." Unable to stop herself from doing so, Anne often lashes out at Mrs. Frank. Though she feels regret at causing her mother pain, it happens again and again.

Anne's relationship with Peter most clearly shows her development into young womanhood; for example, she gets dressed up to go visit him in his room at night. The two teenagers form a close friendship, causing both sets of parents to worry about its sexual nature. With Peter, Anne is able to express her innermost feelings, to the extent that she tells him that she would like to share her diary with him. Peter and Anne also share their first kiss. In her diary, she writes about her excitement about this new relationship. "I must confess that I actually live for the next meeting. . . . Is there anything lovelier than to sit under the skylight and feel the sun on your cheeks and have a darling boy in your arms?"

Identity

During the years in hiding, Anne also searches for her own identity. In talking with Mr. Frank, she reveals her ambivalence about who she is. "I have a nicer side, Father, a sweeter, nicer side," she says. She feels that she is really two people, the "mean Anne" who comes out for everyone to see and the "good Anne" who stays hidden inside. Part of her problem in sorting out identity issues, which are quite typical of all teenagers, is that she has no one her own age to talk to. Margot is too serious, and besides, she is always good. For the majority of time, Anne discounts Peter because he is a boy. She has only her diary to turn to, and she writes, "I feel utterly confused. I am longing . . . so longing . . . for everything . . . for friends . . . for someone to talk to . . . someone who understands . . . someone young, who feels as I do." Anne must draw solely on her own self to sort out these conflicting issues and feelings. While Anne explores her identity through her relationship with Peter, she also explores it through her writing. Her diary allows her to see how much she enjoys writing, and she decides to become a writer when she grows up.

Style

Diary

Goodrich and Hackett's play is based on Anne Frank's The *Diary of a Young Girl;* thus, it posed the challenge of creating a cohesive narrative out of a series of personal reflections. Instead of being overwhelmed by the disparate nature of diary entries, the playwrights transform the diary into a narrative vehicle. They introduce the families and the hiding place with Anne's diary entry about the day she and her family left their home. Almost every scene in the play ends with Anne's voice, reading from her diary. These excerpts serve multiple functions of reminding the audience of the play's basis, giving Anne's voice a chance to come through, and allowing the playwrights to summarize events that have taken place between the individual scenes. Anne's diary entries cover such topics as her relationship with her mother, the atmosphere within the attic, and events taking place in the outside world.

Goodrich and Hackett also incorporated within the text of the play several well-known ideas and passages from the diary. Anne exclaims to her mother, "If we begin thinking of all the horror in the world, we're lost! We're trying to hold on to some kind of ideals . . . when everything . . . ideals, hopes . . . everything, are being destroyed!" This speech reflects the passage from Anne's diary in which she writes, "It's difficult in times like these: ideals, dreams and cherished hopes rise within us, only to be crushed by grim reality." Anne also writes in her diary of her life's goals: "I can shake off everything if I write. But . . . and that is the great question . . . will I ever be able to write well? I want to so much. I want to go on living even after my death." This excerpt corresponds to Anne's entry in her diary, "I want to go on living after my death! And therefore I am grateful to God for giving me this gift, this possibility of developing myself and writing, of expressing all that is in me!"

Narrative

The ten-scene play encompasses just over two years, spanning the period of time from July 1942, when the Franks go into hiding, to August 1944, when the Gestapo take them away. The play primarily follows a straightforward chronology, the exceptions being the first and last scenes, both of which take place in November 1945 on the day that Mr. Frank returns to the attic. These two scenes act as "bookends" for the play. The first scene introduces Anne, her family, her diary, and the situation that drove them into hiding. The last scene serves to conclude the drama. Miep reports that it was the thief who reported the occupancy in the attic, and Mr. Frank reports that, of the group, he is the sole survivor.

Characters

Many of the characters in the play represent archetypes more than they portray real, three-dimensional people. Mr. Frank is the sage of the group. He is kind, good, and patient. Everyone turns to him to make the final decision in any difficult situation. He also tries to put a more hopeful spin on their capture by the Gestapo: "For the past two years we have lived in fear," he says. "Now we can live in hope." Margot is the epitome of a good girl. She is obedient and well behaved. She helps her mother cook dinner, lends Anne her high heels, and remains unfazed by Anne's budding relationship with Peter. Mrs. Frank holds out Margot as the exemplar. Peter Van Daan is the shy boy who slowly learns to open up to a peer.

Historical Context

Post-World War I Germany

Germany in the post-World War I years experienced veritable social and economic disaster. The new Weimar Republic, created out of the desire to end the war begun under the rule of Kaiser William II, was unpopular with the German people. Many Germans both opposed a republican government and disliked their political leaders for signing the humiliating and costly Versailles Treaty that ended World War I. For the most part, the Germans saw the Weimar Republic as a traitorous government. Germany also experienced extreme economic difficulties. Unemployment soared, and inflation rose so high that paper money derived a greater value sold as waste paper than as currency.

The Weimar Republic held on to power during its first few years, destroying several attempts at revolution, yet the many political parties that formed in the postwar years vehemently opposed the government. The National Socialist German Workers Party, reorganized as the Nazi Party in 1920, held extremely nationalistic, racist, and anticommunist views. With its promises to protect Germany from Communism, it drew the support of many wealthy business leaders and landowners.

Adolf Hitler, an early Nazi recruit, became head of the party by 1921 and led a failed uprising in Munich in 1923. While imprisoned, Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf (My Struggle)*, in which he expressed Nazi doctrine of obtaining more land for the German people. After his release from prison, Hitler's ideas—which included the repeal of the Versailles Treaty and the restoration of lost German territory—along with his charismatic speeches, attracted many Germans to the Nazi program. With the Great Depression, even more economically hard-hit German voters came to embrace the Nazi platform. By 1932, the Nazis held 230 seats in the Reichstag, the German legislature; however, this was not enough to give the Nazis control of the government. By January 1933, when it appeared that no other party could successfully form a government, the president of the Republic appointed Hitler chancellor. After a fire was set in the Reichstag building the following month, Hitler used his emergency powers to seize complete dictatorial control of the country.

Nazism and Anti-Semitism

Under Hitler's rule, Germany turned into a police state in which the Gestapo, a secret-police force, held wide-ranging powers to round up anyone who opposed them. Liberals, socialists, and Communists were seen as Nazi enemies. Jews, members of the so-called inferior races, also suffered severe persecution. In 1935, the Nazis instituted a series of laws against Jews, called the Nuremberg Laws, which stripped them of citizenship and forbade them from marrying Christian Germans. Jews were excluded from civil service jobs, and over time, from other professions as well. In some cities, Jews were forced to live in ghettos. In November 1938, persecution against the

Jews erupted in nationwide violence. Germans set fire and otherwise damaged Jewish synagogues and Jewish-owned businesses; practically every Jewish synagogue was destroyed. By the beginning of World War II, Jews could not attend public schools, engage in some businesses, own land, associate with non-Jews, or even go to parks, libraries, or museums. They were also forced to live in ghettos. By 1941, Jews were not allowed to use the telephone and public transportation systems, and Jews over six years old were forced to prominently display the yellow Star of David on their clothing. Europe did little to help the Jews, and many Jews tried to leave the continent. From 1931 to 1941, for example, 161,262 immigrant Jews were admitted to the United States, and tens of thousands escaped to British-ruled Palestine. Some Jews also moved to other countries in Europe.

The Netherlands and World War II

At the outbreak of World War II in 1939, when the German army invaded Poland, the Dutch maintained their neutrality. However, their sympathies lay with the Allied powers, which at the time comprised only Great Britain and France. After the conquest of Poland, the German army invaded and seized Scandinavia and then turned its sights west. On May 10, 1940, German armored units invaded the Low Countries—the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. The Netherlands fell in five days. The Dutch city of Rotterdam put up strong resistance, and even while the country's surrender was being negotiated, the German air force leveled the center of the city. The government, as well as the royal family, fled to England, where they formed a government in exile.

The Nazis established a Jewish Council to oversee all Jewish affairs. The Germans then set about separating Jews from the non-Jewish Dutch population, then confiscated Jewish property, and finally started deporting Jews to the concentration camps and work camps. A resistance movement sprang up, but the Germans retaliated against protests harshly. When dockworkers in Amsterdam went on strike to prevent the deportation of Dutch Jews, the Germans responded by executing Dutch hostages. Some Jews were able to go into hiding, but most were deported to the concentration camps. As the end of the war drew near and the Allies drew closer to Germany, the Dutch suffered from severe food shortages, and during the last months before the end of the war in May 1945, they were near famine.

Critical Overview

After several years in creation, in 1956 Goodrich and Hackett's adaptation, *The Diary of Anne Frank*, opened on Broadway to immediate critical acclaim. Brooks Atkinson, theater critic for the *New York Times*, called it a "lovely, tender drama" and lauded Goodrich and Hackett for treating Anne Frank's diary "with admiration and respect." He noted that creating a play out of the diary was practically "impossible" yet asserted that Goodrich and Hackett "have absorbed the story out of the diary and related it simply." *New York Herald Tribune reviewer* Walter Kerr saw the play in a similar manner. Goodrich and Hackett, he wrote, "have fashioned a wonderfully sensitive narrative out of the real-life legacy left us by a spirited and straightforward Jewish girl." Goodrich and Hackett won several awards for *The Diary of Anne Frank*, including a Tony Award for best play of the season and the Pulitzer Prize in 1956.

Critics also strongly responded to the play's optimistic message; such optimism prevails despite the death of seven of the eight people who went into hiding. "[F]or all its pathos," Kerr declared, the play, was "as bright and shining as a banner." Greg Evans, writing for *Variety*, raved about the play as an "inspiring tribute to [the] human capacity for nobility." Nowhere was this spirit more evident, according to these critics, than in Anne herself, whom Atkinson called "unconquerable because she is in love with life and squeezes the bitterness and sweetness of every moment that comes her way."

The passage of time, however, has not been so kind to the play or its writers. Contemporary critics have tended to see the play, at best, as stilted, melodramatic, and sentimental, and at worst, as universalizing and watering down the horrors of Nazi oppression. More than forty years after the play's original production, in an article in *Commentary,* Molly Magid Hoagland called the play a "construct." As Hoagland noted, "As many critics have since pointed out, missing from the play were Anne's intellect, her sense of irony, her dark foreboding, her sensuality, and most of all her Jewish consciousness."

In 1997, Wendy Kesselman revised Goodrich and Hackett's original play to bring *The Diary of Anne Frank* back to Broadway. As critics turned a fresh eye to Anne's updated story, their attention returned to the 1956 version, often to its detriment. What once was seen, in the words of Walter Kerr writing for the *New York Times* in 1979, as a "10-scene structure that Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett so carefully, so persuasively, constructed out of the unfinished memoir left by a Jewish girl in a Dutch loft," became, in the words of Markland Taylor writing for *Variety*, more "a blueprint than a fully developed play." Criticism also has been lodged against Goodrich and Hackett's characterizations, particularly in portraying Anne as an innocent, saintly girl. However, as Hoagland pointed out, some of the criticism lodged against Goodrich and Hackett can fairly be lodged against the newer version of the play, which had the intended purpose to "repair its faults" but which still fails to present the complexity that is Anne as she presented herself in her diary.

Criticism

- Critical Essay #1
- Critical Essay #2
- Critical Essay #3

Critical Essay #1

Korb has a master's degree in English literature and creative writing and has written for a wide variety of educational publishers. In the following essay, Korb discusses the play's narrative structure.

Upon the initial production of *The Diary of Anne Frank*, critics commented upon the careful structure of the play. In creating the play, Goodrich and Hackett faced the challenge of adapting a personal diary, which spanned about two years' time, into narrative shape. Whereas Anne Frank's diary chronicled the day-to-day life of the families in hiding, all the while touching upon her past and her hopes for the future, the play needed to create a plot with a distinct beginning, middle, and end. Goodrich and Hackett needed to find in Anne's descriptive words a mechanism for creating a play that depicted the growth of a pre-adolescent girl into a young woman as well as the experience of a group of people who are forced to fear for their lives every day. The fact that Goodrich and Hackett worked on this play for about two years seems to indicate that they were well aware of this challenge. Their completed play, though it can be faulted for not strictly adhering to the diary (while also adhering to some of the moral standards of the 1950s), shows a careful attention to plotting and development.

The play opens in November 1945. Hitler and the Nazis have been defeated, and the concentration camps have been liberated. Otto Frank has made his way back to Amsterdam, to the attic where he, his family, the Van Daans, and Mr. Dussel hid. As Mr. Frank moves around the room, accompanied by Miep, he touches the relics of his former life: a glove, a scarf that Anne knit for him for Hanukkah. Unbeknownst to Mr. Frank, an even more important item remains from those years in hiding—Anne's diary. As he picks it up and begins to read the first entry aloud, Anne's voice joins his and then gradually takes over. This scene introduces the key elements of any story—the who, what, where, when, why, and how. The story has been told in an abbreviated form; now it is up to the ensuing scenes to share the emotional resonance that accompanies the bare facts.

Anne's voice reading her diary and the memories that she recounts jettison the audience back to the day in July 1942 when the families first moved into their attic. Mr. Frank lays down the ground rules of their hiding, assigns everyone to a room, and gives Anne the diary. With the exception of Mr. Dussel, who joins them later, this scene introduces all of the play's characters. The audience learns that Mr. Frank has invited the Van Daans to go into hiding with them because of the immense help that Mr. Van Daan provided when he first moved to Amsterdam. This is a crucial bit of information, particularly in light of the tensions the Van Daans introduce into the living situation. Scene 2 also explains the amazingly difficult circumstances under which they must live. During the day, they cannot talk above a whisper, let alone move around their attic apartment. In Mr. Frank's giving Anne the diary (which in real life happened three weeks prior to the move), he is also contributing to the play's dramatic genesis. As Mr. Van Daan points out in the following scene, "Don't you know she puts it all down in that diary?" Anne's diary thus lays claim to its central role in the story.

Scene 3 takes place two months later. Through its depiction of a typical evening in the attic, the playwrights develop important themes and characterizations. After finishing up lessons with her father, the boisterous Anne scuffles with Peter and gets into a fray with Mrs. Van Daan. The ensuing reprimand from her mother gives the play the opportunity to explore the tenuous relationship that exists between Mrs. Frank and Anne. Mrs. Frank is displeased with Anne's behavior and unable to understand her willfulness. In Mrs. Frank's mind, Anne suffers by comparison to Margot, who is "always courteous" and dignified. The scene further develops the audience's understanding of Anne's perception of herself. Unlike her sister, who is held up to her by her mother and the Van Daans as the exemplar for young ladies, Anne is "going to be remarkable." Maybe she will be a dancer or singer, but at any rate, she will be "something wonderful." Anne's ambitions, settling on becoming a writer, will be fleshed out in later scenes.

The play also introduces the tensions that are developing between the adults. Mrs. Van Daan has begun to act with familiarity toward Mr. Frank, whom she only met a short time ago. "I don't know why I didn't meet you before I met that one there [Mr. Van Daan]," she says after kissing Mr. Frank on the mouth. Her actions make Mr. Frank quite uncomfortable and set the foundation for her later gratuitous flirting. Mr. and Mrs. Van Daan also bicker in this scene—as will be their habit. In a rare moment focusing on Mrs. Frank and Margot, Mrs. Frank confides that she "told your father it wouldn't work" having the Van Daans live with them.

Another important element of the scene is the arrival of Mr. Dussel, which immediately creates more tension. In contrast to Mr. Van Daan, Mr. Frank wholeheartedly agrees to Mr. Dussel's staying with them for awhile. Mr. Dussel's arrival is crucial for another reason: he shares with the Franks and the Van Daans news about the deportation of Amsterdam's Jewish population to the concentration camps.

Scene 4 is a short scene that focuses on Anne's waking up from a nightmare and being comforted by her father. This scene is most notable for the way it explores Anne's inner anxieties and confusion and the effect her feelings have on her family. Awakened by Anne's screams, Mrs. Frank rushes to her daughter's side, but Anne sends her mother away, asking instead for her father. When Mr. Frank chastises Anne for making her mother cry, Anne responds, "Oh, Pim, I was horrible, wasn't I? And the worst of it is, I can stand off and look at myself doing it and know it's cruel and yet I can't stop doing it." The truthfulness with which Anne addresses the problem and the raw emotion displayed by Anne and her mother add poignancy to the mother-daughter relationship.

Act 2 closes with the next scene, which takes place on the first night of Hanukkah. Surprising everyone with gifts, Anne introduces the much needed holiday spirit. In the midst of this celebration, the families hear the sound of a person in the offices below. In their haste to turn all the lights off so that whoever is below will not hear them, Peter knocks over a chair. The scene remains tense, even after the noises downstairs cease. The families worry that whoever was downstairs heard them and will report them. Only Anne's singing "Oh, Hanukkah," which the rest join in on, brings back their courage.

Like scene 2, this scene has multiple purposes. On the level of character development, it shows Anne's thoughtfulness. It also adds a dramatic note to a play whose ending most of the audience will already know. Further, it ties the two halves of the play together. The thief who breaks into the office is the person who eventually reports the families' presence to the Nazis. This is a notable departure from reality, since to this day, no one knows who reported the Franks and the others. By using poetic license, the playwrights show their interest in forming the play into a more cohesive body than Anne's diary.

The final scene of act 1 also sets the tone for act 2, which opens more than a year later. Numerous changes have taken place, but none reflects the familial unit that was seen at the Hanukkah party. Anne, much to her delight, is developing into womanhood. Mr. Kraler's arrival to tell Mr. Frank of a blackmail attempt by a worker down below sets off another clash between Anne and her mother, who simply "doesn't understand." After Anne runs from the room, Peter follows her. The ensuing conversation, in which Anne finally finds someone with whom she can share her conflicting feelings, leads to a friendship between the two teenagers.

By scene 2, Anne and Peter have developed a romantic friendship, much to the consternation of their mothers. The relationship between the teenagers only heightens the tension in the attic, as do the obvious signs of Anne's development into a woman, such as her wearing Margot's high heels. Anne and Peter have gotten into the habit of visiting in his room, with the door closed. When Mrs. Frank implores Anne not to "give Mrs. Van Daan the opportunity to be unpleasant," Anne retorts that Mrs. Van Daan does not need any such opportunity, thus implying that she has never ceased to be unkind since they first moved into the attic. Anne and Peter's visit that day, ending in a kiss, shows important changes in each: Peter is no longer as shy, and Anne is no longer as lonely. As Anne writes in her diary, the friendship gives her something to look forward to every single day. More tellingly, she also writes of the joy of holding Peter in her arms, thus reveling in the sexual feelings that have accompanied her growing up.

Scene 3 opens with the tensions between Mrs. Frank and the Van Daans finally coming to a head. Mrs. Frank catches Mr. Van Daan stealing food and demands that he leave the attic. No coaxing by her husband can get her to change her mind. It is Miep's arrival, with the news that the Allies have begun their invasion of Europe, that turns her from this path. The attic inhabitants erupt into happiness, but even the end of the scene alludes to the coming tragedy. Though Anne first writes in her diary, "We're all in much better spirits these days," her tone quickly changes:

Wednesday, the second of July, nineteen forty-four. The invasion seems temporarily bogged down. . . . The Gestapo have found the radio that was stolen. Mr. Dussel says they'll trace it back and back to the thief, and then it's just a matter of time 'til they get to us. Everyone is low.

Scene 4 is the denouement of the play. The families tensely listen to the phone ringing below in the office and argue about answering it. Are the phone calls a message from

Miep? In the midst of this fear, Anne, speaking to Peter, asserts what has since become one of the most well-known ideas of the diary:

I know it's terrible, trying to have any faith . . . when people are doing such horrible things . . . but you know what I sometimes think? I think the world may be going through a phase. . . . I still believe, in spite of everything, that people are really good at heart.

When a police car pulls up in front of the building, everyone in the attic knows their fate.

The play's final scene brings the drama full circle; the story ends at its beginning, in November 1945. Mr. Frank, the sole survivor among the attic inhabitants, reiterates Anne's faith in humanity. The play's final words, "She puts me to shame," are spoken by Mr. Frank, but they serve to succinctly illustrate Anne Frank's unique perception, which she was able to hold throughout the ordeal and which her diary allowed her to share with the world.

Source: Rena Korb, Critical Essay on *The Diary of Anne Frank*, in *Drama for Students*, The Gale Group, 2002.

Critical Essay #2

In the following essay, Page calls The Diary of Anne Frank *a "radically altered, shortened, and skewed document," and explores how and why it has been altered in stage and written versions of the work.*

"In spite of everything, I still believe that people are truly good at heart."—Anne Frank [1944]

These lines, written by fifteen-year-old Anne Frank in her "secret annex" in Amsterdam, have become some of the most famous lines uttered from the Holocaust era. They anchor the only version of *The Diary of Anne Frank* known for forty years, the Broadway play of 1955, the 1959 Hollywood movie, as well as more commonplace interpretations such as the *Cliffs Notes* version read by countless high school and college students. The lines, which many may remember reading or hearing in their youth, have come to symbolize the meaning of Anne Frank's life and death. Through these lines, the Holocaust is made endurable by the optimism of a young girl who hid for two years in an Amsterdam warehouse before being taken to Auschwitz. For if she could be optimistic about people (even, it is assumed, Nazis) then there is hope for the world in the aftermath of its greatest horror.

This is the message which countless millions of young people, as well as adults, have heard and learned in the four decades since *The Diary of Anne Frank* was first published in 1952 and subsequently translated into 56 languages. It is a message, most assumed, which originated from the diary, the "authentic" historical document. But now it is clear that what we know as *The Diary of Anne Frank* is in fact something altogether different. The diary, as written by Anne Frank, has been radically manipulated and indeed rewritten by virtually everyone who had rights to it.

This startling realization has spawned a fierce debate in the popular press. Why was the diary so transformed after its author's murder? What has the "revised" diary meant? How has it been used as a tool for understanding the Holocaust? With a new version of the 1955 play on Broadway, two books on the history of the diary, and numerous articles and reviews in major publications, the question of how the diary has fared since its author was separated from her diary and killed at Bergen-Belsen, has suddenly seemed of great import. Over the past year, *The Diary of Anne Frank*, the single most widely read document of the Holocaust, has come under new, and in many ways its first, scrutiny. The fate of Anne Frank was sealed in 1944, but the fate of her diary and the historical legacy she left has suddenly exploded as an issue for intense debate.

This debate, which revolves around the interpretations of the meaning of the Holocaust, the manipulation of the past, and how historical documents are made public, poses central issues to all historians but, I would argue, especially to public historians. Why specifically should public historians be interested in this debate? I am not, after all, reviewing an exhibit or a historical documentary, or describing the Anne Frank Foundation and its museum in Amsterdam. I am not describing and critiquing a monument or a textbook or a curriculum plan for teaching the diary. One might consider the recent debate over the diary as the province of academic historians, or a debate about the uses of history in the popular press and culture. I would argue, however, that the questions raised by this debate are, or should be, at the heart of what public historians are discussing.

The issue with the Anne Frank diary is at its core a story of how a document—a primary source—made its way from a girl's handwritten journal into a best-selling book, a Broadway play, and an Academy Award-winning movie, and how it was manipulated at each stage of its move into the public arena. What the debate over Anne Frank's diary brings us back to is what is always at the heart of our profession as historians and public historians—the nature of documents of the past. In few cases can we see the perils and pitfalls of abusing the primary pieces of the past left for us as clearly as we can in the debate over this diary. For at every stage of its life in public, the document has been reinvented, by everyone from Anne Frank herself to her father, to translators, playwrights, filmmakers, school teachers, foundations, and reviewers. *The Diary of Anne Frank*, which virtually all of us read as children, adolescents, or adults, is a radically altered, shortened, and skewed document.

This, then, is a cautionary tale for our profession. It should remind us of the centrality of documents to our work, their remarkable flexibility, and their susceptibility to manipulation by well-wishers or evil-doers. The irony is that all of us who have used the diary for history classes or in the course of public history work have unwittingly perpetuated a mistaken understanding of Anne Frank and her diary. I would argue that despite the most recent revelations about the diary's manipulation, we still have not addressed the most fundamental question: How do we reclaim the meaning of a cultural icon such as Anne Frank from the forces which have reinvented her in often cynical ways? How can we, especially now, help to return the public for which we work to a fuller confrontation with this—how can I say it?—most awful of documents.

I offer these reflections and pose these dilemmas from a series of involvements in the debate. First, as a professor of a historical methods and philosophy course for new majors, I used the various documents in the debate about Anne Frank's diary to illustrate and discuss the politics of the past. As a public historian interested in the politics of memory and the manipulations of the past, I was invited to participate in an event in which the two different stage versions of a single scene were presented—one by Meyer Levin (which was never produced) and the 1955 play by Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett. Finally, as a public historian and scholar of how Americans have used and misused the past, I have followed this mid-century tale of bringing history to the public with special fascination.

Little of this valuable debate would have taken place without a searing polemic on the subject by one of our foremost essayists, Cynthia Ozick. Indeed, the publication of her 1997 *New Yorker* article, "Who Owns Anne Frank?" was as much an event as the return of the play version to Broadway. Ozick's essay was built around the confluence of three new interpretations of *The Diary of Anne Frank*—the publication of two new books on the history of the diary since it was recovered by Otto Frank from Miep Gies, one of the

Dutch protectors of the Frank family, as well as the opening of the revised stage version by Wendy Kesselman.

Ozick jolted readers in part because she brought a much wider reading public the arguments made in the books by Ralph Melnick and Lawrence Graver. The books lay blame in different places and to different degrees, but each reveals the clear and extensive manipulation of the diary towards one ultimate end: the transformation of the diary into a document of consolation and uplift, a salvational historical work, which can help us find optimism in the heart of evil. Melnick is the far more critical and accusatory work (which makes it the favored interpretation by Ozick), suggesting ultimately that the softening of the Jewish themes in the Broadway play version was the product of a conspiracy, with Lillian Hellman at the center. We can dispense with the more bizarre claims—for example, Melnick's suggestion that Lillian Hellman received direct payments from Moscow to soften the "Jewishness" of the play—without losing the thrust of his findings: that the diary was subject not just to artistic interpretation but to calculated manipulation and censorship. Otto Frank, perhaps understandably, eliminated those passages in which Anne spoke of her sexual yearnings or of her hatred for her mother. The translator who brought the play to Germany chose to eliminate those passages of sheer hatred not only for Hitler but for Germans more generally. Goodrich and Hackett, in consultation with Hellman, eliminated most of the references to the Franks as Jews and focused instead on the story of the stirring of adolescence of Anne and her struggle for love amidst the stresses of war. In reviewing the play for the *New York Times* in 1955, Brooks Atkinson wrote that Goodrich and Hackett had wonderfully portrayed the "shining spirit of a young girl. . . . They have not contrived anything; they have left the tool-kit outside the door of their workroom. They have absorbed the story out of the diary and related it simply." What the history of the diary shows, and what Ozick so fervently argued, was that there is nothing further from the truth. The story they told was a radically altered version of Anne Frank's life as told in the diary, designed to fit the needs of Broadway producers and Americans in the 1950s. It has continued to serve the needs of hundreds of thousands of teachers worldwide, who have found the diary the perfect answer to their search for an accessible, and perhaps not too depressing, work on the Holocaust.

Ozick catalogued these abuses of the document and focused especially on the elimination of "Anne's consciousness of Jewish fate or faith." To popularize the diary as an uplifting story of courage and youthful love required, Ozick argued, the removal of the specifically Jewish story that is integral to the diary. The diary was, Ozick wrote sharply, subject to "evisceration": "Evisceration, an elegy for the murdered. Evisceration by blurb and stage, by shrewdness and naiveté, by cowardice and spirituality, by forgiveness and indifference, by success and money, by vanity and rage, by principle and passion, by surrogacy and affinity. Evisceration by fame, by shame, by blame. By uplift and transcendence. By usurpation."

Ozick did not end here and thereby offer readers an opportunity to shake their heads in dismay and then quickly move on. She resisted making the simplistic call for a better, fuller interpretation of the diary. Instead, Ozick posed what is sacrilege for historians of all stripes: she suggested that Anne Frank's diary has been so manipulated that one must wonder if Miep Gies should have saved it at all. Might it have been better had the diary disappeared, or been burned, as Anne would have been had she not succumbed to typhus? As Ozick puts it, more pungently: "It may be shocking to think this (I am shocked as I think it), but one can imagine a still more salvational outcome: Anne Frank's diary burned, vanished, lost—saved from a world that made of it all things, some of them true, while floating lightly over the heavier truth of named and inhabited evil."

The thought is astonishing, and infuriating to a historian as well as to the general public. At first, this conclusion to the article seems like a form of absurd rhetorical pyrotechnic. As a historian, there is an almost visceral resistance to Ozick's suggestion: if there is anything that historians can all agree to, it is that documents of the past should be preserved so that over time society can interpret and reinterpret them. The building blocks of our endeavor are the documents from the past. But Ozick's suggestion is not lightly offered—indeed, she is shocked herself to suggest it—but seriously proposed in order to awaken us to the immensity of the diary's cynical transformation. Considering how far the manipulation of the diary has gone, and how its interpretation has been shaped by the censors and translators and playwrights and Hollywood producers, it is worth at least wondering how an important document can make its way through the minefields of popularization.

Consider one widely read "spin-off" of Anne Frank's diary: the *Cliffs Notes* to the diary, first published in 1984. The bulk of the booklet is a detailed summary of the diary, recounting the daily developments in the annex much like a soap opera digest. The main thrust of the interpretive sections of the notes follows those of the Broadway play and Hollywood movie precisely: "Above all else, Anne's feelings are ordinary and so akin to those experienced by any teenager growing up and being confronted by situations and with individuals which he or she is not yet capable of dealing with in a detached or adult way. One of the most striking features that emerges from Anne's diary is the sense of the intensity of the emotions that she experiences as an adolescent." "Essay Topics" are proposed for students: "Try to keep a diary for a week. Can you make it interesting and varied?" "What do you think makes Anne's diary interesting?" "Pretend that Anne survived the concentration camps. Write an account of what she did when she grew up." The *Cliffs Notes* version is hardly more offensive than other volumes in this plentiful series of cheat sheets. But it speaks authoritatively about a very different diary than the one we know to be Anne Frank's actual words.

Ozick wrote her article before the new Broadway play version returned to the stage but she anticipated not liking this version much more than the original play and its Academy Award-winning movie of 1959. She was not mistaken.

The common attitude in the press has been that the new play version of the diary is an improvement because it adds in some lines about Anne's sexual awakening and her conflicts with her mother and because it reintroduces the Jewish aspects in the diary. Others, such as Ben Brantley of *The New York Times,* offered greater praise. With an "uncompromising steadiness of gaze, embedded in a bleak sense of historical context," he wrote, the play is "undeniably moving." Indeed, Kesselman has gone to great lengths to make the Judaism more prominent, to make the Nazi threat seem much closer and more ominous. She has also added extensive voice-overs of lengthy passages from the diary.

But this is merely window-dressing. The 1998 play on Broadway maintains the basic structure of the earlier version and develops the same themes of adolescent awakening amidst the stresses of wartime. Those who praise the play version focus still on the progress of Anne from "self-centered girlishness to the cusp of self-aware womanhood." And the reaction remains the expected "snuffles and sobs from the audience." (The critic Vincent Canby reports on a different reaction: at the end of the play, a woman in the row in front of him exclaimed to her companion, in shock: "You mean, she dies?") The Nazi evil is felt in booming sounds of Hitler over the radio, shadows coming in through the windows, and frightening noises in the building below as inspections bring the Franks closer to capture. The ending is pure 1950s melodrama: the SS, with very classy handguns and cocked hats, burst in while the group is enjoying a rare treat of strawberries.

The comparison that immediately came to mind was the Civil War television series by Ken and Ric Burns. This series was praised profusely for its powerful use of images from the Civil War, its stunning voice-overs by some of our finest actors, and its attempt to incorporate more than previous movies and popular Civil War histories the experience of slaves, of women, of common men on both sides. It remains, however, deeply deficient as a work of public history. For despite these efforts, there is also a nostalgic overtone to each of the thirteen episodes. The maddening repetition of the theme song, the opening sunsets over cannons, the framing of each series with military battles, and the setting of the whole series as a battle of brother against brother (white, of course), as a painful but necessary episode, now all neatly, resolved—all contribute to giving the viewer a message of nostalgia. That was a great time, the Burns brothers suggest, a time of noble fights over ideals, which is now (sadly) all gone, in the distant past. Similarly, in the play version of *The Diary of Anne Frank*, all the tweaking of scripts, the cutting and pasting, does little to restore the power of the diary or even to begin to undo the half century of manipulation.

Ozick, with the aid of Ralph Melnick's book, lines up behind the other play which was written to bring the diary to stage. Ralph Melnick most vociferously argues that had Meyer Levin, the journalist, photographer, and playwright who first urged Otto Frank to bring the diary to a wider audience, been given the job, the play version of the diary would have risen above the aspartame lessons of Hollywood's Goodrich and Hackett. In many ways, Melnick is continuing the battle Levin waged from the moment it became clear that he was to be removed from the Broadway team bringing the play to the stage. Originally favored by Otto Frank as the most able to bring Anne Frank's story to the stage, Levin was removed in favor of Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett by the producers, Garson Kanin and Kermit Bloomgarten. Levin countered with lawsuits, editorials, and an autobiography to defend his version and lambaste what he saw as the desecration of the diary.

Because of the success of the play and movie, Levin's version quickly slipped into oblivion. But because of Melnick's championing of Levin's cause, the Hatikvah Center in Springfield, Massachusetts sponsored a reading of two identical scenes-between Anne and Peter, the son of the other family in the annex—from the 1955 Broadway version and Levin's own rarely produced version. It was a fascinating afternoon and deeply troubling, for it showed how the diary was so effectively sapped of some of its most tragic and powerful meaning as it made its journey from private journal to public entertainment. The Goodrich and Hackett version, no one would now deny, goes as far as it can to erase the Jewish aspects of the diary and to promote a universalist message of faith and hope. "I wish you had a religion," Anne says to Peter. "I just mean some religion . . . it doesn't matter what. Just to believe in something!" Levin's version of the same scenes is substantially different. Anne is suddenly not a Levittown teenager of the 1950s but a young Jewish girl with a far darker view of the world. In Levin's version, Peter longs for the time after the war when he can leave behind his Jewish heritage and just "be one of them." Anne retorts: "But Peter. It wouldn't be honest. . . . We can never be just Netherlanders, or just English, or just French. We will always remain Jews." Whereas Goodrich and Hackett end with Anne's hopeful lines (taken out of their context in the diary) about the goodness of people, Levin's play ends with Anne gloomily reflecting (with words directly from her diary) on a world "turning into a wilderness."

The tone of Levin's play as a whole is markedly different than that of the Goodrich and Hackett version, and his script courageously addresses the Jewish themes head on. But Levin's version has its own spin, which has less to do with the diary than with his own political beliefs. Many of these speeches about being true to one's Jewish roots are based not on the diary but on Levin's own political beliefs. Although I would happily substitute Levin's version for Goodrich and Hackett's—an exaggeration of Anne's clear moral code and identification with Jewish persistence seems a lesser fault than the ethnic cleansing of Goodrich and Hackett—it hardly answers the need for truer public adaptation of the diary.

Most disturbing in all three of the play versions is that so much of them is invented. Voice-overs in the new Broadway version (horribly amplified in the theater) lead the audience to believe that the play is largely an enactment of the diary, which it could never be. The ending scene so crucial to our emotional reaction (the sobs from the audience some critics crowed about in the updated Broadway version) is, of course, not in the diary. Indeed, Anne's diary ends, on August 1, 1944, with a long entry in which she ruminates on "trying to find a way to become what I'd like to be and what I could be if . . . if only there were no other people in the world." Numerous scenes are only briefly noted in the diary, and there is virtually no dialogue. Departing from the document is necessary, of course, for transposing a historical document into another medium. But I wondered, by the end of the new Broadway play, after all that has happened to the diary, if a stage version were worth undertaking. Indeed, I wondered if a stage version, necessitating dialogue and action that is not in the diary at all, contributes to the diary's continued manipulation. For what the play version offers is a revised, perhaps improved and more honest, reflection of the diary. But Anne still becomes a symbol, mostly of an adolescent girl growing up in difficult circumstances, and less so of a Jew who will become a victim of the Holocaust.

But even this debate over what would be the true artistic rendition of the diary is somewhat misleading. What is implied is that there is a single understanding of the diary and its writer. In fact, what is striking as one rereads the diary and also the histories of the diary's life after Anne's murder, is the repeated rewriting of this document called *The Diary of Anne Frank*. It begins with Anne herself, the Jew, the adolescent girl, the German, and also, the writer. When scholars now speak of the diary they must speak about the versions: A, B, C, Definitive. Diary A is what Anne wrote in two years in hiding. Diary B is the diary with parts that she herself had begun to rewrite. One must remember that the diary—or, more accurately, its rewriting—was inspired, in part, by a 1944 radio message from Gerritt Bolkestein, a member of the Dutch government in exile, urging that Dutch citizens maintain records of war-time occupation so that evidence would be available after the war was over. Anne hoped to publish her diary—she titled this supposedly private journal "The House Behind"—and planned to go to Hollywood and become a screenwriter. In her revisions to her diary, Anne changed the names—she was Anne Aulis and, in a further revision, Anne Robin. Thus, the diary was almost a draft in progress for her, not a running series of events and observations. Diary C is what was known as *The Diary of a Young Girl* for nearly forty years; it was the edition approved by 0tto Frank and it became the basis for the millions of editions published in dozens of languages, as well as the play and movie versions. The "official" version, however, is approximately one-third shorter than the diary, or diaries, that Anne had written in those two years. Only after forty years was the "definitive edition" published in 1991 that restored much of what was removed from versions A and B. (It still is, however, titled *The Diary of a Young Girl,* which was never Anne's title for it.) But even the diary we now mistakenly call the definitive version fails to show how Anne herself edited her writing—it does not show the pseudonyms she invented, nor does it show where she edited (although it includes a few passages added or edited by Anne herself). Although the definitive edition brings back into public light Anne Frank's words, in a way it is the least honest of the versions since it suggests "definitiveness" while it simply creates a new text altogether. Publishing a composite of drafts of *The Great Gatsby* as the definitive novel, for example, would hardly have pleased F. Scott Fitzgerald.

I use the analogy of a novel intentionally. What few have reckoned with in trying to come to terms with the meaning of the diary is that Anne Frank was a writer. Cynthia Ozick began her New Yorker piece with the surprising line that "even if she had not kept the extraordinary diary through which we know her it is likely that we would number her among the famous of this century . . . She was born to be a writer." To convey to the public the meaning of Anne Frank's diary, we must also understand that it was itself a work of public history. What we fail to understand about this document, and probably so many documents that we as public historians try to interpret, is that the documents themselves were meant to be secondary sources, works of history for the public themselves. Anne's diary was written not simply as a private journal (although she did, as any writer might, jealously protect her drafts from prying outsiders) to be kept under lock and key. She always expected that this work would be a crucial journal of the war, not just an unconscious document (I believe there are few of these, at least in the textual realm), but a conscious interpretation of the meaning of hiding, as a Jew, from Nazi Germany.

All efforts to understand Anne Frank and her unique work must contend with this fact. Indeed, by ignoring Anne's conscious development of the diary as a work of literature, we misconstrue the diary, misrepresent its author, and take inaccurate lessons that we perceive to be offered by an unconscious author.

So, how might we then, as public historians, attempt to bring *The Diary of Anne Frank* out of its textual covers and into the realm of public history? The irony of Ozick's position is that through her writing (and the publication of her writing in a prestigious magazine), the revelatory history of the diary is making its way into public light. It is difficult now for a broad segment of the reading public not to be aware that the diary has been altered repeatedly. Perhaps the complete diary can now begin to have a new career as a document of the war and of the Holocaust.

A public interpretation of Anne Frank should make one think again; it should challenge people, not just make them weep for a moment. A growing group of artists of Holocaust memorials in Germany, Israel, and the United States have recognized a simple fact of memorials: they often do as much to aid forgetting as promote active remembering. By offering readily accessible narrative forms (soldiers with guns, obelisks, grand archways), traditional memorials universalize particular tragedies in the service of advancing the politically useful feelings of nationalism, jingoism, and individual heroism. "Counter monuments" avoid these simple forms and their suspect purposes; they offer new ways of considering the costs of war and genocide. One barely glances at the American Legion—inspired Vietnam memorial of three soldiers, while one heads to the stunning black granite monument by Maya Lin. It is a monument which makes one stop and think, weep but also honor the dead, consider and remember.

But in the case of a public presentation of *The Diary of Anne Frank*, which is based on an actual historical document, a recognition of the full complexity of that document would return us to the essence of what the diary is, a continuing, writerly record of hiding by a Jewish girl who knew evil and sensed its invasion into her "Secret Annex" and who eventually was murdered by it. The philosopher Karsten Harries has written that the "ethical function" of architecture is to "represent" the act of building, that is, to make people think again about the very notion of building and the existential experience of dwelling. Just so, a public historical interpretation of *The Diary of Anne Frank* should differ from the versions presented in the entertainment venues by promoting remembering of Anne Frank's particularity, rather than her universality, as a Jew, a young girl, a victim. A public historical interpretation may also focus on the document's life itself, its strange career since 1944, which says so much about the manipulation of history over the past half century.

One can imagine a public reading of the diary, with entries read on the anniversaries of Anne's writing of them. Or perhaps there could be parallel readings of different versions of this document, from Anne's versions A, B, and C to the Goodrich and Hackett script to Levin's version. One can also imagine a play written about the successive rewritings of the play—a play about the diary's career. In some ways, the play's life since Anne Frank was murdered could be its most lasting meaning. The diary itself has, for too long and for too many, been asked to hold the weight of meaning for the entire Holocaust. Ozick argues that the diary is "not a Holocaust document." Indeed, it has been used as the primary document for students to learn about the Holocaust precisely because the actual extermination of the Jews of Europe is, due to the nature of the document, never detailed.

Source: Max Page, "The Life and Death of a Document: Lessons from the Strange Career of *The Diary of Anne Frank*," in *Public Historian*, Vol. 21, No. 1, Winter 1999, pp. 87-97.

Critical Essay #3

In the following essay, Fife compares the unproduced script Meyer Levin wrote for The Diary of Anne Frank *to the popular version of the play written by Albert Hackett and Frances Goodrich, contending there is ample evidence that the duo plagiarized Levin's work.*

Before his recent death at age 75, Meyer Levin—author of such books as *Compulsion, The Settlers, In Search*—left the world a copy of his Ethical Will, a document that aspired to pass on to humanity "the moral values learned in a lifetime," which Levin deemed to be "as vital as worldly goods." Levin's true concern, however, turned out to be recounting the story surrounding his long "suppressed" stage version of *The Diary of Anne Frank*—a story that had obsessed him through the last thirty years of his life. And yet, despite Meyer's last literary testament, basic questions about the true authorship of the Pulitzer Prize-winning play based on Frank's diary remained unresolved at the time of his death.

Levin's association with the diary began in 1950, when he came upon the book in a French translation and was immediately convinced that he had heard "the voice from the mass graves" for which he'd been searching impatiently ever since covering the Holocaust as a war correspondent. After contacting Otto Frank and discovering that the book had still not found an American publisher, Levin volunteered his assistance on one condition: that he be allowed first crack at adapting the diary for stage and film, even though he could boast little experience in either field. Otto Frank consented to this demand (even while claiming he "couldn't see" his daughter's work as a play), and Levin went on to use his influence by helping persuade Doubleday to publish the diary, as well as by writing a glowing front-page review in *The New York Times Book Review.*

Levin's motive in all this seems not to have been greed—early on, he announced an intention of donating his proceeds to charity—but rather deeply personal and ideological, a combination of the genuine horror he felt having witnessed the liberation of Auschwitz and other death camps, and an awareness of the impact the diary could have as an indictment of Hitler and anti-Semitism. He had already written in his autobiographical memoir, *In Search* (1948), that he conceived of his artistic role as that of a link between the two great Jewish cultural centers of New York and Israel, and what better unifying force could there be than that youthfully heroic figure, Anne Frank? So it came as a blow to Levin when his adaptation of the book was rejected, first by Cheryl Crawford (owner of the original rights) and then by Kermit Bloomgarden (who had picked up her option). Soon Otto Frank himself was asking Levin to step aside in favor of a "world-famous dramatist" (Carson McCullers? Arthur Miller?); in the end Levin found himself replaced by Albert Hackett and Frances Goodrich, a non-Jewish husband-and-wife screenwriting team, who were friends of Levin's great enemy, Lillian Hellman. As if that weren't galling enough, he found their adaptation to be "the ghost of my own play," containing certain key scenes not in the book, along with whole sections of his dialogue, while omitting most of the references to Jewish issues.

Levin promptly sued Bloomgarden, the Hacketts, and Otto Frank for "plagiarism and appropriation of ideas," with the jury returning a verdict in Levin's favor, awarding him 25 percent of the royalties, or half of what the Hacketts were getting. Despite this apparent triumph, however, everything went downhill for Levin from there on. First, the amount he was supposed to receive (stipulated at $50,000) was held up in appeals for so long that he eventually settled for the payment of his $15,000 legal expenses. Then his lawsuit against Anne Frank's father earned him the very damaging reputation of "litigious Levin" that would follow him throughout his career. And finally, the rights to his own adaptation—which were at the heart of the issue—were entirely removed from his possession by Otto Frank's lawyers, who threatened Levin with a countersuit if he even discussed his diary play. Levin challenged this again and again, finally going so far as to help stage a production of his play at the Israeli Soldiers Theater in 1966, which was soon shut down by Otto Frank's lawyers. This was the point at which Levin and Otto Frank were stalemated until 1981, when both men died, apparently putting an end to the issue . . . except for the legacy of doubts and questions they left behind.

Such as: did plagiary on such a bold scale really occur? Why was there so little publicity about the jury's decision? When the trial took place, the Broadway version of the diary had already enjoyed quite a long run, winning the Critics Circle Award, the Tony Award, and the Pulitzer Prize, becoming a very successful box-office hit, and making Otto Frank into a saint overnight. And yet, as Levin never tired of pointing out later on, "not a single publication commented on the fact that for the first time in history, a Pulitzer Prize work had been judged largely the work of another." Why was this so? Why were so few people interested in what was potentially a major scandal in American letters? Why wasn't Levin's version produced as proof that it was so poor it could not be performed, and that it bore no resemblance at all to the Broadway play? And why has there been so little clarification of the issues in the years since?

One reason, of course, is the tremendous popularity that the Hackett version has enjoyed over the years, among audiences of all ages, Jews and Gentiles alike. Another reason is the extreme reverence accorded Otto Frank, whom Levin found to be as "sacrosanct" as the Broadway diary when he went on his campaign to have his own play performed. Jews especially were unreceptive to Levin, feeling that the success of the Hackett play and the subsequent veneration of Otto Frank were both marks of cultural acceptance that should not be slighted. And then there was Levin himself, whose aggressively defiant behavior could alienate even those who believed him, as he insisted on finding "conspiracies" wherever he looked. "Was I being pushed out because of my closeness to Judaism and Zionism?" he asked in the preface to his self-published play. "Was I on some peculiar form of blacklist, a McCarthyism of its own, for my Jewish views?" These charges were the more startling for being aimed at people like Hellman and Bloomgarden, themselves the victims of blacklisting—all of which earned Levin the reputation of being a Red-baiter, on top of everything else. Even worse, they distracted people's attention from the real issues: were there enough similarities between the two plays to substantiate the plagiary charge? And was Levin's version really as good as he claimed, or was it as poor as the producers insisted—that is, did it deserve a production?

After studying the two diary scripts and comparing them with Anne Frank's book, my conclusion is that Levin has a strong case: there appears to be ample evidence that the Hacketts had access to Levin's play, either directly or through someone who was familiar with its style and emphases. Both chronicle the experiences of two Jewish families, the Franks and the van Daans, during the more than two years they spend together in a warehouse attic, hiding out from the Nazis. Both employ the same basic dramatic structure for relating that story: starting out with the families moving into the hiding place, then tracing the development of the characters through their interaction in a chronological series of episodes or scenes. Furthermore, the selection of scenes that both plays choose to present from the wealth of anecdotal material to be found in the diary is almost identical. Finally, both plays call for substantially the same stage design and performance technique: the four rooms of the hiding place are to be visible at all times, so that incidents in separate rooms can occur simultaneously, the actors' lines counterpointing each other.

Of course, all of this could be simply the result of similar creative processes at work on the same source. But this becomes harder to justify when the Hacketts start using scenes and conversations that exist in Levin's play but not in the diary. For instance, when the Jews unwittingly make their presence known to the thieves in Levin's play, it is through the singing of a Hanukkah song; an almost identical device is used in the Hackett version, yet this is not taken from Anne Frank's description. Of course, the moment is very theatrical, very effective, but why should it occur at the same point in both plays when there were so many other possibilities? There are several other uses of almost identical quotes in both plays that appear nowhere in the diary.

Certainly, though, such similarities are not like copying out a whole speech word for word, or duplicating a long scene exactly; yet they recur often enough throughout the Hackett play to make an impression. Equally striking is the pattern of differences and variations between the two plays. Levin often liked to characterize these differences by comparing two passages from the same moment in each of the works, when Anne is in Peter's room toward the end of the play, trying to convince him not to lose heart, to keep up his faith. In Levin's play, she tells him, quoting directly from Anne's words in the diary:

Who knows, perhaps the whole world will learn from the good that is in us, and perhaps for that reason the Jews have to suffer now. Right through the ages there have been Jews, through all the ages they have had to suffer, and it has made us strong, too.

In the Hackett version, however, this same speech comes out as: "We [Jews] are not the only people that've had to suffer. There've always been people that've had to . . . sometimes one race . . . sometimes another."

Dramatic license like this made Levin furious, for it seemed to violate the playwright's duty to the original material, changing the diary from a specifically Jewish document to something else, which the Broadway producers called "universal." This also had the effect of assimilating Anne Frank into the general culture, a process which Levin thought responsible for creating the climate in which a Nazi Holocaust could take place. *His* diary play is all about the erosion of Jewish identity through anti-Semitism; his two families live in exile within their own country, no longer German or Dutch, yet not Jewish enough to be anything else—a problem that each of the three adolescents vows to deal with in his or her own way, according to what we've been told about them in Anne's diary. Margot, Anne's sister, is determined to become a nurse in Palestine after the war so she can look after "her own people"; Peter van Daan yearns to run away to the West Indies, where he can make lots of money and forget that he was ever a Jew; while Anne steers a middle course between them, vowing to become a Dutch journalist when the war is over, even though "we can never be just Netherlanders, or just English, or just French. We will always remain Jews."

The Broadway diary, in contrast, completely overlooks Margot Frank's Zionist tendencies, while minimizing the Jewish issue for both Peter and Anne. It concentrates instead on what it sees as the general breakdown of civilized values which gave rise to the Holocaust, viewing the Jews as unlucky scapegoats and the Nazis as representatives of man's vilest instincts. Thus, the diary comes to symbolize the generation that was wiped out in the death camps, but whose belief in mankind survived in the diary to give the Otto Franks of the world the will to go on.

This interpretation is certainly valid; it preserves the general outlines of Anne Frank's story (as well as much of its essence), and it shouldn't be too difficult to see the appeal this would have both for the Broadway producers and for Otto Frank. First of all, it condensed the horrifying and overwhelming events of the Holocaust into the easily understandable story of two loving families fighting for survival and destroyed through no fault of their own. Second, here were two non-Jewish writers, treating the Jewish characters with dignity and respect, showing them as human beings who also happened to be Jewish, thus allowing them to transcend their specific condition and become emblematic of all the people who died in the world tragedy of World War II. This was very important for Otto Frank, who wanted to spread his daughter's message of hope and belief to as many people as possible, and who wanted to provide an outlet for all the grief and suffering that Hitler had caused.

And yet this sacrificed an aspect of his daughter's spirit which was very much a part of the diary, and which persisted in asking the question: "Why the Jews? Why always the Jews?" These sections of Anne's ruminations look at the Holocaust as just one in a series of persecutions aimed against the Jewish people, and it was this side of Anne Frank that Meyer Levin was particularly interested in, since its concerns corresponded with what Levin considered to be his own "true task," his own "destiny."

Ultimately, though, Levin's enemy was not the Broadway play, it was Anne Frank's father. Otto Frank's decision to go with the Hackett play over Levin's version is understandable in both commercial and personal terms, yet why forbid performances of Levin's play altogether? Why shouldn't there be more than one interpretation of Anne Frank's diary?

Source: Stephen Fife, "Meyer Levin's Obsession," in *New Republic*, Vol. 187, No. 3524, August 2, 1982, pp. 26-30.

Adaptations

The Diary of Anne Frank, a film adaptation of the play, was released in 1959. It stars Millie Perkins and Shelley Winters and was directed by George Stevens. It is available on VHS and DVD.

Topics for Further Study

Read Anne Frank's *The Diary of a Young Girl*. Compare Anne's diary describing life in the hiding place with the play adapted from this work. Then write another scene for inclusion in the play. Base your scene on an event that Anne describes and dialogue that she records, if possible.

Conduct research on World War II. Choose any aspect that relates to *The Diary of Anne Frank*, such as the deportation of Amsterdam's Jews, the German conquest of Holland, the Allied invasion of the European continent, or the concentration camps.

Imagine that you were directing a stage production of the play. Describe your vision of the production. What would the attic look like? What kinds of mannerisms would define the characters? Describe the types of actors you would want to play Anne and Mr. Frank.

Create an illustration that shows the world as Anne might have seen it while she was in hiding. Illustrations may focus on the attic or anything that she learns about events in the outside world.

Write a poem that Anne might have written about life in the concentration camp.

Conduct research to find out how critics responded to *The Diary of Anne Frank* when it first appeared on stage in 1955, as well as how critics responded to the revamped version of the play, which was staged in 1997. How have attitudes about the play changed over the decades? How do you explain these changes?

Find out more about Anne Frank. Write a biographical essay about her, including information about how her diary has influenced its worldwide readership.

Compare and Contrast

1930s and 1940s: In 1939, the European Jewish population stands at about 10 million. However, an estimated 6 million European Jews are murdered during the Holocaust. By 1946, the total number of Jews living in Europe has fallen to about 4 million.

Today: In 2000, the world's Jewish population is estimated at 13.2 million, of which only 1,583,000, or twelve percent, live in Europe. Most Jews live either in the United States or Israel. In most recent years, the worldwide Jewish population has risen slightly but still remains at a statistical zero-population growth.

1930s and 1940s: In 1939, before the start of World War II, a reported 588,417 Jews live in Germany and 156,817 live in the Netherlands. The majority of these people die at the German concentration camps during the Holocaust.

Today: In 2000, Germany's Jewish population stands at about 60,000, and the Dutch Jewish population stands at about 30,000.

1930s and 1940s: By the beginning of the 1930s, Germany's Nazi Party has 180,000 members, with supproters from all classes of society and people of all ages. Such increased support helps give the Nazi Party a majority in Germany's government in 1932. The Nazis and Adolf Hitler remain in power until 1945, when World War II ends.

1990s: The 1990s have seen a resurgence of Nazi ideology. Neo-Nazis uphold such beliefs as anti-Semitism and a hatred of foreigners. Neo-Nazi doctrine tends to draw young people in countries around the world to participate in these hate groups. In Germany, neo-Nazi youths have called for the restoration of a national Nazi regime.

What Do I Read Next?

Anne Frank began to keep a diary only a short time before her family went into hiding, and she chronicled her experiences until August 4, 1944, when she and the others were taken away by the Gestapo. Otto Frank was given his daughter's diary after the war ended and the concentration camps had been liberated. At the urging of friends, he published Anne's diary in Holland in 1947. *The Diary of Anne Frank* has since become an international classic.

Zlata's Diary: A Child's Life in Sarajevo (1995) is eleven-year-old Zlata Filipovic's diary describing her life in Sarajevo. Begun in 1992, before war broke out, Zlata's diary turns from daily activities to the hardships and deprivations of living under siege.

Thomas Keneally's *Schindler's List* (1993) is a work of fiction based on the true-life story of Oskar Schindler, a German industrialist who sheltered and employed Jews in his factories to prevent their being sent to the concentration camps. Schindler's courageous actions saved more than one thousand Jews from almost certain death in the gas chambers.

In 1944, Swedish businessman Raoul Wallenberg sheltered as many as 35,000 Hungarian Jews from the Gestapo while serving in Budapest as a Swedish diplomat. *Letters and Dispatches, 1924-1944* (1996) is a primary source account of his heroic actions.

A Holocaust Reader (1976), edited by Lucy Dawidowicz, collects primary source documents surrounding the Holocaust, from Nazi legislation to Jewish eyewitness accounts.

Night (1958), by Elie Wiesel, is a semi-autobiographical account of a young boy's spiritual reaction to Auschwitz. Wiesel was taken from his home in Romania in 1944 and deported to Auschwitz.

Man's Search for Meaning (originally published in 1959) by Viktor E. Frankl, a concentration camp survivor, explorers the psychological mechanisms by which Frankl held on to his will to live.

Ben's Story: Holocaust Letters with Selections from the Dutch Underground Press (2001), written by Benjamin Leo Wessels and edited by Kees W. Boole, juxtaposes Ben's letters that document his journey from an Amsterdam ghetto to Bergen-Belsen, where he died in 1945, with reports from the Dutch underground press.

Further Study

Dawidowicz, Lucy C., *The War against the Jews:* 1933-1945, Bantam Doubleday Dell, 1991.

This reissue edition provides a thorough history of the origins and development of the Holocaust. Dawidowicz offers a concise overview of Nazism and also delves into the daily lives of the Jews under growing anti-Semitism.

Gies, Miep, and Alison Leslie Gold, *Anne Frank Remembered: The Story of the Woman Who Helped to Hide the Frank* Family, Simon & Schuster, 1998.

Gies recalls what it was like to shelter the Frank family and the other Jews while living under the Nazi regime.

Lindwer, Willy, *The Last Seven Months of Anne Frank,* Anchor, 1992.

Lindwer's work covers the final months of Anne's life from the time she and the others were taken from their attic hiding place to her death in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp.

Melnick, Ralph, *The Stolen Legacy of Anne Frank: Meyer Levin, Lillian Hellman, and the Staging of the Diary,* Yale University Press, 1997.

Levin, a best-selling author, was instrumental in bringing Anne's story to the stage. He wrote the first adaptation of the diary, one that was faithful to Anne's entries, but Otto Frank rejected this version, instead choosing another production team who selected Goodrich and Hackett as the writers. *The Stolen Legacy* tells this story.

Muller, Melissa, *Anne Frank: The Biography,* translated by Robert Kimber and Rita Kimber, Owl Books, 1999.

Muller's biography of Anne situates her diary within a larger historical framework.

Bibliography

Atkinson, Brooks, "Theatre: *The Diary of Anne Frank*," in *New York Times,* October 6, 1956.

Ehrlich, Evelyn, "Frances Goodrich and Albert Hackett," in *Dictionary of Literary Biography,* Vol. 26: *American Screenwriters*, Gale Research, 1984, pp. 129-34.

Evans, Greg, "*The Diary of Anne Frank*," in *Variety*, Vol. 369, No. 5, December 8, 1997, p. 119.

Frank, Anne, *The Diary of a Young Girl,* edited by Otto H. Frank and Mirjam Pressler, translated by Susan Massotty, Doubleday, 1991.

Hoagland, Molly Magid, "Anne Frank, On and Off Broadway," in *Commentary,* Vol. 105, No. 3, March 1998, p. 58.

Kerr, Walter, "*Anne Frank* Shouldn't Be Anne's Play," in *New York Times,* January 7, 1979.

------, Review of *The Diary of Anne Frank*, in *New York Herald Tribune,* as quoted on "Anne Frank Online," http:// www.annefrank.com/site/af_student/study_STORY. htm (October 10, 2001).

Taylor, Markland, "*The Diary of Anne Frank*," in *Variety*, Vol. 369, No. 1, November 10, 1997, p. 53.

Copyright Information

This Premium Study Guide is an offprint from *Drama for Students*.

Project Editor
David Galens

Editorial
Sara Constantakis, Elizabeth A. Cranston, Kristen A. Dorsch, Anne Marie Hacht, Madeline S. Harris, Arlene Johnson, Michelle Kazensky, Ira Mark Milne, Polly Rapp, Pam Revitzer, Mary Ruby, Kathy Sauer, Jennifer Smith, Daniel Toronto, Carol Ullmann

Research
Michelle Campbell, Nicodemus Ford, Sarah Genik, Tamara C. Nott, Tracie Richardson

Data Capture
Beverly Jendrowski

Permissions
Mary Ann Bahr, Margaret Chamberlain, Kim Davis, Debra Freitas, Lori Hines, Jackie Jones, Jacqueline Key, Shalice Shah-Caldwell

Imaging and Multimedia
Randy Bassett, Dean Dauphinais, Robert Duncan, Leitha Etheridge-Sims, Mary Grimes, Lezlie Light, Jeffrey Matlock, Dan Newell, Dave Oblender, Christine O'Bryan, Kelly A. Quin, Luke Rademacher, Robyn V. Young

Product Design
Michelle DiMercurio, Pamela A. E. Galbreath, Michael Logusz

Manufacturing
Stacy Melson

For more information, contact
The Gale Group, Inc
27500 Drake Rd.
Farmington Hills, MI 48334-3535
Or you can visit our Internet site at
http://www.gale.com

Introduction

Purpose of the Book

The purpose of Drama for Students (DfS) is to provide readers with a guide to understanding, enjoying, and studying novels by giving them easy access to information about the work. Part of Gale's□For Students□ Literature line, DfS is specifically designed to meet the curricular needs of high school and undergraduate college students and their teachers, as well as the interests of general readers and researchers considering specific novels. While each volume contains entries on □classic□ novels frequently studied in classrooms, there are also entries containing hard-to-find information on contemporary novels, including works by multicultural, international, and women novelists.

The information covered in each entry includes an introduction to the novel and the novel's author; a plot summary, to help readers unravel and understand the events in a novel; descriptions of important characters, including explanation of a given character's role in the novel as well as discussion about that character's relationship to other characters in the novel; analysis of important themes in the novel; and an explanation of important literary techniques and movements as they are demonstrated in the novel.

In addition to this material, which helps the readers analyze the novel itself, students are also provided with important information on the literary and historical background informing each work. This includes a historical context essay, a box comparing the time or place the novel was written to modern Western culture, a critical overview essay, and excerpts from critical essays on the novel. A unique feature of DfS is a specially commissioned critical essay on each novel, targeted toward the student reader.

To further aid the student in studying and enjoying each novel, information on media adaptations is provided, as well as reading suggestions for works of fiction and nonfiction on similar themes and topics. Classroom aids include ideas for research papers and lists of critical sources that provide additional material on the novel.

Selection Criteria

The titles for each volume of DfS were selected by surveying numerous sources on teaching literature and analyzing course curricula for various school districts. Some of the sources surveyed included: literature anthologies; Reading Lists for College-Bound Students: The Books Most Recommended by America's Top Colleges; textbooks on teaching the novel; a College Board survey of novels commonly studied in high schools; a National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) survey of novels commonly studied in high schools; the NCTE's Teaching Literature in High School: The Novel;and the Young Adult Library Services Association (YALSA) list of best books for young adults of the past twenty-five years. Input was also solicited from our advisory board, as well as educators from various areas. From these discussions, it was determined that each volume should have a mix of □classic□ novels (those works commonly taught in literature classes) and contemporary novels for which information is often hard to find. Because of the interest in expanding the canon of literature, an emphasis was also placed on including works by international, multicultural, and women authors. Our advisory board members□educational professionals□ helped pare down the list for each volume. If a work was not selected for the present volume, it was often noted as a possibility for a future volume. As always, the editor welcomes suggestions for titles to be included in future volumes.

How Each Entry Is Organized

Each entry, or chapter, in DfS focuses on one novel. Each entry heading lists the full name of the novel, the author's name, and the date of the novel's publication. The following elements are contained in each entry:

- Introduction: a brief overview of the novel which provides information about its first appearance, its literary standing, any controversies surrounding the work, and major conflicts or themes within the work.
- Author Biography: this section includes basic facts about the author's life, and focuses on events and times in the author's life that inspired the novel in question.
- Plot Summary: a factual description of the major events in the novel. Lengthy summaries are broken down with subheads.
- Characters: an alphabetical listing of major characters in the novel. Each character name is followed by a brief to an extensive description of the character's role in the novel, as well as discussion of the character's actions, relationships, and possible motivation. Characters are listed alphabetically by last name. If a character is unnamed□for instance, the narrator in Invisible Man-the character is listed as □The Narrator□ and alphabetized as □Narrator.□ If a character's first name is the only one given, the name will appear alphabetically by that name. □ Variant names are also included for each character. Thus, the full name □Jean Louise Finch□ would head the listing for the narrator of To Kill a Mockingbird, but listed in a separate cross-reference would be the nickname □Scout Finch.□
- Themes: a thorough overview of how the major topics, themes, and issues are addressed within the novel. Each theme discussed appears in a separate subhead, and is easily accessed through the boldface entries in the Subject/Theme Index.
- Style: this section addresses important style elements of the novel, such as setting, point of view, and narration; important literary devices used, such as imagery, foreshadowing, symbolism; and, if applicable, genres to which the work might have belonged, such as Gothicism or Romanticism. Literary terms are explained within the entry, but can also be found in the Glossary.
- Historical Context: This section outlines the social, political, and cultural climate in which the author lived and the novel was created. This section may include descriptions of related historical events, pertinent aspects of daily life in the culture, and the artistic and literary sensibilities of the time in which the work was written. If the novel is a historical work, information regarding the time in which the novel is set is also included. Each section is broken down with helpful subheads.
- Critical Overview: this section provides background on the critical reputation of the novel, including bannings or any other public controversies surrounding the work. For older works, this section includes a history of how the novel was first received and how perceptions of it may have changed over the years; for more recent novels, direct quotes from early reviews may also be included.
- Criticism: an essay commissioned by DfS which specifically deals with the novel and is written specifically for the student audience, as well as excerpts from previously published criticism on the work (if available).

- Sources: an alphabetical list of critical material quoted in the entry, with full bibliographical information.
- Further Reading: an alphabetical list of other critical sources which may prove useful for the student. Includes full bibliographical information and a brief annotation.

In addition, each entry contains the following highlighted sections, set apart from the main text as sidebars:

- Media Adaptations: a list of important film and television adaptations of the novel, including source information. The list also includes stage adaptations, audio recordings, musical adaptations, etc.
- Topics for Further Study: a list of potential study questions or research topics dealing with the novel. This section includes questions related to other disciplines the student may be studying, such as American history, world history, science, math, government, business, geography, economics, psychology, etc.
- Compare and Contrast Box: an at-a-glance comparison of the cultural and historical differences between the author's time and culture and late twentieth century/early twenty-first century Western culture. This box includes pertinent parallels between the major scientific, political, and cultural movements of the time or place the novel was written, the time or place the novel was set (if a historical work), and modern Western culture. Works written after 1990 may not have this box.
- What Do I Read Next?: a list of works that might complement the featured novel or serve as a contrast to it. This includes works by the same author and others, works of fiction and nonfiction, and works from various genres, cultures, and eras.

Other Features

DfS includes The Informed Dialogue: Interacting with Literature, a foreword by Anne Devereaux Jordan, Senior Editor for Teaching and Learning Literature (TALL), and a founder of the Children's Literature Association. This essay provides an enlightening look at how readers interact with literature and how Drama for Students can help teachers show students how to enrich their own reading experiences.

A Cumulative Author/Title Index lists the authors and titles covered in each volume of the DfS series.

A Cumulative Nationality/Ethnicity Index breaks down the authors and titles covered in each volume of the DfS series by nationality and ethnicity.

A Subject/Theme Index, specific to each volume, provides easy reference for users who may be studying a particular subject or theme rather than a single work. Significant subjects from events to broad themes are included, and the entries pointing to the specific theme discussions in each entry are indicated in boldface.

Each entry has several illustrations, including photos of the author, stills from film adaptations (if available), maps, and/or photos of key historical events.

Citing Drama for Students

When writing papers, students who quote directly from any volume of Drama for Students may use the following general forms. These examples are based on MLA style; teachers may request that students adhere to a different style, so the following examples may be adapted as needed. When citing text from DfS that is not attributed to a particular author (i.e., the Themes, Style, Historical Context sections, etc.), the following format should be used in the bibliography section:

□Night.□ Drama for Students. Ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski. Vol. 4. Detroit: Gale, 1998. 234-35.

When quoting the specially commissioned essay from DfS (usually the first piece under the □Criticism□ subhead), the following format should be used:

Miller, Tyrus. Critical Essay on □Winesburg, Ohio.□ Drama for Students. Ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski. Vol. 4. Detroit: Gale, 1998. 335-39.

When quoting a journal or newspaper essay that is reprinted in a volume of DfS, the following form may be used:

Malak, Amin. □Margaret Atwood's □The Handmaid's Tale and the Dystopian Tradition,□ Canadian Literature No. 112 (Spring, 1987), 9-16; excerpted and reprinted in Drama for Students, Vol. 4, ed. Marie Rose Napierkowski (Detroit: Gale, 1998), pp. 133-36.

When quoting material reprinted from a book that appears in a volume of DfS, the following form may be used:

Adams, Timothy Dow. □Richard Wright: □Wearing the Mask,□ in Telling Lies in Modern American Autobiography (University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 69-83; excerpted and reprinted in Novels for Students, Vol. 1, ed. Diane Telgen (Detroit: Gale, 1997), pp. 59-61.

We Welcome Your Suggestions

The editor of Drama for Students welcomes your comments and ideas. Readers who wish to suggest novels to appear in future volumes, or who have other suggestions, are cordially invited to contact the editor. You may contact the editor via email at: ForStudentsEditors@gale.com. Or write to the editor at:

Editor, Drama for Students
Gale Group
27500 Drake Road
Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535