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This paper reports on a document study of children’s drawings from the Terezin concentration camp during the Holocaust years of 1941-1945. The research discusses drawings; first as a background to the Holocaust, where children were living in that liminal space between dream and reality. Next, using Haring’s (2012) Content, Interpretive and Developmental (CID) method of analysis, an exploration of children’s lives, as expressed through their drawings, is presented. Within this liminal space, emotions such as despair, depression and fear accompanied by intuitive knowledge, memory, resilience and wellness were experienced. The Terezin drawings demonstrate children’s intuitive knowledge and feelings of foreboding, as well as their resilience and hope for the future.
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Introduction

After the First World War, Germany suffered extreme economic hardships, imposed by the Treaty of Versailles (Bateson 2011). When Hitler came to power in 1933 his party used this situation as a motivation to scapegoat the Jewish population (Dovidio, Glick & Rudman, 2005). Jews had been unable to settle permanently in Europe; being as “service nomads” incapable by law of acquiring land, and therefore concentrated on business and banking (Slezkine 2004, 9). The historical, cultural, religious, social and economic situation in Europe finally culminated in Hitler’s determination for the genocide of the Jewish people. As Rutland states, “Nazi propaganda reinforced the negative stereotypes of Jews, leading to their humiliation and mass murder” (2010, 75). The Jewish population, as well as the German people, “were constantly deceived and could not possibly know the fate that lay ahead” (Salmons 2003, 146). Jewish children, in particular, were targeted and perished with their parents.

While much has already been researched, Lander (2013) asks for more study and research to be conducted about different aspects of the Holocaust. This document research on the interpretation of the Terezin children’s drawings and paintings aims to add insights into this area. For the remainder of this paper, we refer to them as ‘drawings’, although paintings are included as well.
Background to the children’s drawings from Terezin

The ‘Depression Era’, which followed a decade after WW1, promoted hatred against Jews who held a strong influence over the European financial system (Noakes 2004). The National Socialist German Workers’ Party (NSDAP) offered to bring Germany to greatness again and financial independence for state and individuals (Posner 1997).

When Hitler came to power in 1933, no one in Germany could foresee the “programmed horror the German military conceived for the Jews” (Krystal 2006, 37). The lives of six million Jews, as well as countless Anti-Nazis, people with disabilities, gypsies and ‘vagabonds’ were destroyed. Thousands of those who vanished in gas-chambers were children, “their ashes have long since drifted across the fields around Auschwitz” (Weil in Frankova & Povolna 2011, 11).

Jewish financial involvement had been developed due to their not being able to buy land for farming and get permanently settled in any European country (Flannery as cited in Pista 1997, 7; Slezkine 2004). This fact created an underlying hatred against Jews, and was fuelled by the realisation of Hitler’s associates that Jewish people had riches in savings and private collections that could be confiscated by the Secret Service (SS) (Posner 1997; Toltz 2011). The ‘taking of spoils’ escalated into the mistreatment, torture and transportation of the Jewish population (Toltz 2011). For the Jews, life ended in a “tunnel with no opening” (Frankova & Povolna 2011, 9). As Krystal (2006) notes, “An entire race of people had been condemned to death” and “an entire way of life was destroyed” (43).

In 1941 one of numerous ghettos for Jewish people was established in Terezin (formerly: Theresienstadt), Czechoslovakia, for the purpose of deceiving the Jewish population [claiming that it was a retirement settlement (Blatter & Milton 1981)], and the German people [propaganda told them that the Jews were provided a ‘privileged’ place to live (Brush 2004, 861)]. An inspection by the Red Cross in 1944 (Stargardt 1998) was carefully prepared by the Secret Service (SS) for Terezin as a model camp “to fool sceptical outsiders” (Brush 2004, 861).

It is difficult to imagine the anxiety, fear and confusion the inmates of Jewish ghettos felt, being stripped not only of their clothes but also of their former lives; trying to survive “in the paradox of existence [where]... hunger, illness and deportations were as much part of daily life in Theresienstadt as were its cabarets, concerts and lectures” (Dutlinger 2000, 2). Special mention
has to be made of the children’s opera ‘Brundibaer’, an opera where good transcends evil and which, according to Toltz (2011), was performed fifty-five times in Terezin, to the delight of the children. But Terezin was only a collection place, a “transit camp” before the final transport to the gas-chambers of Auschwitz (Brush 2004, 861).

It had been a most desolate place for the 141,184 Jewish people who were deported to Terezin in 1941-1945 (Adler as cited in Stargardt 1998, 215). Only 16,832 survived on liberation by the Russian Army. According to Dutlinger (2000) of the 12,000 children sent to Theresienstadt, aged under fifteen, only 1,560 stayed alive (169). Statistics, however, have been most inaccurate as Krystal (2006) observed: “some sources display the number of child survivors as a mere 100” (155): a terrible loss to humanity.

Dutlinger (2000) states, that the children “were persecuted along with their families for racial, religious, or political reasons” (26). Stargardt (1998) as well as Frankova and Povolna (2011) assure us that the children knew nothing of their destiny. The question remains: if the children were aware of their imminent fate, “were they traumatized with fright?” (Costanza 1982, 74)? They could equally have been affected by the unpredictability of their existence, like the adults (Posner 1997). Children (being children) may have seen the world differently (Malchiodi 1998), adjusting more easily than adults to the horror around them. There may be symbols in their drawings/paintings that make obvious what happened to them in this liminal space. Colin (2007) notes the children in Terezin “balanced delicately between youthful optimism and idealism on the one hand, and [the] cynicism and hopelessness of reality …on the other” (3).

**Previous Interpretations of Terezin Children’s Art**

Most children in Terezin were looked after in children’s homes by the ‘Jugendfuersorge’, or Youth –Welfare-department (Stargardt 1998). This organisation had been established by Jewish Elders with hope for the future (Ibid) because this was “the real treasure - the children of Israel and their memory” (Slezkine 2004, 7). Some children (mainly girls), had art lessons by Friedl Dicker–Brandeis (1898–1944), a “Jewish artist, intellectual and political activist in Vienna before the Second World War” (Linesch 2004, 57), perhaps “the first art therapist” (Glazer, as cited in Linesch 2004, 59). “She taught them art and gave them hope …to create a better world” (Spitz 2012, 2). For the children of Terezin Dicker- Brandeis provided a “form of escape from joyless reality; it was a delight and therapy” (Frankova & Povolna 2011, 84). Friedl Dicker-Brandeis perished in Auschwitz together with her students in 1944 (Leshnoff
Four thousand children’s drawings and paintings were smuggled out of Terezin after the liberation on 8th May, 1945 (Frankova & Povolna 2011).

Interpretations of Children’s Holocaust Art have been sparse, partly because of the ‘commemorative status’ of this work (Stargardt 1998). According to Stargardt, analysts would “refrain from investing these artworks with the symbolic duty of speaking for all the other murdered children who left no testimony behind” (Ibid, 192/193). Stargardt has carefully categorized the child art of Terezin into three distinctive types (Ibid). First, he discerns between the strictly technical approach where medium and technique are important for the design of the drawing or painting. This is seen in collages, geometric designs and abstract patterns (Ibid). Second, the art generated to express themes like “Seder, Christmas, images of home and countryside” and third “the drawings of everyday life in the ghetto” (Ibid, 195).

Stargardt’s interpretation centres on themes and everyday life with due respect to the children who did not survive the Holocaust. He notices a “sense of composition…[which] is remarkable, [most] probably produced in response to a given theme” (1998, 196). He advises “to exercise real caution” (using the words of Dicker-Brandeis) as children might have tried to please the teacher (161). Stargardt muses that “for the historian, the risks of over- and mis-interpretation are too great because we lack clear methodological precedence” (Ibid, 197). He chose to analyse the third category of the Terezin Holocaust drawings, using “two issues of key importance- food and home” which influenced the children’s lives (Ibid, 212).

Frankova and Povolna (2011) equally distinguish between the three categories, stating that in the first category are artworks which show “the gentle guidance and sometimes experienced touch of the artist and teacher” [Dicker–Brandeis] (83). In the second category is art produced by following a given theme and in the third is art created in free lessons where children selected “what just came into their mind” (Ibid, 83). Considering the contents of the drawings, Frankova and Povolna reported that the children drew from memory what children of that age group would normally draw (landscapes, families, animals, flowers, games and fairies) but a small part of drawings showed everyday life such as “the dormitories, bunks, the Terezin barracks, transport and many sadder themes” (Ibid, 83).

Other researchers, such as Golomb (1992) and Malchiodi (1998), have similarly viewed the drawings and paintings of the Terezin Children. Golomb found the drawings significant, albeit typical of children of this developmental age. She noticed themes of daily life, memories and teacher set tasks, however found that hardly any drawings showed Nazi brutality; confirming
likewise Stargardt’s assumption that unhappy or traumatized children will not necessarily represent what is happening but rather recall happy times. Golomb refrained from analysing the colours the children had used, knowing about their limited art supply, but stated that “if a theme is personally meaningful for a child the drawings can convey his emotions” (149). Malchiodi (1998), an art therapist, agrees that the Terezin children’s drawings regardless of life in the ghetto presented “things of beauty” despite the horror the children witnessed every day (159). Both researchers determined that this probably represented an “act of spiritual defiance in the face of overwhelming powers” (Golomb, 1992, 148), apparently expressing “hope and faith” (Malchiodi 1998, 159).

Stargardt asks if we can interpret these drawings as “expressing real life or fantasies” as in the drawings past and present are often merged, “a time and place before the world went wrong” (1998, 225) to imagine a future. He states that “apparently ‘optimistic’ pictures [are not] necessarily the work of happy children” (Ibid, 192), agreeing with Malchiodi (1998), because “trauma has many faces and the answers in creative form are especially multifaceted in children” (Brummer, as cited in Weissova 2008, 151). Stargardt surmises that “we can only glimpse from these drawings”, from these “involuntary snapshots, the emotional conflicts…we cannot ever quite know what lies behind even optimistic artworks” (Ibid, 235). Does knowledge of the Holocaust colour our emotional response to the drawings. Stargardt (1998) states that “there is no established historical method for looking at the visual material produced by children” (197) and demands to “view them afresh without the benefit of seeing where the railway tracks led next” (233). Therefore it is conducive to research this distinct group of drawings using the CID method, as established in previous research (Haring 2012), presenting the findings from the theme of ‘liminal space’, to fill a gap in the literature concerning the Holocaust children’s artwork.

Methodology
Drawings by Terezin children were at first randomly selected from the collection as presented in books and online. They were then purposively chosen by the authors to supply the richest insight into the lives of the children, as well as provide the most insightful symbolic expression of their thinking and feeling. This method related information and achieved a deeper understanding of what the children experienced and then transmitted in their drawings. As Case
and Dalley state: “the image mediates between unconscious and conscious, holding past, present and future aspects of a [child]” (2013, 137).

This research was qualitative in nature, employing a document analysis approach. As Altheide, Coyle, De Vriese and Schneider state: “The practice of qualitative document analysis (QDA) [is] an emergent methodology, rather than a rigid set of procedures with tight parameters” (cited in Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2008, 127).

Documents (the drawings of the Terezin children) were analysed using the Content, Interpretive and Developmental (CID) method of analysis (Haring 2012). The CID method includes: Content Analysis which is the “process of organising information into categories related to the central question of the research” (Bowen 2009, 133–134); next Interpretive Analysis helps to find deeper meanings within child art by employing a variety of techniques. Several methods can be combined: “Mixing methods allows one to see things from different perspectives and to look at data in creative ways” (Bagnoli 2009, 568); finally Developmental Analysis was explored and critiqued as the first in the line of interpretation of child art. For this, researchers have tried to combine specific stages of cognitive development to the child’s development in graphic ability. An extended description of the CID method can be found in Haring and Sorin (2014).

Due to the inclusion of Interpretive Analysis, and within it Intuitive Analysis [defined by Colman as “immediate understanding, knowledge or awareness, derived neither from perception nor from reasoning”] (2003, 378), a high degree of subjectivity could be expected and was addressed through an ‘audit trail’ and with the input of all three researchers. An ‘audit trail’ permits readers “to trace the course of the research” (Shenton 2004, 72). Further, some factual information was considered while analysing the work. For example, art material was difficult to obtain in Terezin. Children often had to use cardboard instead of drawing paper and any watercolour paint or pencils available to them (Dutlinger 2000, 75).
Findings: The Liminal World

We dwell on the interface between two worlds
— a world as it was
a world as it is meant to be
(Rabbi Schneerson, n. d.)

Through analysing the Terezin children’s drawings using the CID method, a number of themes were uncovered, of which ‘liminal space’ was one. “Liminality entails an effective separation from the everyday routines and entry into an alternative social encounter in which different rules, different values and different relations apply” (Atkinson & Robson, 2012, 1350). Within this liminal space, emotions and states such as despair, depression and fear accompanied by intuitive knowledge, memory, resilience and wellness were experienced.

Despair, depression and fear

The Terezin children lived through the nightmare of enforced removal from their home. According to Nuttman-Shwartz, Huss and Altman (2010) “Forced relocation means involuntarily moving a population from familiar surroundings to a new environment” (1). When moved away from their accustomed surroundings, their homes, families, friends, pets and toys, the world had drastically changed. Relocation has a traumatic effect, especially on children (Ibid). In Terezin the children were living between dream and reality. Their memories and dreams (expressed in their drawings) gave them the power to face the “unimaginable”, absurd life around them (Toltz 2011, 84).

Bone (2008) considered a different aspect of ‘Liminality’. She hypothesized that the ‘liminal space’ where imagination and creativity exist, which is experienced as ‘being in the flow’, leads to recovery and healing; making the child’s world whole again. Csikszentmihalyi calls this state “a holistic sensation that people have when they act with total involvement” (Csikszentmihalyi as cited in Beard 2015, 353).

Rockwood Lane (2005) affirms that when a person is involved with “creative or spiritual acts, even as a passive observer, the process creates hope”; a positive outlook is attained and coping strategies are developed (122). In therapy it is long known that art activities may heal children who have experienced trauma due to living through disaster or abuse (Rubin 1984). Drawing
gives children with limited communication skills an opportunity to express their deep-seated emotions connected with trauma (Ibid).

Despair and depression occur within this liminal time and space. According to Malchiodi (1998), despair and depression are difficult to detect in children. The Terezin art work was accomplished by children of age ten to fifteen (Frankova & Povolna 2011). Stargardt challenges Englaender’s perception that “children of this age live only in the present” (as cited in Stargardt 1998, 224), pointing out that details and themes displayed in the drawings often combine the past and present. Equally, the CID interpretation of the drawings demonstrate that the older children, especially the boys, were intuitively aware of their liminal situation. As Sigal and Weinfeld (2001) explain: “It is only in adolescence [from 12 years on] that we become capable of perceiving our vulnerability to potentially life-threatening events” (77). The Holocaust children expressed in their drawings despair, depression and the ‘Fear of the Unknown’, which is one of the strongest emotions a child can ever experience (Sorin 2003, 121).

Figure 1. Sluice in the Courtyard 1

Helga Weissova’s painting of the “Sluice in the Courtyard 1” (Figure 1) describes the desolate situation everyone in Terezin experienced on arrival (Toltz 2011): exhausted bodies and piles of luggage are waiting to be numbered and sorted into ‘useful’ or ‘to be discarded’ (Weissova 2008, 122). This means that young, strong adults, able to work in a factory or farm, were sent off in a different direction to those too young, too old or too weak, who stayed on in Terezin (Weissova 2008, 138) until dying of disease or transported to certain death in Auschwitz (Toltz 2011).
The children became aware of the depressive liminality of their existence. This is forcefully expressed in young Vilem Eisner’s unnamed drawing (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Unnamed Drawing

It seems a cage-like situation: bunk-beds are overpowering while the people are rather squashed on the bench and seen from the back which indicates no individuality is discernible. Strong brushstrokes mainly in black combine with dark green and dark red: a hopeless situation made mysterious by the gloomy shadows. Life was joyless or, as Pavel Friedman, a child in Terezin, wrote, “Butterflies don’t live here in the ghetto” (Frankova & Povolna 2011, 7).

Another snapshot into the reality of the children’s existence in Terezin is depicted in 13 year-old Helga Weissova’s painting of the ‘Bread on the Hearses’ (Weissova 2008, 44). It illustrates that food was of utmost importance. In her painting (Figure 3), the heavy cast iron hearse is piled high with bread loaves. It could be assumed that the self is presented here in the middle of the painting, her gaze down on the much wanted food with arms outstretched to enclose all loaves [reminiscent of ‘Bread of Life’].
According to Stargardt (1998), everyone in Terezin was hungry all the time. People would scavenge in the garbage bins for something to eat (Weissova 2008). She recalls that, “everything was transported on old hearses – luggage, bread and elderly persons” (Ibid, 44). It is questionable whether “Jugendfuersorge” (‘Welfare for the Young’, defined in Stargardt 1998, 210) was displayed on the side of the wagon. This could have been wishful thinking, however, it shows her desire that the bread be only for the children.

One third of the population in Terezin died of diseases like Typhus (Weissova 2008) or starvation (Frankova & Povolna 2011). The children experienced “everyday life in all its tragedy” (Schimmerling in Weissova 2008, 12). They were continuously confronted with death: they observed and intuitively understood that the hearses carried both bread and corpses; this would have had a lasting effect on the children (Wiegand in Weissova 2008); as Weissova recollects, “The impressions that were to orient me from this point in time ended my childhood” (2008, 150).

**Intuitive Knowledge**

Another state within this liminal space and time is intuitive knowledge, defined by Colman (2003) as “immediate understanding, knowledge or awareness, derived neither from perception nor from reasoning” (378). The children intuitively knew about their predicament, although Frankova and Povolna (2011) claimed that the children “saw reality, but they still maintained their childish outlook” (10). While Costanza (1982) noted that they sometimes escaped “into a
world of fantasy” (77). Harris (2009) asserted that “Symbolization through fantasy may itself enable children to erect a fortress in the mind that defends them from the worst psychological effects” (2).

Bigger (2009) added a further aspect to liminality, to include “an in-between state of mind, in between fact and fiction” (212). This becomes obvious in Dora Zdekauerova’s drawing (Figure 4), where she has intuitively displayed her fear of the unknown. A dangerous situation is depicted for the princess, foreshadowed by the black background and the orange fire breathing dragon. The strange, rather sketchy magician in the background is adding a sense of dread to the drawing. The princess seems to await her fate, holding her hands on her back and does not show feet, which could be a sign of feeling powerless (Di Leo 1983). She is diverting her gaze away from the dragon.

![Figure 4. Dora Zdekauerova’s Drawing](image)

The black shading behind the delicate girl could convey the danger the princess (the artist?) is facing at this moment. Cirlot (1971) explains that this symbol shows, “the search for the anima and its liberation from the subjugation in which it is held by malign and inferior powers, it seems to be of mystical origin” (186). The young girl has avoided to draw the hands of the princess, they are hidden behind her back. According to Malchiodi (1998), children find it difficult to draw hands “in a realistically satisfying way” (95).

The princess is a favourite symbol of young girls aged 10 to 12 (McClure Vollrath 2006). The child has depicted the objects as she imagined them: delicate lines and colours for the princess (beautiful white soft dress and blonde hair). The dragon has crosshatched, green skin; a spiky back; red/orange wings and sharp claws. Its head is drawn as a circle with a beak. It is breathing
fire. The dragon is larger in size than the girl and appears fearsome. Cirlot (1971) stated that “Present-day psychology defines the dragon-symbol as ‘something terrible to overcome’, for only he who conquers the dragon becomes a hero” (88). Jung further suggests that the dragon quite simply represents evil (Ibid).

Costanza (1982) noticed that in close examination of the Terezin drawings “amid the familiar appear disconcerting elements”. In this artwork the magician seems a disconcerting figure, perhaps a disguised symbol of authority. He stands in a stance of power, disconnected to the fairy-tale theme; carrying a hastily drawn swastika on his costume. This seems to reveal the real fear this child intuitively felt.

The presence and positioning of objects in a drawing also needs to be considered. For example, Gregorian, Azarian, DeMaria and MacDonald (1996) noted the presence of a black sun in many traumatized children’s drawings. It became obvious in the analysis of the Terezin drawings/paintings that the sun, which is usually depicted in children’s drawings, was missing from all work that the children had produced (except in some collages or abstract artwork), but noteworthy in eleven year-old Margit Koretzova’s colourful depiction of the life cycle of butterflies (Figure 5).

![Figure 5. Koretzova’s depiction of the life cycle of butterflies](image)

Here it shows the sun as setting in the west (top left corner) which, according to Rollins (2005) is an expression of inner spiritual knowledge of the end of life. This agrees with Jung’s view that a sun in the top left corner represents death at the end of the life cycle (as cited in Bertoia,
“Jung compares a life cycle to the path of the sun. It rises at birth from the horizon and moves one hundred and eighty degrees in an arc to set again at the horizon at the time of death” (Bertoia, 1993, 106).

Furthermore, the depiction of the life cycle of butterflies demonstrates the child’s intuitive knowledge; another feature which can present in liminality. Cirlot stated that “Among the ancients, [the butterfly was] an emblem of the soul and of unconscious attraction towards the light” (1971, 35). For young Weissova butterflies meant ‘Freedom’. She hoped for metamorphosis, symbolic of her wish to end the liminal existence in space and time in Terezin (Shakespeare, 2013).

**Memory**

Memory is another aspect emerging in liminal space and time. Two drawings of unknown children speak to the aspect of memory, unnamed drawing (Figure 6) and ‘At the Dormitory Window’ (Figure 7).

![Figure 6. Unnamed Drawing](image)

Memory has been defined by Jones (2003) as “consisting of image and feeling, the event and the response to that event” (34). We might assume that in the drawing ‘Figure 6’, it was a happy memory that motivated this unknown child to draw. The relationship between humans and a tree is a happy, non-threatening one. The birds blend into the green of the tree and are hard to
distinguish between the leaves. If we agree with Di Leo’s (1983) idea that a tree represents the self, it should be noted that the child depicted this tree with a strong trunk. The children’s clothes are colourful and each child has a different hairstyle. The choice of the colour yellow for a dress or hair symbolizes important spiritual or intuitive knowledge (Bach as cited in Bertoia 1993). The children are holding hands and are either dancing or involved in a game [standing opposite each other in two lines]. We can assume that there was no happy, carefree dancing in Terezin and that this painting depicts a memory from times before the relocation to Terezin.

The crossing out of the happy children with black lines conveys a depressed mood or anxiety (Di Leo 1983). This might point to deep thinking and depression in a young child. The tree has not been crossed out which could indicate a strong awareness of self (Ibid).

Figure 7. At the Dormitory Window

There is a sadness in the ‘At the Dormitory Window’, drawn by another unknown child (Figure 7). The real world seems far away. It is outside of the child’s present situation. She is longing to look further than the window, waving a handkerchief. It is most unusual that there are no other living objects included besides the girl: no trees, no plants, no sun, no people in the landscape.

In this drawing the girl has pushed a chair against the window to help her look into the countryside, as she remembers it. It is almost as if she wants to escape: similar to Iris, another young girl from Terezin, who wrote (as cited in Frankova & Povolna 2011): “We want to go
home, just home” (16). Straight lines of the opened window have been executed by a ruler. This and the stereotyped houses could be an indicator that the child feels unsafe (Malchiodi 1998). The self is drawn in a rather ethereal way, similar to the chair and curtains. No shading has been attempted; perhaps the drawing was never completed.

**Resilience and wellness**

The drawings of the Terezin children show symbolic expressions of resilience, wellness and adjustment to a difficult situation. Costanza (1982) insists that many of the drawings were of ‘happy children’, because they show memories of joyful times together with their families. “Memory puts us back in touch with the ‘essence of things’, with what is beyond time itself” (McConkey as cited in Jones 2003, 35). For Stargardt (1998) this means that the children are “still dreaming of their old homes” (227) and that they depict material which gave them “the greatest comfort” in their day dreams (231). Segal (1991) writes: “the daydreaming ignores internal reality and deeper conflict. It is an omnipotent wish fulfilment” (103).

![Figure 8. Hanus Perl’s Drawing](image)

Hanus Perl’s drawing (Figure 8) indicates ‘snapshots of memory’, spotlighting his family. The drawing is executed on yellow paper; perspective has been attempted; and it shows extensive and careful shading on all items except for the beach. Although extensive shading has been linked to depression (Di Leo 1983; Malchiodi 1998), here, in fact, it could be seen as an attempt to cautiously bring the disassociated parts of the drawing together: the furniture, the people and the boy, which could be a representation of the self. The bigger figure could be the father. However, both individuals are represented with no feet, which could mean that they are grounded and cannot run away. The father has no arms: he is totally powerless (Di Leo 1983).
Both figures suggest that the artist, Hanus Perl, was aware that they were at the mercy of the Terezin situation. The imagined beach scene could have been added later to fill the page and to achieve some form of balance. The woman, possibly the mother, pushes a pram; the younger boy has arms and feet, while the girl seems to be covered in cloth and sand. A cat is watching and a dog is running towards them. However, Jewish children were not allowed pets, even in pre-ghetto time (Stargardt 1998). Di Leo (1983) indicated that buttons on clothing, here depicted on the shirts of the father and the child, could be pointing to “maladjustment” (8) to the Terezin situation. Further, the scene of disassociated furniture items under three glaring lights seems disturbing and depressing. Still, as Berger (2001) observed in another context, these parts belong together: that which is not there is equally important as that which can be seen; or as Hecht (2001) establishes: “These furnitures and fixtures …are more than mere things…they are a collection with meaning and memory” (123). It is the memory of a happy family life that brings both sadness and hope for the future as seen in the smiling baby cup on the table.

An idyllic scene of an outing in a park is depicted in the drawing by Gabi Frei (Figure 9). Children are playing different games between trees, mothers with prams, watching their children playing, while some people are sitting on benches. Perspective has been attempted by placing trees in the foreground or further back. The trees show full crowns, achieved by squiggly lines in extending circles, seemingly (to be) looked at from below. According to Di Leo (1983) trees stand for the self (10). Tree tops stand for intellect and social tendency (Ibid, 168). Also different sizes of people shows the child’s awareness of adult – child relationships (Malchiodi 1998). Movement has been achieved: birds and an aeroplane are flying overhead and jump ropes are in the air. The ratio of human-made objects and natural objects is well
adjusted. The group of eight, holding hands, are wearing what appears to be a school uniform. The flying aeroplane seems to have swastikas painted on the wings. These two features and the unsmiling people could be seen as Frei unconsciously knowing that life in the park has come to an end. It is a memory that ‘is ruled by the heart’ (Jones 2003). This child has been yearning for a normal social life, more so as the SS had forbidden Jewish Polish children to play in parks (Eisen as cited in Fine 1989).

According to Huss, Nuttman-Shwartz and Altman (2012) memories of traditional symbols from “collective ideology create[s] a transitional space in which both stress and resilience can interact and heal”, thereby achieving wellbeing (58). For the multidimensional aspects of wellbeing McMahon, Williams and Tapsell (2010) cite Hettler’s definition of wellbeing or wellness, which includes: “Physical, Spiritual, Intellectual, Social, [and] Emotional” concepts of overall health and happiness (282). Further, Malchiodi (1998) defines resilience in children as an “ability to maintain a positive and meaningful view of life” (156); which is “strongly linked to children’s spirituality” (Ibid, 217). The drawing of a “Table with a Chanukkah lamp” by Irena Karpelesova (Figure 10) depicts the child’s remembrance of the festival of light when eight successive candles are lit from the ninth in the middle. The space has been filled. It is a pleasantly arranged, well-balanced design.

Figure 10. Table with a Chanukkah Lamp

Perspective is attempted through shading of the walls and under the table, which could have been used as “artistic intent” (Di Leo 1983, 22). There appear to be people, flowers and corners of buildings and, in the right window, possibly a sun. This could suggest that life goes on in the outer world and does not include this child. She might be yearning for a different time in life: the inside room is full of light as the child remembers the lighting of the candles as
peaceful, sacred and blessing–giving (Chabad.org 2014). Wellings (2001) defines the symbol of light as enclosing “joy and hope, a sense of spirit, immortality” (33). For Bertoia (1993) the choice of Yellow light symbolizes important spiritual or intuitive knowledge. Equally Furth (as cited in Malchiodi 1998) states that depiction of the child’s family’s religious symbols provides comfort and mirrors “harmony between body and soul” (218). These positive symbols help the developing child to grow towards resilience and wellness.

**Conclusion**

Liminal space was one of the themes investigated in this research. This was undertaken using the CID method and resulted in the finding that the Holocaust children existed in liminal space. In this space, emotions such as despair, depression and fear, accompanied by intuitive knowledge, memory, resilience and wellness seemed to have been experienced and expressed in their drawings.

In a time where the children of the Holocaust were living between dream and reality, in an absurd environment, these symbolic expressions may have led to recovery and healing; making the children’s world whole again.

While a limitation of this research is the small number of drawings examined here, future research using more drawings and exploring different themes than Liminality could be valuable to our understanding of the Terezin children’s drawings.
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