

(Re)Producing Family: Women Surviving the Holocaust

Zelda Abramson, Acadia University, is a daughter of Holocaust survivors.

Abstract

This paper explores women's survival strategies in concentration camps through a series of interviews with women Holocaust survivors. There are three prevalent themes that weave through this paper: stories of individual survival; stories of collective survival; and the reproduction of family.

Résumé

Cet article explore les stratégies de survie des femmes dans les camps de concentration à travers une série d'entrevues avec des survivantes de l'holocauste. Il y a trois thèmes prévalents qui s'esquissent tout au long de l'article; histoires de survie individuelle; histoires de survie collective; et la reproduction de la famille.

My research interests on Jewish women's survival of the Holocaust stem from my personal background. I grew up in Montreal with parents who were Holocaust survivors. The post World War Two immigrant Jewish community in Montreal lived in a tightly knit, physically defined neighbourhood. Yiddish was spoken everywhere and the schools were almost exclusively attended by these immigrant children. As children, the Holocaust was all we knew; the world was made up of Jewish families who came from concentration camps.

My mother recounted her stories to me on a daily basis: tales of starvation, death and torture; but also of survival, connection and altruistic generosity in times of utmost deprivation. All my parents' friends in Montreal were also Holocaust survivors. Many of them were not only friends, but my mother's *lager shvester* (Yiddish for "camp sister"). Not totally comprehending the significance of these words, I intuitively knew that these women, although not linked by "blood," were family, the only family I knew.

I was intrigued, both as a child and now as a sociologist, by the power of the term - *lager shvester*¹ and decided to explore women's survival strategies of the Holocaust through a series of interviews. The predominant theme that emerged in these interviews was the role family played in their survival. Family, for these women, was not always defined by blood relations. Their stories challenge both conventional sociological and common sense understandings of family. In this paper, I examine interviews with women who survived the camps and ask the question: what makes a family? More specifically, I scrutinize three key themes that emerge from the interviews: stories of individual survival, narratives of

collective survival; and the reproduction or making of family.²

Feminist scholarship on women and the Holocaust first emerged following the 1983 conference, "Women Surviving the Holocaust" (Katz and Ringleheim 1983). A leading feminist scholar on the Holocaust, Ringleheim asked (1991, 244), "[i]f you were Jewish, in what ways did it matter if you were a man or woman?" There are at least two ways to examine this question: 1) from a social policy perspective - what role did gender play in the Nazi's construction of a racist ideology?; or 2) how were Jewish women's experiences in the Holocaust different from those of Jewish men? There is some hard evidence on the first question, the relationship between Nazi policy and Jewish women, less on the latter question.

The role of women in the Third Reich was well defined - women were inferior to men. Women were not permitted to serve in any leadership position within the Nazi Party and they were forbidden to seek judicial office or pursue most professions. Only limited numbers of women were authorized to pursue higher education and the educational goals of younger women were modified accordingly. To promote the procreation of Aryan families, financial incentives such as marriage loans, child subsidies and family allowances were available. Aryan families were to become "breeding" grounds; more children resulted in more benefits. In contrast, non-Aryan women, specifically Jews, were prohibited to procreate. In this regard, as Bock notes, all women, regardless of their "superior" or "inferior" status, were subjected to reproductive policies that were both sexist and racist. As "superior" women, Aryan women faced "racist sexism" meant to further race ends, while "inferior" Jewish women faced "sexist racism" that included prohibitions of procreation (1993, 178).

Jewish women were intentionally targeted at every stage of the Third Reich's Final Solution - from the first arrest, to the transport, to the final selection. Women, as bearers of future generations "posed a greater threat than any fighting man. To be father to a

child had no impact on selection" (Felstiner 1994, 207). Jewish women were "specifically linked with the fate of minor children on the ramps at Auschwitz" (Milton 1983, 15). The ramps in this instance refer to the organized chaos that confronted the prisoners when they disembarked the trains where every individual was examined; some were allowed to live, the majority was selected to be gassed. All children under the age of fourteen and their accompanying mothers were selected for death.

Sexual differences in extermination, according to Felstiner (1994), occurred systematically. Using records of deportation trends of Jews from France to Auschwitz, she reports that, upon arrival at Auschwitz, about 50% of men and 75% of women were selected for death. She points out that if the selection process had been gender-neutral, 43% of women (the total percentage of women deported from France) would have been designated to slavery as opposed to death. Furthermore, camp records, which document the numbers tattooed on prisoners' arms, show that of all those prisoners who were "stamped," only one third were women.

On the other hand, some survivors (both men and women) have observed that more women than men survived the camp experience (Karay 1998). Drawing on medical documents from the Warsaw Ghetto, the concentration camps Gurs and Theresienstadt, and personal memoirs of women prisoners, she argues that women were better able than men to sustain hunger for longer durations and were also better equipped to develop strategies for sharing and stretching minimal amounts of food: "...in the pre-war years, women had served as cooks, preparing the family meals and as a result learned ways of extending food in times of need...In many memoirs...women report that men were unable to control their hunger and that women were better at this; furthermore that men could not plan ahead...or save food for special occasion or for sharing..." (Milton 1983, 18). Milton's focus on food, however, only partially answers the second question. In

considering what other factors besides food contributed to women's survival, my intention is not to exalt women's survival strategies and denigrate men's but, rather, to reveal women's agency in relationship to concentration camp survival.

The issue of "survival" is contentious. Ringelheim (1991, 262) shockingly asks. "Did anyone really survive the Holocaust?" Her personal struggle with the word "survival" has led her to replace this term with the word "maintenance" because whether one survived or was murdered was determined by the Nazis or by one's "fate" (that is, luck). I am not disputing her point but rather think it worth asking what motivated the people who did survive to continue to fight to live? The word "maintenance" denies any notion of agency in resistance and survival. In contrast, I will argue that although women were targeted for death by Nazi policies, there was scope for agency by those who were permitted to live.

Thus, this research in part is situated in Abrams (1982) and Giddens's (1979) work on structure/agency. For Abrams, agency is "the problem of finding a way of accounting for human experience" (1982, xiii). Both Abrams and Giddens contend that the dilemma of human agency - the relationship between action and structure, consciousness and being - must be understood historically, that is through "process in time." Abrams explains: "People make their own history but only under definite circumstances and conditions: we act through a world of rules which our action creates, breaks and renews; we are creatures of rules, the rules are our creations: we make our own world...." (1982, xiv). Giddens asserts that in order to truly understand the philosophy of action, it is crucial to incorporate an acceptance of the role of the unconscious: a theory of motivation must be included because "it supplies the conceptual links between the rationalisation of action and framework of convention..." (Giddens 1979, 59).

To show the relevance of agency as outlined by Abrams and Giddens, in what on the surface might be a

situation of total subjection, I draw upon interviews I conducted with four women survivors. Small samples are not atypical in Holocaust research (Linden 1993). Two of the women came from fairly well-to-do backgrounds in Hungary. The other two came from Poland: one was from a middle-class family; the other was very poor. Of the four, only one was married at the outbreak of the war. The age at deportation ranged from fifteen to twenty-five. The interviewees requested that their identity not be kept secret. Contrary to many subjects of research, most Holocaust survivors prefer disclosure of identity (Linden 1993), to publicly propagate their truths - that the Holocaust did exist - and to teach the dehumanizing lessons of racism and oppression. Of the four women, only one, Judy, had previously shared her story in a formal fashion.

Each interview lasted no less than six hours and occurred over two meetings. Since it is crucial to be honest with survivors, who, in contrast to other informants, have reason to not be fully trusting of others, I was explicit about my problematic - women's survival strategies. I also hoped that this would make the interview more focused and interactive. All interviews followed a similar format. Each began with a general discussion about time and place. I asked my informants about their city or town, the local economy, and governance. I then asked more specific questions about their respective parents. I was particularly interested in social class, cultural diversity, and the role of women within the family. Two of the women enthusiastically recounted their stories of childhood, each noting that they seldom thought about this time and how good it was to do so. It was a helpful reminder of the quality of the good life they led before the war.

The core of the interview focused on the women's experience in the concentration camps. The tone of the interviews noticeably changed as they related events leading up to their deportation to labour camps. At times they became visibly agitated, other times stoic. On numerous occasions, I would ask to stop the interview

or take a break, but the women insisted on continuing, demanding to do so with great conviction and assuring me that the tears were not a sign of anguish but rather memory. Clearly, these women needed to tell their stories. As Bos observes, telling one's story is "an important function for survivors. It can allow them to reconsider events, rethink their role in them, and create a bridge between the past and present - in short, reassert their subjectivity and agency" (Bos 2003, 35). Delbo, a French writer who was deported to Auschwitz in 1943 for her activities in the French resistance, was committed to telling her readers about the Nazi concentration camps "the way it really was" so that future generations will not forget her struggle to stay alive in spite of "unthinkable" circumstances. She thus describes "the stench," the "hollow-eyed corpses, their hands twisted like the feet of birds dead from the freezing cold" and the "thirst, hunger, fatigue" (Delbo 1995, 343).

The interviews were taped, transcribed and thematically coded. Following a method that is common in Holocaust literature, I build on one person's narrative and integrate the other women's when appropriate (Linden 1993). I begin with Judy and her poignant and detailed narrative.

Survival

It was early in the morning when Judy and her family of six arrived at Auschwitz. Chaos surrounded them. All children under fourteen had to go with their mothers to the left. Judy was fifteen. Pregnant women and older people - her mother, father, aunts and cousins - also went to the left. Judy and her three sisters - Elizabeth, Claire and Eva - were sent to the right. As Judy recalls, "This happened so fast, now we sort of know what happened, at that time we didn't know."

After the initial selection, "those who went to the right...were herded into this place where we were shaved: pubic hair, everything, our head. They disinfected us - did it sting, a two-minute cold shower and then

out. They gave us a piece of rag to wear, whether it fitted or not did not matter. The good stuff went to Germany what they took from us. Only the shoes³ we could keep.

As an adolescent, Judy felt utterly degraded by the shaving. Furthermore, with no hair,⁴ everyone was unrecognizable. Claire was given a long blue night gown that reached her ankles. She cut the garment short to her knee and divided the remaining piece into four kerchief-like pieces which served as head covers but also helped identify the four sisters to one another. The women were marched to a barrack still under construction: there were no bunk beds; there was nothing. After receiving "something that passed for coffee, but it was really some black water," they were told to go to sleep. They spent much of their first night at Auschwitz crying and then promised each other never to cry again until liberation.

The first week particularly stands out in Judy's mind. Her eldest sister Elizabeth managed to obtain a piece of wood; she somehow borrowed a knife and carved four spoon⁵-shaped implements. Although the food in Auschwitz was vile - soup contained bugs, pieces of glass, sand, grass - Elizabeth recognized that the only way to survive was to eat and she forced her sisters to do so.

The four sisters were inseparable. According to Judy, almost all the women at Auschwitz were in a family group formation. Those who survived the selections without family tried to attach themselves to a family group. Although the family groups primarily took care of each other, a consciousness of helping one another prevailed throughout the barrack. Everyday there were at least one or two roll calls when selections took place. During these especially difficult times, recalled Judy, the spirit of mutual help and community prevailed:

I remember the roll calls in the morning. It was so cold, like 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning, and the women were warming each

other. Elizabeth always wanted to make sure that I was in the middle somewhere so I have the warmth of two bodies. Those were terrible those roll calls. We could have diarrhoea and you had to stand there. Women tried to help each other. But once the SS came you had to line up properly, but 'til then you were sort of warming each other, propping people up from the back...under the arm pits so they won't collapse because if you couldn't stand up at roll call, it was curtains, you see. I remember propping people up under the armpit - that much we could do for each other.

During one of the roll calls (after about two months in Auschwitz), Eva and Claire were selected and taken away. Elizabeth and Judy did not know their other sisters' destination but were confident they had not been sent to the "crema" (crematorium), in part because they kept their shoes and mostly because they were too healthy looking to be sent to the gas. That was the last time Judy saw Claire. Judy recalls that they missed their sisters but did not worry about their fate. "You don't worry in Auschwitz. It wasn't the kind of worry" that questions what could have been done to change the circumstances. "We knew we were powerless to do anything." Instead the women realized that the only worrying was "worrying about your survival." Thereafter, Judy and Elizabeth mainly kept to themselves and chose not to join up with another family group. They did, however, connect with two other sisters - Helena and Alicia⁶ - one of whom was unofficially engaged to their younger brother.

The days in Auschwitz were long. The women were in a holding tank waiting to be transported to another camp for work or to be sent to the crematorium. The women spent their time sharing stories and trying to cheer up one another. Hours were spent, according to Judy, "torturing themselves cooking all the time and exchanging recipes - how they baked a cake;

how they made a chicken...Fantasy cooking, this was all fantasy cooking because we were so hungry...."

The most dramatic story that Judy narrated of women connecting at Auschwitz occurred on Yom Kippur. Somehow, a group of women managed to secure a siddur (Jewish prayer book) and a candle. All the Jewish women, about 800 in number, regardless of religious belief, attended this ten-minute service in the barrack.

Elizabeth was an atheist, but yet she wanted to come. So we got into this barrack and the two kapos⁷ said "here's your candle and here is your siddur and you have ten minutes." And each one watched the two exits of the barrack. If the SS come they give you a signal. "All you have is ten minutes."...This was a no-no. Celebrating anything was totally forbidden. I remember this woman, to me looked elderly. She could have been thirty. I mean when you're fifteen and a half everybody looks older. Anyway, she opened up [the siddur] and she just read the kol nidre [prayer for the dead] which is a relatively short prayer and I remember she did it very slowly so if people wanted to repeat the words they could. But nobody repeated the words because everybody was crying. That was the only time beside after the war....If you ever heard a few hundred women cry! I don't know if you ever heard, but I never did. This will always be with me.

It was a cry for help. It was a cry of misery. Whatever it was - including Elizabeth - it had more than religious meaning. It had nothing to do with religion or expecting help. It was a release of some kind. Most people were familiar with [kol nidre]. It was the mesmerizing effect maybe of that one candle and everybody was looking at it....It's community. Everybody was equally miserable....I

don't know what you call it but people wanted to be there even those who weren't religious....Connection, yes.

That was the last Yom Kippur Judy spent with Elizabeth. Shortly thereafter, Judy was "selected." All these years later, she could still remember the horrified look on Elizabeth's face and that no good-byes were exchanged.

The women were in holding for an unusually long time - overnight. Unbeknownst to Judy at that time, her life may have been spared because of an explosion in one of the crematoria. Judy has only recently learned about this explosion, which may have been the work of four female inmates who had smuggled out explosives from the factory where they worked. After the war, Judy found out from Eva that Elizabeth, who did not survive, believed that Judy was gassed because her shoes were left behind.

Fortunately for Judy, the friends Helena and Alicia were among the women in the selected group. All alone at age sixteen, Judy recognized the importance of being part of a family and asked them "Can I be part of [your family]?" From that point on, the three women were inseparable; Judy adopted their family name.

It was terribly important for everybody to have somebody, how could I put this, to care whether you wake up or not the next morning. Somebody you can talk to and help you if your feet were swollen to put a shmata (cloth) around. You couldn't help too much each other; we were always in such terrible conditions. But the little you could help...was, first of all, a good feeling that somebody is helping, and secondly you wanted to help. That was always there.

The next day Judy ended up in Bergen Belsen, where "the hunger" was worse than in Auschwitz.

Fortunately, after three and a half months, the three of them managed to "manoeuvre" into a transport of five hundred women being sent to the Junkers⁸ airplane factory. At Junkers, conditions vastly improved. The accommodation was, "in comparison with Auschwitz, heaven, but only in comparison."

Understanding Survival

Judy's story of survival is indeed one of luck but it is also one of strategy, support and connection. She understood the need to have a family-like support system. Both Rivka and Clara (two of my other interviewees) agreed. Rivka and her family grouping of three spent the six years of the war inseparable as they were transported from one camp to another, marching⁹ for three months during the harsh winter months through Poland and Germany, propping one another up when necessary. Rivka also recounted survival stories of stealing and scavenging for food and then sharing every piece of food equally. At times, if there was extra food, the weakest got it. Eating meant survival and, in turn, survival was equated with defeating the Nazis. For Rivka, her personal victory against the Nazis was staying alive. Survival was resistance. Clara similarly describes the spirit of mutual help that extended outside the family and gives the personal example of helping two women access abortions in Auschwitz.

The subject of family groupings during the Holocaust - and there were thousands of them in the camps - has received considerable attention since the 1980s. In her research on the formation of these self-help and mutual assistance groups in labour camps, Baumel focussed on one of these groupings of women, known as the Zehnerschaft (group of ten) that formed in the Plaszow labour camp. Although only some of the women had known each other before incarceration, they all were connected either through attendance at the same school, family ties and/or the same country of origin. That the group itself was diverse in age, marital status and experiences, argues Baumel, gave them "a distinct

family quality" (1995, 68). She argues that the individual members did not have equal status; rather the relationships were symbolized by "mother-daughter," "older sister/younger sister" interactions. Some women took on the role of nurturing "mother" while others were more dependent and in need of mothering - the "daughters." To explain why, Baumel draws on Chodorow's work on women nurturing and motherhood (1974) and her theory on object-relation, which posits that "females (as opposed to males) can easily form ties with female kin - or, in this case, substitute mother figures - who are their seniors, in order to be vertically integrated into the adult world."

Central to Chodorow's argument is that women's personalities are fundamentally defined "in relation and connection to other people."¹⁰ Most women maintain relationships - to children and other women - that are deep and meaningful. Men, by contrast, tend to be less able to connect to children and their relationships with other men are detached, as dictated by universal role expectations. Feminist supporters of Chodorow view the female style of interaction and relating to be psychologically superior to men's characteristic style of being separate.

In contrast, Kaschak (1992) argues that such an outlook is dualistic and problematic, as human qualities cannot be separated from a societal level of analysis. Ringelheim similarly argues that "cultural feminism entrenches us in a reactionary politics of personal or life-style change, in liberation of the self, and is not truly concerned with bringing about fundamental changes in the ordering of human society or even solidarity with women" (1991, 256). It is my view that Baumel's analysis reduces the experiences of the *Zehnnerschaft* to the personal and the interpersonal ignoring the larger cultural context that may offer more insightful explanations of women's behaviour in the camps. For example, the *Zehnnerschaft* all attended the same ultra-orthodox girls' school system, although not necessarily the same school. The school's curriculum

encouraged "self-sacrifice, kindness, modesty and chastity." For these women, the values of "human decency and moral responsibility" formed the "backbone" of Jewish society (Baumel 1995, 66). The women she studies were profoundly influenced by their religious upbringing. In Orthodox Judaism, women are solely defined by their role as wife, mother, and nurturer. Perhaps, then, they adopted these very same roles in the camp.

But can we explain the experiences of all women in the camps in the same way? What about women who are secular? What about women who are from differing socioeconomic classes and educational backgrounds? Furthermore, do all women need to be relationally oriented? Do all women need to be mothers or daughters? When I asked Clara if one person took on the role of "mother" in her grouping, she laughingly responded, "there was no mother figure, just a dominating character."

From this we can see that to develop a comprehensive feminist analysis of women in the Holocaust, the starting place must be in their individual and collective histories. Such meaning fashions the material from which a woman can make sense of, and subsequently construct, her environment. Therefore, theories of social reproduction are much more fruitful in explaining survivors' experiences. Social reproduction "...includes how food, clothing and shelter are made available for immediate consumption, the ways in which the care and socialization of children are provided, the care of the infirm and elderly...aimed at providing the historically and socially, as well as biologically, defined care necessary to maintain existing life and to reproduce the next generation" (Laslett and Brenner 1989, 382-83, in Fox and Luxton 2001, 26).

The population of women in the concentration camps was not homogeneous. They came from different geographical regions and socio-economic backgrounds; some were religious while others were atheists; and there was no common language. But they shared many

commonalities in large part shaped by Yiddish culture, its history and traditions.

The Zehnerschaft typified women in the shtetl.¹¹ The role of shtetl women was well-defined and rooted in orthodox religious traditions. A "good" wife's primary responsibility was the maintenance of the domestic home. Women were also involved with the local marketplace - buying, selling, and negotiating. These women were resourceful and handled the family economics.

At the turn of the century, many European Jewish women, particularly those living in large urban centres in Western Europe (notably in Germany and France), abandoned orthodox religious traditions, although Jewish cultural traditions were maintained, and sought education that had been previously denied them. The new modern Jewish women's needs were divided between "learning and independence" and sustaining their Jewish home. The Jewish bourgeois mother was responsible for shaping the family's values, rituals, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours. Being sociable - maintaining life-long friendships and connecting to other women - was an essential part of a woman's daily life. Afternoon visits were spent gossiping, exchanging recipes, discussing politics, children and health concerns.

In the Nazi labour camps, women maintained the same type of connectedness. Stories of recipe sharing in the camps¹² are well documented in the literature. As Ringleheim observed, "the warmth you gave each other, the ways in which you divided food, the ways in which you carried each other, even singing the songs, the sharing of recipes, those small and seemingly trivial events in the daily life that made it possible for you to get through." "The ways in which women transformed recipes into communal sharing," she added, "did not exactly transform death into life, but transformed situations of death and impoverishment into possibilities for life" (Katz and Ringelheim 1983, 26).

Raab's autobiographical account of the war years makes a similar point. She interprets the times she and other women spent recipe-sharing as not only

"lend[ing] new energy to the owner of the recipe" through "remembering the past," but also "awak[ing] a tiny secret hope" (Raab 1997, 55).

Feminist and Marxist scholar Bettina Aptheker's research on African American women addressed how "[b]lack women create their own destiny, carve their own way through the sludge of a racist and sexist world, and set their own standards of value and self-worth" (1989, 61). She introduces two concepts - "dailiness" and "making do" - that also help explain Jewish women's survival strategies in the labour camps. "The dailiness of women's lives means the patterns women create and the meanings women invent each day and over time as a result of their labors..." (1989, 39). The daily lives of women are fragmented in terms of the different tasks they perform - meals, laundry, childcare, etcetera. Women's role requires flexibility as they must accommodate and adjust to changes not in their control. The task of women becomes to "make do" to ensure the family's life is well protected. "Making do" is not passive, but is an act of agency that requires intuitiveness, strength, creativity and resourcefulness. Dailiness is therefore defined as a process. Women sharing recipes in good times and in times of crises is a representative instance of the "dailiness of women's lives." The way in which women create meaning to their daily lives, according to Aptheker, is to develop deep relationships with friends, family and children; to be involved within the community and to share "a belief in life" (1989, 73).

Conclusion

The stories of these women tell us that in the most degrading and depriving conditions there is scope for agency. In the concentration camps, the skills women acquired as wives and mothers in their pre-war homes were transferable to those needed to survive in the camps. Aptheker's conceptualisation of how women's social realities are embedded in the "dailiness of women's lives" (1989) contributes to an understanding of the

latitude of human possibilities in times of crisis. Simply put, women in the concentration camps continued to do what they had always done - "make do." This work as well has implication for our contemporary world, which reflects the economic and social dislocations of individuals as a result of such dramatic developments as globalization, democratic struggles, religious wars, and environmental catastrophes.

Finally, the stories of the women I interviewed and those told in published memoirs draw similar conclusions - that in times of persecution, many women developed deeper and stronger relationships, networks and support groups. These family groupings were indeed agents of survival. However, these family groupings were not fashioned through a typical or functional family model. The women came from diverse backgrounds, the only commonality being their "Jewishness." In fact, there were no prescribed roles - mother/daughter, older/younger sister - assigned to the various members. The family groups were fluid and in constant flux. Typically, the family consisted of two or three people, though at times the grouping might include a whole barrack. And the women became *lager shvesters*. The women's actions were determined by what made sense at any particular moment or, in Abram's words, "we act through a world of rules which our action creates breaks and renews...we make our own world" (1982, xiv). The women in the labour camps made their own families.

Endnotes

1. To the best of my knowledge, men survivors did not refer to one another as *lager brudder* (camp brother).
2. Other survivors who were in hiding or passing as non-Jews also formed family groupings.
3. Shoes became a symbol of life or death. Shoes were only taken away from the women when they were selected for the crematorium.
4. The subject of hair taking on symbolic meaning for all women, specifically religious Jewish women in the camps, is addressed in Baumel 1995.

5. Primo Levi's account of his life in Auschwitz also gives weight to the symbolic meaning of a spoon. Not having a spoon symbolized "impotence and destitution" (Levi 1988, 114).

6. Pseudonyms

7. Prisoners who had a somewhat more privileged position. Most of them were not Jewish. They tended to be either from Poland or Czechoslovakia and had survived in Auschwitz for two to three years.

8. Owned by the Krups family.

9. Marching refers to the "Death March" that took place in 1944-45. The Germans, fearing the advancing Allies, forced the Jewish prisoners to march the roadsides, often without any destination.

10. Psychoanalytically, this is referred to as being less individuated and having ego boundaries that are more flexible.

11. Small Jewish town in pre-Holocaust Eastern Europe.

12. Young women and girls avoided discussions of food (Bondy 1998). Recall that Judy referred to times of "cooking" as "torture."

References

Abrams, P. *Historical Sociology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Aptheker, B. *Tapestries of Life: Women's Work, Women's Consciousness and the Meaning of Daily Experience*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.

Baumel, J.T. "Social Interaction Among Jewish Women in Crisis During the Holocaust: A Case Study," *Gender & History* 7.1 (1995): 64-84.

Bock, G. "Racism and Sexism in Nazi Germany: Motherhood, Compulsory Sterilization, and the State," *Different Voices: Women and the Holocaust*, C. Ritner and J.K. Roth, eds. New York: Paragon House, 1993, pp. 162-86.

- Bondy, R. "Women in TheresinStadt and the Family Camp Birkenau," *Women in the Holocaust*, D. Ofer and L. J. Weitzman, eds. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998, pp. 310-26.
- Bos, P.R. "Women and the Holocaust, Analyzing Gender Difference," *Experience and Expression: Women, the Nazis and the Holocaust*, E.R. Baer and M. Goldenberg, eds. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003, pp. 23-50.
- Chodorow, N. "Family Structure and Feminine Personality," *Women, Culture and Society*, M.Z. Rosaldo, and L. Lamphere, eds. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974, pp. 44-66.
- Delbo, C. *Auschwitz and After*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Feig, K.G. *Hitler's Death Camps: The Sanity of Madness*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1981.
- Felstiner, M.L. *To Paint Her Life: Charlotte Salomon in the Nazi Era*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1994.
- Fox, B. and Meg Luxton. "Conceptualizing Family," *Family Patterns, Gender Relations*, 2nd edition, B. Fox, ed. Don Mills: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 22-33.
- Giddens, A. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. London: Macmillan, 1979.
- Gurewitsch, B, ed. *Mothers, Sisters, Resisters*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1998.
- Kaplan, M. A. *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women Family and Identity in Imperial Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991a.
 _____. "Tradition and Transition: Jewish Women in Imperial Germany," *Jewish Women in Historical Perspective*, J. R. Baskin, ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991b, pp. 202-21.
- Karay, F. "Women in Forced-Labour Camps," *Women in the Holocaust*, D. Ofer and L. J. Weitzman, eds. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998, pp. 285-309.
- Kaschak, E. *Engendered Lives: a New Psychology of Women's Experience*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
- Katz, E. and J. M. Ringelheim, eds. *Proceedings of the Conference on Women Surviving the Holocaust*. New York: Institute for Research in History, 1983.
- Levi, P. *The Drowned and the Saved*. New York: Summit Books, 1988.
- Linden, R.R. *Making Stories, Making Selves: Feminist Reflections on the Holocaust*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993.
- Milton, S. "Issues and Resources," *Proceedings of the Conference on Women Surviving the Holocaust*, E. Katz and J.M. Ringelheim, eds. New York: Institute for Research in History, 1983.
- Raab, E. M. *And Peace Never Came*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press, 1997.
- Ringelheim, J. M. "Women and the Holocaust: A Reconsideration of Research," *Jewish Women in Historical Perspective*, J.R. Baskin, ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991, pp. 243-64.
- Thompson, P. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.