The unmaking of the modern railway experience began before victims were forced to board the trains. Roundups, unannounced inspections, ruthless extractions from apartments, and beatings were all features of the forced relocation from ghettos, towns, and villages. Observing the deportation of Jews from Salonica, Greece, Rosa Miller wrote: “And the Jews emerge, weighed down by their rucksacks, their bundles, their bags, loaded with baskets containing food for the journey ahead. Children press close to their parents, uncomprehending, fearfully following their every move. Older people have difficulty in walking, they stumble and fall sometimes, but everybody must carry their burden. Young people walk out defiantly, head up, completely silent.”¹

Using Miller’s description as a departure point, I analyze victims’ testimonies of departure from ghettos in different locations across Europe. I explore what they were discussing, responding to, and witnessing at each critical stage of transit, of which I identify three: identification and roundups, assembly and waiting, and boarding the trains. I have divided the departure stage into these intervals, acknowledging that deportees were not so explicit in their distinctions. An examination of how survivors represented their departure experience recalls Robert Eaglestone’s notion of existential truths. These existential truths are conveyed in entries from the Warsaw Ghetto’s Oyneg Shabbes (OS) Archive, maintained under the direction of Emanuel Ringelblum, and personal chronicles by Judenrat officials and leaders. Other chronicles include those from the major ghettos in Eastern Europe, and testimonies based on experiences in Central and Southern European ghettos.² An examination of these assorted testimonies might not necessarily reveal new data that historians consider original or revelatory about victims’ experiences. Rather, my intention is to interpret deportees’ representation of departure in relation to mobility, exile, and displacement from time and geography. I chart the ways in which deportees represented existential shifts from the ghettos and the loss of anchors to the familiar—be it work, social commitments, or family—to the railway stations. Deportees
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moved from their residences into the condition of interminable transit, a condition that seriously undermined and often terminated the sustainability of familiar anchors.

Victims’ experiences of forced relocation and impending train journeys can be read as a commentary on ambivalent and traumatic modern transit experiences. The narration of deportation is inseparable from the destabilizing impact of mechanized transit and its administration: timetables, trains, trauma, and stations. Survivor testimonies, whether in diaries, chronicles or postwar reports and memoirs, offer vivid descriptions of suspension between stability and uncertainty. I explore what impact the physical and mental fatigue of expulsions had on witnessing, arguing that the perception of terminated mobility pushed deportees into abjection and despair. This abjection was a prologue for the train journey. What traumatic geographies guided witnessing when it was without a location or place-based anchor? What were deportees thinking and discussing in response to resettlement directives? First, I provide a brief review of historians’ interpretations of deportation. Second, I analyze each interval of departure, suggesting that victims initiated a dialogue with the capacity of the visual to capture separation and struggle. Using insights from cultural theory and geography, I suggest that removal from familiar routines, relationships, and locations propelled deportees into the vocation of an itinerant. Testimonies of departure convey a mode of address that struggles with the tellability of memories without obvious place-based anchors. This witness address also counters the representation of deportation as a perpetrator-centered procedure of resettlement, and refutes historians’ assessments of victims as willing volunteers for this forced relocation.

Victims’ responses to deportation, and particularly their options for resistance, are a long-standing, if not divisive, theme in historiography. Scholars have examined deportation as a failed galvanizer of armed physical resistance, particularly in the East European ghettos. During the years of mass deportations—1942 and 1943, and most often after roundups and news of liquidations in nearby ghettos and massacres in the Eastern territories became known, urgent resistance calls were issued. In the January 1943 “Call for Resistance by the Jewish Military Organisation in the Warsaw Ghetto,” reference is made to the destination of deportation trains as the motive for choice making: “Whoever defends himself has a chance of being saved! Whoever gives up self-defense from the outset—he has lost already! Nothing awaits him except only a hideous death in the suffocation machine of Treblinka.” The call to resist the Nazi pretense of resettlement, and to choose to die fighting resonates in “An Appeal: Bialystok Ghetto Resistance Organisation,” issued on 15 August 1943, as does knowledge of the death traffic of deportation:
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Be Aware—five million European Jews have already been murdered by Hitler and his hangmen. All that remains of Polish Jewry is about 10 per cent of the original Jewish community. In Chelmno and in Belzec, in Auschwitz and in Treblinka, in Sobibor and in other camps more than three million Polish Jews were tortured, suffering the most gruesome deaths ... Jews, we are being led to Treblinka! Like mangy animals we will be gassed and cremated. Let us not passively go to the slaughter like sheep! Even though we are too weak to defend our lives, still we are strong enough to preserve our Jewish honor and human dignity by showing the world that although we are in shackles we have not yet fallen. Do not go to your death willingly.4

Resistance calls extended the image of the passive Jew to the voluntary deportee, an update that was repeated in other wartime witness accounts and in postwar indictments of Jewish responses. Associated with the “sheep to the slaughter” image, the allegation of voluntarism implies that in relation to deportation, individual and group attempts to avoid it were possible, common, and ignored. The will to resist that scholars and postwar audiences so commonly expected of deportees but which they did not deliver is misplaced, if one considers the options presented to them. They had other less heroic concerns to consider. If roundups were accompanied by extreme brutality and were an ominous indicator of future peril, why was there not more resistance to them? If deportees had some warning that boarding the trains meant an almost certain death, then is there not some truth to the image of Jews as compliant victims? These readings are implicit in the following exchange from the Eichmann trial. The exchange demonstrates a common temptation to elicit prophetic actions from deportees, and downplays the highly volatile environment that influenced their assessment of freak and unpredictable options. The Attorney General asked Ya’akov Gurfein about his deportation from Galicia to Belzec:5

Attorney General: Tell me, at the railway station when they packed you into the train going to Belzec, when you thought that it was likely to go to Belzec why didn’t you resist, why did you board the train?

Gurfein: We no longer had any strength left. Very simply, we wanted it to end quickly. This was in 1943. After so many years we did not have the strength to resist any more.

Attorney General: You wanted it to end?

Gurfein: We wanted to die more quickly.

Attorney General: Then why did you jump from the window?

Gurfein: There nevertheless was an impulse. From the moment that we saw that the train was going in the direction of Belzec some spark was ignited. We saw
someone jumping and some spark was kindled within people who wanted to save
themselves. I wouldn’t have jumped, if my mother hadn’t pushed me forcibly.

Gurfein’s suggestion that choice making was possible at the time of boarding
has produced a discourse of shame in victims for not anticipating, and conse-
quently averting, the fate mapped out for them. This discourse has minimized
how the conditions of ghettoization, roundup, and violence impacted on vic-
tims’ immediate options. The perception that victims could have done more
to direct their own fate during ghettoization is echoed in readings of apathy
in the responses of Jewish individuals and groups in relation to resistance and
action resulting from Nazi persecution and its threat prior to mass depor-
tations in 1942. The contention of apathy is undermined if one considers
deporation as a profound and irreparable incision into a ghetto’s existence.

Anticipation, anxiety, stress, uncertainty, hope, and ambivalence were
just some of responses to violent, unexpected, and forced roundups of
ghetto residents and the separation of families, as well as the deportation
of vulnerable ghetto groups, such as the sick, the elderly, and the children.6
Communities were held captive to the fear of deportation before announce-
ments were made and roundups commenced. To avoid deportations, ghetto
residents frantically attempted to save themselves and create alternative
destinies—of escape, and of demonstrating their capacities for reinven-
tion in new occupations for which they had little practical experience. For
women, and at tremendous risk, this included passing as Aryans to facilitate
communication between Jewish resistance networks. Survivor testimonies
and chronicles made reference to the devastating impact of incarceration
and fluctuating ghetto populations, of overcrowded accommodations, and
ambivalence about the future. Ghettos did not receive major permanent
replenishments from incoming migrations; rather the opposite was true.
Disease, starvation, suicide, and random violence claimed lives, as did the
deporation trains that carried people away to their deaths in the euphe-
misms of “outsettlement,” “evacuation,” and “resettlement.”

Deportation’s impact was not only ethnically destructive, it was also rep-
resentational. Wartime chroniclers and survivors used the euphemisms of
transit to mock the brutal intention and impact of deportation. The impera-
tive to be a witness to deportation’s constant motion of removing people
from communities was often narrated as the admitted incompleteness of
the testament. The incompleteness was exhibited as a self-conscious dia-
logue with language to be documentary and objective. How could language
capture scenes, migrations, emotions, and experiences that were, above all,
embodied? How did extremity create frustrated witnesses and testifiers?
Deportations brought to the fore the difficulties of creating an objective
historical account of Nazi occupation amid a psychological assessment of
the community. It produced a temporal divide of “before” and “after” in testimonies, underscored by a fervent embrace of writing and telling the ordinary witness story. The “after” theme is especially striking, as deportations disrupted the archiving process in many communities, removing the already contributing and potential witnesses. The rupture was especially felt in the Warsaw Ghetto and the fact-gathering work of the OS.7

Prior to the deportations in the summer of 1942, the OS was the biggest underground archive in Europe devoted to the collection, study, and testimony of genocide and civil resistance in and around the Warsaw Ghetto. Ringelblum’s primary objective as director was to undertake an ethnographic and historical investigation of the texture of everyday life, and Jewish popular expression. There were secondary, but no less monumental aspirations, as Ringelblum also sought to create a usable past through assembling an archive of the material culture, economic structures, and folk customs of Polish Jewry’s masses. These objectives oscillated between the idealistic and the urgent, and as the war progressed, were shaped by threats to ethnic survival and imagining a Jewish secular humanism after the war.

The periodization of trauma in contributions to the OS about deportations had a memorial basis in Jewish history. Gabrielle Spiegel characterized the representation of deportations according to traditional modes of commemoration, of the historicization of these departures in Jewish collective memory through “liturgical time.”8 The deportations provoked Ringelblum to lament the loss of community history and society, the texts of which would have provided the “ordinary” character of the archive.9 As described by Spiegel, Ringelblum wanted to complement the liturgical presence in the OS archive, which included Yizkor books, poetry, songs, and prayers, with a renewed focus on life writing and telling through memoirs—a genre he felt was neglected among Eastern European Jews.10 Ringelblum attempted to remedy the marginalized memoir genre following deportations, urging a wide-ranging endeavor to document the disappearing traces of the Polish-Jewish shtetl world, and to identify its burial ground—Treblinka. He wanted to revive a modernist impulse in life telling detached from liturgy.

An exploration of how deportation shaped the commitment to witnessing is explored by Alexandra Garbarini in *Numbered Days: Diaries and the Holocaust*. Analyzing chronicles from Central and Eastern Europe, the author builds on the “after” theme foregrounded in the OS. She contends that 1942 and 1943 witnessed a period of extreme ruptures, which provoked in diary writing “new questioning about God, humanity, the future, and the continuity of their [Jewish] identities and a sense of total alienation from the outside world.”11 Garbarini argues that this writing departed in intensity from earlier ghetto chronicles, diaries, and reports, which tended to valorize the act of writing itself as a response to persecution.12
These approaches by scholars are indicative of how victims’ testimonies are read for their themes of resistance, coping mechanisms, and the self-conscious archiving of individuals and communities in crisis. I add to these interpretations by considering the embodied anticipations and impacts of deportation as an impending immobility. This approach reads testimonies through the prism of cultural geography, and theories of mobility and transit normally associated with sociology, anthropology, and postcolonial studies. Although cultural geography and spatial knowledge are long-standing topics of debate in the humanities, their integration into Holocaust studies is relatively recent.13

Analyzing representations of the self and other in relation to place allows a consideration of the spatiality of testimony and the emplotment of experiences—in effect, an expansive and constricted geography of mobile witnessing. This mobile witnessing is not fixed or finite. Particularly apparent in this geography are references to the infrastructure of transit such as railway stations, platforms, carriages, and tracks. This narrative attachment to the street landscapes and physical infrastructure of deportation is a fascinating and untold chapter in which everyday objects metamorphose from banality to extremity. This metamorphosis also occurs in other public places, such as hospitals, market squares, and places of religious observance. These public buildings are, however, more than mere backdrops in testimonies to the main themes of loss, displacement, and estrangement. Taken collectively, they constitute a memory map that marks the boundary between the familiar and the unknown. The witness’s tellability of departure from ghettos, with its desperation, anticipation, and sense of motion without destination, evokes an image of a frontier or border that is to be crossed. The human and inhuman landscapes of this frontier are the central referents through which the experience of train transit is initiated, negotiated, and interpreted.

Local architecture is an important spatial marker in testimonies as it allows the witness to anchor experiences. In the “Architecture of Terror,” J. Krzysztof Lenartowicz suggests that architecture is not a mute witness to events, but enables a type of “imaging.” In his article, buildings and structures are interpreted as tropes and constant presences in the witness’s testimony. Their imaging refers to the “knowledge, memory and feelings of the viewer; the physical structure shapes behaviours and is perceived through senses.”14 The impact of mobility and motion on the departure from ghettos anticipates the sensory destabilization that occurs during deportation transports as unwanted social relations and intimacy among the crowd of bodies. During the representation of this en route witnessing between roundups and boarding the trains, the civic architecture provides initial locations and places from which to ground the witness’s emerging dialogue with loss of the familiar, especially one’s accommodation and family. In different forms
of testimony, but especially applicable to postwar memoir writing, deportation is narrated as an unknown route map.

The contention that deportation testimonies are unknown route maps acknowledges the influence of cultural theory. As an output of reimagining, reanimating, and reliving, testimonies are representations of the self shaped in relation to an elsewhere. Sociologists Barry Curtis and Claire Pajaczkowska assert that the “journey is a symbol of narrative … its destinations are often described as a passage through symbolic time, forwards towards a resolution of conflict and backwards towards a lost aspect of the past.”

Holocaust testimonies, however, defy this resolution and are permanently shaped by the constancy of conflict. Frances Bartkowski contends, “travel is movement, movement through territorialised spaces, movement by those who choose to move and those who are moved by forces not under their control. Travel could then suggest crossing cultural boundaries, trespassing, visiting, capture.”

Testimonies convey emplotment insofar as experiences are framed in temporal moments of increasing danger and diminished spatial expression and mobility: peace and relative stability, the Nazi onslaught, the rapidity of the collapse of the community, or the resistance to it, the suffering of family and friends, the deportation experience, the camp, and finally liberation. This pervasive sameness of the structure of Holocaust emplotment, or as telling a familiar story or rhetorical trauma, admittedly make testimony vulnerable to attacks about the survivor’s dilution, repression, and inflation of particular experiences. Yet the sameness is also a source of evidentiary and corroborating strength of testimony from different periods and locations.

The emplotment of experiences also offers a route map of transit: it guides, it displaces, it tours, and it transgresses. The spatiality of testimony refers to the impacts of dislocation and removal of the victim from his or her ghetto housing or accommodation, life, and community. The cultural theorist Michel de Certeau reflected on emplotment in narrative, suggesting that “every story is a travel story—a spatial practice.” While de Certeau was not referring to the narrative maps produced by Holocaust chroniclers and survivors, his writing is evocative for considering the tellability of transit and spatial constraints. In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, de Certeau reflects on the metaphors of modern movement: “In modern Athens, the vehicles of mass transportation are called metaphorai. To go to work or come home, one takes a ‘metaphor’—a bus or a train. Stories could also take this noble name: every day, they traverse and organize places; they select and link them together; they make sentences and itineraries out of them. They are spatial trajectories.”

De Certeau proceeds to explain how narrative structures have the status of spatial syntaxes: “By means of a whole panoply of codes, ordered ways of proceeding and constraints, they regulate changes in space … made by
stories in the form of places put in linear or interlaced series: from here one goes there.”

Holocaust testimonies are spatial trajectories that can be read, in de Certeau’s words, as “narrative actions; this will allow us to specify a few elementary forms of practices of organising space: the bipolar distinction between ‘map’ and ‘itinerary,’ the procedures of delimitation or ‘marking boundaries’ and ‘enunciative focalizations.’”

Testimonies provide both maps and tours of the sites and spaces of life and its decline: “description oscillates between the terms of an alternative: either seeing (the knowledge of an order of places) or going (spatializing actions). Either it presents a tableau (there are) or it organizes movements (you enter, cross, turn).”

De Certeau’s reflections on mapping are applicable to the emplotment impulse in Holocaust testimonies, which are often seen to have their own assessment criteria by scholars and survivors who advocate the uniqueness of the event. With each stage of departure, familiar anchors of testimony, such as residence, place, public sites, friends and communities, are removed. Increasingly, as deportees are confined to limited and temporary waiting sites, the struggle between place as a physical anchor and space as an experiential marker of mobility and constraint, becomes more obvious and traumatizing. Existential truth takes on increasingly sensorial form that challenges visual knowledge as persistently available to mobile witnesses.

**Roundups: Street Scenes of Despair**

During roundups, victims reported on a wide range of incidences, abuses, and reactions. Chronicles of roundups and removals testified to the physical expulsion of ghetto residents and their capacity to witness and report existential truths. Two deep community traumas of lasting loss occurred in the Warsaw and Lodz ghettos between June and September 1942. Avraham Lewin’s *A Cup of Tears: A Diary of the Warsaw Ghetto* includes an agonizing mapping of deportation traumas. His “Diary of the Great Deportation” argues that the disappearance of the ghetto community was not only historically unprecedented, but was also a representational rupture. His entry of 22 July 1942 scopes the community’s fear: “A day of turmoil, chaos and fear: the news about the expulsion of the Jews is spreading like lightning through the town, Jewish Warsaw suddenly died, the shops are closed, Jews run by, in confusion, terrified. The Jewish streets are an appalling sight.”

Lewin’s depiction of the streets seeps with emotional despair, evident in his entry of 23 July: “Weeping. The Jews are weeping. They are hoping for a miracle. The expulsion is continuing. Buildings are blockaded. 23 Twarda Street. Terrible scenes. A woman with beautiful hair. A girl, 20 years old, pretty. They are weeping and tearing at their hair. What would Tolstoy...
have said to this?” In the 25 July entry, Lewin moves the reader to the Umschlagplatz, the assembly and deportation point in the Warsaw Ghetto: “Last night there were a lot of suicides. Conditions at the Umschlagplatz. People are dying where they are being held. You can’t go in or out. By yesterday, 25,000 had been taken away, with today, 30,000. With each day, the calamity worsens. Many give themselves voluntarily. It is supposed that hunger forces them into it.” Irreconcilable visions dominate the entry of 26 July: “The buildings at 10–12 Nowolipie Street are surrounded. Shouts and screams. Outside my window they are checking papers and arresting people. Human life is dependent on some little piece of paper. It’s really enough to drive you insane. A lovely morning, the sky is wonderfully beautiful: the sun is shining, the acacia is blooming and the slaughterer is slaughtering.”

Lewin’s reference to the “slaughterer” comes from Chaim Bialik’s famous poem, “In the City of Slaughter” (1904), written in response to the devastating Kishinev pogrom of April 1903. With each diary entry, Lewin insists on the futility of historical analogies to describe the ghetto assaults. They are more than pogroms. On 31 July, “the tenth day of the slaughter that has no parallel in our history” is isolated in keywords that indicate comparison and precedent, and is further evident in his entry of 1 August: “The nightmare of this day surpasses that of all previous days. There is no escape and no refuge. Mothers lose their children. A weak old woman is carried on to the bus. The tragedies cannot be captured in words.” Lewin’s descriptions accrue in intensity and are an example of crisis writing. His words evoke the pain of past expulsions as he continues his frustrated look into history to filter a contemporary truth. The Jewish police are implicated in the crime, as are Ukrainians and Germans who led the crowds to their departure point:

The 19th day of the “action” of which human history has not seen the like. From yesterday the expulsion took on the character of a pogrom, or a simple massacre. They roam the streets and murder people in their dozens, in their hundreds. Today they are pulling endless wagons full of corpses—uncovered—through the streets. Everything that I have read about the events in 1918–19 pales in comparison with what we are living through now. It is clear to us that 99 per cent of those transported are being taken to their deaths ... Twenty Ukrainians, Jewish policemen (a few dozen) and a small number of Germans lead a crowd of 3,000 Jews to the slaughter. One hears only of isolated cases of resistance. One Jew took on a German and was shot on the spot. A second Jew fought with a Ukrainian and escaped after being wounded ... the Jews are going like lambs to the slaughter.

Lewin’s portrayal of the street as a public murder site also resonates in other accounts of the July 1942 deportations from Warsaw. Ghetto communities deeply resented the Jewish police’s involvement in these removals. Their ruthless approach and roaming mobility are represented primarily in terms
of the physical injuries they inflicted during roundups. Josef Zelkowicz condemned their actions:

The Jewish police take, they take whomever they can. Whoever is there. If someone has hidden and cannot be found, he remains free. But they, when they take, take the one who is there and the one who is not ... The sun settles bloodily in the west, the entire west, swimming in blood. It would be foolish to think the sky is reflecting the blood shed in the ghetto today. The sky is too far from the earth. Nor have the cries and moans of the ghetto reached it. The lamentations were all in vain; tears were shed and lost for nothing. No one saw them. No one heard them.30

The Jewish police were secondary in authority to the German police, who were the primary instruments of terror. The power of German mobility was reflected in the random seizure of anyone who looked deportable. Stanislaw Sznapman recorded that “early on the morning of Wednesday 22 July 1942, a sense of foreboding descended on the Jews inside the ghetto ... At about 11 AM, word went around that the deportation had begun. The despair was boundless. People were overwhelmed by panic and dread. Meanwhile, the Germans began riding around through the ghetto in their cars and picking men off the street, especially the better dressed; some were killed where they stood.”31 Sznapman also graphically describes the roundups, in which the ghettos’ streets and walkways were thoroughfares of brutality:

Red traces of German bestiality could be seen inside the apartments, in the courtyards, on the sidewalks, and along the streets—puddles of Jewish blood and dozens of motionless bodies of men, women, children and old people, the innocent victims of the self-proclaimed cultural crusaders ... And so, from 22 July on, every day from morning to evening, the barbarians’ hapless victims marched through the ghetto streets under a hail of blows from clubs or rifle butts, their faces frozen in pain, their bodies bowed under the weight of their packs and bundles, their last material possessions.32

What is interesting in Sznapman’s description is not only the forced and brutal movement of people, but also the absorption of individuals into the hapless crowd, which has become a primary, albeit misleading, symbol of the voluntarism of Jews during deportation actions.

Emanuel Ringelblum described the compulsion to witness in the OS archive as a storyboard of emotion: “a photographic view of what the masses of the Jewish people had experienced, thought and suffered.”33 Certainly, this preoccupation manifests in the cinematic-like descriptions of landscapes in the removal of people from houses, the tearing apart of families, and beatings of non-compliant Jews. Also pervasive in the OS archive were references to fatigued and terminated transit. Lamenting the expulsion of displaced and
persecuted Jews in Russia and the Eastern territories from the Einsatzgruppen massacres, Ringelblum wrote about the violent local geography of Jewish history: “‘Blood-red Highways’—this is the name we can give to all the tales of wandering of Jewish men and women, young people and children, who roamed constantly from the time the Germans approached their homes until they found a place of rest and settled in a spot from which they could wander no farther. All the highways are stained, like Jewish history, with drops of blood shed by the Gestapo murderers or the Wehrmacht.”

Ringelblum’s references to the fatal effects of transit (and the incredible stories of return) were evident in his selection of articles for the OS archive. His naming of street addresses and destinations inserted witnessing locations into a feared geography of captivity and death. These locations included: “Death-Camp Chelmno,” “First Day of the Deportation ‘Action’ on No. 3 Dzika Street,” “Ten Days of the ‘Trans-Settlement Action’ of Warsaw Jewry,” “The Destruction of Warsaw,” “The Last Stage of Resettlement Is Death,” “Some Information about Treblinka,” and “Reminiscences of a Treblinka Escapee.” Ringelblum depicts images of complicity and betrayal that emphasize the ethnicity of the landscapes, their persecuted communities, and the final foot journeys of the deportees:

All are driven to the Umschlagplatz, which turns into an island flooded with tears of Jewish pain, suffering, affliction and death … Empty freightcars are ready, standing there, and these are then fully packed with 120 to 200 persons and AWAY! Where to? No one knows … But whoever knows the story of Chelmno, Trawniki, is aware of the manner in which these unfortunate must perish: machine guns, gas, electrical current—these are to be their redeemers from pain… Despair and hunger force people to go voluntarily to the Umschlagplatz. The Community issued posters saying that volunteers to the Umschlagplatz will be given 3 kilograms of bread and one kilo of jam. Claimants come forward. Instead of dying from hunger they prefer a bullet. So they go towards death.

Ringelblum’s mournful commentary is further internalized by deportees’ embodiment of violence. The prevalence of sensory witnessing emerges in these testimonies as the collision of aural and visual cues of invasions and extreme juxtapositions.

Motion was indicative of endings, as terrifying sounds shape the memory of Zofia Pollak, who was deported from a small ghetto in Poland to Belzec: “Wednesday, the night of August 26, 1942. One can hear the first shots, crushing of windows, shattered doors, lamentation, weeping, screams. There is a feeling of cruel slaughter outside. The action started. Midnight, a beautiful and clear night, with the moonshine lighting up the rooms, so nice around, and in such a night you hear cries of innocent children, of mothers and fathers, shaking the air.” Returning to that moment, she
writes: “At 2:30 in the morning the ‘Schupos’ with whips in their hands, having the merciless face of murderers, are driving us out from our house. We join the other Jews, and we are assembled in the Square near Bristol, where the horse-cars used to stay, and here we are watching the scenes of children being shot to death in their Mothers’ hands and thrown from the balconies.”38 The insistence on a visual truth also shapes her testimony. Her merging with the crowd created its own captivity: “I recall the horrible stories from the barbarian times, but even these atrocities are pale as compared with the cruelties and savagery before my eyes. Wherever I look around, familiar faces. We are arranged in formation of ‘sixes’ and we are completely surrounded, so escape is out of the question.”39

One of the most shockingly ruthless roundups of victims for deportation took place in the Lodz Ghetto in 1942 in the action known as the “Sperre”—the daytime curfew that the Nazi administration imposed and brutally enforced between 5 and 12 September.40 During those eight days the Nazis deported 15,685 people, mainly children under the age of ten, people over sixty-five, the sick, those unable to work and those without employment, openly conducting their roundups in courtyards, squares, orphanages, hospitals, and on the streets. They were targeted as the ghetto’s “weak links.” The “Sperre” provoked Chaim Rumkowski, the head of the Judenrat in Lodz, to further promote the ghetto as an industrially productive center, although the belief in productivity was an illusion manufactured by the Nazis as long as it was self-serving. Diary chronicles and postwar survivor testimonies illuminate the desperation that intensified with each day of the “Sperre.”

Testimonies about the impact of the “Sperre” continue the theme of witnessing in crisis, namely, the challenges involved in testifying to the forced movement of ghetto residents. They also reveal, as did testimonies from the Warsaw Ghetto, the locations of violence that were inscribed into architecture or material sites of witness. “Sperre” memories of violence and separation are inscribed in locations of care and ostensible protection, such as hospitals, and testimonies are anchored to infrastructure, if not buried inside different buildings. Josef Zelkowicz’s diary entry from September 1 depicts the targeted victims and their impending immobility:

The hospitals are emptied ... At seven o’clock sharp, trucks drove up in front of the ghetto hospitals on Lagiewnicka Street, Wesola Street and Drewnowska Street, and began loading the patients who were in these hospitals onto them ... The morning of the third anniversary of the war was soaked in tears that could not rinse the dust and blood from the ghetto streets. News that the sick are being taken from the hospitals’ spread like wildfire across the ghetto. Fearless pandemonium began ... Who in the ghetto did not have someone in the hospital?
Among the sick who are mobile, a feverish activity rules—they make attempts
to save themselves, jumping from the upper stories, leaping over fences, hiding
themselves in cellars, impersonating hospital attendants.41

Zelkowicz’s reference to the mobility of the sick implied not just physical
motion, but also the urgent passage into a new identity to avoid capture.
The quest for reinvention and healthy bodies on the announcement of the
“Sperre” is also reflected in Riva Cherug’s comment: “It is impossible to
describe the panic that ensued. The old wanted to look young; they wanted
to work. The ill wanted to look well, and children wanted to look older than
ten years of age—but no one knew what he must be in order to survive.”42

Teenager Dawid Sierakowiak recorded trepidation following the hospital
evacuation in his diary entries: “The mood in the ghetto is panicky; every-
thing’s in suspense, and everyone’s waiting … In the evening disturbing news
spread that the Nazis had allegedly demanded that all the children up to the
age of ten must be delivered for deportation, and supposedly, for extermina-
tion.”43 On 4 September 1942, Chaim Rumkowski confirmed this suspicion
with his notorious “Give me your children” speech, which set the tone and
justification for the deportation. He presented the action as a tale of rescue
and survival. Ironically, he rationalized this removal through invoking the
anti-Semitic metaphor of the unhealthy Jewish body in need of cleansing
through a symbolic amputation of its limbs. He declared:

A grievous blow has struck the ghetto. They are asking us to give up the best
we possess—the children and the elderly … In my old age I must stretch out my
hands and beg: Brothers and sisters, hand them over to me! Fathers and moth-
ers, give me your children! You may judge as you please; my duty is to preserve
the Jews who remain. I do not speak to hotheads. I speak to your reason and
conscience. I have done everything and will continue doing everything possible
to keep arms from appearing in the streets and blood from being shed. The order
could not be undone; it could only be reduced … The part that can be saved is
much larger than the part that must be given away.44

The effect of Rumkowski’s speech was palpable, as ghetto residents desperately
pursued an alternative to immobility. According to Sierakowiak, “The panic in the
city is incredible. Nobody’s working anywhere; everyone’s running to secure work
assignments for those in their family who are unemployed.”45 The representation of
roundups in terms of panic and fear in the East European ghettos was similar to the
anticipation of resettlement in other locations where ghettoization was relatively
brief.

Magda Weisberger’s testimony about her deportation from Czechoslovakia is one of thousands that can be described as an ordinary witness. Weis-
berger’s report exhibits no distinguishing literary qualities or sophistication.
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Life events and family members appear and disappear in her account with ostensible ease. Her testimony fuses the three stages of departure, yet also recalls an unusually long waiting period before deportation:

The nightmare started when one morning a German soldier appeared in front of our gate forbidding anyone to leave ... Soon our turn came and we managed to take a few belongings. We were herded into the Synagogue where we found the rest of the Jewish community. The following day we were taken to Nagy Szolos both on foot and in a caravan of horse drawn wagons. The Jews from the whole state were being concentrated there. For about a month we lived in squalor and subsisting on meager food. We were humanity in despair, uprooted from our homes, and not knowing what the future will bring.46

Gizel Berman was relieved that deportation brought a kind of certainty to her life, albeit painfully experienced a separation from her family in Uzhhorod—a town in Western Ukraine with a complex ethnic and political history that was under Hungarian rule from 1938 until 1945. The motion of the trains represents the work of removal: “Most of us were looking forward to leaving. Because those being taken were strong, healthy people, the sick and the old worried they’d be left behind. They begged the younger ones to be sure to take them along.”47 Restrictions on luggage were met with a selection crisis: “I started to sort through our things. Should I take warm or cool clothing? Which sentimental items could I not bear to leave behind?”48

Lotte Weiss, deported from Slovakia in August 1942, recalls the three stages of her diminishing mobility and her anticipation of departure as a collective voice for her sisters Lily and Erika, who were deported with her: “The last night in our parents’ home was the worst in our life. Because of the rumours we had rucksacks ready and my parents filled them with food and clothing.”49 Anna Krausz’s roundup in her native Hungary during 1944 is a continuation of her directed motion and captivity:

Finally, after Passover we were given a few days to pack our belongings since we were told we were being sent to a ghetto from which we’d be placed in work camps. Although we were terrified and obviously did not want to leave on April 15th with our small bundles they took the 10 Jewish families from our town to the main ghetto 28km from our town. There 100s of people were pushed into houses and from there on May 1st they took us to cattle wagons—we didn’t know where we were going and put 100 in a wagon and went 4 days without food, water or toilets to Auschwitz, we arrived on a Friday night. But because there were so many trains we didn’t leave the trains till mid Saturday. Obviously the heat was terrible and everyone was crying.50

Krausz’s impressions are corroborated by Isabella Leitner’s memory of her deportation from the ghetto of Kisvárda, in the northeast of Hungary, to
Auschwitz. In an example of backshadowing in narrative, she returns to 29 May 1944, the day before her deportation: “tomorrow is deportation … My skull seems to be ripping apart, trying to organize, to comprehend what cannot be comprehended. Deportation? What is it like?”51 In response to an SS directive to be up at 4:00 AM for deportations, otherwise her family would be shot, she’s outraged: “A bullet simply for not getting up? What is happening here? The ghetto suddenly seems beautiful. I want to celebrate my birthdays for all the days to come in this heaven. God, please let us stay here. Show us you are merciful … We want nothing—nothing, just to stay in the ghetto.”52 Leitner’s impressions of the ghetto as a preferred location render it, in comparison to the violence of roundups, as a safe space rooted in the repetition of familiar routines. Recalled retrospectively, these accounts seek to impart an aura of fear about the unpredictable destination of roundups. The emphasis on physical contact, force, threat, and abuses characterized this stage, but what anchors guided deportees on their foot journeys to assembly areas?

In Motion: To the Collection Points

Movement from ghetto residences to assembly areas was the second stage of departure. In this stage, mapping of the self and the collective forced movement are depicted in descriptions of battered and bloodied landscapes, destroyed buildings, and violent encounters in the streets. Hospitals, synagogues, prisons, assembly squares, and platforms at railway stations are the signposts in this traumatic, mainly urban, geography. In the Lodz Ghetto, Oskar Rosenfeld’s description of the impact of the outsettlement order depicts the congested mobility of frenzied and forlorn journeymen. The “street” is in constant motion with the trafficking of journey provisions, transit, and death:

The “outsettlement” of the newly settled from Berlin, Cologne, Düsseldorf, Hamburg, Frankfurt, Vienna, Prague and Luxemburg [sic] began on May 4, 1942. A bleak, rainy day, intermittent snow flurries. Impression of a November day ... The street has changed. No more aimless scurrying about, no more bundled-up faces of corpses ... Something new. From everywhere people with bundles and sacks on their backs, bags and baskets, knapsacks and little bread sacks, rushing toward some destination ... all around, people who are accompanying those who are in a hurry, supporting them or guiding them ... old people and children ... carts loaded with bundles, the streetcar carries the human masses ... Bundles in all colors ... from gray-white to black green ... Suddenly they arrive in front of the central prison. The deportees who had already been “drafted” pass over the wire fence clothing, overcoats, blankets, and other meager belongings, which they don’t dare take along, to their relatives and friends, attempting to exchange these items for a few grams of sausage or bread or margarine ... The human chains
are mostly soundless, all are prepared ... Some fall dead to the ground ... others put an end to their lives before embarking on the journey by hanging themselves ... But the street hears little about this. It does not care about individual fates. It belongs to everybody. It is just. Those who fall remain lying there. We have no time. Hunger pushes on, death awaits.\textsuperscript{53}

Waiting for trains in assembly areas, courtyards, and railway stations further reduced deportees to various states of unease, anxiety, expectation, and depression. These reactions were also typical, if not more intense, in the interiors of synagogues, public buildings, and factories. The depiction of deportees as an internal crowd struggling with lack of food and sanitary provisions features in several testimonies. Anna Heilman’s march to the Umschlagplatz followed the liquidation of the Warsaw Ghetto in May 1943. She provides a traumatic map of the ruined streets, resistance efforts, and indelibly, the smell of memory. Arrival at the intermediate destination of the train station reinforces the passivity and submission of the group to order: “We were marched through the still-glowing ruins of the ghetto, the smoke and acrid smell of burned bodies in our eyes and noses. Nobody talked, nobody cried, we went like robots, only our feet moving, our hands shifting the heavy knapsacks on our backs that contained all our earthly possessions ... We entered the Umschlagplatz and joined a sea of humanity. Everybody was sitting on the floor, hugging their possessions, families keeping together, waiting.”\textsuperscript{54}

Joseph Kutrzeba describes his waiting scene inside the Umschlagplatz: “In that building waiting for the deportation, every room was smeared with blood, or people having vomited, bloodied everywhere, because as it turned out, when the order came to be herded onto the freight train, the SS and the Ukrainians, who so ever didn’t move fast enough, shove them or beat them.”\textsuperscript{55} The brutality prompted Kutrzeba to reconsider his options: “I began to change my mind with regard to hanging around and coming onto the freight train, because seeing what happens in the process of loading, I didn’t know whether I would enter a cattle car still alive.”\textsuperscript{56}

Frank Stiffel applies a temporal distinction to the different uses of the Umschlagplatz. For him it was the passage to the Umschlagplatz that marked the boundaries between before and after, and familiar and hostile territory. He depicts how the ordinary waiting area became an extraordinary repository of despair: “It was not far to go. We were now approaching the Umschlagplatz. I was thinking how different the same place can be if it is seen on different occasions. It didn’t even resemble the Stawki hospital in which I had worked for three months and which I had known so well. Now it was a set of gloomy buildings surrounded by barbed wire and inhabited by a huge crowd of Jews who had been brought there before us.”\textsuperscript{57} Stiffel describes the scenes in the Stawki hospital: “People were everywhere: sitting
people, standing people, lying people. The corridors, the wards, the stairways, all smelled of people and their excrements. People were sitting in their own feces, jealously clutching their bundles and their bread. They had been waiting for four or five days for the deportation transport to arrive.\textsuperscript{58} His comment about the deliberately inhumane lack of provisions also depicts the work of excrement in preparing deportees for the conditions of transport.

Away from Warsaw, deportees provide corroborating testimony about waiting to board the trains. Elie Wiesel recalls the metamorphosis of places of worship into scenes of terror. Buildings of religious observance assumed an extraordinary function, housing crowds who anticipated their own fate by initiating transgressions that would later intensify throughout the journey: “Our convoy went toward the main synagogue ... The synagogue was like a huge station: luggage and tears. The altar was broken, the hangings torn down, the walls bare. There were so many of us that we could scarcely breathe. We spent a horrible twenty-four hours there. There were men downstairs: women on the first floor ... Since no one could go out, people were relieving themselves in a corner.”\textsuperscript{59}

Scenes of distress were also reported by Gerald Jacobs, who wrote about the Holocaust experiences of Miklos Hammer and his deportation from Nagyvarad in Hungary in May 1944. Walking toward the synagogue, Jacobs wrote that Hammer “felt thankful he had no sweetheart, wife or children. And he felt ready for the transport, for a new regime of terror ... Nothing, however, could have prepared him for his last few hours in Nagyvarad.”\textsuperscript{60} Hammer depicts the everyday functions of the ghetto synagogue and its transformation: “On this May evening, the gallery was filled to overflowing, men and women indiscriminately bundled along the gateways and the benches ... The heat from the mass of bodies was oppressive. A murmur of voices was rising with panic and excitement. A few men up at the front of the stalls were praying, an art of sublime incongruity.”\textsuperscript{61} Then the synagogue doors were shut: “A sudden wailing resounded like a wave around the walls, broken by individual screams. The atmosphere was stifling. People stampeded for places to sit or lie down.”\textsuperscript{62} The impact of immobilization was confined to these locations, where people were forced to abandon their usual, socially conditioned behaviors: “The drone of sounds in the darkened synagogue, the coughs, screams, laughter, whispers and moans of despair, merged with impressions of the past and future.”\textsuperscript{63}

Following his roundup, Simon Klein was detained for eight days in a brick factory before his journey from Hungary to Auschwitz. He describes the sources of immobilization as bodily and structural:

Toward the end of June one midnite [sic] the police raided the house. On July 2, 288 people were draged [sic] away to a brick factory which could house 2000.
40,000 people were crowded in here. There was no room for anyone—no sanitary accommodations, no food and many of the older people were exposed in mud and rain, lost their minds and killed themselves. From all the neighboring small towns the people were herded; it was a very sad reunion. We were kept there 8 days and then crowded into cattle cars. I was put into the last transport with our family.64

Cecilie Klein-Pollack, deported from the Khust ghetto in Hungary to Auschwitz, described a humiliating violation before her deportation. Marched to what she thought was a brick factory, she was forced to strip naked and searched for valuables. Her clothes were returned before boarding the train.65 Kay Gundel emphasizes the pain of separation in the assembly area before her deportation from Theresienstadt to Auschwitz in August 1942:

The group was assembled in the large yard for inspection. Once again, the same scene of tears, sobs and clutching hands as people were torn away from each other to meet still another demand of Nazi business. The SS guards stomped about and screamed with rage for the people to settle down; with brutal shoves and slaps and deep jabs of their gun butts, they pushed and squeezed a herd of frightened people onto that first cattlewagons [sic] poised on the tracks. An engine rolled up and under heavy armed guard, the wagons rolled out of the ghetto toward ... no one knew.66

Fear of the impending transport was also evident in accounts that testified to psychological ruin through depression, fatalistic behavior, and emotional despair. Karol Jonca includes a selection of such testimonies in his article on the deportation of Breslau Jews from Silesia in late 1941 to Theresienstadt and Auschwitz. In one example, Karla Wolff reported on the collective despair that prefaced deportations, listing 108 Jews who committed suicide before the impending liquidation of the Breslau Jewish community. She recalls the indelible scene:

It was February 27, 1943. I don’t remember exactly how everything began. But all of a sudden everyone knew: this was the day of the complete liquidation of the Jewish community. I was busy with my duties at the old-age home whose windows faced the courtyard of the “Stork” synagogue ... Families and groups assembled in the cold courtyard, people were busy packing up and sorting. Many however were sitting apathetically on their boxes, staring blankly. Initially, people tried to preserve their dignity [and] personal dignity. Everyone still retained his own human countenance. But with every passing hour the familiar faces faded away; one’s own face got blurred. They turned into bundles of fear and bottomless despair.67

These foregoing accounts are more than reportage. They are also commentaries on the perpetrators and their approaches to roundups, the disregard
for deportees, and the impact of the resettlement premise to solicit deportees’ compliance to board trains.

Leaving and Boarding

The final stage of departure, the loading of deportees into the trains, reveals common sentiments of relief and anticipation. It was the image of the train at the station, of an endless constellation of freight (and sometimes passenger) cars, or the guarded cattle car transport, that represented a new variant of frontier journeys between the known and tolerated ghetto existence, and despite the rumors, a still unconfirmed future. The train station lingers as a traumatic arrival and departure motif in testimonies, evoking its power as a historically ubiquitous construct of modern transit, adventure, and discovery. It also features in modern literature and suspense fiction as an enduring marker of danger, tragedy, and unfulfilled promise. Railway historians Jeffrey Richards and John MacKenzie contemplate this fascination: “What was it about the station that was so fascinating? ... The station was truly a gateway through which people passed in endless profusion on a variety of missions—a place of motion and emotion, arrival and departure, joy and sorrow, parting and reunion.”68 Railway stations were administrative shelters of departure and entry to the modern city, and also attempted to cultivate a feeling of domesticity, community, and familiarity through their design as residences. Consisting of porches at the front, shelters inside, verandas at the back, chimneys, and windows, modern stations invited temporary comforts that not only assisted in the institutionalization of modern transit but also in the pacification of Holocaust deportees at departure. They personified an order that was civic and social in design, but regulatory in purpose: “the station, with its timetables, tickers, uniformed staff, and ubiquitous clocks, is an inherent supporter and encourager of discipline and order ... it has over time acquired a more disciplinary, structural and organizational connotation.”69

Michel Foucault’s perspective about administrative functions of the station can be applied to their use in the Holocaust: “panoptism was a technological invention in the order of power ... it involves surveillance, and the institutionalization of surveillance, first on a local level and then greater.”70 The long and narrow platforms at many stations permitted the control of deportees through intimidation, brute force, and compliance. In critical writing about deportation, stations and platforms are represented as powerful cultural signifiers of endings and abandonment. Writing about deportations from the Warsaw Ghetto, Jaroslaw Rymkiewicz asserts, “it is on the Umschlagplatz that the history of Polish Jews came to an end, was arrested and seemingly terminated.”71
This sentiment is grounded in the testimonies of deportees, who provide intimate evidence about the multiple assaults and enclosures they endured. Irrespective of the departure location, whether at the Umschlagplatz in the Warsaw Ghetto, at Westerbork transit camp, Radogoszcz outside Lodz, Drancy transit camp, Salonica in Greece, and others, deportees recalled cruel acts of compression, beatings, and occasional assistance from others to get on to the trains that were often one meter or more from the ground. There was occasional restraint in the use of force, especially when the pretense of safe travel had to be maintained where rumors about deportation’s fatal connotations were not as widespread.

Josef Buzminsky recalls the sadistic methods that accompanied his deportation in November 1942 from the Umschlagplatz:

Surrounding us were the SS men with dogs, and a group of men stood before the entrance to the wagon. An elderly woman stood there and at a particular moment a SS man set his dog on her. The dog jumped on her and tore off a piece of flesh from her buttocks and brought the piece of flesh to his master. She screamed in great fright and jumped into the high wagon, on top of the people. All these Germans laughed a great deal. We were loaded—more than one hundred people—into this wagon and they slammed the door.72

Stanislaw Sznapman concurs, describing in detail the actual assault of transport even before the main destination of Treblinka had done its death work. He recalled that in Warsaw people were loaded onto freight cars, one hundred or more to a car. The cars were packed so tightly that people had to stand squeezed together, unable to move. There were no benches. People tossed out their knapsacks, suitcases, and packages to save room. All the doors and windows were bolted and sealed. There was a terrible heat wave, so it was absolutely stifling inside the cramped cars, and there was not a drop of water. Many people died in the railroad cars for lack of air.73

In his account, Surviving Treblinka, Samuel Willenberg reported that he was marched eighteen kilometers from the market square in the Opatow Ghetto to the railway station, with this march resembling a much shorter version of the punishing evacuations of camp inmates at the end of the war. The expendability of Jewish life is described in graphic terms, as people who could not continue were shot, and “with each shot, a shattered skull sent a fountain of blood splashing onto the earth.”74 Rudolf Reder, one of the few survivors from Belzec, was deported from Lemberg in one of the first actions in August 1942. He confesses that the fatal destination of Auschwitz was not a secret: “Nearly two weeks before deportation everyone was talking about it as an imminent disaster. We were in despair, since we all already
knew what the word *Aussiedlung* (Jewish resettlement) meant.”75 It is often recalled in testimonies that delays in departure of trains after loading further contributed to the fear. Reder reported:

in the general scramble we trampled those who were below. We were all in a hurry, wanting to have all this behind us. On the roof of each truck sat a Gestapo man with a machine gun. Others beat us while counting 100 people to each car ... Our transport contained many men, including some who had the so-called “secure” work permits, young girls, and women. Finally they sealed all the trucks. Squeezed into one trembling mass we stood so close to each other that we were almost on top of one another. Stifling heat was driving us mad. We had not a drop of water or a crumb of bread. The train started to move at eight o’clock.76

The irreversible effects of deportations on Jewish ethnic futures in Eastern Europe were repeated in Southern Europe, with the deportation of the almost fifty thousand Jews from Salonica to Auschwitz between March and May 1943, of whom almost 80 percent were immediately gassed upon arrival.77 Aron Rodrigue and Esther Benbassa argue that these deportations destroyed the historically and culturally vibrant Judeo-Spanish centers in Greece, and dealt a death blow to the Judeo-Spanish language of Ladino.78 In accounts of the persecution and public ridicule of Jews, the conditions of deportation were widely commented on in relation to the inadequate provisions made for deportees and the inhumane methods of transport. These accounts provide a corroborating witness narrative to many deportee testimonies. A document from the Directorate of Special War Services attempted to quantify the human compression that was standard for deportation. A report from April 1943 detailed that

2700 men, women, old people, infants, handicapped and injured persons were packed like crates, 60–80 at a time, into box-cars of the type normally used for transporting animals and left Thessaloniki without luggage and with one oka (1280 grams of bread) each. That was the only provision made by the Germans for the six-day trip facing the persons being exiled in this manner. The box-cars were sealed from the outside before the train departed.79

The capacity of trains to inflict suffering on deportees was also noted by Erika Amariglio, who was deported from the Baron Hirsch ghetto in Salonica, Greece, in March 1943. Her focus on the number of wagons underscores the volume of people being deported in one convoy as well as the industrial capacity of the railroads to achieve it. She recalled that “with a sense of great anxiety and misery our second day in the Baron Hirsch ghetto came to an end. The next day everyone was talking about the railroad cars at the train station. Michael Molho writes in his book *In Memoriam* that
there were 40 railway wagons. Forty wagons! An endless line, and they were waiting to be loaded.”

Although Amariglio uses Michael Molho as a postwar empirical validation for her memories, no such validation is needed to interpret the following reactions during loading, the “screams, yelling, wailing, in front of the railway car doors … people were disappearing, disappearing into the depths of the cars, more and more.”

The loading process itself was often fatal. Deportees sometimes deliberately taunted the guards, defied orders, while the older ones were overcome by extreme physical stress. The stress is clear in the following account of the deportation of Jews from Didymoteichon, a prefecture of Evros:

On 4 May 1943, all the Jews of Didymoteichon were loaded on to box-cars, the men, women and children being placed, 80 at a time, in separate cars. Each Jew was entitled to bring effects to a total weight of 30 kilos. During the loading, three persons died of heart attacks. The destination of the train was not announced, but may be Poland. It is believed that these Jews will be eliminated during the course of the journey.

The deportations continued until May 1944, with Jews of Greek, Spanish, and Portuguese descent arrested in Athens and taken to the Rouf railway station. One of these deportations was witnessed by an observer:

They were packed with suffocating tightness, 80 or 100 at a time, into 37 closed box-cars to be sent north. The box-cars were sealed, and gangs of station workmen put barbed wire and planks of wood across the slit windows. People were piled on top of one another: pregnant women, children, invalids and old people, all calling for help. In separate though equally crowded box-cars were the Jews of Spanish nationality. Their windows were not blocked, and the Germans allowed their Ambassador to given them a little food.

The procedure of loading deportees in Warsaw and Salonica is corroborated in accounts from the Netherlands, Hungary, and Transylvania, which recall trauma, separation, and the ominous appearance of train carriages at stations. These testimonies mourn the loss of the familiar and bear witness to the transformation of deportees into itinerants.

Etty Hillesum’s diaries and letters from the Westerbork transit camp in the Netherlands provide a tour of loading and its distressing impact on herself and for the deportees. Trains circulate as a central motif of freedom and incarceration in her diary entries, as she constantly speculates about who will gain a temporary reprieve from deportation during the roundups. In one respect, Hillesum is a detached and observational chronicler, in another she is that community’s witness-activist as she reports mournfully on despairing street scenes in the camp. Temporalities are fused in her writing, as she
is unable to separate the historical persecution of Jews from their present journeys: “We are being hunted to death all through Europe … I wander in a daze through other barracks. I walk past scenes that loom up before my eyes in crystal-clear detail, and at the same time seem like blurred age-old visions.” The train is an industrial instrument that severs the camp community, as depicted in Hillesum’s letter of 24 August 1943: “The camp has been cut in two halves since yesterday by the train: a depressing series of bare, unpainted freight cars in the front, and a proper coach for the guards at the back. Some of the cars have paper mattresses on the floor. These are for the sick.” Westerbork’s population is further compressed into cattle cars at the “Transport Boulevard,” the station platform, and the closing of the cattle car doors seal the victims’ final abandonment. Hillesum shrieks:

My God, are the doors really being shut now? Yes, they are. Shut on the herded, densely packed mass of people inside. Through small openings at the top we can see heads and hands, hands that will wave to us later when the train leaves. The commandant takes a bicycle and rides once again along the entire length of the train. Then he makes a brief gesture, like royalty in an operetta. A little orderly comes flying up and deferentially relieves him of the bicycle. The train gives a piercing whistle. And 1,020 Jews leave Holland.

At the conclusion of the loading, an odd normality and camp rhythm return: “The tide of helpers gradually recedes; people go back to their sleeping quarters. So many exhausted, pale, and suffering faces. One more piece of the camp has been amputated.”

In deportation testimonies from Hungary, the train carriage inspires mournful commentary on the geography of temporary security and uncertain transit futures. Anna Koppich was deported from Kolozsvar in early June 1944. She describes the peripatetic life of deportees affected even further by the incarcerational appearance of cattle cars, and the agony of leaving: “The day of our departure arrived! We were loaded with heavy backpacks … It was hot, and we had winter coats on as we started our exit from the brick factory … Pretty soon we were loaded into the cattle cars, thirty-six of us in one; only nine of these made it in the camp. We said goodbye to Kolozsvar. It was very painful.” Exile from the familiar is evident in Isabelle Leitner’s testimony: “We drag ourselves to the railroad station. The sun is mercilessly hot. People are fainting, babies screaming. We, the young and healthy teen-agers, are totally spent. What must the old, the sick, feel? Totally stripped of our dignity, leaving the town we were born in, grew up in—what happens after this long wait? Where are we off to? I am ready to go. Away from my cradle of love.” Leitner’s lament recalls de Certeau’s mapping of trauma in terms of narrative routes: the station, the theater of
loss, and impending departure from the community. Her fragment is told as a persistently relived experience, returning herself and the reader to wartime with verbs of transit such as “drag,” “going,” and “leaving.” While describing the appearance of exhausted, frail, and anxious deportees, Leitner presents a map without a destination, “Where are we off to,” suggesting an elsewhere without location, through the action of “away.”

Deported from Győr, Hungary, Eva Quittner writes of her return journeys to wartime captivity: “my mind reproduces still pictures from the film of stored memories of 11 June 1944. The pictures are in black and white: we stand frozen, my family and I, together with all the Jewish people of Győr and its surrounding areas ... The line of railway tracks extends as far as the eye can see in front of us. Cattle wagons wait, their doors wide open like gaping mouths.”

Quittner’s fragment is an example of mapping described by de Certeau; she recalls the image from her past and imposes an order over the space and visuality of departure. She depicts the images of unfamiliar transit, with the people from Győr on the one side, and the cattle wagons on the other. It is the crossing of the space between them that signals the first of many transgressions.

Piri Bodnar’s loading was prefaced by an arduous march to the station, where the image of the cattle car provoked regret that she had not followed through on family offers of emigration. Deported from a small ghetto in Hungary in June 1944, she recalls that “finally, after hours of exhaustive marching, we arrived at a station where a convoy of cattle cars was waiting for us. When I saw those cars, I knew our journey would take us farther away from home than I had ever been, and I remembered my uncle who had offered more than once to bring me to his home in the United States.”

Olga Lengyel invokes the image of the endless train to organize her boarding scene. Deported from Cluj [Koloszvar] in 1944, she recalls the deception she felt at the platform, and the circuitous continental journeys of the cattle cars: “We had no inkling of the treachery of which we were the victims until we all stood together on the platform in the railroad depot ... There was a nightmarish quality to the scene. On the tracks, an endless train awaited. Not passenger coaches but cattle cars, each filled to bursting with candidates for deportation. We stared. People called to each other fearfully. The insignia on the car indicated their points of origin: Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania.”

Deportees’ testimonies about the stages of mobility are not as discrete as I have implied in this analysis. The roundups, marching, and assembly, and loading onto trains are commonly represented as an endless transit memory of fused landscapes and experiences. Deportees give understandably more attention or emphasis to encounters and scenes that were violent, emotional, and embodied. The purpose of making interpretive incisions into
these descriptions is to chart the impact of mobility on perception and sight-based witnessing. The incisions are also designed to highlight the various scenes, experiences, landscapes, and traumas that constitute deportees’ memory maps. Their maps are emotionally charged inventories that comprise objects, people, and encounters, culminating in an irreversible expulsion from the familiar. In the three stages of departure—roundups, movements to the station and waiting, and boarding of trains—testimonies reinforced the importance of a visual perspective, mapping emotional and spatial stresses. This visual perspective is grounded in somatic responses and traumas. Reading deportation through victims’ voices acknowledges the impact of reduced personal space and mobility as a profoundly unsettling frontier of experience and representational geography in Holocaust testimony.

Although the locations of departure from ghettos and villages varied across Europe, the collaborative work and claims of these testimonies is multiple. First, they locate forced individual and group displacement from one’s community in historical and cultural time and place, providing an anguished version of urban ruin that refuges the Holocaust’s geographies of persecution in demystified, material, and spatial terms. Second, these testimonies initiate the reader into an experiential history of corporeal distress. Finally, these testimonies subvert the bureaucratic image of a controlled and distanced human contact between victims and perpetrators. Pushing, shoving, screaming, shouting, and beating: deportation was nothing if not personal.

Unsure of the destination of the trains, many victims desperately clung to the hope that the words written in letters (and later, etched into the walls of train carriages) would find readers. This was especially true for the deportees at the moment of exile from the ghetto and their former life. Just before entering the trains, and almost immediately after boarding, they scribbled notes to loved ones, family, and friends. Susan Beer’s knowledge of the destination of Auschwitz meant little to her:

On July 22, 1944, after three weeks in prison, we were told to pack up our few belongings and prepare to leave. At the time, I didn’t know what that meant, although I assumed it would not bode well. I found a postcard in my bag, and scrawled a message to my boyfriend. I wrote that I was being taken to Auschwitz, not wanting to disappear without a trace. Along the way, I dropped the postcard, hoping that a passerby would find it and throw it in a mailbox.94

Hans Behr, writing his address as “letter written on cattle train,” in between concentration camps in France, and dated 3 March 1943, wrote to his wife: “My dearest Edith, so tomorrow we are leaving, destination still unknown. This is my last sign of life, for the moment.”95 Lisa K.’s letter, written on a deportation train, Convoy 61, from Drancy to Auschwitz,
fears the future. Her words provide a strikingly accurate prediction that was not known or believed by most deportees: “My Dearest, the day before yesterday I received your letter. I have no more strength to cry. Tomorrow Thursday at 2 o’clock after midnight they will finish us up. We are here 1000 people. Among us are many old people and small children. Where they are going to take us, we do not know.”
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