Chapter 5

Reconstructing Trajectories of Persecution

Reflections on a Prosopography of Holocaust Victims

Nicolas Mariot and Claire Zalc

Comparing the number of Holocaust victims against estimates of the prewar Jewish population has allowed historians to calculate deportation rates in Western Europe with reasonable accuracy, with figures of 25 percent for France, 40 percent for Belgium, and even 73 percent for the Netherlands. Numerous studies have proposed stimulating hypotheses to account for these disparities, typically proceeding on a macrosociological level by focusing on factors such as relations between Nazis and local officials, the role of Jewish community representatives, the extent of relationships among different ethnic communities, as well as the effects of religion and the amount of assistance and rescue support available.[1]

Sometimes priority has been given to a more individual approach, particularly when focusing on the choices and options available to victims. Firsthand accounts by survivors, which were initially studied for memorial purposes, have more recently contributed to a broader understanding of the genocides.[2] Yet as Michael Pollak's work has forcefully

demonstrated, these accounts—which are often haunted by the question of "How and why did I survive?"—reveal and reflect upon the methods and characteristics of survival.[3] The insights provided by this approach have stark implications for historians. Firstly, since researchers know how the story ends, such accounts may lead to arguments that explain persecution trajectories by way of a regressive logic. Historians may be tempted to mirror the polarized thinking of survivor accounts, which embrace binaries such as "good" or "bad" choices, or individuals who are naïve or lucid, "fortunate" or "unfortunate."

It is on this individual scale of analysis that we seek to proceed, although we reject the notion that decisions—whether to register as a "Jew" with the authorities, whether to leave or stay—can solely be explained by way of individual choices supposedly made with full awareness. The following methodological principles that we used stem from this position:

- Instead of basing our analysis on survivor testimony, we propose using archival documents that were for the most part contemporary with the persecution, in an attempt to reconstruct the world of possibilities surrounding these trajectories, while freeing ourselves from our knowledge about how these stories end.
- Instead of focusing on a limited set of carefully selected cases, we attempt to define and assess actual trajectories within a relatively large group in order to make statistically verifiable comparisons. Quantitative analysis helps avoid an approach focusing on individual cases and provides a certain detachment that is particularly helpful with controversial subjects and matters involving collective memory. A case study method would have risked focusing on "exemplary" or "non-normative" cases, those involving the most powerful or compelling evidence, or on cases that are familiar through privileged access to descendants or private archives. This makes it possible to compare individual and family trajectories that would otherwise remain apart in their solitary singularity.
- Rather than a corpus of unrelated individuals, we have chosen a well-defined community with preexisting bonds of acquaintance and reputation, whose members were faced with the same situations. By following a cohort of people over the five-year war period, we have attempted to transcend psychological judgments about the choices made by individuals. We do not believe that these actors made moral decisions with a supposed full awareness of their possible outcomes or consequences, nor have we evaluated their choices through the prism of the preestablished categories of researchers

> or readers. Instead, we have resituated their decisions within the familial, economic, and local environments in which they were made. This study is therefore predicated on the assumption that the individual or family decisions made by victims, whether voluntary or imposed, inevitably had a social dimension. They therefore have meaning only within the restricted limits of a particular life or lives, in which relationships between people and the resources at their disposal are accounted for and analyzed by restoring the original social "thickness" to an individual persecution itinerary.

We believe that a monographic approach is essential for putting these methodological principles to the test. It provides the only way of anchoring analysis of behaviors within the social spaces in which they take on concrete form and meaning. The present study is based on a cohort of approximately one thousand Jews residing before the war in the Lens area, a city in the Pas-de-Calais department in northern France.[4] We chose this location firstly because of the wealth of sources, which makes it possible to document on a local level the process of stigmatizing and persecuting groups. In addition to standard sources, including both national (Aryanization and naturalization dossiers) and international (ITS Archives and Swiss government files), local departmental archives have, in a rare occurrence, notably conserved all of the self-declarations of Jewishness mailed from Lens to prefecture authorities.

It is important to note at the outset that the local situation in Lens was highly particular and distinguished it from the persecution of Jews in the rest of France. Firstly, the town's Jewish community, which in the 1930s represented 3 percent of the population of thirty-three thousand, was particularly devastated by these policies, as nearly half of the Jews in Lens were deported, as opposed to a quarter for France as a whole. Secondly, Lens was part of the "forbidden zone" encompassing the "Nord" and "Pas-de-Calais" departments, which was annexed to Belgium by the Germans after the Armistice. The local chronology differs relatively little from the more familiar chronology of the larger "occupied zone." In the fall of 1940, the first statute targeting Jews came into effect, and the first census of Jews in the northern zone—required but based on self-declaration—was conducted. The first expulsions from professions also occurred during this period, as did the Aryanization of businesses and the internment of some foreign Jews. In June and July 1941, the second statute on Jews took effect, the program of professional quotas and expulsions was expanded, while a second census was conducted. Curfews were imposed in the spring and summer of 1942, as well as the law requiring Jews to wear the Star of David. French

authorities also conducted frequent roundups of Jews, whom they then turned over to the Germans, while mass arrests and deportations also continued from the summer of 1942 through 1944. The incorporation of Pas-de-Calais into the German wartime administration of Belgium had harsh consequences for the local Jewish population; in the case of Lens, the French Jews who remained there became like any other foreigner, and Jewish families no longer had the protection of French nationality during local roundups in the summer of 1942.

In this respect Lens is not at all representative of France, a circumstance often referred to in microhistory as a "normal exception." Our priority was not to select a representative area, but to write the story from the bottom up in order to understand precisely why Lens is nonrepresentative and why the persecution inflicted on Jews there was so severe. What's more, it is not Lens that proves this history correct; the research could have focused on many other locations, although it had to be situated "somewhere," in a setting that could be identified as social space, a well-defined terrain of observation where it becomes possible to reconstitute—between choice and imperative—the social factors that shaped the decisions made by the individuals concerned.

The essay unfolds in four parts. We begin by introducing sources, based on a household monograph, pertaining to anti-Semitic persecution against a particular group of Jews who resided in the Lens area in 1939. This first section attempts a step-by-step reconstruction of certain aspects of the lives of Jews, in order to shed light on the actual experiences of those facing persecution. Next, we pursue our effort to construct a prosopographic approach by exploring different ways of treating the data that we uncovered. We will then discuss the problems associated with applying different quantification and modeling methods to this specific case, which involves discrimination, persecution, and extermination. We will conclude by presenting potential complementary projects to engage in both a microhistorical and sequential approach for this singular context.

Selecting Sources: Different Persecution Trajectories in the Same Household

Joseph Dawidowicz and His Close Relatives

In October 1944, after four years spent evading German and French authorities, Joseph Dawidowicz finally returned to Bethune only to learn that his lease had been canceled on 13 May 1942, allowing the city government to purchase his apartment building. A neighbor housed him

while he appealed to have the lease reinstated, and he sent the following letter to the prefect of Pas-de-Calais after his appeal was denied:

> I would ask you very respectfully, Monsieur le Préfet, to be kind enough to contact Monsieur le Maire and to allow him to authorize me to live in my home, which is unoccupied, so that I may house my family, which comprises eight members, four of whom are minors, who need to rest because of the constant travel that they have been forced to endure for the past four years. Monsieur le Préfet, please accept my assurances of the deepest respect.[5]

This was not the first time that Joseph had addressed the prefect. He had sent a handwritten letter four years earlier in response to a census of the Jewish population that began on 13 December 1940. His letter stated that he was born in 1886 in a village near the Polish city of Lodz, which at the time was under Russian rule, and that he had settled in Bethune as a "purveyor of clothing and furs" with his wife Chana, and their children Jean (aged nineteen), Jenny (fourteen), Fanny (eleven), and Simon (ten).[6]

On 16 December 1940, three days after Joseph drafted his letter, the Germans decided to expel Jews from Boulogne-sur-Mer and Bethune as part of their effort to "protect" the coastal zone, which was at risk of a British invasion. Learning from a friend on the police force that he was on the list, Joseph and his family fled in the middle of the night, the first stage in an extended odyssey that would eventually take them to Pau, Lyon, Nice, and Uriage.

The Dawidowicz family had first left Bethune in mid-May 1940 during a mass exodus in advance of German troops. They climbed into the family Peugeot sedan "with a trunk in the back," followed by a Ford truck borrowed from a mechanic friend carrying household items such as "bedding, packages, suitcases of clothing and linens, and medication."[7] The first halt on their trip was at Noisy-le-Grand with the Jablon family, who owned a distillery: "We thought we would stay a little while in Noisy; with a bit of patience, once the Germans were defeated, we would then return to Bethune." The Germans were steadily advancing, however, and Joseph, who had already spent several years as a German POW in the previous war, quickly decided to take to the road.

They would never again see the Jablons, who disappeared after their deportation. The family next halted in Angouleme, where they met a cousin who had fled from Metz, but who was unable to take them in. They again departed, traveling first to Cognac and later to Bordeaux, where Joseph searched in vain for a boat to Africa. Soon enough, the Germans arrived there as well. "We were unable to escape," wrote Jean, the eldest son, explaining their decision to turn around and return to

Bethune. While his mother, brothers, and sisters returned home by train, he and his father transported the family's luggage and personal effects, crossing the Somme River at a tiny village, Pont-Rémy, where a German guard briefly detained them. The Dawidowicz family eventually found their way home to Bethune, with no plans to leave again.

For Joseph, leaving had always been a possibility. Until he settled in the North of France, his itinerary was like that of thousands of other Jews who emigrated for economic reasons from Central Europe at the turn of the century. Some of his cousins left for England, but he traveled to Germany sometime in 1901 or 1902 and found work as a cabin boy on a coaster plying the waters between Hamburg and coastal ports in the Netherlands, Denmark, and Great Britain. In 1914, he was imprisoned as a "Russian emigrant" and conscripted to work at a meat-curing plant. After he was liberated in 1918, he returned to his native village in Poland and married, before quickly leaving again in 1921, this time for France. Chana and Joseph first traveled to Nancy and later to the Meuse region, where their oldest son Jean was born in 1921. They then moved to the area in the North around Douai in 1924. Rumors were circulating that in the wake of mass migrations of Polish miners to the coal-mining region in northern France, there was a market for Jewish immigrants who could speak Polish and who were familiar with the tastes of this potential market. Joseph first opened a small shop in Douai that sold *Salaisons douaisiennes* (Douai cured meats), before moving to Bethune and establishing himself in a well-located boutique on the town's main square as a purveyor of women's clothes, under the appealing name "A la Femme Chic" (The Chic Woman's Shop).

This may indicate that the family was relatively comfortable financially by this time, and at some point in the interwar period, Joseph and Chana requested and were granted French nationality. Joseph socialized with other members of the Jewish community in Lens, most of whom had arrived in the area in the 1920s and '30s, like he and Chana. Yet he simultaneously cultivated professional and personal contacts beyond this circle of fellow immigrants, particularly in an association for fellow former German POWs. The family may also have served as a type of model for friends and relatives who later moved to the region. For example, in 1928, Joseph's youngest brother, Abraham, moved to Avion (near Lens), where he worked as a shoemaker. Abraham was married and had three children, two born in Berlin in the late 1920s, and the youngest, Liliane, born in Avion in 1941. Another relative, Moïse Dawidowicz, lived in the nearby coal-mining town of Sallaumines with his wife and two children, who were born there in 1932 and 1937. One of Chana's sisters, Sara Glicksman, lived in Douai with her husband and their five children.

Like Joseph and his immediate family, all three related families officially registered themselves as "Jews" in December 1940 in accordance with the 18 November 1940 regulations "relative to the measures against the Jews." Article 3 of the regulations stated that "any Jewish person will be required to present themselves without delay to the sub-prefect of the district of their residence to be registered in a special ledger. The declaration of the head of household will be valid for the entire family."[8]

However, unlike other families, they remained in the town, submitting to three censuses and enduring the Aryanization of their businesses and homes (in Sallaumines, a neighbor residing in the same street made an offer on Moïse's house[9]); they were eventually arrested on 11 September 1942 during a wave of mass arrests among the remaining vestiges of the Jewish community of Lens.[10] The 10 September "daily report" to the mayor from the Sallaumines police commissioner reported two events that day under the heading "interesting events public order"—the "arrival of five new guardians of the peace," and the "arrests of the Jewish Katz, Klajnberg, and Dawidowicz families by German authorities. Their animals and fowl were donated to the *Secours national*"—before concluding that there were "no major events."[11] After first being transferred to Malines in Belgium, all three families were deported by Convoy X to Auschwitz on 15 September 1942. When they arrived, Moïse was registered and assigned to forced labor under the registration number 42,828. He survived less than three months, dying on December 3. The other members of the household were gassed immediately on 17 October after descending from the train.

Approximately one thousand Jews lived in the coal-mining basin surrounding Lens in early 1940. Following the exodus of about half of this number beginning in May 1940, the December 1940 census recorded 482 "Israelites." The census of 1 October 1942, less than two years later, noted a total of thirteen survivors.

How to Interpret the Dawidowicz Family Itineraries

This recursive narrative of the itineraries of the Dawidowicz household provides the basis for a family monograph, like those written by Daniel Mendelsohn and Götz Aly.[12] In methodological terms, the history of Joseph's immediate family and close relatives is remarkable in that it spanned the entire period that began with their exodus in May 1940 and ended with their return as refugees and survivors in late 1944 and early 1945. This family's history demonstrates the importance we have given to chronology in analyzing individual, familial, and collective itineraries. Establishing the precise timing of their initial departures also offers

information on the means and methods of itineraries, as well as their determining factors. This is particularly useful in explaining certain points in the family members' itineraries that remained murky, such as their return in late 1944. Even at the time, local authorities experienced considerable difficulty relinquishing the old reflexes from the era of "Jewish affairs" (*affaires juives*) under the Vichy regime.

Joseph's narrative is also unusual because his was one of the few family trajectories that can be traced through practically every layer of intersecting documentation that we unearthed for the study. This enabled us to construct a portrait of the family's history based on a wide array of original resources, varying both with regard to where and by whom they were produced. The sources include the testimony of one of Joseph's daughters, Fanny (which was collected and preserved by the Yad Vashem Institute in memory of the non-surviving members of her family), as well as individual refugee and displaced person search-service files created by the International Red Cross (and consulted online on the USHMM website in Washington), Aryanization files in the French National Archives, documents located at the Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation (particularly deportation lists), and a major trove of administrative and police documents stored in departmental archives (including inventories of people and property, surveillance and pillaging reports, commercial ledgers, distribution documents concerning yellow stars, arrest lists, and return documents). Only two other sources are missing in the case of the Dawidowicz family—the naturalization requests filed by Joseph and Chana (because the dossier is inexplicably missing), and Swiss refugee dossiers, which are stored in Bern (because none of the Dawidowiczes pursued this route). These documents represent potentially fertile additional sources, since the firsthand narratives they contain date from before and during the family's persecution.

The dispersed geographic locations of the archives used in this study, although not unusual, were further complicated by the fact that the four related families in the study resided in four municipalities—Bethune, Sallaumines, Avion, and Douai. The first three of these municipalities are in two different districts (Bethune and Arras) of the department of Pas-de-Calais, while Douai is located in the neighboring department, the Nord. The families' records are consequently stored in three different sub-prefectures, a distribution of sources that illustrates the principle we used to shape our choice of population: instead of dividing the population sample according to basic administrative divisions (a history of the Jews of the city of Lens, for example, or "from the Bethune district" would have constituted a more convenient sample), we have focused on the group's boundaries as the group members themselves defined them,

notably by using the list engraved in the room that once served as a synagogue; this list includes all local victims of deportations, whether they were arrested in the immediate region or elsewhere in France and whether they were residents of Lens itself or of neighboring towns.

With respect to the origins of the documents, the itineraries of Joseph and his family members are corroborated by direct testimony from the study subjects themselves. Some accounts were collected by officials at the time—as seen earlier, this includes an unusual collection of handwritten self-declarations that offer a privileged look at the different approaches adopted by the Jews of Lens in their written declarations. Additional narratives were collected in the course of our investigation, including an oral interview with Jean Dawidowicz, and two short memoirs of his recollections, one typed and the other handwritten. The close correlation between sources indeed indicates an astonishing degree of reliability. Clearly, if we possessed only Jean's testimony, we would have had no information about the declarations of Jewish identity submitted to the authorities by the three heads of household. Nor would we have been aware of the conflict between the Bethune town hall and Jean's father after he returned (because Jean's father did not allude to the declaration), and we obviously would have remained ignorant about the experience of the family members who remained behind (because Jean was not present). And finally, without Jean's firsthand account, we would have lacked basic but critical details concerning the family's exodus, their decisions en route, and the various people they met along the way.

The startling depth of these sources allowed us to conduct the intensive and strictly localized study that we argued was needed to answer our initial research questions. Our recourse to the monographic genre is not justified solely for this reason, but also because the local setting makes it possible to closely contextualize individual trajectories by giving them back their social depth.

A series of questions arises from this perspective: Should one report oneself as a Jew? If so, when? Should one simply continue with one's business? Should one flee? If so, how? Should families remain together or travel separately? What should be done with property and assets, and who could be trusted?

Additional related questions also arise. What factors influenced individual answers to these questions and, more broadly, the future of the Dawidowicz household? What was the effect of such factors as nationality, the family's relative wealth, their length of residence in the area, or the diversity of their local and broader social networks? The answers to these questions often draw on individual consciousness and then trans-

late to the register of choice, sense of responsibility, or even moral judgment, contrasting the "naiveté" of some against the "lucidity" of others, or "consent" with "resistance." It is precisely because such questions involve the inner world of individual consciousness that they arguably cannot be adequately addressed in a historical study. They are supposed to be private, personal decisions that cannot be evaluated or judged, yet too often this is how reconstruction of the possible range of options available to individuals is conceived, even and especially when this range is limited not to discussion of what they supposedly had in mind, but more simply to retrace the order of the thinkable and the possible at a given point in time.

Intensive analysis of the sources on the ground level implies resituating the unusual trajectory of the Dawidowicz family in its material and social context, partly by comparing it with the trajectories of other families who did not declare themselves or who either did not leave or left under different circumstances (as a group, at another time). The goal of giving observable itineraries and decisions their social depth or of establishing links between individual behaviors and personal characteristics makes quantitative analysis necessary.

A Household within a Community: Was the Dawidowicz Family's Trajectory Representative?

Quantitative analysis does not merely imply counting how many people were dispossessed, hidden, and deported, but instead knowing who they where and how they were different (or where not) from those who did not suffer the same fate. The first step was to create a detailed chart, with the names of individual family members in the left-hand column and, in the corresponding columns to the right, as many personal and family variables as the data allow, including age, nationality, date of entry in France, family composition, and profession. These data were then compiled into a single database that allowed basic statistical analysis to establish the relationships between individual fates and personal variables. Significantly, this also made it possible to compare characteristics and itineraries among individuals and family groups according to whether they had declared themselves as Jews, whether they departed or remained in Lens, and whether they were placed under house arrest, interned, or "departed with no forwarding address" during the course of the occupation. Without quantitative analysis, in other words, it would have been difficult to accurately compare the Dawidowicz family's departures to other Lens residents.

Let us begin by returning to the December 1940 census. The four Dawidowicz households all chose to officially declare themselves as "Jews." Each member of the four families was registered on the first set of lists created by the prefecture. The decision to register, which may have been jointly agreed to during an extended family meal, can be compared to that of other members of the Jewish population of Lens. Based on their letters of declaration preserved in the archives, we are able to describe their reactions to the official self-declaration requirement.

The declaration letters represent an exceptional archival resource that is in many ways the product of a historical accident. In Paris and most other cities, Jews declared themselves in person directly to the authorities, encounters that left no detailed trace. Lens, however, was so remote from prefectural headquarters that direct registration was considered impractical, and many declarations were therefore submitted in writing. The resulting documents provide a privileged glimpse of the act of self-declaration and the way in which the declarant experienced and represented this act to the authorities.[13]

In one letter, for example, a father declares himself to be Jewish—"as a nationality"—but describes his daughter as "French" because "she was born in France." At approximately the same time, a woman wrote to the sub-prefect in Bethune to explain her reluctance to respond. Acknowledging that she was of "Jewish origin," she also argued that she was born a French citizen and was the child of French parents. She also noted that her father had volunteered for military service in 1870, followed by her husband, who had volunteered in 1914, and her son in 1939. "I therefore come to you to ask, Monsieur le Sous-Préfet, if, with all these French qualities, I should be classified among the Jews who are currently being investigated." Her reasoning demonstrates the extent to which prewar "Israelites" had internalized the dichotomy between citizens and foreigners, which is central to French jurisprudence. Her case also reflects a sociological distinction between, on the one hand, long-standing French citizens of Jewish faith or culture, who were endowed with "French qualities," and on the other, *Ostjuden,* who were immigrants seeking employment or refugees fleeing official anti-Semitism in their native countries—the "Jews who are currently being investigated" referred to by the author of the letter. This distinction offers a significant clue into how French Jews positioned themselves.

The official reply that arrived a few days later pursued a rather different interpretation of what it meant to be a Jew, by asserting that "[because you were] born, as you yourself declare, to parents of Jewish origin, you belong to the Jewish race." The petitioner was compelled to declare herself at the Lens town hall, demonstrating that the bu-

reaucracy of the time was entirely indifferent to logic or even legality. Indeed, the variety of ways in which individuals declared their Jewish identity differed markedly from how the resulting data were treated at the time and subsequently interpreted by historians and others.

We have attempted to answer two simple but hitherto largely neglected questions concerning these letters of self-declaration:

1. What concrete steps were taken to identify and list Jews in France during World War II?
2. Who was in charge of this operation, and what criteria and methods did they use?

Our findings show that three-fourths of the Jewish population in and around Lens elected to self-declare, contradicting the widely held view that most Jews were identified by being detected by the Vichy government and were therefore to be treated as foreigners according to Third Republic policy. The self-declaration initiative was not widely contested, despite taking place on a massive scale, with *90 percent of the Jews* in the department of the Seine, for example, *ostensibly self-declaring (although the source of this estimate is unknown).*[14] Declaration letters also revealed the gray area between self-identification as Jewish by religion and Jewishness construed as "nationality," "origin," or "race."

Self-declaration varied across categories and locations. Younger and single people, as well as those who were spatially isolated, were born in France, or had entered the country more recently, were least likely to declare themselves (see table 5.1). Socio-professional status, however, was not closely related to whether individuals or families self-declared,

Table 5.1. Characteristics of Self-declared and Non-declared Jews

	Non-declared	Self-declared	
Type of household (chi-sq. ***)			
Single	44%	56%	100% (34)
Couples	22%	78%	100% (54)
Families of 3 to 4 members	21%	79%	100% (310)
Large families	31%	69%	100% (192)
Total	26%	74%	100% (590)
Age (chi-sq. ***)			
0–16	32%	68%	100% (181)
16–30	28%	72%	100% (107)

31–45	20%	80%	100% (197)
46 and over	17%	83%	100% (96)
Total	25%	75%	100% (581)
Entry into France (chi-sq. ***)			
Born in France	31%	69%	100% (177)
Prior to 1928	20%	80%	100% (97)
Between 1928 and 1930	13%	87%	100% (132)
Between 1931 and 1934	16%	84%	100% (55)
1935 and subsequently	27%	73%	100% (62)
Total	22%	78%	100% (523)
Number of households per street (chi-sq. **)			
One household	37%	63%	100% (86)
2 to 4 households	26%	74%	100% (118)
5 to 9 households	19%	81%	100% (160)
More than 10 households	24%	76%	100% (221)
Total	25%	75%	100% (585)
Socio-professional status (chi-sq. *)			
Student	30%	70%	100% (64)
Minor	33%	67%	100% (135)
Self-employed	20%	80%	100% (143)
Employee	22%	78%	100% (63)
No profession	21%	79%	100% (155)
Overall total	24%	76%	100% (560)
Real estate ownership (chi-sq. **) (total households for which information is available)			
No	12%	88%	100% (57)
Yes	29%	71%	100% (35)
Total	18%	82%	100% (92)

The chi-square test of significance assesses the difference between an observed situation and the theoretical independence of variables, making it possible to measure the extent to which two variables are related to each other. By convention, the symbol *** is used to indicate that the value of the chi-square test is significant to the level of 1%. The interpretive risk in minimal, because there is only one chance in one hundred that the gap observed with respect to the situation of independence is due to chance (i.e., the situation in which self-declaration or non-self-declaration was unrelated to family status, age, date of entry into France, or professional status). The symbol ** indicates that the chi-square value is significant to 5%, and the symbol * to indicate that it is significant to 10%; NS indicates no significance.

as self-employed workers, employees, and the unemployed were equally likely to register. The influence of age was enormous, which explains the over-representation of bachelors and individuals "born on French soil" among those who chose not to self-declare. The non-declared group included a relatively higher proportion of young adults, who were evidently less likely to comply with the declaration requirement. It also included more children, whom heads of household tried to protect by not declaring. If we change scale, it is also possible to observe dynamics of social contagion, as non-declared Jews were highly concentrated in two streets in Lens, rue Flament, where three out of five households did not declare, and rue Félix Faure, where eight out of thirteen heads of household decided not to declare their families to the authorities. Elsewhere, declarations were made en masse: all eleven families residing in rue Gauthier, ten out of the twelve Jewish households in rue Pasteur, and eight of the Jewish households in rue Camille Beugnet officially registered themselves as Jewish.

This micro-local approach helps better understand the factors determining the act of declaration. Let us examine rue Félix Faure. Of the sixteen Jewish families residing in the street, three left Lens at the time of the initial exodus in 1940 (living at numbers 14, 16, and 39), and eight did not declare themselves. These latter lived at numbers 14, 14bis, and 15. However, five families chose to declare, those residing at numbers 12, 14bis, 15bis, 16, and 39. Considering the proximity of the addresses of the non-declared households and the range of responses within the same street, it is difficult to argue that ignorance or isolation were factors in explaining non-declaration. This is particularly true given that the same address, number 14, housed both the household of Jechezkiel Himmelbarb, president of the Israelite Community of Lens, and the headquarters for the Association of the Jewish Faith. The decision of whether to obey the order to register was probably a topic of discussion among neighbors. Did these discussions juxtapose legalism with the sense of a perceived threat? We do not know the precise nature of such discussions, as they have left no traces.

A second indicator nevertheless makes it possible to determine the relative level of local integration of non-declaring households. Over 25 percent of property-owning households (ten out of thirty-five) did not respond to the declaration requirement (as compared to 12 percent of non-property-owning households). Should we conclude that it was precisely the lesser degree of social fragility and the higher visibility of property-owning Jewish households that encouraged them not to declare (particularly since non-declaration did not prevent them from being identified beginning in December 1940)?

From the perspective of those who did self-declare, the various Dawidowicz couples are highly consistent with the choices of their neighbors in Lens. These similarities within extended families and with respect to other Jews in the area tend to mask the highly exceptional nature of the itinerary of Joseph Dawidowicz's household during the war. Quantitative analysis can again provide revelatory information. Examining the relationship between household size and family ties outside of the Lens area reveals that Joseph's family actually had a high statistical probability of not leaving because, as tables 5.2 and 5.3 illustrate, higher numbers of children per family as well as more local family ties increased the probability of being arrested.

Table 5.2. Those Who Left and Those Who Remained: Household Size

Household type (chi-sq. ***)	Departed	Remained	Total
Single-member households	73%	27%	100% (70)
Couples	73%	27%	100% (110)
Families of 3 to 4 persons	65%	35%	100% (508)
Large families	51%	49%	100% (298)
Total	62%	38%	100% (986)

Table 5.3. Kinship Network and Arrest of Departed (compared to total number of households)

Ties to other Lens households (chi-sq. ***)	Not arrested	Arrested	Total
No family ties acknowledged with other households	78%	22%	100% (125)
One family tie with other households	73%	27%	100% (44)
From 2 to 4 ties with other households	51%	49%	100% (39)
Total	72%	28%	100% (208)

How can the differences between the itineraries of the various Dawidowicz family members be explained?

First, it is worth recalling that Joseph and his family were forced to flee within a few days of having filed their self-declaration, meaning that, unlike other families, their choice was not independent of the circumstances. Jean's testimony also informs us of the person who notified the family that they were on the arrest list and how they organized

their "furtive departure," to use language typical of police records. On the evening of 15 December 1940, Jean learned of their imminent arrest from a brigadier from local police headquarters, which was immediately across the street from the family business, where the German occupying force's *Kommandantur* (local headquarters) was also located. The statistical relationship between time of departure and individual destinies also shows that the family's forced departure took place at exactly the "right" moment. Their incentive to remain discreet, if not completely hidden, along with the certainty that any eventual return would be in the distant future, was far clearer than at the time of their first departure in May 1940; however, the ability of Jews to flee or circulate and reach the unoccupied zone was better than in the summer of 1942 (see tables 5.4 and 5.5).

Table 5.4. Destination as a Function of Time of Departure

Chi-sq. ***	Destination unknown	Unoccupied zone	Occupied zone	Switzerland	Total
Departure prior to December 1940	47%	27%	17%	9%	100% (388)
Departure in 1941	40%	41%	11%	8%	100% (98)
Departure in 1942	52%	14%	24%	10%	100% (124)
Total	48%	26%	17%	9%	100% (610)

Table 5.5. The Effect of Departure Time on Arrest Rates

Chi-sq. ***	Arrested	Not arrested	Total
Final departure before December 1940	34%	66%	100% (388)
Final departure between December 1940 and December 1941	17%	83%	100% (98)
Final departure between January and September 1942	20%	80%	100% (124)
Total	28%	72%	100% (610)

Joseph's networks—local, in Paris, and elsewhere—significantly improved the conditions under which the family departed, as well as their eventual chances of surviving. Beginning on the morning of December 16, the aid network for lost British soldiers to which Joseph and Jean both belonged was mobilized to help organize their departure. Fanny

and Simon, aged ten and eleven, left first, blending in with other children at the town hall in the care of Monsieur Delestrez, the same person Joseph consulted regarding his letter to the prefect in October 1944. Joseph remained in the shop until he met his wife and oldest daughter, Jenny, who was fourteen, in a café. They were then driven to Noeux-les-Mines and temporarily hidden by a laborer family. Jean was assisted by a merchant from Lens who had a stall in the Bethune town market. These connections also made it possible for Joseph to use the truck and identity card of an Italian (who could circulate freely because Italy was allied with the Germans) in order to reach Albert Goldberg's apartment on the rue de la Paix in Lens. He eventually arrived at the nearest railway station and boarded a train to Paris.

The family then separated, and the oldest child, Jean, left for Paris, while Joseph, his wife, and their oldest daughter, Jenny, found refuge at the Caine's home in Noeux-les-Mines thanks to the assistance of a Red Cross worker. The two youngest children, Fanny (eleven) and Simon (ten) were entrusted to Monsieur Delestrez at the Bethune town hall. Their parents and Jenny were able to reach the capital several weeks later, where they joined Jean, who then returned north to retrieve Fanny and Simon. The entire family was finally reunited in Paris before departing for Grenoble, where they remained in hiding until the end of the war.[15]

The destiny of this family is without question highly exceptional. The Dawidowiczes were only able to leave in separate groups because they enjoyed a series of networks and trusted friends, as well as acquaintances who consented to hiding their children. The home of the Delestrez family, who were municipal employees, was on the top floor of the Bethune town hall, directly opposite German police headquarters on the town square. The Dawidowicz family was additionally able to find shelter with cousins in Paris. Support networks and relatives outside of Lens—more specifically in the southern zone—clearly facilitated departures in a significant way, because there were no guarantees, even after the occupied/unoccupied line had been crossed (see table 5.6).

Table 5.6. Arrest as a Function of Final Destination

(Chi-sq. ***)	Arrested	Not arrested	Overall	As %
Occupied zone	62%	38%	100% (107)	17%
Unoccupied zone	25%	75%	100% (165)	27%
Switzerland	0%	100%	100% (54)	9%
Unknown destination	14%	86%	100% (290)	47%
Total	24%	76%	100% (616)	100%

Individual testimonials also demonstrate the crucial importance of the material resources available to Joseph during the latter stages of the family's forced exodus. In January 1941, they were able to arrange for the family to be reunited in late February 1941 and to stage their crossing into the "free zone": they used a Parisian apartment in the rue Notre Dame de Nazareth belonging to suppliers of their clothing shop, as well as a hotel where "they usually stayed." They also benefited from the involvement of the Bethune support network, including a neighbor who was a *charcutier* (a purveyor of cured meats) and a "devoted" salesclerk, who helped remove and sell the remaining merchandise from the clothing shop. It was Jean who clandestinely returned to Bethune via Lens and the rue de la Paix to recover the proceeds from this sale along with the younger children. Later, each phase of their wanderings appears to have been chosen based on the location of friends or acquaintances. In Pau, they stayed with other "refugees from Lens," in particular "the insurance agent and friend" Léon Baron. This socialist activist was close to the local *député* (congressman), the former president of the association of the internees at Gurs, who is buried in the Jewish cemetery of Eleu (called Lauwette) on the outskirts of Lens.

Jean related another significant episode that took place while they were in Pau. Jean's parents heard about the first mass arrests of foreign Jews in the occupied zone and decided to send Jean north one last time in April 1941 to persuade the other branches of the family to join them. He thus returned a second time to Lens, again staying with the Goldbergs. Neither friends nor family members heeded his pleas, however: "They answered that they had done everything they could, and that they were working and earning an honest living. And that if we, the Dawidowiczes, had been harassed … it was because we had engaged in reprehensible activities." Their refusal to leave is a testament to the influence of peer pressure on decision-making. Unlike Joseph, who was isolated in Bethune and maintained contacts with non-Jews, the other Dawidowicz households, particularly those in Douai and Sallaumines, lived in streets in which five to nine other Jewish families resided. Yet judging from table 5.7, living in a street shared by other members of the same faith seems to have made it harder to decide to leave, perhaps because these households felt protected by this proximity to one another.

The Chronology of Persecutions and the Changing Effects of Variables

The statistical approach used in the previous sections provides several interesting findings, particularly concerning the reasons for departure,

Table 5.7. Departing versus Remaining in Lens: Street Addresses and Proximity

Number of Jewish households in street (chi-sq. ***)	Departed	Remained	Total
Isolated household	35%	65%	100% (114)
2 to 4 households	62%	38%	100% (186)
5 to 9 households	72%	28%	100% (272)
More than 10 households	62%	38%	100% (370)
Overall	62%	38%	100% (942)

while revealing powerful differences for several of the variables at work. On the other hand, our quantitative methodology is not effective in reflecting relationships of causality between variables that change over time. Nor would more sophisticated statistical procedures such as logistical regression have provided more nuanced information about evolving relationships between variables. Indeed, on several occasions we observed that the negative and positive effects of certain variables evolved over time as the geographic and chronological situations of individuals changed. Something that was a handicap in Lens could become an advantage in another setting or vice versa. What follows is a description of several important examples of this chronological phenomenon that reveals the fundamental patterns underlying persecution, including a tendency toward increasing arbitrariness in which searching for causative factors loses its meaning amid the reality that every Jew was eventually a target for repression.

In introducing these findings, we would like to call particular attention to the systematic results of the chi-square tests of significance/non-significance that were used in this study. As we know, the test makes it possible to determine the significance or non-significance of the results obtained. We also wish to underscore the fact that a finding of statistical non-significance can in fact provide important insights. For example, the relationship between self-declaration (or not) and deportation (or not) is quite revealing. As a general rule, with regard to the probable uses of the census data, it is conceivable that the act of self-declaration indicates a certain level of naïveté or even blindness on the part of the families. But this viewpoint fails to consider the time frame—declaring oneself Jewish in 1940 was not necessarily perceived as suggesting a tragic future outcome. More specifically, whether one self-declared or not did not change the risk of being arrested, as noted previously. As table 5.8 illustrates, the same proportion of declared and non-declared households were deported to the East two years later.

Table 5.8. Family Declaration in December 1940 and Deportation

Chi-sq. NS	Not deported	Deported	Total
Not declared—identified by authorities	43%	57%	100% (37)
Self-declared	46%	54%	100% (150)
Total	45%	55%	100% (187)

Having demonstrated a probable statistical independence between declaring oneself Jewish (or not) and subsequently being deported (or not) is very important. It allows us to avoid value judgments concerning the alleged "quality" of the "choice" made by the individual families.[16] In this sense, the creation of a database is also an argument for a depersonalized and collective analysis of what could be called extreme situations.

The role of nationality illustrates how the effects of a particular variable can change over time. Nationality played a relatively minor role in the decision to remain in Lens or to leave. There is a slight disparity, however, between French and Polish citizens, who represented the majority of those who left, and other nationalities, who were more likely to remain. It is very likely that French and Polish citizens, who represented the majority of the local Jewish population, had more local acquaintances, both in the region and throughout occupied France, and thus confronted fewer obstacles to departing and/or going into hiding (in some cases even by remaining near the Lens area) (see table 5.9).

Table 5.9. Nationality and Departure between 1940 and 1942

Nationality (chi-sq. **)	Departed	Remained	Total
French	62%	38%	100% (218)
Polish	59%	41%	100% (491)
Other	47%	53%	100% (142)
Total	46%	54%	100% (851)

Nationality was a predictor of arrest, however. In theory at least, French citizens in the forbidden zone that included Lens were considered foreigners just like everyone else, since the region, as mentioned, came under German command and was annexed to Belgium (see table 5.10). Yet there were disparities in arrest rates depending on nationality. "Only" 36 percent of Jews in the Lens area who had French nationality were arrested, compared with 59 percent for Polish citizens and 63 percent for other nationalities (e.g., Romanians, Czechs, Russians). This result stems from the fact that the table does not take displacement or chronol-

ogy into account. Jews who left the Lens area—which once again was administratively attached to Belgium—and entered the "French" zones regained the prevailing "national" criterion used for managing arrests. They therefore once again became "nationals," whereas the Polish remained just as foreign as they had been in the "forbidden zone."

Table 5.10. Nationality and Arrest

Nationality (chi-sq. ***)	Not arrested	Arrested	Total
French	64%	36%	100% (218)
Polish	41%	59%	100% (491)
Other	37%	63%	100% (142)
Total	46%	54%	100% (851)

Leaving Lens and entering occupied France guaranteed nothing, for the French or for anyone else. In fact, when they crossed the border between these two sectors, Jews from Lens who had acquired French nationality after 1927 were no longer necessarily protected by it. The law of 22 July 1940 stipulated that citizens naturalized after that date would have their cases reexamined and risked being stripped of naturalized French citizenship. Indeed, over fifteen thousand individuals lost their French nationality in this way between 1940 and 1944, including approximately ten Jews from Lens.

Finally, the "nationality" variable shows a strong positive correlation with the date of departure from Lens. On average, 20 percent of Jews from Lens left in 1942, but this number comprised 41 percent of the French, as opposed to only 19 percent of Poles and 8 percent of other nationalities (see table 5.11). As we had hypothesized, the sense of being protected by their nationality influenced the decision of French citizens to leave.

Table 5.11. Nationality and Date of Departure

Nationality (ch-sq. ***)	Final departure before December 1940	Final departure between December 1940 and December 1941	Final departure between January and September 1942	
French	39%	21%	40%	100% (135)
Polish	65%	16%	19%	100% (284)
Other	79%	13%	8%	100 % (191)
Total	64%	16%	20%	100% (610)

The effects of socioeconomic status represent a mix of the two previously discussed variables. Indeed, although it was relatively strongly related to the likelihood of departure, the relationship between socioeconomic status and being arrested and eventually deported disappears completely. The binary opposition between "staying in Lens" and "leaving Lens" serves as an example of this distinction. There is a marked effect for socioeconomic status, although it appears to be less significant than variables such as age and especially household size; on average, 56 percent of the Jews living in or near Lens left, but the rate was 62 percent for independent workers and 53 percent for salaried employees (see table 5.12).[17]

Table 5.12. Socioeconomic Status of Jews Who Left Lens between 1940 and 1942

Employment status (over 16 years of age) (chi-sq. **)	Departed	Remained	Total
Independent workers	62%	38%	100% (229)
Salaried employees	53%	47%	100% (88)
No profession	49%	51%	100% (201)
Overall	56%	44%	100% (518)

Factors correlated with being arrested or not suggest a non-significant relationship with socioeconomic status: similar percentages of independent workers, salaried employees, and those with no profession avoided arrest (roughly 45%); this was also true of individuals who self-declared (see table 5.13).

This can easily be explained, as Aryanization files and professional declarations from the different occupation censuses make it possible to verify the socioeconomic status of Jews residing in Lens in the fall of 1939. Auschwitz entry questionnaires also provide evidence that some individuals continued to occupy their professions even until entering the camps—at least those who were not immediately gassed on arrival. The confiscation of Jewish property as early as the latter half of 1940, coupled with being banned from practicing their professions, however, renders any attempt to establish the socioeconomic classification of Jews meaningless. The population's socioeconomic categories therefore evolved over time, making this an unstable statistical criterion. In fact, it was impossible for Jews to convert currency under the Vichy regime, because as early as the fall of 1940, there was a concerted effort in the occupied zone to despoil them and to confiscate their assets and prop-

erty. This was accompanied by the loss of any legitimate means of earning a living, which forced Jews to survive without work for several years, sometimes in a new location (this was also true in the southern zone for individuals who lacked community connections). This also helps to explain why, for some individuals and in some cases over the long term, forced participation in a Groupement de Travailleurs Etrangers (GTE; Foreign Workers' Group of the Vichy regime) offered a credible solution to the profound hardships suffered by Jews who fled after May 1940.

Table 5.13. Socioeconomic Status and Arrest

Employment status of individuals over 16 years of age (chi-sq. NS)	Not arrested	Arrested	Total
Self-employed	48%	52%	100% (229)
Salaried employees	45%	55%	100% (88)
No profession	42%	58%	100% (201)
Total	45%	55%	100% (518)

Indeed, our search for causal factors rapidly encountered the arbitrariness that characterized the application of persecution policies and, to some extent, the lack of evidence for a relationship between socioeconomic status and whether an individual was arrested or not.

Discussion and Conclusions

These examples of the interplay of variables show that answering the question haunting the contemporary historian as he or she narrates (or as the reader reads about) the fate of 991 Jews from Lens during World War II—"Why did some people survive while others did not?"—is difficult using an approach favoring "linear causality." The research conducted on the Jews of Lens facing persecution suggests the importance of abandoning the fiction of monolithic determining factors and accepting that the variables have different meanings.[18] More broadly, this involves rethinking both how variables are constructed and how they are used.

Yet in the same field of operation, variables can vary over time, with differing methods and effects. Our selected area of Lens directly confronted us with this fact: the context speeds up time, often from one day to the next, and the factors characterizing individuals evolve.

We readily acknowledge that the statistical approach that we used in this study has failed to a certain extent, because it proved unable to offer

a plausible explanation for the chronological variability in the destinies of the roughly one thousand Jewish subjects of our study. For a particular variable "to be explained" (for example, leaving Lens, regardless of time of departure), some variables are determinant, such as household size, whereas others have been shown to be non-determinant (such as gender) or only slightly determinant (such as socioeconomic status or nationality). There are nevertheless difficulties, as revealed even by our book's table of contents (*Face à la persécution. 991 Juifs dans la guerre*). Indeed, the relevance of "spaces of possibilities" (to borrow terminology used by microhistorical studies) diminishes significantly as individual itineraries move forward in time from one period—the early days of the persecution (between the summer of 1940 and spring 1942)—to a later one (summer 1942, when circumstances worsened significantly). In the process of attempting to make sense of the causative factors for actions revealed by our data and to present and interpret our findings in writing, we have increasingly been struck by the apparently random nature of persecution, a gloomy sensation that became increasingly powerful as our project advanced. The population's room to maneuver shrank gradually but steeply, and the categories of victims seem to have become increasingly blurred. The logic behind the various methods of persecuting the population varied from place to place and from one official to another, ultimately evolving into the steamroller that carried a significant portion of the Jewish population of Lens inexorably toward death. As researchers, we are left with the sense of having failed to decipher any overall causal pattern, despite our best efforts to make sense of a rich collection of data on this specific, well-defined population.

We also confronted another pitfall, in that the implementation of a causal explanation clashes with the arbitrariness specific to the policy of persecution; in a certain sense, the lack of a relation between socioeconomic status and arrest that we presented already indicates the presence of this arbitrary element. Is there any sense in parsing variables in the summer of 1942? Were there improbable situations whose possibility can nevertheless be examined? The lives of the Jews living in Lens appear to have often hung by a thread, like that of young William Scharfman, arrested with his mother on 11 September 1942, but saved by a railway worker on the station platform.[19] A fleeting, apparently random incident thus determined the boy's survival, but how can such apparent randomness be accounted for empirically?

In the face of the difficulties presented by quantitative analysis, a doubt can arise—should one quite simply give up? The difficulties encountered are not specific to the period or the subject studied—as numerous colleagues continue to believe by arguing that the radical sin-

gularity of the genocidal war context dooms any attempt at modeling to failure—but rather to a way of conceiving the social. For this reason, we anticipate reorienting the investigation by adhering to other ways of reading the data and formulating the thinking, as well as modeling the data. As we became aware that the deck of cards was reshuffled at every phase of the persecution, we realized that we needed a way to analyze trajectories that could also account for particular "turning points" and "bifurcations" in individual itineraries. It is unclear, in fact, whether concepts such as "career" or "sequence" are even relevant to the fates of this population or to the ebb and flow of their itineraries during different phases of persecution. This suggests that studies should be based on shorter-term strategies and on a direct approach to the methodological question of how to accommodate unpredictable or missing data, all the more important as the individuals escaped persecution. These are promising subjects that future research should address.[20]

As is clear, a microhistorical approach and quantitative analysis are not contradictory, and the shifting scale of analysis does not necessarily require a monographic or linear narrative. On the contrary, the example of the Jews from Lens offers a reminder that monographic endeavors are not part of the Labroussian model of puzzle pieces that one attempts to put together.[21] To conclude, one of the results of this text is to promote, in spite of the methodological challenges, a new approach to studying the Holocaust process, using all of the traditional methods in the historian's toolbox. We remain convinced that social science research methods can be applied to research subjects that, due to their exceptional character, are also subjects of debate and contention. There is no reason why the history of this period should be written using tools that are different from those of other historians and social scientists.

Nicolas Mariot is senior research fellow at the National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS, France). Among his publications are *Face à la persécution. 991 Juifs dans la guerre* (Facing the persecution: 991 Jews during the war) published with Claire Zalc (Odile Jacob, 2010); "Does Acclamation Equal Agreement? Rethinking Collective Effervescence through the Case of the Presidential *Tour de France* during the 20th Century," *Theory & Society* 40, no. 2 (March 2012): 191–221; and *Tous unis dans la tranchée? 1914–1918, les intellectuels rencontrent le people* (Seuil, 2013). His website is http://www.jourdan.ens.fr/~mariot/.

Claire Zalc is research fellow at the Institut d'histoire moderne et contemporaine (Centre national de la recherche scientifique-Ecole normale supérieure). She is the CNRS bronze medal winner for 2012. She

is the author of *Méthodes quantitatives pour l'historien* (2008), *Melting Shops. Une histoire des commerçants étrangers en France* (2010), and *Face à la persécution. 991 Juifs dans la guerre* (2010) and is the coeditor of *Pour une microhistoire de la Shoah* (2012).

Notes

Translated from the French by John Angell and Arby Gharibian.

1. Pim Griffioen and Ron Zeller, "La persécution des Juifs en Belgique et aux Pays-Bas pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Une analyse comparative," *Cahiers d'Histoire du Temps Présent, CGTP-BEL* 5 (1998): 73–132. For discussions based on statistical analyses of municipal data, see Marnix Croes, "Anti-Jewish Policy and Organization of the Deportations in France and the Netherlands, 1940–1944: A Comparative Study" and "The Holocaust in the Netherlands and the Rate of Jewish Survival," *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 20, no. 3 (Winter 2006): 437–73 and 474–99; also see Peter Tammes, "Jewish Immigrants in the Netherlands during the Nazi Occupation," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 37, no. 4 (Spring 2007): 543–62. For the debate regarding survival rates in France, see Jacques Semelin, *Persécutions et entraides dans la France occupée. Comment 75% des Juifs en France ont échappé à la mort* (Paris: Les Arènes-Éd. du Seuil, 2013), as well as the controversy surrounding this book, particularly Robert O. Paxton, "Comment Vichy aggrava le sort des juifs en France," *Le Débat* 183 (2015): 173–81.
2. Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006). For examples of studies, see Christopher Browning, *Remembering Survival: Inside a Nazi Slave Labor Camp* (Chicago: WW Norton, 2010); Götz Aly, *Into the Tunnel: The Brief Life of Marion Samuel, 1931–1943* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007); Jürgen Matthäus and Mark Roseman, *Jewish Responses to Persecution,* vol. 1, *1933–1938,* Documenting Life and Destruction: Holocaust Sources in Context (Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2010).
3. Michael Pollak, *L'expérience concentrationnaire. Essai sur le maintien de l'identité sociale* (Paris : Métailié, 1990).
4. Nicolas Mariot and Claire Zalc, *Face à la persécution. 991 Juifs dans la guerre* (Paris: Odile Jacob, 2010).
5. Departmental Archives (AD), Pas-de-Calais, 1Z499.
6. AD Pas-de-Calais, 1Z500 bis.
7. Jean Dawidowicz Archives, untitled two-part memoir, part handwritten and part typed, "1939–1941" and "1941–1945," undated, but after 1990, partially published in "*Un jeune couple dans la guerre. Témoignage de Jean et Charlotte Dawidowicz*" [A young couple in the war: The testimonials of Jean and Charlotte Dawidowicz], *Tsafon, revue d'études juives du Nord* 47 (2004): 41–60.
8. Journal Officiel (*Verkündungsblatt des Oberfeldkommandanten*) containing the orders of the Military Governor of the Departments of the Nord and Pas-de-Calais, no. 7, 6/12/1940, pp. 129–30, ADPC 1Z497.
9. Archives Nationales (AN), AJ38/4932 dossier 8874.
10. Two of Joseph Dawidowicz's nephews, Léon and Paul Glicksman (aged twenty and twenty-six), were arrested and "recruited" to work on the Todt organization's fortifications on the Anglo-Norman islands. They were deported on Convoy No. 55, which left Drancy for Auschwitz on 23 June 1943.

11. Daily report from the police commissioner to the mayor, dated 10/9/1942, Municipal Archives of Sallaumines.
12. Daniel Mendelsohn, *The Lost: A Search for Six of Six Million* (New York: HarperCollins, 2006); Aly, *Into the Tunnel.* More generally, see Matthäus and Roseman, *Jewish Responses to Persecution,* vol.1, *1933–1938.*
13. Nicolas Mariot and Claire Zalc, "Identifier, s'identifier: recensement, auto-déclarations et persécution des Juifs lensois (1940–1945)," *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* 54, no. 3 (July–September 2007): 91–117.
14. Jean-Jacques Becker and Annette Wieviorka, eds., *Les Juifs de France de la révolution française à nos jours* (Paris: Liana Levi, 1998), 200.
15. "Témoignage de Mme Fanny Fleinman, née Dawidowicz," collected by Danielle Delmaire, *Tsafon, revue d'études juives du Nord* 9–10 (Summer–Fall 1992) : 6–11.
16. Mariot and Zalc, "Identifier, s'identifier."
17. The study considered only individuals over sixteen years of age.
18. Andrew Abbott, *Time Matters: On Theory and Method* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
19. Interview with William Scharfman, Lille, January 2011.
20. Pierre Mercklé and Claire Zalc, "Trajectories of the Persecuted during the Second World War: Contribution to a Microhistory of the Holocaust," in *Advances in Sequence Analysis: Theory, Method, Applications,* ed. Philippe Blanchard, Felix Bühlmann, and Jacques-Antoine Gauthier (New York, London: Springer, 2014), 171–90.
21. Peter Bruke, *The French Historical Revolution: The Annales School 1929–1989,* Key Contemporary Thinkers (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990).

Bibliography

Abbott, Andrew. *Time Matters: On Theory and Method.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Aly, Götz. *Into the Tunnel: The Brief Life of Marion Samuel, 1931–1943.* New York; Metropolitan Books, 2007.

Becker, Jean-Jacques, and Annette Wieviorka, eds. *Les Juifs de France de la révolution française à nos jours.* Paris: Liana Levi, 1998.

Browning, Christopher. *Remembering Survival: Inside a Nazi Slave Labor Camp.* Chicago: WW Norton, 2010.

Bruke, Peter. *The French Historical Revolution: The Annales School 1929–1989.* Key Contemporary Thinkers. Palo Alto, CA; Stanford University Press, 1990.

Croes, Marnix. "Anti-Jewish Policy and Organization of the Deportations in France and the Netherlands, 1940–1944: A Comparative Study." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 20, no. 3 (Winter 2006): 437–73.

———. "The Holocaust in the Netherlands and the Rate of Jewish Survival." *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 20, no. 3 (Winter 2006): 474–99.

Griffioen, Pim, and Ron Zeller. "La persécution des Juifs en Belgique et aux Pays-Bas pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale. Une analyse comparative." *Cahiers d'Histoire du Temps Présent, CGTP-BEL* 5 (1998): 73–132.

Mariot, Nicolas, and Claire Zalc. *Face à la persécution. 991 Juifs dans la guerre.* Paris : Odile Jacob, 2010.

———. "Identifier, s'identifier: recensement, auto-déclarations et persécution des Juifs lensois (1940–1945)." *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* 54, no. 3 (July–September 2007), 91–117.

Matthäus, Jürgen, and Mark Roseman. *Jewish Responses to Persecution*. Vol. 1, *1933–1938*. Documenting Life and Destruction: Holocaust Sources in Context. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2010.

Mendelsohn, Daniel. *The Lost: A Search for Six of Six Million*. New York: HarperCollins, 2006.

Mercklé, Pierre, and Claire Zalc. "Trajectories of the Persecuted during the Second World War: Contribution to a Microhistory of the Holocaust." In *Advances in Sequence Analysis: Theory, Method, Applications,* edited by Philippe Blanchard, Felix Bühlmann, and Jacques-Antoine Gauthier, 171–90. New York, London: Springer, 2014.

Paxton Robert O. "Comment Vichy aggrava le sort des juifs en France." *Le Débat* 183 (2015): 173–81.

Pollak, Michael. *L'expérience concentrationnaire. Essai sur le maintien de l'identité sociale.* Paris : Métailié, 1990.

Semelin, Jacques. *Persécutions et entraides dans la France occupée. Comment 75% des Juifs en France ont échappé à la mort.* Paris: Les Arènes-Éd. du Seuil, 2013.

Tammes, Peter. "Jewish Immigrants in the Netherlands during the Nazi Occupation." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 37, no. 4 (Spring 2007): 543–62.

"Témoignage de Mme Fanny Fleinman, née Dawidowicz." Collected by Danielle Delmaire. *Tsafon, revue d'études juives du Nord* 9–10 (Summer–Fall 1992): 6–11.

"Un jeune couple dans la guerre. Témoignage de Jean et Charlotte Dawidowicz" [A young couple in the war: The testimonials of Jean and Charlotte Dawidowicz]. *Tsafon, revue d'études juives du Nord* 47 (2004): 41–60.

Wieviorka, Annette. *The Era of the Witness*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.