

I. Mark Herman and Cultural Theme

Mark Herman, The renowned director, made the film *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas*. He borrowed the subject-matter from John Boyne's novel having the same title *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas*. In fact, Mark Herman's movie *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas* is the re-representation of John Boyne's novel with ironic twist. Herman's movie represents Holocaust with the ironic twist and turn. The bogus superiority of the Nazi is exposed to nullity. On whatever ground the Nazi Condemned the Jews, that ground evaporates. The Nazi went to the extreme extent in giving vent to their active form of anti Semitism. Nazi Holocaust and harsh realities in the concentration camp are ironically represented in this movie. The Nazi soldiers set up a concentration camp. In this camp hundreds and of Thousands of Jews are cremated. Unfortunately, the eight year son of a German soldier enters a concentration camp guided by his Jew friend Shmuel, and dies in the disaster. The German soldiers set up a concentration camp as a trap for the jews. Unfortunately their own sons fell into this trap and died a disastrous death. The Gestapho Nordic German soldier digged a grave for Jews but their own offspring fell into. The Nazi practisoners of anti-semitism are taught a bitter lesson. The old Englshi adage "as we saw, so we rea'" is perfectly applicable in the representation of Nazi Holocaust in *The Boy in the Stripped Pyjamas*. Different aspects of Holocaust are represented in this movie. There are both the Germans and Jews as the important characters. Ralf is the German soldier. He is charged with the important responsibility of observing the concentration camp. He belongs to the well-to-do family. Because of his professional restrictions and limitations, Ralf is transported to the village in order that he could handle the concentration camp. Ralf instructs his son Bruno that Germans have to love their fatherland. The rhetoric of remaking their fatherland is loudly chanted by every

German during the reign of Adolf Hitler. Ralf also practices the rhetoric of establishing the superiority of the Nordic German. The only way to establish the superiority of the German race is by intensifying the rhetoric of anti-Semitism. By condemning Jews the Germans sought to establish the distinct and unique superiority of the German race. By subjecting the Jews to the Holocaust concentration camp the Germans thought that they won't face further challenge and ordeal from the Jews on the path to the progress. To achieve their purpose of Nordic superiority, the process of brainwashing the youth began. The Nazi soldiers, the supporters of Hitler began to implant in the minds of youths hatred and animosity against the Jews. Jews were presented as the treacherous parasites, faithless figures and fanatical threat to the uninterrupted progress of the German people. Propaganda about the negativity about the Jews spread throughout Germany like a wild fire. Even in the schools, academies, colleges and universities, anti-Jews propaganda, prejudices and slogans were spread. In the movie *The Boy in the Striped Pajamas*, anti-Semitism is represented in ironic way. This movie shows that not only the Jews but the Germans also fell victims to the dehumanizing practice of anti-Semitism in the Holocaust, concentration camp. Ralf's son Bruno feels lonely, sad and monotonous. He lives with his mother and father along with sister. He does not have any friend to talk to and to play with. At that time his father brings a tutor named Herr Liszt in his house so that his son Bruno and daughter Gretel can receive education. Herr Liszt brainwashes and manipulates Bruno and Gretel. The role of Herr Liszt is acted in the film by Jim Norton. Herr Liszt forbids Bruno to read adventure books. But Bruno has the enthusiasm to become the explorer. Liszt draws Bruno's attention to the contemporary political history of Germany. Liszt implants dangerous ideas in Bruno's mind. He tells Bruno that Jews are basically bad in their intention, that Jews are

deceptive and treacherous, that they are not worthy of being befriended. The mentor Liszt furthermore says that “if Bruno finds any good Jews worthy of being befriended, he would be the best explorer of the world” (13). Despite Liszt’s propagandist suggestion, Bruno feels friendly towards a boy who is Jew. His name is Shmuel. Shmuel lives inside the barbed fence which is dangerous. Ralf, Bruno’s father, and the tutor, Herr Liszt try to convince Bruno that it is far more better to live a lonely and companionless life than to seek the companionship of a Jew. These kinds of suggestions are highly ironical because Bruno, despite his small age, comes to know the ground realities. Bruno goes beyond German bias and prejudice. He stands and thinks independent of practices of anti-semitism. He develops friendship with a Jew boy named Shmuel.

Ralf put hundreds of thousands of Jew into the concentration camp. But unfortunately, his own son died in the concentration camp. Ralf’s propaganda and his insistence that Jews are the worst embodiments of mankind create sense of curiosity in Bruno. As a result, Bruno goes curiosity to the Nazi concentration camp along with Shmuel in search of Shmuel’s father. In the moment of sending hundreds of thousands of Jews Shmuel and Bruno died in the Concentration Camp. The concentration camp is set up to kill hundreds of thousands of Jews. But ironically the son of a Nazi soldier happens to die in the Holocaust crematorium.

To endorse the ironic representation in the Nazi Holocaust concentration camp the researcher adopts the concept of irony. The word ‘irony’ is troublesome to define. Since the time of Aristotle, the concept of irony emerged and flourished. Playwrights practice irony as the major dramatic device. This device is used to widen the gap between the appearance and reality. If irony is used as a tool to keep illusion at bay and to make reality more lucid and perceptible, it becomes a device. In the movie *The*

Boy in the Stripped Pajama irony is used as the device to dramatize the realistic fact that Holocaust practice of anti-Semitism is dreadful and dangerous not only to the Jews but to the Germans also. By using the device called irony, the extent to which Holocaust can turn out to be self-destructive to the practitioners of anti-Semitism is explored. Let's introduce and expound on the concept of irony. Irony is a rhetorical device, literary, technique. It involves a situation in which there is a sharp incongruity or discordance in the intention of words or actions. There is presently an accepted method of textually indicating irony. Ironic statements are statements that imply a meaning in opposition to their literal meaning. A situation is often said to be ironic if it is exactly opposite from what was intended. Irony consists in stating the contrary of what is meant. The use of irony may require the concept of a double audience. Irony is a form of utterance that postulates a double audience, consisting of one party that hearing shall hear and shall not understand and another party that, when more is meant than meets the ear is aware both of that more and of the outsiders' incomprehension. The term irony involves incongruity between what might be expected and what actually occurs. Lee M. Capel argues that irony is "that little grain of salt that alone renders the dish palatable"(38). Kierkegaard has gone very far to describe irony as the seminal substance of life. According to Kierkegaard, "as philosophers claim that no true philosophy is possible without doubt, so by the same token, one may claim that no authentic human life is possible without doubt, so by the same token, one may claim that no authentic human life is possible without irony" (66). Both L.M. Capel and Kierkegaard have placed so much importance upon the concept of irony. In the text *The Boy in the Stripped Pyjamas*, the Nazi perpetrators of violence happen to acknowledge the authentic realities.

The importance of being ironical can't be established without at the same time establishing the importance of being earnest. The golden eggs of irony could not be laid so abundantly. As skepticism presupposes credulity, so irony needs alimony which is Greek for braggartism but in works on irony is shorthand for any form of self-assurance of naivety. To say that history is the record of human fallibility and that the history of thought is the record of the recurrent discovery that what people assure themselves was the truth, was in truth only a seeming truth is to say that literature has always had an endless field in which to observe and practice irony. This suggests that irony has basically a corrective function. It is like a gyroscope that keeps life on an even keel or straight course, restoring the balance when life is being taken too seriously or not seriously enough.

Nietzschean view of irony plays a paramount part in the analytical part of this research project. Nietzsche says that "Only that which has no history can be defined" (16). For this and other reasons the concept of irony is vague, unstable and multiform. The word "irony" does not now mean only what it meant in earlier centuries. It does not mean in one country all it may mean neither in another, nor in the street what it may mean in the study, nor to one scholar what it may mean to another. The different phenomena the word is applied to may seem very tenuously related. The semantic evolution of the word had been haphazard. Historically, our concept of irony is the cumulative result of our having applied the term sometimes. The concept of irony at any one time may be likened to a ship at anchor when both wind and current, variable and constant forces are dragging it slowly from its anchorage. It is only very recently that the word has achieved full colloquial status, together with a certain modishness that has led to the eruption of the ironical situation.

Irony is the concept, literary tool theoretical device. It helps to penetrate the illusion and appearance. It foregrounds reality in the authentic form of manifestation. Irony has several forms Verbal irony is a disparity of expression and intention. Dramatic irony is a disparity of awareness between actor and observer. Situational irony is the disparity of intention and result. Cosmic irony is the disparity between human desires and the harsh realities of the outside world. With the help of these ideas regarding irony the researchers throw critical light upon the movie *The Boy in the Stripped Pyjamas*. In the movie, a different situation occurs in which a new kind of reality emerges in a peculiar way. The Nazi soldiers dig a ditch to throw the Jew into it but unfortunately the son of the German soldier falls prey to the trap set by them. The mode of representation of Holocaust is entirely ironic. Nazi police officer Ralf and his wife Elsa have a twelve year old daughter, Gretel and an eight year old son Bruno. The well –to-do family must move to the countryside when the father is promoted to the senior level. Unknown to Bruno, the new house is near a Nazi concentration Camp, and Ralf is the new commandant. Bruno initially dislikes the new house as he always has to stay in the house or the garden; also there are no other children to play with, apart from his sister. From his bedroom window, Bruno spots a barbed wire fence with people in striped Pyjamas behind it. Though he thinks it is a farm, it is the camp with Jewish people in their camp clothing. Bruno is forbidden to go there, because according to Ralf, “they are not really people, it is agreed that at least they are a bit weird, as demonstrated by their clothing.

Bruno goes there anyway, secretly and becomes friend with a Jewish boy, named Shmuel (Jack Scanlon) whom he meets at the fence, and who is the same age. Shmuel tells Bruno that he is a Jew and that the Jewish people have been imprisoned here by soldiers, who also took their cloths and gave them the striped camp clothing

and that he is hungry. Bruno is confused and starts having doubts about his father being a good person. Later, he is received after seeing a propaganda film about the camp. Bruno often returns to the fence. He brings Shmuel food and plays draughts (Checkers) with him through the fence. An elderly Jewish man named Pavel is a servant in the family home. He is treated rudely by Ralf's adjutant, lieutenant Kotler. Formerly a doctor, Pavel mends Bruno's cuts when he falls off his home made tire swing. Ralf hires Herr Liszt to tutor Gretel and Bruno, although in reality he is brainwashing them with anti-Semitic Nazi propaganda. Gretel is very responsive to this and becomes an even more fanatical Nazi than she already was, also because she likes Kotler. However, Bruno is bored and also confused, since Shmuel and Pavel are friendly.

In the meantime, Elsa notices a strange smell that she keeps noticing outside their house just as lieutenant Kotler walks past. Kotler, thinking the camp, says to her "They smell even worse when they burn" (17). Elsa, who thought that the camp was a labor camp and not a death camp, is shocked and quarrels with Ralf about it, and ultimately breaks down.

Kotler is blamed by Ralf and Ralf's visiting father (who is also a firm Nazi) that he failed to report that his father emigrated to Switzerland some time ago, as opposed to contributing to the national. Frustrated, Kotler responds to a small accident by Pavel of spilling some wine by beating him up severely. Pavel is not seen in the house any more. Later in the film, Maria, the maid, is shown cleaning up blood from where Pavel was beaten up.

Shmuel appears in the house as a new servant and in his joy Bruno gives him a cake to eat. However, Kotler starts yelling at Shmuel for speaking with Bruno and stealing food. Shmuel tells the officer that Bruno is his friend and that he gave him the

cake. Frightened, Bruno denies, adding that he does not know Shmuel. The soldier tells Shmuel that they will later have a little chat about what happens with rats who steal. Shmuel and at first not at the fence either. Finally, Shmuel is at the fence again, with an injured right eye. Bruno apologizes, Shmuel soon forgives Bruno and they become friends again. Kotler is later sent to the front for not advising his superiors of his father's opposition to the Nazi regime.

Elsa decided to move away with the children. Ralf agrees, and tells Bruno that Elsa does not feel that the area is a good place for children to grow up. Bruno does not want to leave anymore, because of his friend Shmuel. Shmuel tells Bruno that his father is missing. Bruno gives him the bad news that he will be moving away for good the next day-after lunch. Wanting to make up for letting Shmuel down and unaware that his father has likely been murdered, Bruno agrees to help Shmuel to find his father, and returns the next day with the fence to get into the camp, while Shmuel will bring an extra set of camp clothing. Shmuel's suggestion that he could leave the camp through the hole is the target of finding the father.

Bruno changes his clothes and wiggles under the fence, and is now in the camp with Shmuel. Bruno comes to realize that the camp is completely the opposite of what he saw in the propaganda film and wants to return, but Shmuel encourages him to continue helping to find his father. While they look in Shmuel's hut a group of guards and Kapos arrive and march all those inside (including Bruno and Shmuel) to a low concrete building. The men and boys are made to undress, supposedly for a shower packed together into a gas chamber, and killed.

In the meantime, Elsa warns Ralf (who is in a meeting about increasing the capacity of the crematorium) that Bruno is missing. With Gretel, they run to the camp and try to find him. They find Bruno's clothes next to the hole under the fence. Ralf

runs throughout the camp and discovers an empty hut and reaching the gas chamber, concludes that Bruno has been brought to the gas chamber with a group of Jews. Pavel is also seen undressing near the boys and he looks at them and then turns away. When Ralf arrives, the boys are already dead and he is devastated. Upon hearing Ralf's cry of Bruno, Elsa and Gretel realize what has happened and are equally devastated. At last showing the undressing room with many camp uniforms reminds the viewer that the tragedy is not just Bruno, Shmuel and Pavel's deaths, but that of many other Jewish people.

The ironic device plays an instrumental role in throwing spotlight on the issue of anti-Semitism practiced in the Nazi concentration. This movie creates a situation in which the Nazi German soldiers themselves fall victims to the trap they set for the Jew. Bruno is encouraged to hate Jews. But ironically enough Bruno befriends a Jew belonging to Bruno's age. It is a small boy of eight who is capable of thinking independent of the pervading prejudice of anti-Semitism. Liszt, the tutor, brainwashes Bruno but Bruno ironically thinks and acts reasonably. Bruno possesses a sense of love, humanity and friendship. Ralf does his best to prevent Elsa from knowing the cruel facts about German brutality, atrocity, ruthlessness and callousness which are practiced mercilessly in the Holocaust gas chamber on the concentration camp. But Elsa happens to know the reality regarding concentration camp.

The movie *The Boy in the Striped Pajamas* has received a wide range of critical treatment. Different film critics and reviewers have given different kinds of responses. Mark Herman is not only a director but the popular film critic also. His view as to the film is presented below:

The movie makes a mild jolt upon the callous German prejudice that is anti-Semitism. In this movie anti-Semitism is presented as a kind of

crazy fantasy of the vainglorious and loutish Germans who are maddeningly whimsical and nefarious . This movie gives a slap on the face of the Nazi Germans. (13)

Mark Herman arrives at the conclusion that the movie represents a contradictory situation in which the stronghold of anti-Semitism crumbles automatically. Tim Robey is the popular critic of Hollywood films. According to Tim Robey :

The Boy in the Striped Pajamas based on John Boyne's teen-lit novel sets itself the tricky task of witnessing the Holocaust through the uncomprehending eyes of a child-eight years old Bruno whose Nazi officer father moves with his family to the vicinity of a concentration camp. Bruno perceives this as a farm and befriends a Jewish boy Shmuel with devastating consequence. (2)

Tim Robey goes to a great length in saying *The Boy in the Striped Pajamas* is profound and genuine message can be derived from the movie.

Jason Buchanan has concentrated upon the dramatic sensationalization of German brutalities. What struck Buchanan is “the grasping of shovel by Bruno and making his way to the camp, setting into motion a tragic and devastating sequence of events” (13).

Driven by ironic sense and awareness the researcher concentrates upon the issue of Nazi Holocaust. The present work would have three different chapters. In the first chapter, the researcher introduces the dominant and striking content of the film and its historical background. In chapter two, the notion of irony will be dwelt upon widely. The concept of irony would be the methodological basis on which the analysis of the movies will be done. In the last chapter concrete findings would be listed. This is the tentative schedule along which the present research work will continue.

II. Ironic Representation of Holocaust in the movie *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas*

Mark Hermans *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas* is characterized by the ironic representation of holocaust. The ironic representation of Nazi Holocaust is designed to teach a bitter and tragic lesson to the callous Gestapo Nazi armies who are intoxicated with the idea of Nordic German superiority.. Ralf is the typical German soldier who takes charge of concentration camp as the responsible commandant. He is the die-hard follower of the vainglory chanted madly by Nazis. He is seduced by the utopia of empowering the Germans by practicing the genocide of Jews in the Nazi Holocaust Concentration Camp. He is callous, ruthless, brutal and inhuman. Only one idea reigns sovereign in his mind that the Jews are the enemies of the Germans and Jews should be slain. This rhetoric of anti-Semitism is exposed to nullity and voidness when his eight year old son Bruno dies in the concentration camp. This rhetoric of anti-Semitism is flatly countered by the ironical situation in which Bruno, the son of a Nazi soldier, died disastrously. Ralf intensifies the rhetoric and propaganda of anti-Semitism. He manipulates, and brainwashes the minds of his son Bruno and daughter Gretel. The idea of Germany as the fatherland is always emphasized recurrently by Ralf. He keeps his wife and children away from knowing that Jews are killed in the Nazi concentration camp. But ironically, his wife happens to know the truth. He admonishes Bruno that Jews are worthwhile. Jews are not worthy of being befriended. Ralf erects a boundary between the Nordic Germans and the Jews. Despite Ralf's efforts to erase humanity, his son Bruno succeeds in loving and befriending a miserable Jew boy of his age, who is called Samuel. Ironic sense is clearly manifest in the representation Nazi Holocaust. Hence, the researcher makes use of plenty of major theoretical ideas.

The movie *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas*, contains situational irony. Ralph creates a situation by making several propaganda films so that Jews continued to be executed in the concentration camp without lifting the public a chance reality. But the situation takes an unprecedented form in which his son Bruno is trapped and dies. Hence the researcher dwells upon the situational irony. Situational irony involves and incongruity between what is expected or intended and what actually occurs. Lyman A . Baker defines situational irony in the following way:

Situational irony is a relationship of contrast between what an audience is led to expect during a particular situation within the unfolding of a story's plot and a situation that ends up actually resulting later on. It is thus the result of a special sort of discrepancy in perspective that is not moment bound, in that it involves the contrast between what we know in one moment with what we have come to know in another. (10)

Like dramatic irony, situational irony ranges from the tragic to the comic. It result from recognizing the oddness or unfairness of a given situation, be it positive or negative. Situational irony occurs in literature and in drama when persons and events come together in improbable situations, creating a tension between expected and real results.

In the movie Ralf affirms the historical necessity of saving Germany, the fatherland from the wounding treacherous Jews. Ralf seeks to convince that Jews are really a bad and dreadful lot. But the boy, despite his small age, develops an ironic awareness. The following portion of the dialogue between Ralf and Bruno dramatizes the pervading prejudice of anti-Semitism:

Sit down, sit down. Well, what do you think Bruno, oh deer, I want to go home. You are home; Bruno Home is where the family is not that

right? Bruno, you have to at least give the place a chance. I promise you, why do the farmers wear Pyjamas? I can see them from my window. The thing is, Bruno, those people are not really people at all.

It is it your duty to serve in the farm? Ralf answers, it is necessary to work in that farm to make our fatherland prosperous. This cited part of the movie is concerned with the father Ralf and his son Bruno. Ralf knows that his son Bruno. Ralf knows that his son Bruno is unhappy in the new residence where Ralf is recently transferred. So Ralf tries to convince Bruno that soon Bruno will find their new residence pleasing Ralf is the Nazi police officer. To handle the new challenging responsibility, he is sent to the village. The quarter Ralf is given is confined. Moreover, the boy Bruno feels lonely and sad due to the lack of a chance to meet and talk is, however, aware of the growing unhappiness and discomfort on the part of his son. Therefore, Ralf tries to convince Bruno.

Bruno happens to see a farm across the fenced residence where he lives. He longs to know what the barbed fence is across his residence. Bruno is sure that it is the farm where some people live. Bruno is curious to know what it is. In response, Ralf says that the people who live in the farm are not really people. This is the dramatic and blatant expression of German arrogance. This utterance of the Nazi soldier Ralf is fought with anti-Semitism. The flagrant expression of anti-Semitism makes doubtful. The commandant Ralf does not frankly say that the so-called farm is not the farm at all. He does not tell his son Bruno that the camp is where Jews are brutally and mercilessly killed. Ralf wants to put his son away from any idea of Nazi concentration camp. But he does not hesitate to implant the dangerous idea of hating the Jews if they are no less than animal and Satan.

Ralf's attempt to orient Bruno to the track of German prejudice against the Jews declines to achieve the intended purpose. Instead of being the die-hard German seduced by the grand idea of making the fatherland glorious, Bruno develops the skeptical bent of mind. But he does not become ready to comply with the words of his father. The growing skepticism on the part of Bruno itself is the ironic representation of the Nazi Holocaust and active practice of anti-Semitism.

In the movie other ironic elements are available. Ralf hires a tutor. His name is Herr Liszt. He is hired to teach Ralf's daughter Gretel and Bruno. Herr Liszt, the tutor represents the then system of education which had prevailed under the Nazi rule. When the tutor Liszt comes to know that Bruno is interested in adventure books and in exploration, he scolds and admonished Bruno. He instructs Bruno to turn his eyes away from fantasy books and set on the books of concept contemporary realities. Gretel agrees with the lessons and suggestions given by the tutor. Actually, Herr Liszt is not teaching Gretel and Bruno. On the contrary, he is brainwashing them. He is orienting them to the organized practice of anti-Semitism. Liszt spreads propaganda in the name of teaching. He is mouthpiece of Nazism. He counts Jews as subhuman creatures. He is capable of nay fraud practice and treacherous. The following extract highlights the point:

Are you interested in current affairs? Yes, very, so you will be aware of the situation. Bruno, have you been reading newspapers? Bruno says that he is interested in adventure books. Listz says in response that it is the time to know the fact. Time, I think to turn your mind to the real world. I think, Bruno if you ever found a nice Jew, you would be the best explorer in the world. The aim of the jew is to become the ruler of

mankind. The Jew is not creative but destructive. He is the enemy of culture. Thousands of Germans have been made poor by the Jew.

The tutor hates Jews with the extreme intensity. He seeks to implant extreme hatred against the Jews in Bruno. But a big gap appears between Liszt's propagandist effort and Bruno's friendly attraction to a Jew boy of similar age who is found inside the barbed fence of the concentration camp. Through a short conversation with Shmuel a Jew boy of the camp, Bruno understands that Jews are confined inside the camp. He also comes to know that Jews are confined and compelled to engage in the construction work. Bruno is impressed by Shmuel's openness. When Shmuel says that he feels sad and tells Shmuel that he will help him to track down the lost father of Shmuel. Ralf and Liszt seek to orient Bruno to the anti-Semitic campaign of hating the Jews. His tutor has said that Jews are dangerous. But upon interaction, Bruno finds that Shmuel is good to befriend. Bruno and Shmuel become friendly. Bruno brings cakes and sweets to Shmuel who eats by sitting inside the dangerous barbed fence of the concentration camp. His friendly gestures and moves counter the arrogance and superiority of the Germans who seek to erect an iron curtain between Jews and themselves. What the Nazi officers and tutors say and what Bruno feels, acts and think create a gap? It is this gap that gives birth to irony.

Having introduced a set of evidences from the movie the researcher once again moves ahead to expound upon the theoretical part. It was at the very end of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth century that the word irony took on a number of new meanings. The old meanings were, of course, not lost, and the old ways of being ironical were not discontinued, though one notices a tendency towards disparaging satiric irony as cheap as cruel, corrosive or diabolic. The new meaning are in number of respects which can perhaps be sorted out but what they add up to is

as radical a transformation of the concept of irony as Romanticism was of the worldview of the previous centuries. It is possible to think of irony as something that could instead be unintentional, something observable and hence, representable in art. Irony is double-natured, sometimes instrumental irony can be thought of as a finite act or at most an adopted manner. On different occasions, it could now be thought of as a permanent and self-conscious commitment. The ideal ironist would be always an ironist. Irony could be seen as obligatory, dynamic and dialectical. D.C. Muecke says that “the specific meaning of the word irony emerged out of the ferment of philosophical and aesthetic speculation the intellectual leader of Europe” (19). In the discussion of irony Schlegel’s name often comes frequently. The idea that life is irremediably flawed or even contradictory was not something that first occurred to the Romantics. The use of the word irony was already there in that particular context. According to Schlegel, “Irony is the almost inevitable influence of selfish motives in human nature” (22). Irony can also be widely considered as the tacit objections to the idealized representations of human nature. Irony is a dexterous manoeuvre. It is the projection of the ironical view of human relations.

The concept of irony enlarged in the Romantic period beyond instrumental irony to the observable irony. The observable ironies comprise of irony of event, irony of character, irony of situation, irony of idea. These observable ironies can be seen as local or universal. Credit goes undoubtedly to Schlegel for making irony, open, dialectical, paradoxical or Romantic. The observable irony of man’s situation should not be regarded as a hopeless predicament, because it can be countered by an instrumental irony. Just as a personified nature might be said to play with or ironize its created forms, so man too, has both a creative and decreative energy.

The originality and strength of Schlegel's thinking lay in, what Karl Solger says, "his firm grasp of life as a dialectical process and his insistence that human behavior is fully human only when it also exhibits an open dynamic dualism"(25).

Everywhere in his writing he repudiated the law of contradiction. Irony is the form of paradox. Paradox is the soul, source and principle of irony. Irony is "the analysis of thesis and antithesis"(24). It is equally fatal for the mind to have a system and to have none. It will simply have to decide to combine the two.

Peter Firchow has given his view regarding irony in the following way:

Irony is the only involuntary and yet completely deliberate and serious, guilelessly open and deeply hidden device. It originates in the union of savoir vivre and scientific spirit, in the conjunction of a perfectly instructive and a perfectly conscious philosophy. It contains and arouses a feeling of indissoluble antagonism between the absolute and the relative, between the impossibility and the necessity of complete communication.(108)

Artistic creation has two contrary but complementary phases. In the expansive phase the artist is naïve, enthusiastic inspired, imaginative. But this thoughtless ardour is blind and so unfree. In the contractive phase the artist is reflective, conscious, critical, and ironic. Irony without ardour is dull or affected. Both phases are therefore, necessary if the artist is to be urbanely enthusiastic and imaginatively critical. Having forwarded these conceptual insights concerning irony, the researcher once again delves deep into the text in search of the pertinent evidence. The movie contains lots of elements with respect to the irony of idea, irony of situation and other observable ironies. Elsa sees a flame of smoke high in the air above the camp which lies across far from her residence. She asks Ralf what takes place in the farm, in the camp. Ralf

says that certain constructive activity is taking place. He tells a lie to her. He manipulates her and dissuades her from knowing exactly what happens in the concentration camp. From the mouth of lieutenant Kotler she becomes aware of the fact that hundreds of thousands of Jews have been killed in the concentration camp. She can't tolerate that her husband has had the leading role in the inhuman task of executing the Jews in the Holocaust concentration camp. Ralf had done his best to prevent Elsa, his wife, from knowing the ground reality regarding the concentration camp. His effort to put her in the illusion is ironical. Finally, she came to know that inhuman and brutal cremation of living Jews take place.

Innocence is credited with a huge sage of approval and acceptability. The innocent have the capacity and audacity to know the truth, however twisted manipulated and glossed it might be. The uncorrupted and uncontaminated innocence leads to the disclosure of truth. Innocence makes no room for bias, prejudice, vanity arrogance and inhumanity. Shmuel is the victim of anti-Semitic practices which produced intolerable fall out in his life. His father disappeared in the concentration camp. His family disintegrated. He is the pathetic victim of the violent from of anti-Semitism. The German arrogance and superiority tortured him but he does not discontinue from loving and befriending a German boy named Bruno. Shmuel fell victims to German outburst of racial superiority but Shmuel does not hesitate to befriend Bruno. Shmuel's willingness to render good for evil is a fine example of the potentiality of human virtue to rise above the based thinking of revenge and retaliation. The way Shmuel loves and befriends Bruno is entirely productive of the ironical sense. A thorny irony arises from Shmuel's stroke of love and forgiveness for Bruno.

Bruno – Shmuel friendship is an example of modular friendship which continued to germinate and grow in the concentration camp. Bruno is manipulated viciously. His mind is oriented towards the doctrine of anti-Semitism. Although Bruno is badly educated by the propagandists of Nazi system of education, he succeeds in thinking independent of the Nazi Jingoism.

The innocent boys Shmuel and Bruno are curious. Prejudice and racism have not entered their mind. They are prevented from knowing the actual truth about why concentration camps are set up, what happens in those camps and who set up the camp and why are Jews so excluded, executed and electrified in the camp? It is this practice which is largely responsible for the emanation of curiosity. The situation created by the Germans is itself ironical. It is not indirectly hinted that Jews are captured, confined and executed in the concentration camp. Far above in the sky a smoke is seen. Actually this smoke is the smoke of the executed Jews in the Nazi gas chamber.

Herr Liszt once said, “Bruno if you find any Jew worthy of being a friend, you would be the best explorer of the world” (128). This utterance too, is fainted with irony. The Nazi propaganda is also responsible for implanting a formidable sense of curiosity on the part of the German boy Bruno. Once Ralf was assigned with the task of making several propaganda movies and videos. A group of Nazi police officers come to Ralf’s residence and watched the movie. Bruno peeped through the window and come to know that the so-called camps are the camps for training students, children and learners. Camps are set up for the over-all growth what Bruno learnt from the movie is in conflict with what he guessed from his conversation with Shmuel.

Having dealt with these textual evidences from the movie, the present researcher once again dwells upon the role of irony in making ground reality more prominent, visible and strikingly lucid. For the pig-headed Germans the loss of Bruno is necessary if they are to perceive the reality. By intensifying and foregrounding the appearance versus reality relation, irony tends to penetrate the illusion of which the Germans come out of the cocoon of arrogance and perceive the bitter disastrous reality. Irony compels the readers to think beyond the apparent meaning. Truth requires thinking through the contradictory force of language. It requires difference from both what is and what remains beyond question. To approach a piece of art ironically, requires the continued force of philosophy's truth and contradiction.

Irony can neither be achieved nor overcome. One can't remain in a naively postmodern position above and beyond any discourse. The liberal ironist who has freed himself from metaphysical commitment remains blind to the ways in which this discourse of detachment has its own attachments.

Wayne Booth presents her view concerning irony as follows:

All utterance is haunted by irony. All speech is tainted by irony. Not only can we question whether what is said is really meant. Any act of speech can be repeated and quoted in other contexts generating unintended forces. Further, and more importantly, insofar as speaking creates some event of decision, force and difference, or makes a claim about what is other than itself, it must refer to what is not itself. One can only make a statement about the world, or really say something, if one recognizes the force of contradiction. To assert that something is the case is only a forceful speech act in a context where one could or would assert that it is not the case. (162)

According to Booth irony is the soul of any utterance. Whether irony is traditional or postmodern it hardly distorts its expressive and penetrating purpose. Traditional irony is intuited or suspected because one assumes a principle of noncontradiction. If the text is contradictory, absurd, clichéd or self-refuting, then it must be assumed that what is said is not meant. However, one can't remain in a position of pure not saying; for the not-saying is itself a part of speech.

Elsa comes to know that innocent faultless Jews are executed and cremated in the Nazi Holocaust concentration camp. She asks, "What takes place regularly inside the camp, Ralf?" (36). In response, Ralf wants to avoid the situation. He intentionally lays her. But she breaks, before him and weeps and prays to God for ending this inhuman act as soon as possible.

The movie *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas* excoriates German Nordic superiority and Nazi Jingoism. When will the eyes of the self-conceited arrogant Germans be opened? This question carries gravity. The answer is "When innocence is lost and humanity is gained" (81). Before Elsa, Ralf trumpets the rhetoric of Nazi Jingoism. Nazism is also a kind of fascism. Any patriotic sentiment created on the notion of fatherhood is fragile. Ralf says, "What happens and what is happening are always in favor of rebuilding the fatherland" (86). In a family father hardly can be the symbol of unity. Father embodies pragmatism, fact, calculation, ambition and obsession with the parents responsibility and professional ethics. Hence, father can't embody the spirit of union, harmony, affection and the unconditional show of mutual care. German idea of nationalism is based on the notion of father. Germans prefer to call their country the fatherland. Ralf confesses that he must be cruel to remake his fatherland" (96). Even the tutor Herr Liszt affirms that right kind of education is necessary to enrich the fatherland. This program of rebuilding the fatherland can be

successfully launched only after Jews are finally executed fully from the soil of Germany.

Elsewhere in the movie most of the die-hard Nazi followers and police officers are seen chanting the hollow and self-destructive ideology of German nationalism. The Jingoistic and self-destructive ideology of German nationalism is no less an addiction than opium. The Fascist glorification of German Jingoism based on the analogy of father is utterly ironical. Ralf's rhetoric of fatherland fails to save his own son from the fatal trap of concentration camp. If Ralf's rhetoric has failed to save Bruno, how can Hitler's discourse of Nordic Superiority save the nation? The Euphony of Nazi rhetoric is formidable, fatal and self-destruction.

The movie *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas* makes an ironic juxtaposition between the rhetoric of inhumanity and the silence of humanity. Humanity needs no language. It needs no discursive form and methods. Bruno and Shmuel hardly talk; they have already got plenty of opportunity to interact and converse. Shmuel is inside the barbed wire of a fence whereas Bruno lives outside the fence. In between Bruno and Shmuel there is the electrified barbed wire which is the symbol of animosity and racial rivalry. Nazi police officers are busy in heightening the wall between Germans and Jews. But the two innocent boys are busy in demolishing the wall of division, execution, incarceration and execution. The friendly gestures of the move of Bruno and Shmuel are subversive.

This project requires further theoretical elaboration. The contemporary Yale School critic J.Hillis Miller has made the following observation:

If something is universally and unquestionably true then it does not need to be said. Saying something unquestionably true can never be a speech act of one's own: Universality can have no copyright. To recite

a multiplication table is not to say anything at; one only speaks or speaks with force, if what one says can be contradicted, if what is asserted can also not be asserted. (163)

Miller maintains that to speak is to adopt a position and style. One must rely upon the principle of no contradiction, a commitment that in saying this one negates or rejects its contrary. This inhabitation of contradiction or sense of irony can mark texts that are not presented as ironic.

The movie raises an unasked question, a silent question. This question is – who is responsible for the catastrophic demise of Bruno in the concentration camp? The answer to this question is very short and straightforward. If there were no concentration camps, the question and possibility of Bruno dying in the Holocaust would never have arisen. By seeing the disastrous end of Bruno perhaps Ralf might have realized the pros and cons of the empty German rationale behind establishing Nazi concentration camp.

Nazism is criticized a lot in this movie. But the tone of the criticism is subtle and subterranean. The foundation of Nazism is breakable. It can evaporate at any time. Shmuel says, “My father is lost. He is not found in the concentration camp. Bruno replies I come to your aid in search of your lost father” (175). An eight year boy Bruno is touched by the loss of Shmuel’s father. Therefore, Bruno brings the shovel digs the land below the wire fence, throws off his clothes, and puts on the striped Pyjamas. An eight year boy Bruno is worried about the disappearance of Shmuel’s father. But the father of the same boy is sadistically enmeshed in the diabolic adventure of genocide. What induced the self-seduced Germans to engage themselves in the genocide of Jews? This question demands answer which is ironical. Arrogance, bias, hollow sense of superiority, vainglorious notion of fatherland and

German obsession with their sense of superiority, German act of ego gratification are the factors which gave rise to the establishment of Holocaust concentration camps and the genocidal extermination of Jews. The foundation of Nazism evaporates as a small lotus of humanity blossoms in the pond of Holocaust. The following extract cited from the movie justifies the point:

Bruno: Is your father farmer?

Shmuel: No he is the watch maker. But now he is busy in mending boots. What is your father?

Bruno: My father is soldier.

Shmuel : I don't like soldier.

Bruno: My father is a different kind of soldiers; he does not take out clothes.

Bruno: If your father is a watch maker, why is he mending boots? Yes in my house also there is a man doctor but gave it all up to peel potatoes.

This above-mentioned dialogue between Bruno and Shmuel tells plenty of things about the then situation of war-mongering country Germany. Execution of Jews in the concentration camps is metonymically emphasized in this movie. The genocidal case is gradually hinted so that the ironic effect can arise. Jews were businessmen, watch makers, doctors, and administrators. But they were humiliated, embarrassed to the extent of extremity. The genocidal brutality comes at last. In the beginning, Jews are subjected to the serious cases of mental, physical and psychological inferiorization and atrocity.

Extreme harassment and then indiscriminate execution of Jews reveal that the Germans under the horrible rule of Hitler had began to demonstrate qualities more inhuman than the worst version of degraded humanity. The dialogue between Ralf

and Bruno reveals the ironic potentiality embedded in the subtext of the movie. The following part of the father-son dialogue clarifies the point:

Bruno: Did you smell from the chimneys. What is it?

Ralf: I think they just burnt rubbish there sometimes. Bruno, look at the game.

Bruno: I got it.

Gretel (daughter) : It is not fair.

Elsa: Gretel, It is just a game.

This extract captures the scene of a family members living in the residence. Bruno is playing chess with his sister Gretel. While playing the game Bruno does not hesitate to ask his father if he has noticed the smell. Ralf does not tell the truth. The smell which Bruno and Elsa, Smelt is the smell coming from the concentration camp where innocent Jews are executed and cremated. Ralf does not like to reveal the truth. He prevents his son from knowing the truth. This act of Ralf not to reveal the truth boosted the curiosity on the part of Bruno. Had Ralf told everything about the camp, Bruno might have feared the camp and he would not have gone to the concentration camp. Ralf's attempts to hide the truth concerning the Holocaust are utterly ironical.

In the movie the director has so designed the screenplay that ironic situation unfolds instant any awareness of the spectators. The screenplay of this movie is largely contributive to the emergence of the ironic circumstance. Ralf embodies the inhuman Nazi programme of exterminating all the Jews. Hence the move and motion of Ralf are so handled that ironic glimpse originates.

Once again theoretical knowledge is introduced so that the very analysis of the text can proceed ahead. The twentieth century of German history built by Nazi is depicted in this movie. The history of Nazism, Holocaust concentration camp and several links, connection of propaganda, discourse, semiotic exploitation to raise the

voice of anti-Semitism are directly and indirectly brought to the focal point of representation. Now the present researcher views the history of Holocaust from the vantage point of irony. How history is represented acquires the ironic tone. Richard Rorty's concept of irony is supposed to be of some value in diagnosing the historical rendering of the issue of Holocaust. In the postmodernist era, the concept of irony still carries crucial meaning and subversive as well as the constructive role. The researcher treats the poststructuralist concept of irony in the positive light.

Post structuralism appears as one possible response to the predicament of post modern irony. If postmodern irony affirms the equal validity and ultimately groundless nature of all discourse post structuralism recognizes that one can't speak from a position of groundlessness. Even the assertion that all values depend upon context constitutes itself as a position capable of revealing some contextual truth. Richard Rorty, the contemporary American liberal pragmatist, "has insisted that the value of post modern irony lies in its ability to refrain from making such truth claims"(76). Rorty can only affirm the value of a postmodern refusal of truth claims because he has posited a better standard of truth and a better standard of speech. Against a postmodern irony that claims to have freed itself from all hierarchies, grand claims and metaphysical posturing, post structuralism of the Derridean and Paul de man variety acknowledges judgment or subjectivity. The ironic subject does not just take part in the discourses and norms that are present.

Irony allows for detachment and eternal point of view. The ironic self can question whether life might not be otherwise, whether we might create ourselves differently. Indeed, irony detaches itself from any recognized 'we' in order to question and disrupt accepted norms. Irony is provocative, disruptive but also hierarchal – setting itself above everyday life and opinion.

Jacques Derrida conveys his poststructuralist concept of irony in the following way:

Any expression of this ironic self as a principle would once again give substance representation to what is essentially unrepresentable. This ironic subject also places itself above the historical epochs it surveys. This is why any text can be read ironically. If it is the case that there is a power or potential of human subjectivity, which can never be exhausted by any images of the self or man. Then it is also possible to see the entire history of literature and philosophy as a series of creations and productions behind which lies a creative spirit. (120)

It is in this gesture that irony can fall back into the very normalizing morality that it sought to avoid. The essence of man or subjectivity is that he has no essence. He is nothing other than a power for self-creation, self-determination and active becoming.

Once Ralf was in need of a boy with tiny fingers, who can clean the glass. To serve, Shmuel, is brought to Ralf's house. Up to that time, Bruno, a German boy, had been developing a friendly acquaintance with Shmuel. Having seen the sudden presence of Shmuel in the kitchen, Bruno is delighted and amazed. Bruno instantly offers him a piece of cake. Then he asks Shmuel, was his father a good man. Shmuel says that his father was a good man. He is punished and forced to work heavily by soldiers in the concentration camp. Because Ralf has kept Bruno in an illusion as to what is done in the concentration camp. So he wants to know about the camp from Shmuel. All of a sudden lieutenant Kotler comes, and begins to scold Shmuel threateningly. Kotler tortures and torments Shmuel to the degree of causing physical

injury and cuts. Bruno – Shmuel dialogue carries weight. The following extract carries weight:

Bruno: You've never thought he was not. And you're proud of him?

Shmuel: Are not you proud of yours?

Bruno: Is it really horrible in the camp?

(suddenly Kother comes and explodes with anger and shout).

Kotler: How dare you talk to people in house! How dare you! Are you! Eating? Have you been stealing food? Answer me!

Shmuel : No, sir, he gave it to me. Bruno is my friend.

The above-cited snatch of conversation shows how noble Jews are. Even Bruno denies friendship with Shmeul. Later on, Bruno apologizes, and Shmuel forgives him. Again their friendship continues. Kotler gives vent to his tantrum. Shmuel had no option other than enduring it. Pavel had cured Bruno's cut. Shmuel has forgiven Bruno's denial of friendship. Germans are parochial, aggressive, superior to the extent of insanity, dreadfully demoniac to the degree of apocalyptic debacle. On the contrary, Jews are the patience incarnate, nobility personified, virtue valorized and magnanimity modularized. The growing gap between the German ugliness and the beauty of semitic forbearance adds ironic flavor to the representation of Nazi Holocaust concentration camp.

The movie centers on a young German boy whose father is the commandant of a Nazi extermination camp. The father is evil, a Nazi ideologue; his wife is horrified by what she knows is going on; the daughter joins the Hitler youth; and the boy, our protagonist, is too young to understand what is really going on inside the camp. One day the boy sneaks out of his house and comes across a young Jewish boy sitting on the other side of the camp's electrified barbed-wire fence. They talk for a while, and

then agree to keep meeting at the fence. Slowly, over the course of a number of weeks, they become good friends. The Jewish boy continually hints at the treatment to which he and his family are being subjected, but never explicitly discusses the killings that regularly take place in the camp. The following extract cited from the movie makes the following revelation:

Nazi soldier: Up, up, move up, up!

Bruno : What is happening?

Nazi soldiers: Which means that our capabilities would be almost tripled?

Bruno: Where are we going?

Other jews: No it is just a shower.

The last response is utterly ironical. Actually those jews were taken to the Nazi gas chamber concentration. Even in the moment of being cremated in the Holocaust the boy Bruno is being told that he is going to enjoy the shower.

The movie ends with a disturbing twist: the German boy digs a hole under the fence, puts on a Jewish “uniform,” and enters the camp to help the Jewish boy look for his father. Unfortunately, he arrives in the camp just as the final group of prisoners is being sent to the gas chamber. The German boy dies along with his Jewish friend, his father arriving a split-second too late to prevent the guards from dropping the Zyklon-B into the chamber. The father is distraught, and the movie ends with a fade to black from the gas chamber door.

It is certainly wonderfully acted, especially by the two boys and by the amazing David Thewlis, who plays the father. But what message is the movie trying to send? That friendship knows no boundaries among the innocent? That seems like a

rather sick message: that the real tragedy is not the senseless murder of the thousands of Jews in the camp, but the unfortunate murder of one boy who doesn't belong in the camps and doesn't deserve to die.

The Boy in the Striped Pajamas nevertheless partakes of the same logic of identification that corrupts movies like *Schindler's List*: we certainly don't want the Jewish boy to die, but we really don't want the German boy to die, because he has done nothing to deserve his fate – the sins of the father should not be visited upon his son. The rush and mounting hustle and bustle of Elsa demonstrates genuine concern for the missing son. She has the sinister intuitive premonition that her beloved son Bruno has fallen victims to the booby trap of concentration camp. The extract discloses the growing rush on the part of Elsa and Ralf:

Elsa: Bruno?

Maria: master Bruno?

Gretel: Bruno?

Elsa: Bruno ?

Maria: He must still be outside somewhere ma'am.

Ralf(in the meeting): Out responsibility is mounting .

Elsa: Ralf , Bruno is missing . He is nowhere to be found.

The problem with that, of course, is that *no one* deserved to die in the gas chamber – not the German boy, not the Jewish boy, and certainly not the other Jewish prisoners. The movie thus does both the viewer and the Holocaust a great disservice by forcing us, via its narrative structure, to identify with the German boy. Innocence does not admit of degrees.

On the basis of this view of language, Rorty then, in some of the most interesting sections of the book, especially for those unfamiliar with his earlier writings, goes on to describe the modern intellectual, the "liberal ironist," someone who accepts the contingency of language, the contingency of selfhood, and the contingency of community. For the liberal ironist, a sense of one's individual identity comes through a re-creation which emancipates one from the tyranny of one's ancestors, through the creation of a "final language," a process which, though it inevitably starts with what tradition provides, develops one's own unique tool and "somehow makes tangible the blind impress all one's behaving bear" (29). Following Harold Bloom, whose image of the Strong Poet, "the person who uses words as they have never before been used, [and who] is best able to appreciate her own contingency" (28). Rorty warmly endorses, he sees the liberal ironist as horrified by the prospect of having to surrender to someone else's system and thus driven to seek the means to the Nietzschean affirmation: "Thus I willed it." Such self-creation is a private affair and takes place in a realm hermetically sealed from one's public life. On this point Rorty is repetitively emphatic:

Ironists should reconcile themselves to a private-public split within their final vocabularies, to the fact that resolution of doubts about one's final vocabulary has nothing to do with attempts to save other people from pain and humiliation. We should stop trying to combine self-creation and politics, especially if we are liberals. The part of a liberal ironist's final vocabulary which has

to do with public action is never going to get subsumed under, or subsume, the rest of her final vocabulary. (120)

Finding new descriptions of the truth of oneself may, moreover, have odd results. Only luck will determine whether or not the new private language will indicate genius, perversity, or eccentricity, will, that is, "also strike the next generation as inevitable" so that "Their behaving will bear that impress" (29) or suffer rejection and pass into instant oblivion.

The commitment to self-creation is not, however, confined to intellectual types. No particular self-definition, no matter how private, fantastic, or idiosyncratic, has any special privilege. In a view that at times comes close to the sort of essentialism Rorty emphatically repudiates, he insists that all methods of self-creation are equally expressive of human nature, and all are part of the innate human desire to poeticize life anew and thus represent the "final victory of poetry in its ancient quarrel with philosophy, the final victory of metaphors of self-creation over metaphors of discovery" (40). For, as Rorty has pointed out in his earlier writings and as he stresses here, the proper role of philosophy in the world of the liberal ironist is to assist in the creation of private self-definitions.

Philosophy cannot edify us about the state of our knowledge of external reality or our moral responsibilities; it can however, in some cases assist our therapeutic fantasies: "within our increasingly ironist culture, philosophy has become more important for the pursuit of private perfection rather than for any social task" (94). This is the case because "the relation between the intellectual and moral virtues contingent" (111), although elsewhere Rorty does seem to allow for a more public role for philosophy:

"philosophy is one of the techniques for reweaving our vocabulary of moral deliberation in order to accommodate new beliefs (196). What, then, for society? In a world of contingency and private self-creation, what does the modern liberal ironist hope for her community?

The themes are justice, The Holocaust and curiosity. Bruno is a curious boy and he is very naive, has very little understanding of the Holocaust. The book is looked upon from a child's view and everything seems confusing and unfair. Especially to Shmuel, because he doesn't see how Bruno can be complaining about where he lives. Bruno's new house seems like such a luxury compared to Auschwitz where he lives with thousands more. It is based on justice

"The Boy in Striped Pajamas" is a powerful and complex movie. Its ending is devastating, but the power of the movie does not lie solely in the memorable conclusion. Throughout, it provokes strong and complicated emotions.

The film touches on the variety of hate's manifestations and reactions to them and demonstrates that hatred is not a natural phenomenon for young people.

It makes one think about moral issues and reminds us of the consequences of hatred, first, of course, for the victims but for the oppressors as well.

These films can help introduce to a new generation of film viewers the history of that time and the important moral and ethical dilemmas, and the life and death decisions that had to be made in the path of the Nazi killing machine. This is especially important at a time when Holocaust survivors are dwindling in number, and as memory of World War II fades with the passage of time.

There is the growing sense that irony has emerged as a mode of expression that is strange out of vogue. Politicians and pundits seldom use it. Irony is a complex rhetorical move. It depends on deep and shared levels of understanding, knowing

namely, that one means what one doesn't mean and that that actually means something else completely. Linda Hutcheon examines the nature of this scene. She explores what constitutes irony, how irony functions, in what ways it is political, and how it disrupts the space between expression and understanding. She examines" irony not only as an intercommunicative act, but as a discursive practice that is, in manyways, a cultural event, which happens in discrete and often sophisticated ways"(78). She analyzes irony's logic and the way in which it operates in relations to concepts of difference and identity, intentionality and interpretation, and the inappropriate and the appropriate. She examines these concerns vis-a-vis an array of references gathered from contemporary and modern culture.

The Boy in the Striped Pajamas is set in World War II in Germany. The very setting is strongly evocative of the ironic overtone. The grim and arid situation is likely to enhance the ironic impressions. The two key characters in the movie are two 8 year old boys. One of the boys, Bruno, is the son of SS Commandant Ralf. The other, Shmuel, is a Jewish boy, in striped pajamas, imprisoned in a concentration camp. Ralf is the officer in charge of the concentration camp and moves his family to a house very close to the camp. The growing friendship between two boys and the German bias towards the jews are set to heighten the ironic juxtaposition.

The house is so close to the concentration camp that Bruno goes exploring through the woods and finds it. This is where he meets Shmuel. The two boys talk to each other either side of the fence and become friends. Bruno is outside the fence while Shmuel is inside though they are both trapped in a sense. Both are trapped by the Nazi's evil and hate. Shmuel's friendly frankness and Bruno's curiosity to explore are bent upon to bridge the chasm between jewish plight and german vanity.

The film is not a documentary nor is it based on true events. Though many scenes are very intense, there is tension within the family from Ralf's parents disagreeing with each other about the war to Ralf's wife, Elsa, having arguments with Ralf about the situation. The indoctrination of Bruno's 12 year old sister, Gretel, starts and she can be seen hanging Swastika's on her wall. The whole movie creates an atmosphere of uncomfortable tension.

Even the two boys portray an uncomfortable innocence. Bruno betrays Shmuel, yet he is forgiven and they remain friends. They do not even realize all of the death around them. Despite the few obstacles they do realize in their circumstances their friendship keeps them going.

) The movie is a great reminder of how wicked the human heart can be. It shows how people can be trapped by their own sin. It also shows how one's sin can trap others, especially, one's own children. I can't help but think of how prevalent fear is in this movie. Nazi's feared Jews for some reason.

Ultimately, everyone was afraid that another group of people were going to take something from their lives. Whether a life style or life itself. We are all going to die. It's just a matter of when and how. At the house, Bruno's absence is noticed and Elsa bursts into Ralf's meeting, telling him that Bruno is missing. After Gretel and Elsa discover the open window Bruno went through, Ralf and his guards enter the camp searching for Bruno, while his wife and daughter follow close behind. In the gas chambers, the inmates—including Bruno and Shmuel—are told to remove their clothes, amid speculation that it is only for a shower. They are put into the gas chambers, where Bruno and Shmuel take each others' hands. A soldier pours some Zyklon B pellets into the chamber. The prisoners start yelling and banging on the metal door. Ralf,

still with his guards, arrive at an empty dormitory, signaling to him that a gassing is taking place. Ralf cries out his son's name and Elsa and Gretel fall to their knees, Elsa screams and sobs with sorrow while clutching Bruno's abandoned clothing. The movie ends by showing the closed door of the now silent gas chamber, and then slowly fades to black before the credits begin.

Dramatic is produced intentionally by speakers. There are examples of verbal irony that do not rely on saying the opposite of what one means, and there are cases where all the traditional criteria of irony exist and the utterance is not ironic. A fair amount of confusion has surrounded the issue regarding the relationship between verbal irony and sarcasm; ridicule is an important aspect of sarcasm, but not verbal irony in general. By this account, sarcasm is a particular kind of personal criticism leveled against a person or group of persons that incorporates verbal irony.

Research shows that most instances of verbal irony are considered to be sarcastic; suggesting that the term sarcasm is more widely used than its technical definition suggests it should be

The loss of Bruno and his disastrous end certainly taught a bitter lesson to Ralf and other pig-headed Germans. To execute the Jews the supporters of Nazi made the concentration camps. Ironically enough, the innocent son of a callous Nazi police officer died on it. It is after the catastrophic end of Bruno that Ralf perhaps understood the agony of losing the beloved son. Once he perceived the agony of losing a son he certainly might have understood the agony of millions of Jews. Hence the very representation of Holocaust is straightforwardly ironical.

III. Ironic Overtones in the *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas*

The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas brings into light how the consequence of anti-Semitism fell back on the perpetrators of anti-Semitism. 'As we sow, so we reap' is the proverb which is utterly applicable in exploring the intended and manifest objective of this film. A Nazi soldier puts his eight year old son Bruno in the confined surrounding and environment. Bruno is obviously dissatisfied with the idea that his father is the soldier, though his father Ralf is promoted and sent to the village. Bruno lives with his family which is assigned with the duty of putting the concentration camp under surveillance. Bruno needs friends to play. He needs mates to talk to. But he is lonely. He feels bored. He explores the surrounding and finds a camp a bit far from his residence. He meets a boy of eight. His name is Shmuel. Shmuel and Bruno belong to the same age. Their friendship increases. But his father and tutor persuade him that Jews are bad; they are dreadful; they are treacherous; they are the causes of the impoverishment and backwardness of the Germans. The boy Bruno is not convinced. He is at pains to see the atrocity of lieutenant Kotler's upon the Jew Pavel who is a doctor by profession but who is a forcibly brought to Ralf's house to work as a servant. Bruno is touched by Pavel's act of healing his injury on the leg. Bruno is broken-hearted by Kotler's inhuman treatment of Shmuel who comes to work in Ralf's kitchen. Bruno feels guilty of not saying to Kotler that the Jew boy Shmuel is his friend and it is Bruno who has given him the cake to eat. Later on Bruno confesses his weakness to Shmuel who easily forgives him. Bruno is a parabolic figure who stands for philanthropical magnanimity and humanitarian generosity. There is the racial barrier between Shmuel, a Jew and Bruno, the German. The barbed fence Between Shmuel and Bruno is the symbol of racial barrier. Mature, adults and Middle Ages men can't think that friendship and understanding between the German and Jew

is possible. But Bruno and Shmuel develop friendship, love and intimacy despite the racial game, slogans and propaganda.

From the eye of an innocent German boy Bruno, the violence called into question. Viewed from the parochial perspective of the arrogant and intoxicated Germans, anti-Semitism appears to be defensible, justifiable and logically approvable. But viewed from the angle of Bruno's innocent observation and understanding anti-Semitism is callous, inhuman, brutal practice which has embarrassed and humiliated themselves. Holocaust, concentration witnessed the cremation of millions of Jews. This sort of practice has degraded the Germans morally. This movie portrays Holocaust ironically. The German viewpoint is filled with propagandas. But the boy's perspective is filled with natural curiosity to know, explore and transcend the area of anti-Semitic prejudice. There is the difference between the German reality Jews and camp and the boy's reality regarding how love, friendship and humanism are ripped in the bud in Holocaust concentration camp.

Bruno is forbidden to befriend, empathize, love the Jew. His brain is cleansed. He is manipulated so much so that he is doubtful with the idea of friendship with the Jew. But he overcomes this hurdle and befriends Shmuel. His act of friendship is ironically depicted. To kill Jews and their children, camps were established. But the Nazi officer's own son is lost in the camp. The very representation of Holocaust is entirely problematical. The movie *The Boy in the Striped Pajamas* is not vocal in condemning the atrocity and injustice committed in the name of opening golden space for the progress of German people by perpetrating callous practice of anti-Semitism. The approach to call into question the German brutality against Jews is soft and mild. In other words, it is entirely ironical

- Albert, G. *Understanding Irony: Three Essays on Friedrich Schlegel* MLN, 108.
5:825-48
- Alfred, S.E. *Irony and the Logic of the Romantic Imagination*. New York: Peter
Lang, 1984.
- Booth, W. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Green, D.H. *Irony in the Medieval Romance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press, 1979.
- Handwerk, G. *Irony and Ethics in Narrative: From Schlegel to Lacan*. New Haven:
Yale University Press, 1985.
- Kierkegaard, S. *The Concept of Irony with Continual Reference to Socrates Together
with Notes of Schelling Berlin Lectures*. Trans. H.V. Hong and E.H Hong,
Princeton Up, 1975.
- Mueckem D.C. *Irony and the Ironic*, London: Methuen, 1983.
- Muecke, D.C. *The Compass of Irony* London: Methuen, 1986.
- Rortym R. *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*: Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press, 1989.
- Vlastos, G. *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher*, Cambridge: Cambridge
Univerisity Press, 1991.
- Wilde, A *Irony in the Postmodern Age: Toward a Boundary2: A journal of
Postmodern Literatue and Culture*, 9.1:5-.46.