

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Traumatic Experiences in Anne Frank's *The Diary of a Young Girl*

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Masters of Arts in English

by

Ranjana Regmi

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

September 2009

TRAUMATIC EXPERIENCES IN ANNE FRANK'S THE DIARY OF A YOUNG GIRL RANJANA REGMI 2009

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Kirtipur Kathmandu

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

M/s. Ranjana Regmi has completed her thesis entitled "Traumatic Experiences in Anne Frank's *The Diary of a Young Girl* under my supervision. She carried out her research work from June 12, 2009 to November 07, 2009. I hereby recommend this thesis be submitted for viva voce.

Amar Raj Joshi

Reader

Central Department of English

Date:

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

This is to certify that the thesis entitled "Traumatic Experiences in Anne Frank's *The Diary of a Young Girl*" by Ranjana Regmi, submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head
Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to thank Mr. Amar Raj Joshi, Reader, Central Department of English (CDE), without whose encouragement and scholarly guidance, this thesis would not have seen the light of the day.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, Head of the CDE, who was ever helpful and encouraging. Besides, all the lecturers of the CDE deserve my sincere gratitude.

I also take this opportunity to express my thanks to my husband Mr. Narayan Prasad Marasini, for all the faith and support he bestowed to me in the process of completion of this thesis.

Besides, my dear father and mother also deserve thanks for their moral and ethical support. Last, but not the least, I would like to remember all friends and teachers for their scholarly support in the completion of this thesis.

September 2009

Ranjana Regmi

Abstract

Anne Frank's diary, *The Diary of a Young Girl* is one of the most celebrated diaries in the modern world. It narrates Anne's severe mental torture in a hideout in Amsterdam, in the Netherlands, during the Second World War. Anne, who hardly was thirteen years when the family was forced to a hideout, spent two years hiding in an annex of two rooms and a kitchen with eight members during the most gruesome days of the War. She penned down, some of her innermost feelings in relation to love, adolescence feelings, way and meaning of life in the hideout in the extraordinary situations of the war. Her portrayal provides a stark glimpse into her extraordinary ordeal gripped from childhood to adolescence. She captives the reader with an innocence that contrasts the reality of her situation, which outwardly looks calm and quiet, but is like a resisting volcano. The suffering of the young girl, Anne is a portrayal of trauma that speaks volume of the trauma of the Jews during the Second World War.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

I. Introduction to Anne Frank and Her Traumatic Experiences	1
II. Holocaust and Trauma: A Historical Perspective	11
III. Traumatic Experiences in <i>The Diary of a Young Girl</i>	31
IV. Fall of Innocence	49

Works Cited

I. Introduction to Anne Frank's and Her Traumatic Experiences

Anne Frank's *The Diary of a Young Girl* narrates her traumatic experiences in a hide-out in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, during the Second World War (1945-49). Anne records the two-years' of horrific experiences of living in the hiding with eight persons, including her family members – father, mother and sister. The present research will take into consideration the appalling mental and physical subjugation faced by Anne during the transition from the late childhood to the early years of adolescent. For the same, the researcher will apply Trauma theory to analyze the Diary.

Anne's diary describes the two arduous years she spent in seclusion before her tragic death at the age of 15. Most readers and critics are spellbound by the fact that such a young girl, in confinement and under the extreme of mental conditions, could pen down her diary with such intelligence. Since its first publication in 1947 it has been and is still one of the most read and appreciated diaries throughout the world. Perhaps more than any other figure, Anne gave a human face to the victims of the Holocaust, which makes her diary a world-wide success.

Early in the Nazi regime of Adolf Hitler, the then Chancellor of Germany, Anne's father, Otto Frank (1889–1980), a German businessman, took his wife and two daughters – Margot, the elder one and Anne, to live in Amsterdam. In 1941 German forces occupied the Netherlands and Anne along with her sister was compelled to transfer from a public school to a Jewish school. Faced with deportation (supposedly to a forced-labor camp), the Franks went into hiding on July 9, 1942, with four other Jews in the back-room office and warehouse of Otto Frank's food-products business. With the aid of non-Jewish friends who smuggled in food and other supplies, they lived confined to their secret annex until August 4, 1944, until the Gestapo, acting on a tip from Dutch informers, discovered them.

The family was transported to Westerbork, a transit camp in the Netherlands, and from there to Auschwitz in German occupied Poland on September 3, 1944, on the last transport to leave Westerbork for Auschwitz. Anne and her sister Margot were transferred to Bergen-Belsen the following month. Anne's mother died in early January, just before the evacuation of Auschwitz on January 18, 1945. Both Anne and Margot died in a typhus epidemic in March 1945, only weeks before the liberation of Bergen-Belsen. Otto Frank was found hospitalized at Auschwitz when it was liberated by Russian troops on January 27, 1945.

Friends who had searched the family's hiding place after their capture later gave Otto Frank the papers left behind by the Gestapo. Among them he found Anne's diary, which was published as *The Diary of a Young Girl* (originally in Dutch, 1947). Precocious in style and insight, it traces her emotional growth amid adversity. In it she wrote, "In spite of everything I still believe that people are really good at heart" (212).

Anne and the others in the group were discovered and arrested by the Gestapo, the German secret police, on August 4, 1944. Members of the group were deported, first to Westerbork prison in the Netherlands, then to the Auschwitz concentration camp in Poland, where the Franks were separated. Anne and her older sister, Margot, were sent to the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp, where they died of typhus. Of the Frank family, only Otto survived.

Returning to Amsterdam, Otto compiled an account of the hiding period from Anne's two incomplete diary drafts, which had been saved by Miep Gies, one of the members of hideout. The diary was first published in Dutch in 1947 as *Het Achterhuis* (*The House Behind*). German and French translations followed in 1950. An English translation, *Anne Frank: The Diary of a Young Girl*, appeared in 1952. It was made into a Pulitzer Prize winning play by Francis Goodrich and Albert Hackett in 1956 and then into a motion picture

in 1959. This publicity increased the diarist's renown, linking her image with her most famous words: "In spite of everything I still believe that people are really good at heart" (37).

In 1995 another version of Anne's diary appeared that contained materials edited from the original version, including passages in which Anne was critical of her parents. Afterward, the existence of several additional unpublished diary pages was revealed, and in 2001 a new edition of Anne's diary was published with the missing pages restored.

Annelies Marie Frank was born on June 12, 1929, in Frankfurt, Germany and her father Otto Frank, along with his family left Germany in 1933 to escape the anti-Jewish measures imposed by the Nazis onto the Jews members. The rules imposed on the anti-Jewish community restricted them from entering in to the public vehicle, to ride bicycle and were forced to walk everywhere. They were not permitted for any social and economic activities. As such, Anne's father, Otto, took the family to Amsterdam, where he had established a small food-products business. When Germany invaded The Netherlands in 1940, the Franks once again became subject to escalating anti-Semitic persecution. In 1941 Anne was required to transfer from a public school to a Jewish school.

In June 14, 1942 on Sunday, Anne received a diary for her 13th birthday. She began to write down her thoughts and experiences in the form of letters to an imaginary friend. Her first entry in the diary enters with a happy note that says, ". . . we are going to be great pals!" (1). One month later the Franks went into hiding in the office building. For the next two years the Frank family shared cramped quarters with four other Jewish people. They were aided by several non-Jewish friends, including Miep Gies, who published her memoirs, *Anne Frank Remembered*, in 1987.

Over the course of 25 months, Anne recorded her experiences while hiding from German troops. Her diary describes the fears and emotional conflicts of people crowded together in secrecy, as well as humorous and joyful moments. These include birthday

celebrations and Anne's first experience of falling in love. Many of the passages concern Anne's emotional growth and her discoveries about herself, other people, and the beauty of life. With hopes of becoming a professional writer, she produced a first and second draft of her diary, as well as various short stories.

In the very short span of her life, Anne has become famous for her diary. Between the thirteen to fifteen years of age, besides the diary, she also composed one or two short stories and had started a novel; which could never be completed. Delinda C. Hanley describes the young mind's caliber as, "mature and insightful penetration into the human mind" (23). Besides, it also, "provides an intimate examination of daily life of Nazi occupation" (22) opines Hanley.

In the course of writing diary, she gave it a name 'Kitty,' so as it would be her friend, the truest and closest of all. She writes, "In order to enhance in my mind's eye the picture of the friend for whom I have waited so long, I don't want to set down a series of bald facts in a dairy like most people do, but I want this diary itself to be a friend, and I shall call my friend Kitty" (3). The young mind had another reason to give it a name, as she explains, "No one will grasp what I'm talking about if I begin my letters to Kitty just out of the blue, so, albeit unwillingly, I will sketch in it the brief story of my life" (3).

There are ample advantages of the diary to many people from different perspectives. However, Lillian S. Kremer classifies the advantages of the diary according to two major interests to various groups of people, as:

The Diary of a Young Girl has two main source of interest. First, it gives an excellent insight into what occurred during the World War II in the Nazi occupied nations. Frank's realistic account of her life illuminates the historical situation more than any secondary source could, as her diary is an intimate and intense record of her own experiences and reactions. Second . . . the diary is of

lasting importance as a document of adolescence. Despite her imprisonment in a strange environment, Anne shows all the characteristics normally associated with the difficult transition from childhood to the verge of adulthood. (232)

The central theme of her adolescence, however, is the quest for her own identity in the time of internal and external turmoil.

The strongest of the emotions displayed, by Anne is, of course, the fact that she may not be alive after all. She dreams of being a journalist and a writer, but is equally aware of the scenario in which she is in. But, everyone has praise for her high spirit of life, as well as death. As her last entry reads, "I want to go on living even after my death! And therefore I am grateful to God for giving me this gift, this possibility of developing myself and of writing, of expressing all that is in me" (276). Kremer praises this strong appeal for life as, "Anne is a hope, hope of life, a new life and the world beyond it" (234).

Some critics and writers also take interest in Anne's writing style. Analyzing her writing style, the dramatist Mayer Levion, who worked with Anne's father on the dramatization of her diary shortly after its publication, praises it for "sustaining the tension of a well constructed novel" (5). While poet John Berryman wrote that it was:

A unique depiction not merely of adolescence but of the mysterious,
 fundamental process of a child becoming an adult as it is actually happening.
 Anne's writing is largely a study of characters and she examines every person
 in her circle with a shrewd, uncompromising eye, an outcome of her dilemma
 of being a good Anne and a bad Anne. (5)

Her deep analysis of the characters around is of course the result of her talent to penetrate into the surroundings with ease. Her examination of herself and her surrounding is sustained over a lengthy period of time in an introspective, analytical and highly self critical manner,

and in moments of frustration she relates the battle with self between the 'good' and 'bad' Anne.

As a diary, she also acquires the autobiographical quality where she reflects her own activities and the condition of the outer world. Though many critics take it as a product of adolescent mind but apart from these it is the record of what was happening outside during the Second World War. She is told about the life situation of people where Mr. Dussel joins the Annex in latter months of 1942. He brings the news of the Jews deportation to the camps. "The sick, the early children, babies and pregnant women all are marched to their death" (72). Anne responds to Dussel's news with compassion. She feels that the Jews misery on the outside is far greater than anything she has had to suffer in the hide-out.

Among several critics and admirers of Anne's diary, American president Ronald Reagan, comes amongst the top. According to Elaine Showalter, he terms the diary as, "the best and the least known of the female documentaries" (21). Addressing a crowd of around thirty thousand victims of the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp, Reagan not only praised their bravery to have survived the camp, but also declared that the diary of Anne would be incorporated in the American Education System. He said:

. . . her diary has been translated into numerous languages and is part of the curriculum in schools around the world; yet despite her embrace by this general audience, she had been for the most part gently but unambiguously dismissed as a figure not meriting serious academic examination. Therefore, although her name earns a level of recognition matched by few if any survivors of the Holocaust, little effort has been expended in analyzing her voice. Hers remain a life largely unexamined except by her. (qtd. in Showalter, 21)

Regan shows the importance of the diary so that it is included in school curriculum in the United States. Along with the direct experience of holocaust, Anne also writes about the current situation of the nation together with her relation with her mother, her emerging sexuality and on the status of women, in her culture.

Another critic, Berteke Waaldijk finds the significance of diary from the point of view of an adolescent youth. She focuses on the woman's right. He writes:

She focuses on part on the differences between three versions of the diary; the unbridged, the containing Anne's own revisions and that finally published and finds that . . . in the fact of which critical edition had in fact been compiled, they are extremely significant for readers interested in Anne Frank as a woman writer. They have to do with her body, menstruation and sexuality, her conversation with Peter and her relationship with her mother. (330)

It is highly ironic that the public has been prevented from knowing Anne as a woman or as a mature writer, because these two aspects of her are intricately related. The rejection of her mother and of her mother's role as a bourgeois house wife was deeply linked to Anne's literary ambitions. Her wish to lead the life of a writer coincides with her desire to lead a better life than that of her mother.

Similarly, Delinda C. Hanley takes the diary, as the mirror of all the people, not only for the young and the adolescent. He praises her for being able to expose the current situation at such a young age. He remarks:

The story of Anne Frank's life and death resonates with people of all ages and backgrounds. Anne's diary provides a vehicle for people to learn from Europe's holocaust and examine prejudice, persecution, discrimination, hatred and violence. Anne's worlds survive death and inspire young people to express

their idealism. Her faith that good will triumph over evil still gives hope to millions around the world. (22)

Nazi's exploitation of the Jews is in the extreme point so that they are compelled to live in the secret place for safe living. And the Jews are totally cut off from the outside relation and contact.

However, the diary also has been the centre of conflict at times. Some critics negate its reflection of real life situation as rather fictional. They also deny the wide range of holocaust as described in the diary. What these critics say about Anne's diary can be understood through the following words of Norman Ravin:

It is the watery aspect of the diary that now interests many critics and readers and has been driven the claims of a wide range of holocaust deniers that the diary is a hoax. They call it "Twisting the Truth: The Diary of Anne Frank." It catalogues the twisted claimants who have dedicated themselves to such works. The list includes David Irving and Robert Faurisson. The involvement of these men in the argument for the diary's fraudulence should give pause to readers who are willing to give their scholarly methods credit in other contexts. (144)

Ravvin finds many contradictions and absurdities in the diary. He rejects its realistic events rather he says that the diary is the result of poor imagination of the author. According to him, "Improbabilities, incoherencies and absurdities are the qualities of the diary" (142). He clearly mentions his opinions in the following lines:

The absurdities of the diary are those of a poor imagination that developed out side of a lived experience. They are worthy of a poor novel or a poor lie every one is made to believe with soothing words. Every personality; however, it

may contain what it is proper to psychological, mental or moral contradictions.

(143)

He points out the negative aspects of the diary but it does not mean that he negates the existence of the diary, nor its popularity. He accepts that it is a world famous diary. Despite contradictions, it presents teenage psychology, especially from the point of view of a girl, who is confined from freedom.

Another critic Martha V. Paravano says that this book has a pictorial quality. In the issue, she writes, "In fact the entire text is a model of picture book writing" (740). The diary also has been adapted to number of movies, television programs, theatrical productions, and even an opera based on the diary.

It is beyond doubt that the diary is most popular to all groups of person around the world, with especial impressions on the youths. Sue Gibson argues that Anne's diary is a popular diary among teenagers and adults. She says, "Today her diary is a classic, read and cherished by teenagers and adult alike" (22). Frank is aware of the feelings and sufferings of teenage psychology and hence her diary is popular among the young the old alike.

Thus, her short life has been one of the most debatable issues through various comments and commentaries on the diary. However, the Anne Frank House, with nearly 1 million visitors annually, is one of the Amsterdam's largest attractions. The museum is operated by a Dutch foundation that fights discrimination through educational programs and international exhibitions. The diary has been translated into more than 65 languages and is one of the most widely read diaries in the world. A new English translation with material edited out of the original version, making the new work nearly one-third longer than the original was published in 1995. The Frank family's hiding place on the Prinsengracht – a canal in Amsterdam has become a national museum in the Netherlands.

Though, there are different aspects in Anne's diary that have been analyzed, the present researcher will look into the historical perspective of traumatic experience based on the experiences of young Anna, an outcome of holocaust of the Second World War.

II. Holocaust and Trauma: A Historical Perspective

Holocaust

The term 'holocaust' is derived from Greek word *holocaustos* which in turn is made up of two words, *holo* (whole) and *caustos* (burned). As such, originally, it referred to a burnt offering, or a religious sacrifice that was totally consumed by fire. However, the meaning of the word has changed dramatically, since the beginning of nineteenth century. In Germany, it was used by Adolf Hitler, the then dictator, to describe the treatment of the Jews as early as 1942. According to *Oxford English Dictionary* holocaust is:

The sum total of all anti-Jewish actions carried out by the Nazi regime in between 1933 to 1945; from stripping German Jews of their legal and economic status in the 1930, to segregating and starving Jews in millions in the various occupied countries occupied by then German forces in Europe.

(267)

The holocaust is a part of a broader aggregate of acts of oppression and murder of various ethnic and political groups in Europe by the Nazis. Nevertheless, it has special significance due to the exceptional attitude with which its perpetrators, the Nazis, regarded their Jewish victims. In the Nazi terminology, the Jews were referred to as "world Jewry" a term unparalleled with respect to any other ethnic, ideological or social group. The Nazis' proclaimed goal was the eradication of European Jewry. Holocaust, today, refers to the almost complete destruction of Jews in Europe by Nazi Germany and its collaborators during World War II (1939-1945). The leadership of Germany's Nazi Party ordered the extermination of 5.6 million to 5.9 million Jews. Jews often refer to the Holocaust as *Shoah*, derived from the Hebrew word that stands for *catastrophe* or *total destruction*.

The biblical word "Shoah" became the standard Hebrew term for the murder of European Jewry as early as 1940s, as the corresponding term in English, originally meant a

sacrifice, burnt on altar. The selection of these two words with religious origin reflects recognition of the unprecedented nature and magnitude of the event. Many understand holocaust as the general term for the crimes and horrors perpetrated by the Nazis; others go even farther and use it to encompass other acts of mass murder, as well.

Anti-Semitism was common in Europe in the 1920s and 30s. Hitler's fanatical brand of racial anti-Semitism was laid out in his 1925 book *Mein Kampf*, which though, largely ignored when it was first printed, became a best seller in Germany once Hitler came to power. On April 1, 1933, shortly after Hitler's accession to power, the Nazis, led by Julius and Streicher, organized a one day boycott of all the Jewish-owned business in Germany. A series of increasing harsh racist laws were soon passed in quick succession. In 1936, Jews were banned from all professional jobs, effectively preventing them exerting any influence in education, politics and higher education and industry. On November 15, 1938, Jewish children were banned from going to normal schools. By April 1939, nearly all Jewish companies had either collapsed under financial pressure and declining profits, or had been forced to sell out to the Nazis German government as part of the "Aryanization" policy inaugurated in 1937.

As the war started, large massacre of Jews took place, and by December 1941, Hitler decided to exterminate the European Jews. In January 1942, during the Wannese conference, several Nazi leaders discussed the detail of the final solution of the question. Josef Buhler urged Reinhard Heydrich to proceed with the final solution in the General Government. They began to systematically deport Jewish populations from the ghettos and all occupied territories to the seven camps designated as extermination camps, like Auschwitz, Belec, Chelmnno Majdanek, Maly, Trostenets, Sobibro and Treblinka II. Hitler was eventually interested to control over Europe and eventually to take over the U. S. However, his failed dream to achieve the same resulted in the extreme cruelty he took against the European Jews.

Although, not successful in his first goal, Hitler was largely successful in achieving his second goal.

By the end of the war much of the Jewish population had been killed in the holocaust. Poland, home of the largest Jewish community before the Second World War, was a home of about 3,000,000 Jewish population, out of which around ninety per cent died, directly or indirectly because of Nazis cruelty on them. The penalty imposed by the Germans for hiding Jews was death, and this was carried out mercilessly. In spite of this some people hid Jewish children and families saved their lives at risk to their own families. Greece, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Lithuania, Bohemia, the Netherlands, Slovakia and Latvia each had over seventy per cent of their Jewish population destroyed. Belgium, Romania, Luxembourg, Norway and Estonia lost around half of their population, the Soviet Union over one third of its Jews, and even countries such as France and Italy had each seen around a quarter of their Jewish population killed. Denmark was able to evacuate almost all of the Jews in their country to nearby Sweden which was neutral during the war. Using everything from fishing boats to private yachts, the Danes whisked the Danish Jews to safety. The King of Denmark had earlier set a powerful example by wearing the yellow Star of David that the Germans had decreed all Jewish Danes must wear. Some Jews outside Europe under Nazi occupation were also affected by the holocaust and treatment of the Nazis.

Trauma

The systematic state-sponsored killing of six million Jewish men, women and children and millions of others by Nazi Germany and its collaborators during World War II left their homes traumatized. Even before the Nazis came to power in Germany in 1933, they had made no secret of their anti-Semitism. As early as 1919, Adolf Hitler had written, “Rational anti-Semitism, however, must lead to systematic legal opposition . . . Its final objective must unswervingly be the removal of the Jews altogether” (qtd. in *Mein Kampf* 1925–27). Hitler

further developed the idea of the Jews as an evil race struggling for world domination. Nazi anti-Semitism was rooted in religious anti-Semitism and enhanced by political anti-Semitism. To this, the Nazis added a further dimension: racial anti-Semitism. Nazi racial ideology characterized the Jews as *Untermenschen* (sub-humans in German). The Nazis portrayed Jews as a race and not a religious group. Religious anti-Semitism could be resolved by conversion, political anti-Semitism by expulsion. Ultimately, the logic of Nazi racial anti-Semitism led to annihilation.

When Hitler came to power legally on January 30, 1933, as the head of a coalition government, his first objective was to consolidate power and to eliminate political opposition. The boycott of Jewish businesses was the first of the systematic assaults on Jews that started on April 1, 1933. A week later the Nazis dismissed Jews from the civil service and by the end of the month, the participation of Jews in German schools was restricted by a quota. On May 10, thousands of Nazi students and professors stormed various university libraries and bookstores in more than 30 cities throughout Germany to remove tens of thousands of books written by non-Aryans and those opposed to Nazi ideology. The books were tossed into bonfires in an effort to cleanse German culture of “un-Germanic” writings. A century earlier, Heinrich Heine, a German poet of Jewish origin—had said, “Where one burns books, one will, in the end, burn people” (qtd. Showalter, 47). However, in Nazi Germany, the time between the burning of Jewish books and the burning of Jews was spread in between a gap of eight years.

As discrimination against Jews increased, German law required a legal definition of a Jew and an Aryan. Promulgated at the annual Nazi Party rally in Nürnberg on September 15, 1935, the Nürnberg Laws – the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honor and the Law of the Reich Citizen—became the centerpiece of anti-Jewish legislation and a precedent for defining and categorizing Jews in all German-controlled lands. Marriage and

sexual relations between Jews and citizens of “German or kindred blood” were prohibited. Only “racial” Germans were entitled to civil and political rights. The Jews were reduced mere to subjects of the state with no specific rights and duties. The Nürnberg Laws formally divided Germans and Jews, yet neither the word *German* nor the word *Jew* was defined. That task was left to the bureaucracy. Two basic categories were established in November: Jews—those with at least three Jewish grandparents—and *Mischlinge* (“mongrels,” or “mixed breeds”)—people with one or two Jewish grandparents. Thus, the definition of a Jew was primarily based not on the identity an individual affirmed or the religion he practiced but on his ancestry. Categorization was the first stage of destruction.

The Jewish society responded with alarm to Hitler's rise and sought to defend their rights as Germans. For those Jews who felt themselves fully German and who had patriotically fought in World War I, the Nazification of German society was especially painful. Zionist activity intensified. “Wear it with pride” (8) wrote journalist Robert Wildest in *Jewish Identity* in 1933. Similarly, Martin Buber led an effort at Jewish adult education, preparing the community for the long journey ahead. Rabbi Leo Baeck circulated a prayer for Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement) in 1935 that instructed Jews how to behave: “We bow down before God; we stand erect before man” (12) as quoted in *Jewish Identity*. Yet while few, if any, could foresee its eventual outcome, the Jewish condition was increasingly perilous and expected to get worse.

By the late 1930s there was a desperate search for countries of refuge. Those who could get visas and qualify under stringent quotas immigrated to the United States. Many went to Palestine, where the small Jewish community was willing to receive refugees. Still others sought refuge in neighboring European countries. Most countries, however, were unwilling to receive large numbers of refugees.

Responding to domestic pressures to act on behalf of Jewish refugees, U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt convened, but did not attend, the Évian Conference on resettlement, in Évian-les-Bains, France, in July 1938. In his invitation to government leaders, Roosevelt specified that they would not have to change laws or spend government funds; only philanthropic funds would be used for resettlement. The result was that little was attempted, and less accomplished.

On the evening of November 9, 1938, carefully orchestrated anti-Jewish violence “erupted” throughout the Reich which since March included Austria. Over the next 48 hours rioters burned or damaged more than 1,000 synagogues and ransacked and broke the windows of more than 7,500 businesses. The Nazis arrested some 30,000 Jewish men between the ages of 16 and 60 and sent them to concentration camps. Police stood by as the violence—often the action of neighbors, not strangers—occurred. Firemen were present not to protect the synagogues but to ensure that the flames did not spread to adjacent “Aryan” property. The pogrom was given a quaint name: *Kristallnacht* (“Crystal Night,” or “Night of Broken Glass”).

In its aftermath, Jews lost the illusion that they had a future in Germany. On November 12, 1938, Field Marshall Hermann Göring convened a meeting of Nazi officials to discuss the damage to the German economy from pogroms. The Jewish community was fined one billion Reichsmarks. Moreover, Jews were made responsible for cleaning up the damage. German Jews, but not foreign Jews, were barred from collecting insurance. In addition, Jews were soon denied entry to theatres, forced to travel in separate compartments on trains, and excluded from German schools. These new restrictions was added to earlier prohibitions, such as those barring Jews from earning university degrees, from owning businesses, or from practicing law or medicine in the service of non-Jews. The Nazis would continue to confiscate Jewish property in a program called “Aryanization.”

Göring concluded the November meeting with a note of irony: "I would not like to be a Jew in Germany!" (qtd. in Encyclopedia Britannica).

Credit for the development of trauma theory goes to Austrian psychoanalyst and medico, Sigmund Freud. He initially took the job of managing and flourishing the trauma theory in course of his treatment of the people who were being mentally and physically wounded, disturbed and disordered in World War I. Being the founder of psychoanalytical approach both in treatment and literature, most the trauma theorists and critics and more or less influenced and associated with him and they try their best to define trauma basing on Freud's psychoanalysis even speak for or argue against it.

However, in modern sense, the phenomenon of trauma seems all-inclusive trauma which can be defined from the two approaches: first, psychoanalytic-formalistic approach and second, cultural approach. According to the first approach, a victimized subject does not disclose the real traumatic experience; she rather exposes and expresses the testimony, in a very distorted and deceptive manner due to the fear of social death. Regarding the psychoanalytical approach, Freud's ideas are very much significant. In *Studies on Hysteria*, Freud and Breur are committed to the view that the "reminiscences that cause hysterical suffering are historical in the sense that they linked to actual traumas in the patient's life" (186). The effect associated with the past trauma can not be acknowledged and the amnesia that results means that the force of the affect becomes dammed up. The injured person's reaction to the trauma exercises a completely cathartic effect if it is an adequate reaction. According to Breur trauma is, "the past that continues to wound the present and finds no outlet" (187).

Geoffrey Hartman, Cathy Caruth, Dominick LaCarpa, Ryan Lamothe, James Berger and others, basing their theory of trauma on Freud's psychoanalysis speak and argue about the need for "acting-out" or "working-through" of the trauma for leading life of a healthy

citizen. Trauma is intrinsically multidisciplinary so it needs to displace older paradigms and attend to new configuration of cultural knowledge. Unlike the psychoanalytic-formalistic approach, historical approach examines the undercurrents of the distorted by contextualizing it in the network of cultural-politics. Luckhurst writes, "These concerns of trauma theory range from the public and historical to the private and memorial" (497). Sigmund Freud, in "Mourning and Melancholy," describes two opposite forces that act simultaneously to convert traumatic experience in all form of writing as:

The literary form gets its strength from the struggle between the urge to cry out from the burning core of traumatic experience on the one hand, and the drive to rationally construct the core of the trauma as a symbolic representation molded in language, thus keeping it at a safe distance from fact to fiction" (8).

In the sense, trauma brings home the limitations of our understanding and at the same time, it dislocates the so-called traditional disciplinary boundaries leading us to rethink our notions of experiences and of communication. In a person's telling of trauma, what remains to be said is the disaster, ruin of words and demise of writing for both the speaker and listener in the course of conversation.

Trauma theory is a privileged critical category which includes diverse fields, with its specific focus on psychological, philosophical, ethical and aesthetic questions about the nature and representation of traumatic events. In other words, all forms of writing on traumatic history is based on two forms of remembering trauma – the first result in the process of "working-through," the other is based on denial and results in "acting-out." Both concepts come from Freud and have been developed in such a way that it could be used in historical studies.

In 1980s, historical trauma surfaced as a topic of serious and intense debate within the community of scholars and critics. By the mid-1990s, trauma therapies had mushroomed into an entire industry. The disorder's acronym, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), became a household word, a metonym that stands for a whole constellation of symptoms, reinforced by popular culture images ranging from the now well-known phenomenon of "flashbacks" to the stereotype of the "crazy vet," to the claims of some women that they have recovered memories of child sexual abuse. Literary interest in trauma and traumatic events is long-standing, and works of both creative artists and critics have always reflected and helped to shape contemporary cultural understanding of the nature of historical trauma. Much of the recent literary critical writing on trauma memory is rooted in memory approaches. As a body, it draws heavily on Freud and Lacan.

In the analysis of the relation between traumatic memory and history, expanding Freud's ideas, Caruth and Felman have added some more themes on the topic. Trauma's meaning in Western medicine extends from a surgeon's description of a wound to the head in the early nineteenth century to a much more complex and puzzling narrative about a wound to the psyche toward the century's end. This transformation has about it a compelling social character: trauma becomes attached to psychic injury when train accident victims complain of lingering mental and physical disorders despite the fact that they emerge from accident scenes "unharmed". Giving a general definition of trauma in her essay "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History," Caruth says:

Trauma describes an overwhelming experience of sudden or catastrophic events in which the response to the event occurs in the often delayed, and uncontrolled repetitive occurrence of hallucinations and other intrusive phenomena. The experience of the soldier faced with sudden and massive death around him, for example, who suffers this sight in a numbed state, only to relive it later on in

repeated nightmares, is a central and recurring image of trauma in our century.

(181)

The trauma theory has aroused a vivid interest among the cultural and literary theorists. The reason behind why trauma theory has begun to drag the attention of theorists pushes us to look at popular culture and mass media obsessed by repetitions of violent disaster. James Berger in this regard opines:

It has become popular because of the successions of movies like Die Hard, Terminators and Robocops, as well as Nightmares on Elm Street, disease and epidemic films, and now the return of the “classic” disaster films and twisters and turbulence and the repeated sequence of miniapocalypses within each films: at “real life” cop shows; and at the news itself, that never exhausted source of pure horror. (571)

By the same token of why trauma theory has become popular and inevitable makes us look at the preoccupation with family dysfunctions, child abuse, incest, spousal abuse in the media, most strikingly on the talk show circuit. There appears to be the sense both that family is the only hope for curing all social ills and that the family is “damaged beyond hope” (571).

Along with the interest in family breakdown and violence comes the interest of enigmatic figure of the survivor, the one who has faced the catastrophe and can tell us what it is like. The survivor is a kind of living “black box,” a source of final knowledge of authority. Over the past fifteen years there has been an enormous growth in the interest in eyewitness accounts and testimonies of all kinds: by victims of child abuse, holocaust survivor, survivor of near death experiences.

Trauma has now crossed the boundaries of psychiatry and medico-clinical field and has shown an increasing insistence on the direct effects of external violence in psychic disorder. This happened after the multi-culturalist’s celebration of decanter and

meaninglessness. Within psychiatry, recent discussion has been dominated by two disorders that entered the official diagnostic manual of the American psychiatric Association in 1980s; Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Multiple Personality Disorder. Multiculturalists and post-colonial critics share an interest in dismantling those intuitional mechanisms that rein scribed a power structure that favored the interests and continuing privilege of certain groups and nation. This interest did not arise in a vacuum; however its emergence had been prepared by the Civil Rights, women and Gay Liberation movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Theses movements provided strength from a radical questioning of federal authority to which the protest against Vietnam War had given vent and which contributed to its conception as a ‘national trauma’. In order to clarify this issue, Berger points out:

A theory of trauma in addition suggests ways of re-conceptualizing important directions in critical theory itself. In particular, the recent crisis in post structuralism thought brought on by Heidegger and Paul de Man controversies seems to require a way of thinking about how events in the past return to haunt the present. More fundamentally, it may be useful to look again at the rhetoric of post structuralism and post modern theory-their emphasis on decent ring, fragmentation, the sublime of apocalyptic- and explore what relation they might have to the traumatic historical events of mid-century [...] like Jacques Derrida, Jean-Francois-Lyotard and Hayden white while writing explicitly about the Holocaust in the 1980s in ways that seem uncannily to echo earlier works. (573)

Similarly, Cathy Caruth in “Violence and Time: Traumatic Survivals” further clarifies that “traumatic disorders reflect the direct imposition on the mind of the unavoidable reality of horrific events where impact of violence cannot be registered” (24). Trauma is constituted not

only by the destructive force of a violent event but by the very act of its survival. In this point she posits:

In recent years an increasing insistence in psychiatry in relation to external violence in psychic disorder has culminated in the study of “Post-Traumatic Streets Disorder.” As it is generally understood today, [...] as the most real, and also most destructive psychic experience. If we are to register the impact of violence we cannot, therefore, locate it only in the destructive moment of the past, but in an ongoing survival that belongs to the future. It is because violence inhabits; incomprehensibly, the very survival of those who have lived beyond it that it may be witnessed best in the future generation to whom this survival is passed on. (25)

In the same way, Dominick LaCapra’s theory of trauma focuses on three psychoanalytic topics: the return of the repressed; acting out versus working through; and the dynamics of transference. A traumatic historical event, as LaCapra argues, “tends first to be repressed and then to return in forms of compulsive repetition” (574). LaCapra is primarily concerned with the return of the repressed as discourse, rather than that with physical returns such as the genocidal repetitions in Cambodia and Bosnia, and he outlines two symptomatic possibilities for the return of historical trauma as discourse. LaCapra emphasizes more in trauma’s nature which denies compulsively fixated but accepts the role of paradox and aporia. In this regard, Berger writes:

LaCapra is of the opinion to create a position that avoids both redemptive narrative and sublime acting out. He sets out to describe a way to work through trauma that does not deny the irreducibility fixated [...]. If there is no acting out at all, no repetition of the traumatic disruption, the resulting account

of the historical trauma will be that teleological, redemptive fetishizing that denies the trauma's reality. (575)

Among the three, transference is the most pervasive concern of LaCapra that the failure to come to terms with the discursive returns of some traumatic event usually signals the failure to recognize one's own emotional and ideological investments in the event and its representation. Transference in psychoanalysis is itself a return of the repressed, or rather a more conscious summoning of the repressed; it repeats or acts out a past event or relationship in a new therapeutic setting that allows for critical evaluation and change. Transference is the occasion for working through the traumatic symptom. It is imperative therefore to recognize the symptom and the trauma as one's own, to acknowledge that the trauma still is active and that one is implicated in its destructive effects.

South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) provided a forum for the voice of—often the repressed, suppressed or uneasily accommodated voice of certain victims who were being heard for the first time in the public sphere. In “Trauma, Absence and Loss,” LaCapra tries his best to draw and elaborate the distinction between absence and loss. These stakes certainly include intellectual clarity and cogency but they also have ethical and political dimensions. Post-apartheid South Africa and post-Nazi Germany face the problem of acknowledging and working through historical losses in ways that affect different groups differently. Indeed the problem for beneficiaries of earlier oppression in both countries is how to recognize and mourn the losses of former victims and simultaneously to find a legitimate way to represent and mourn for their own losses without having a self-directed process occlude victims' losses or enter into an objectionable balancing of accounts.

Trauma may be in the forms of natural and technological disasters, war or individual trauma. Emotional trauma occurs when “the psychological pain of a traumatic event involves damage or threat of damage to an individual's psychic integrity or sense of self” (Mayer 29).

Trauma effects may also be evidenced as, multiple personalities, paranoia, anger, and sleep problems; tendencies towards suicidability, irritability, mood swings and odd rituals; difficulty in trusting people and difficult relationships; and general despair, aimlessness, and helplessness.

Trauma theory, which focuses on acting out has its own issues and it cannot be explained within its limited territory for it is interconnected “with specific ethical and socio-cultural tension” (Hartman 269). This arises from an awareness of persistence of violence in a culture that no longer condones the martial virtues of war. The yearning for art and peace has been greater since the Nazism and Totalitarianism. But continuous ethnic conflict, genocidal episodes and irrational and bloody events reported as the main staple news, it set up an intolerable contrast between the yearning and intractable. As a matter of fact, the trans-historical awareness of the incidence of trauma-personals should make us realize the extent of human suffering.

Likewise, trauma theory synthesizes resource from a number of critical schools. In “Mixing Memory and Desire: Psychoanalysis, Psychology and Trauma Theory,” Roger Luckhurst regarding the different aspects about the trauma mentions:

Freudian psychoanalysis provided a model of traumatic subjectivity and various accounts about the effects of trauma on memory. Feminism generated not only the crucial political context but also a model of community for speaking out about forms of physical and sexual abuse that has been borrowed by subsequent “Survivor” groups. New Historical, fascinated by ideological omissions and repressions of historical narrative [...]. Finally, deconstruction particularly in its American Yale school version redirected its concerns with reference, representation, and the limits of knowledge to the problem of trauma. (497)

Thus, trauma is a crux, speaking to the undecidability of representation and the limits of knowledge. The major thrust of Geoffrey Hartman in “Trauma within the Limits of Literature” is to consider trauma within the limits of language and literature. In order to clarify this issue about the limitation of language of literature, Luckhurst further argues:

I am considering trauma within the limits of language and especially literature. Respect for the formal integrity of literature has a salutary side effect: it prevents theory from being applied reductively. Theory should not insist, in particular, on the psychic would be located in a single biographical events, that would be occulted by literary device that must be cleared always as if they were defensive structures. (495)

The art of trauma study explores the relation between psychic and its signification. Hartman further discusses about how trauma affects the formation of words or how words deal with trauma. Similarly, in “On Traumatic Knowledge and Literature Studies,” he talks about the literary studies and then posits that the theory derives mainly from psychoanalytical sources, though it is strongly affected by literary practices. Here, he points out:

The theory holds that the knowledge of trauma, or the knowledge which comes from that source, is composed two contradictory elements. One is the traumatic event, register rather than experienced. It seems to have bypassed perception and consciousness, and falls directly into the psyche. The other is a kind of memory of the event, in the form of a perpetual trooping of it by the bypassed or severely split [...]. (537)

Hartman further argues that trauma theory throws light on figurative of poetic language, and perhaps symbolic process in general, as something other than an enhanced imaging or vicarious repetition of a prior experience. He again asserts that the emphasis falls on the imaginative use of language rather than on an ideal transparency of meaning. “The real-the

empirical of historical origin-cannot be known as such because it presents itself always within the resonances or fields of the traumatic” (544).

By the same way in “The Location of Cultural Experience,” Levion Mayer has defined trauma as “the interruption of a sense of going on being, a fracture of the sense of the continuity of the self” (114). He describes this event as it occurs in the mother/baby relationship. The mental representation of the good object in the inner world (that is the idea of loving mother in the mind) is kept alive by the external, actual mother, responding to the baby with her continual care.

Again, Dominick LaCapra in *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory and Trauma* talks about two related goals: to intervene in and clarify some of the recent public controversies regarding holocaust representation and to elaborate a theory of historical trauma and its transmission. His contribution to the trauma theory and its cultural transmission is extraordinarily lucid and insightful. A traumatic historical event as LaCapra argues, “tends to be repressed and then to return in forms of compulsive repetition.” (574)

Showing the connection between trauma, violence and political community in “Introduction: Trauma, Violence and Political Community” Edkins Jenny points out how traumas such as wars or persecutions are inscribed and rein scribed into everyday narratives. She further states, “[...] takes place in practices of remembrance, demoralization and witnessing. It also takes place in political action. All these practices are the site of struggle” (15). These lines clearly show that temporality and inexpressibility of trauma makes the role of the witness almost an unbearable one. Similarly, she puts forwards her idea about trauma and posits, “Memory is not straightforward, especially in case of traumatic memory” (16). Jenny further argues that some forms of remembering can be seen as ways of forgetting: ways of recovering form trauma by putting its lessons to one side, refusing to acknowledge

that anything has changed, restoring the pretence. So, after traumatic events, there is struggle over memory. In this regard she points out:

As far as memory is concerned, how we remember a war, for example, and the way in which we acknowledge and describe what we call trauma can be very much influenced by dominant views, that is, by the state [...], can be contested and challenged. Forms of statehood in contemporary society, as forms of political community, are themselves produced and reproduced through social practice, including practices of trauma and memory. (11)

In fact, this definition about traumatic memory clarifies that memory is not straightforward, especially traumatic memory. So forms of state hold in contemporary society are produced and reproduced themselves through social practices, including practices of trauma and memory. In this way, the essence of the trauma is precisely horrible to be remembered, to be integrated in to our symbolic universe. They cannot forget, and some are haunted by nightmares and flashbacks to scene of unimaginable horror.

In this way, Cathy Caruth's famous idea of latency argues that trauma as it first takes place is uncertain but that the survivors' uncertainty is not a simple amnesia; for the event returns, as Freud points out insistently and against their will. Her ideas reinforce the fact that trauma can't be forgotten. She gives emphasis on the part of latency, the temporary delay which should not be misunderstood as repression because trauma by its nature, displays with a vengeance over a period of time, especially when triggered by a similar event. For the person who has experienced unbearable pain, the psychological defense of dissociation allows life to go on but at great internal cost. Similarly, her another essay "The wound and the voice" opens a new ground on a problematic explore by Geoffrey Hartman, Elaine Scamy and Slavoj Zizek in the relation between pain and language, narrative, historical and ethnic dimensions. Caruth posits that the trauma as it first occurs is incomprehensible. It is only

later, after a period of latency that it can be placed in a narrative, “the impact of the traumatic event lies precisely in its belatedness, in its refusal to be simply located” (Berger 577).

Traumatic narrative, then is strongly referential, but not in any simple or direct way. And the construction of a history develops from this delayed response to trauma which permits “history to arise where immediate understanding may not” (578).

However, there are critics, who take a different stand in defining trauma, other than that of Caruth and LaCapra. One such critic is Kali Tal, who takes an approach entirely. In “Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literature of Trauma,” he presents a different approach for defining the concept of trauma. Tal is hostile to psychoanalysis and bases her views of trauma on cognitive psychology and a feminist politics that identifies strongly with the testimonies of rape and incest survivors. This strategy has certain strengths—a keen awareness of systematic violence against women and a sense of how traumatic literature might produce social change—but certain limitations as well. Defining the “Literature of Trauma,” Tal writes that it is defined by the identity of another. Pointing to the work of the critic in relation to the literature of trauma is both “to identify and explicate literature by members of survivor groups and to deconstruct the process by which the dominant culture codifies their traumatic experience” (569). But for Berger, Tal’s criticisms seem to be overstated and ill-formed because:

Tal has no sense of a traumatic return of the repressed, of widespread cultural symptoms and fetishes, of the role trauma in ideology and most notably, he is unable to discuss the social symptoms, the transmission and reverberations of widespread or systematic violence into forms not overly testimonial. (580)

Caruth relies heavily upon Freud to provide her with a framework for her examination of trauma, returning again and again to the passages of *Beyond the Pleasure Principle and Moses and Monotheism*, Caruth presents de Manian reference as a literary symptom, an unconscious, inevitable imprint of events on texts in the form of verbal tricks, or tropes; and

she quite effectively reinterprets de Man's blindness and insight model in terms of traumatic impact and later inscriptions. Caruth, in *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*, is concerned principally with questions of reference and representation: how trauma becomes text, or as she puts it in her introduction, how wound becomes voice. She sketches a theory of trauma as instigator of historical narrative through an analysis of *Moses and Monotheism*, describes the intersections of traumatic narratives which outlines a theory of reference as the imprint of a catastrophic fall in a discussion of de Man and H.V. Kleist ends with a reading of Lacan's gloss on Freud's interpretation of the dream of the burning child, in which she proposes testimony as providing an ethical relation to trauma.

Soshana Felman agrees with Caruth in the way of history writing that history is always written from the position of those in power. However, traumatic history is reliable in the sense that it does not claim to project reality and it is based upon the testimony of the survivor and not those in power. Felman's concept is of bearing witness, which is the narrative recapitulation of trauma in Freudian terms "psychoanalytic dialogue" that is a critical activity. In her text *Testimony: Cries of Witnessing in Literature, psychoanalysis, and History*, she explains the act of bearing witness as:

To bear witness is to take responsibility for truth: to speak, implicitly, from within the legal pledge and the juridical of the witness's oath. To testify-before a court of law or before the court of history and future, to testify, likewise before an audience of readers and spectators-is more than simply to report a fact of an event or relate what has been lived, recorded and remembered. Memory is conjured here essentially, to address another, to impress upon a listener, to an appeal to a community. (45)

So, Felman is of the opinion that the witness's "act of seeing" or what is called the "testimonial witnessing" is a responsible affair and irreplaceable performance. The

testimonial witnessing is act of seeing thing through his/her own eyes, and whatever is witnessed gets accumulated in the mind in the form of memory. Such memory needs to be shared because it is special memory consisting of first hand seeing; it is unique and irreplaceable.

Trauma disrupts the core of identity. Yet people do manage to reestablish a sense of purpose and identity after major loss compound by traumatic experience. For many, they try to cope by blocking all memory of shattered past. Referring to Freud, in *Refugee Trauma-The Assault on Meaning*, Miranda Alcock, another critic of holocaust and trauma points out:

[...] deep attachment to this object has been shattered, due to rejection, indifference or disappointment. Survival requires that the love of the lost object somehow be preserved. Unable to bear the painful reality, the person often potentially identifies [...]. Instead of anger and frustration being directed towards the loved object, the aggression is turned on the self. To preserve the attachment, not to give up the love relationship, although the object is gone, the attack has been redirected, so the idealization of the loved object can be retained, preserved from the hatred and rage provoked by the narcissistic wounding of the initial abandonment. (298)

So, these different ranges of concerns can be conceptualized under the category of trauma. It has been now stretched from psychic life to public history, reading materials that can include romantic poetry, psychiatric histories, accounts of sexual abuse, memoirs, testimonies, documentaries, the symptoms, silences, omissions and so many others in national histories. Trauma theory can be understood as a place where different critical approach converges. Therefore, Hartman turns from work on the undecidability of interpretation in literature to problems work on the Holocaust memory and witness in the early 1990s.

As such, trauma – experience of a human's inner most sufferings, which may not be physical, is associated with holocaust. Holocaust, in case of Anne, is the total destruction of her dreams and desires and youthful fancies. She is able to dream and write, but, unable to experience them in reality. It is, in turn, associated with psychoanalysis and its outcome is in the form of sufferings, invited by the disaster of the Second World War. Characters like Anne continue to struggle the holocaust of trauma, even today; however, the scale of sufferings and trauma may differ. The holocaust of the Second World War might have ended but not its outcome, and will continue to haunt hundreds of critics and readers on the causes of its happening, today and for many years to come.

III. Traumatic Experiences in *The Diary of a Young Girl*

The Diary of a Young Girl despite few disputes has reached the height of literary antics. In the first glimpse it seems to be the bitter experience of a young girl forced to live in confinement under the Nazis rule in Germany. However, it carries deeper level of meaning and significance in the history of mankind, which has its root in the traumatic experiences faced by its writer, Anne Frank.

Anne Frank, who was the victim of German anti-Semitism, narrates her life that became increasingly restricted by anti-Jewish decrees. In 1942 the deportations to the concentration camps began. The Frank family went into hiding with the Van Daar's family and Fritz Pfeffer's in the annex of the building that housed Otto Frank's business. The diary has a great impact because it is a poignant record of the struggles of adolescence: the anger, the aspiration and doubts, first love, and the search for an authentic self in, probably one of the most troublesome era of human history. Anne is a vibrant and passionate personality, full of life and vague longings that she sometimes cannot understand. *The Diary of a Young Girl* is both tender and humorous. Frank has the capacity to laugh at herself and to make the readers laugh with her. "I hope I will be able to confide everything to you, as I have never been able to confide in anyone, and I hope you will be a great source of comfort and support," (June 12, 1942). In June 12, 1942, Anne Frank's parents gave her a small red-and-white plaid diary for her thirteenth birthday. She named her diary "Kitty."

The diary became a way for Anne Frank to express her feelings and sorrows, and thereby to reduce her internal pain of being away from school and society. It was also a true friend to explore how she felt about becoming a woman, and her evolving identity. Through writing she gave voice to her inner self, which became the best way to reduce her mental and psychological sufferings, from which she was having day to day experience. She records the

fear and trauma of living during World War II and the "hunt" of the Jews. On July 6, 1942, Anne and her family were forced to go into hiding. She wrote on July 8, 1942:

Years seem to have passed between Sunday and now. So much has happened; it is just as if the whole world had turned upside down. But I am still alive, Kitty, and that is the main thing, Daddy says. Yes, I'm still alive, indeed but don't ask where or how. You wouldn't understand a word, so I will begin by telling you what happened on Sunday afternoon. (14)

On that very unfortunate day, they received the call of attaining the Concentration camp, and the very day, they decided that it was time that they move into their hiding.

The days of trauma were in the offing. She and her sister, Margot were to go together in the hiding, which means no social and public appearance any more for the young girls. Initially, they were restricted from the common schools, and into the Jews school, and now that too was being seized from them. Moreover, they were to join the labour camps, which meant certain death, or at least in most cases that was the result.

So, on the day when a letter from the Nazis came ordering them to join the camp, the family decided to move on the hiding place, the Secret Annexe. However, for Anne it was memories and more memories. She writes:

Into hiding – where would we go, in a town or the country, in a house or a cottage, when, how, where . . .? [. . .] Margot and I started packing our most important belongings into a school bag. The first thing I stuck in was this diary....Preoccupied by the thought of going into hiding, I stuck the craziest things into the bag, but I'm not sorry. Memories mean more to me than dresses. (15)

And then the life started for them, the next day. A life away from the normal chores, societal values and gatherings, with no playgrounds, friends, and above all restriction in all the

activities they were to perform. It was like a horrible nightmare for young Anne, and her sister and rest of the members of the hideout; however, the ordeal was the strongest for the younger members in the hideout. But, surprisingly, Anne, the youngest one was the bravest of all to face the shock, as her best friend to sooth her was her dear "kitty."

For over two years, Anne wrote about her life with seven other people in hiding, her parents, her sister, the van Pels family, Mr. Pfeffer, the helpers, the war going on around her, and her hopes for the future. On March 29, 1944, Anne heard over the radio that the Dutch government wanted people to save their wartime diaries for publication after the war. Mr. Bolkestein, the Cabinet minister, speaking on Dutch broadcasted Radio from London had said that after the war a collection would be made of diaries and letters dealing with the war. She decided to rewrite her diary entries as a novel that would be entitled *Het Achterhuis*, generally translated as "The Secret Annex." On March 29, 1944, she writes, "Of course, everyone pounced on my diary. Just imagine how interesting it would be if I were to publish a novel about the Secret Annex. The title alone would make people think it was a detective story" (202).

As Anne rewrote whole sections of her diary on loose sheets of paper, she gave pseudonyms to the residents of the Annex: Mr. Pfeffer became Albert Dussel, Mr. and Mrs. van Pels became Mr. and Mrs. van Daan, and Peter van Pels became Peter van Daan. The helpers' names were also changed: Miep Gies became Miep van Santen, Bep Voskjuil was Elli Vossen, Johannes Kleiman became Mr. Koophuis and Victor Kugler was Mr. Kraler. On August 4, 1944, the Nazis raided the Secret Annex and arrested the residents. Anne's entire diary, notebooks, and loose sheets of paper, remained behind in the Annex.

Things in the confined place were never the same, as everyday invited more intrigues among the hiding members. They were full of worries and eagerness to what happened outdoor. In the day time, they limited their activities within the close doors and at night they

moved to upper portion of the Annexe. The Annex was in the rear portion of Mr. Otto's office. It was cleverly hidden behind the bars of a cabinet, with steps to go downstairs with three rooms to live for. Anne, found it very difficult and was often called by other members as a contradictory creature. To which, she writes in one of her final entries, "Forgive me Kitty, they don't call me a bundle of contradictions for nothing!" (277) on July 21, 1944. She has queries like, what are the different ways that each of us defines ourselves? What pieces make up who we are? How do we identify others? To which she answers, in the following manner in her diary dated August 1, 1944:

As I've told you many times, I'm split in two. One side contains my exuberant cheerfulness, my flippancy, my joy in life and, above all, my ability to appreciate the lighter side of things. By that I mean not finding anything wrong with flirtations, a kiss an embrace, an off-colour joke. This side of me is usually lying in wait to ambush the other one, which is much purer, deeper and finer. No one knows Anne's better side, and that's why most people can't stand me. (279)

The cheerful side of young Anne during the extreme is an encouragement to other members in the hideout. Of course, she too, a victim of the trauma, however, serves as the source of inspiration to other members.

It was an era of depression, everywhere. The Nazis were left free in the street of Amsterdam, searching for prey. It was as if like things were in total control of the killer Nazis, the German offenders. After the conquest of the Amsterdam by the Nazis, the fellow Jews, either went in a hideout, or left their business cheaply or for no money, to the Nazis. In the scenario, young Anne and other members of the Annexe were having a tough time. All their hopes of coming back to the normal life were falling apart and into distant dreams. Somehow, these deteriorating dreams are reflected in the following lines:

I don't fit in with them, and I've felt that clearly in the last few weeks. They're so sentimental together, but I'd rather be sentimental on my own. They're always saying how nice it is with the four of us, and that we get along so well, without giving moments thought to the fact that I don't feel that way. (178)

Amid the time of depression, there was patience; patience to endure whatever falls. This depression reflected in the following form in the diary, dated April 11, 1944 as:

Who knows, maybe our religion will teach the world and all the people in it about goodness, and that's the reason, the only reason, we have to suffer. We can never be just Dutch, or just English, or whatever; we will always be Jews as well. And we'll have to keep on being Jews, but then, we'll want to be.
(210)

It was a situation, when the humanity crosses all the borders and turns into mere savage. The Nazis in the course of imposing their ethics and values into the normal people went to the limitless cruelty of dominating religion and people.

She knew she was a Jew, and it was her only crime sufficient to stay in the Annexe, away from natural freedom. The Franks were in hiding from the Nazis because they were Jews. Narrating the scene, while they were going to hideout, as:

We've been strongly reminded of the fact that we're Jews in chains, chained to one spot, without any rights, but with a thousand obligations. We must put our feelings aside; we must be brave and strong, bear discomforts without complaint, do whatever is in our power and trust in God. One day this terrible war will be over. The time will come when we'll be people again and not just Jews! (211)

Men and women live in different spheres in all societies and experience many historical epochs and turning points in quite different ways. Thus, the Holocaust experienced by males

and females are different, their experiences cannot assimilate together. Anne, a thirteen year old girl changes her mind time and again but her resistance against patriarchy finds expression from the beginning to end.

All the Jews whether they were male or female were the victim of the Nazis' anti-Jewish policies. As Anne narrates:

Our many Jewish friends were being taken away by the dozen. These people are treated by the Gestapo without a shred of the big Jewish camp in Drente. Westerbok sounds terrible only one washing cubicle for a hundred people and not nearly enough lavatories. There is no separate accommodation. Men, women and children all sleep together. One hears of frightful immorality because of this; and a lot of the women, and even girls, who stay there any length of time, are expecting babies. (40)

Jews were facing the toughest time; being secluded from the society, education and even from the basic facilities, which derived them to a bleaker tomorrow. Their activities were limited and the young and the adults were taken to the labor camp, often forced to work under harsher conditions, leading to their untimely demise.

Anne gradually experienced the difficulties and sufferings of living in a confine place, with no where to go. Moreover, she developed dislike towards her mother. She finds her mummy very different to her. Commenting on her dislike towards her mummy, Anne writes:

We are exact opposites in everything; so naturally we are bound to run up against each other. I don't pronounce judgment on Mummy's character, for that is something I can't judge. I only look at her as a mother, and she just doesn't succeed in being that to me. I have to be my own mother. I've drawn myself apart from them all, I am my own skipper and later on I shall see where I come to land. All this comes about particularly because I have in my mind's

eye an image of what a perfect mother and wife should be, and in her whom I must call "mother." I find no trace of that image. (47)

It was no doubt the gift of the harsh situation in which they were living. It tortured Anne, so terribly that she starts ignoring her mother. She makes a resolution, as "I am always making resolutions not to notice Mummy's bad example" (47). As such Anne believes she has been treated badly by her mother.

Anne wants her mother to be a real mother, a friend, a guide, so that she could reduce her pain of being isolated from the rest of the world. Anne lacks a real mother in the mothering of her mother. She imposes her ideology and strict discipline rather than to understand Anne's inner sufferings and psychological worries caused to her. In Anne's imagination mother could teach her daughter about the feminine qualities and the changing physical appearance with the change of age. She wants Anne to understand her physical as well as psychological changes coming to her and limit her activities.

Anne wants to break all the stereotypes created by the society for women. Her wish to be a writer is also a challenge for the society. Till that time women used to read only the male written texts where women have not get their space. But Anne challenges all the existing bourgeoisie stereotypes about women and wants to create her own identity. Many times she writes that she would not be like her mother. She wants change for the betterment.

Anne possesses extraordinary quality as a good writer and desires to earn a living as a writer, but is forced to live a life in a mouse trap. She wants to be strong enough to break away with the barriers set by the world; however, is forced to live a life like a mice trapped in a mousetrap. She laments her present living, in the following manner, as noted in her diary dated October 1, 1942: "We are as quiet as baby mice. Who, three months ago, would ever have guessed that quicksilver Anne would have to sit still for hours – and, what's more, could" (38).

The things were not in her control. As outside the Annexe much more were going on, beyond her innocent young mind was able to think and determine. Within a week after the capitulation Hitler put a fellow Austrian, Arthur Seyss Inquart as the incharge of German occupied Holland. Arthur Seyss Inquart made an address to the Dutch people. In his address Inquart said that the German would not impose their ideology upon Holland; furthermore, he would respect existing Dutch laws. Seyss Inquart's speech heartened the Jews in Holland and they had the expectation that if the German were not going to impose their Nazi ideology on Holland, they would not impose anti-Semitism either. But slowly and gradually, in the summer of 1940, the Nazis began to impose anti-Jewish measures in Holland. After the imposition of anti-Jewish laws in Holland, the good times for Jews were gone. First there was a war and second, a series of anti-Jewish laws totally deprived the Jews of any freedom. A list of anti-Jewish laws pushed the Jews to live the life in misery and pain. Anne, in her diary, listed some of these rules. She reports the boycotting facilities of Jews in this way:

Jews were required to wear a yellow star, Jews were required to turn in their bicycles; Jews were forbidden to use trams; Jews were forbidden to ride cars, even their own; Jews were required to do their shopping between 3:00 and 5:00 P.M; Jews were required to frequent only Jewish owned barbershops and beauty salons; Jews were forbidden to be out on the streets between 8:00 P.M and 6:00 A.M; Jews were forbidden to go the theatre and Cinema or only other forms of entertainment; Jews were forbidden to use swimming pools; tennis courts, hockey fields or any other athletic fields; Jews were forbidden to go rowing; Jews were forbidden to go any athletic activity in public; Jews were forbidden to sit in their gardens or those of their friends after 8:00 P.M. Jews were forbidden to visit Christians in their homes; Jews were required to attend Jewish schools etc. (8)

There were restrictions imposed upon the Jews. Everywhere Jewish people were confined within the boundary of Nazi terrorism.

After the imposition of anti-Jewish laws in Holland, Nazis forced the Jews to sell their business. The forcing of Jews to sell their business and the restriction on many others to practice their professions was causing great financial hardship for many Jewish families. Gradually most of them were sinking into poverty. The fathers of many households were without work. The Nazis tricked about how to deport the Jews from Holland to German Concentration camps. German wanted to make Holland an integral part of Germany. Holland had many attractions for the Germans, but chief among them was the superior' racial quality of Dutch people, Nazis ideology was observed with the so-called superiority of Germanic people. Of the 900,000 people living in Holland some 140,000 of them were Jewish. If Holland could eventually become a part of Germany then Holland's Jewish problem would diminish in some way. So Nazis policy of boycotting the Jews was similar in Holland as in other German occupied places.

Along with the implementation of their anti-Jewish policy in Holland, they announced for the deportation of Jews from Holland to Germany. In Holland, there was no peace; anything would happen in any time. The German police raided the places wherever they liked. The Jews were unsafe even in their residence. Every minute they fearfully expected the call-up notice. Receiving the call up notice was another form of the invitation of death. The anarchy had been spreading throughout country as well as throughout the Europe. Anne mentioned her experiences when her sister received call-up notice. She trembled from top to toe and said, "I was stunned. A call-up, every one knows what that means. Visions of concentration camps and lonely cells raced through my head" (19). Once the Jews got call-up notice, they had no hope life. The Jews who were aware of Nazis' terrorism, and who had money to support, started to search secret places so that they could save themselves from

cruelty of Nazis. But many of the Jews had no way to escape from the German's clutches. Mr. Van Daans arrived a day earlier to hide with Anne's family; Mr. Van Daans arrived in hiding before his scheduled time because of the horrific situation of the outside world. Anne was afraid from Van Daan's earlier arrival.

Every time the door knocked, she could not open the door thinking that the door was knocked by the German police. She could not go outside and feared that her hiding place would be discovered very soon and they would be shot. A kind of horror was increasing in the mind and body of Jewish people. The Jewish people had no future. Everybody, whether young or old, women or men all were the victim of the Nazis' inhuman treatment. The world was beyond their favor; nobody listened to their pain. The Nazis rather celebrated their happiness with the blood of Jewish people. Anne shows Jewish people's compulsion to surrender themselves into Nazis clutched through these lines: "No one is spared. The sick, the elderly, children, babies and pregnant women all are marched to their death" (73). Hitler's policy to extinct Jews from the world did not leave any Jews from the clutches of death. These cruelest monsters, the heartless creatures swarm into the blood of those kind hearted intelligent Jews. Such inhuman activities made the world as grave.

The Germans no longer sent call-up notices as they changed their methods. They caught the Jews from any places without any notice. If the German saw the Jews, the Jews were caught and deported to the camp. In regards to the place of Jews keeping, they created a mythical story, but the reality was unbearable. The Jews once deported never returned. The Jews began to guess about what Germans had done to their relatives. After the stoppage of the formality of call-up notices, German entered any part of Jewish residence and arrested the Jews apartment by apartment. For their convenience ease in identifying the Jewish people they looked upon the yellow star that the Jews were wearing. The night raid was activated by the Germans. So, Jews no longer slept at night. They have the fear that the Nazi could arrest

them any time. They did not have rest in their mind during the day and night. Neither they could work during daytime nor could they sleep during the night. Even the small voice of people was enough to scare the Jews. The sound of the bombs added the more scare and pain in the Jewish family. It seemed that the Jews were living in between the monsters and the dead bodies. The sound of bombs made Jewish people wailing time and again. Anne presents that difficult life situation of Jewish people through these lines:

At two- third, Margot had finished her office work and was just gathering her things together when the sirens began wailing again. So she and I trooped back upstairs. No one too soon it seems, for less than five minutes later the guns were booming so loudly that we went and stood in the passage. The house shook and the bomb kept falling. I was clutching my 'escape bag' more because I wanted to run away. I know we can't leave here, but if we had to, been Jeen on the streets would be just as dangerous as getting caught in an air raid. (116)

The escape from the house was as dangerous as the fighting in the battle field. The war heroes were rewarded but the Jews were murdered mercilessly in the Camp. As a result, the German deported 110,000 Jews out of Holland. Only some 5,000 people survived the war. All in all 35,000 Jews in Holland survived the war. More than 70% of all Jews in Holland were lost in the Holocaust.

Anne tries to capture the contemporary life situation of Jewish people in Holland as she herself represents the condition of the Jews in the Holland under German's occupation. As previously mentioned men were unable to narrate the gender-specific experiences of women. The voice of female witness of Holocaust is different from the voices of male witnesses of the Holocaust. So the Holocaust experience written by male differs from the Holocaust experiences written by female. Among the topics absent in male writing are the

always female sexuality and the motherhood, the cooperative networks women prisoners developed, and the manner in which female cooperation and interdependence contributed to survival. Lillian Kremer in the journal *MELUS* writes about the women's specific Holocaust writing. She writes: "Some women's holocaust writing manifest the feminist tradition of privileging the dynamics of the mother-daughter holocaust-ravaged relationship and parent-child role reversal, and others are in the mode of female peer bonding and support" (241). By writing own experiences women tried to be conscious about their position during the Holocaust.

Anne's writing was also affected by the Holocaust. What she wrote in her dairy was the mirror of that time. Since literature is the mirror of the society; every writer's writing affected by the situation of the society and the situation of the country. The political, cultural and the economical situation of the country directly affect any piece of literary writing. Though Anne was writing a diary, means she recorded everyday events. The events that she recorded in her diary were the reflection of the then political, social, cultural and economical condition of the Jewish community of Europe. Women were a step back from men and superstitions like woman is the cause of longer or shorter life of man, woman should tolerate difficulties for the betterment of her husband's future prevailed in the society which blocked the path of any woman who wants to develop her intellectuality.

People who desired for equal treatment for both sexes were badly treated even by their family. These women had to face different difficulties. They had to start revolt against their family at first. The ruler determined the rights of the people in any country. If the ruler is liberal, people have the opportunity to get more freedom. But if the ruler is tyrant then people are deprived from the minimum rights. Jewish people's condition under Nazis' terrorism was miserable. Anne sometimes became absurd that there was nobody to understand her psychology and difficulty. She annoyed and wants to live alone which was

impossible. Sometimes she felt misbalanced and wants to scream so that her tension would be lessened. So, she writes:

I'm seething with rage, yet I can't show it. I'd like to scream, stamp my foot, give mother a good shaking cry and I don't know what else because of the nasty words, mocking looks and accusations that she hurls at me day after day, piercing me like arrows from a tightly strong bow, which are nearly impossible to pull from my body. I'd like to scream at mother, Margot and Vaan Dans Dussel and father too: leave me alone, let me have at least one night where I don't cry myself to sleep my eyes burning and my head pounding. Let me get away, away from everything, away from this world'; but I can't do that. I can't let them see doubts, or the wounds they inflicted on me. I could not bear their sympathy or their good derision. It would only make me want to scream even more. (84)

Anne reflects her psychology through the above lines. She was a girl having different qualities than her family members and the women in general. The lack of understanding Anne's inner potentially, she always ridiculed by the family members, especially from own mother who stood for bourgeoisie model of woman.

The holocaust female survivors such as Charlotte Delbo, Ida Fink and Isabella Leitmer also emphasized on the woman's marginality in the male dominated society. They also revealed the masculine bias and introducing the particularities of the feminine experiences. Similarly, Anne always took her writing as a mean of resistance of her mother's bourgeoisie ideology, of patriarchal society in general and her writing is also the resistance of Nazis exploitation of Jews. She wanted freedom in every sector of life and wants to be a person having something special. From her writing we realize that our life is not only for eat and sleep. But it is more than that. Once, we have in the earth, we are never reborn, that's

why we should struggle in our life. Anne wanted to be different from common personality that has been possessed by her family members. To make clear her vision of life, she writes:

If I don't have the talent to write books or newspaper articles, I can always write for myself. But I want to achieve more than that, I can't imagine having to live like Mother, Mrs. Van Dann and all the women who go about their work and are then forgotten. I need to have something besides husband and children to devote myself to; I don't want to have lived in vain like most people. I want to be useful or bring enjoyment to all people even I've never met. I want to go on living even after my death; and that's why I'm so grateful to God for having given me a gift, which I can use to develop myself and to express all that's inside me. (248)

Anne advocated the value of human life. Birth and death are natural processes, we can't handle them but we can do our best throughout our life so that many generations would remind us. She emphasized on good work with the philosophy of 'Simple living and high thinking' that matches with her way of living. So she is remembered by many though she died in early years of her life.

Anne also emphasized on the equality of different races. Nazis' policy to eliminate so-called inferior races affected her teenage psychology. She knew all the injustices and prejudices of Nazis upon Jewish people and she has the optimistic look that one day Nazis would fail to oppress the Jews and war will be over. Anne did not like the racial system but she was compelled to tolerate Nazi's anti-Jewish policy. She was waiting for the day of equality, the day of freedom and the day of reward for good work and punishment for evil.

But the days to live in the Annex were limited. Soon, they were discovered, probably due to some burglars, who came in the night to rob the house, or one of the outdoor helpers of the Franks betrayed them. They were seized and sent to the concentration camp in Holland.

But, when the Russians threatened to conquer the camp, Margot and Anne were sent to the Bergen-Belsen, where they perished. Of the eight persons in hideout, only Otto Frank survived to tell the world the horrible incidents of the hideout. He died in 1980, but, not telling the world through the famous diary, the horrible sufferings in the hideout.

Such pathetic situations were innumerable in the life of young Anne, and the eight Jews members in which they were living in. It was a man-made tragedy of sorrow that had eclipsed the lives of the Franks and the other residents. They were hurt, mentally, physically and much more beyond that.

IV. Fall of Innocence

The Diary of a Young Girl by Anne Frank depicts the bitter side of humanity. It is the story of a young girl, Anne Frank, her parents and sister Margot, along with four other Jews members who went into a hiding in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, during the Second World War to avoid the life-threat they received from the Nazis, the then rulers. These characters in the process are a means to expose the traumatic experiences faced by the Jews community of people, a result of the holocaust imposed on them by the Nazis.

The time was 1942, when the Nazis of Germany, under the command of Adolf Hitler took over the Netherlands, and forced the Jews, either to join the concentration camp, or face death penalty. Otto Frank, father of Anne had prepared for the day by setting up a hiding place, which they named *Secret Annexe* in the rear side of his office and eventually went into the hiding. The members spent almost twenty-six months until they were discovered in August 2, 1944.

Life, confined in a hideout of a large building, obviously was very tough and painful for all the members. However, it was more so for the young and innocent Anne, who was hardly fourteen years when forced into the hideout. It was her time to go out to the society, make new friends and explore the world. However, fate had other things restored for her and she could not fight it. But the walls of confinement made her known to mere pain and sorrow, which became her friends and foes, at the same time. Writing her innermost feelings of love, hate and growing femaleness, she spent almost twenty-four months, before she was found and along with rest of the members were sent to a labor camp.

On the pages of her diary, Anne in simple words depicts her internal pain and her cry for freedom and liberty. She externally seemed quiet but as was not having any outlet to the outer world was in the verge of explosion. She had no friends, except her sister Margot and Peter, who were largely unable to understand her, as they could not understand her level of

intellectuality. Even her mother was at the taking hands with her, as she too, could not understand her words and actions. She shared a strange relationship of love and hate with her mother. Her father, who was a calm and quiet personality, was her best friend, yet, he was not having sufficient time for her.

Amid these restrictions and hostility of the members around her, Anne explores the meaning of life in a way that is quite typical to a young teen, yet, quite extraordinary under the circumstances under which she was forced to live. Her portrayal provides a stark glimpse into her extraordinary ordeal. She captivates the reader with an innocence that contrasts the stark reality of her soft writings to the hardships borne by her and her family. The Nazi regime restricted the Jews community from attending the public school, institutions, business and transportation. They were forced to live in the extremes of life, or face death penalty through hard labor in the concentration camps.

Anne, still quite young to understand things when she and her family were forced into the hideout spent almost twenty four months before they were caught and sent to concentration camp. Anne penned down her ordeals of being lonely, aloof and isolated from the normal way of life and living. Her young life and desire where limited to three rooms and a kitchen, shared by eight members. They spent their entire day in the hideout and during the night the family were at little ease, when they were allowed to move to other parts of the building; however with no light and noise. They were often indulged in quarrel and intrigues, largely due to the minimal space and anger of not having to go anywhere.

Young Anne was physically and mentally shattered by the odds of life. However, she gave a precious gift to the mankind that will ever remind us that war should be condemned, at all costs. Anne's diary, besides being an autobiography is a chronological history of the events that took place during the Second World War. It is a picture of the horror of holocaust of the Second World War imposed on the Jews community. Nations and communities are

directly affected by the conflict, and is more so when it is targeted to a community in special. We can find the horror of living amid mental and physical trauma in the writings of Anne. She is pretty young to elaborate the political details, however, in a series of writing, Anne touchingly exposes the trauma of having lived life in a confine place under the fear of being caught and shot, any moment, which eventually took place in August 2, 1944. They were discovered probably by tips from some of their friends who helped for foods and rations or by a burglar. They were arrested and sent to the Belsen-Bergen Concentration Camp in Germany, where the young Anne and her sister including others eventually perished to the hardships of the camp. However, father Otto survived to narrate the world the traumatic experiences borne by them in the camp. Thus, ends the saga of ordeal of the innocent girl, who was forced to face the historical blunder created in the name of communal hatred by the Nazis. Nevertheless, it is not only Anne's story, but the ordeal of the thousands of Jews, who were forced to meet the cruel fate, on the ground that they were Jews by birth.

Works Cited

- Alcock, Miranda. "Refugee Trauma-The Assault on Meaning." *Washington Post* 27.3 (Summer 1978): 288-302.
- Felman, Soshana and Caruth Henry. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. *New York Times Review* 36.8 (Summer 1976): 37-49.
- Frank, Anne. *The Diary of a Young Girl*. New Delhi: Heritage Publishers, 2009.
- . "Encyclopedia Britannica." *Encyclopedia Britannica 2009 Ultimate Reference Suite*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 2009.
- Geoffrey Hartman, James Berger and et. al. "Theory of Trauma and Psychoanalysis." *The New York Times Review* 16.3 (Fall 1985):
- Göring, Hermann. "Encyclopedia Britannica." *Encyclopedia Britannica 2009 Ultimate Reference Suite*. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 2009.
- Hanley, Delinda C. *Will Americans Get to Hear the Voice of an American Anne Frank?* *The Times Review* 25.4 (May/June 2006): 21-25.
- Hartman, Geoffrey. "Trauma within the Limits of Literature." *Washington Post* 24.8 (Fall 1988): 260-78. 490-503.
- Hitler, Adolf. *My Struggle*. Trans. Richard Terry. London: Sage, 1978.
- Jenny, Edkins. "Introduction: Trauma, Violence and Political Community." *Wartime Memories* (May 2003): 13-16.
- Kremer, Lillian S. "Women's Holocaust Writing: Memory and Imagination." *Melus*. Eds. Katherine Newman and Joseph T. Skerret. New Britain CT: Hitchcock Printers, 1997. 227-246.
- LaCarpa, Dominick. *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory and Trauma*. London: Sage, 1982.
- Levion, Mayer. *In Search*. Paris: Authors Press, 1950.

Luckhurst, Roger. "Mixing Memory and Desire: Psychoanalysis, Psychology and Trauma Theory." *Literary Review* 29.7 (Nov. 1986): 493-498.

Ravvin, Norman. "Anne Frank: Reflection of her Life and Legacy Bialystok to Birkenau." *Wartime Memories* (May 2003): 141-143.

Roth, Philip. *The Ghost Writer*. New York: Farrar, 1979.

Showalter, Elaine. *Literature of Their Own*. London: Oxford, 1977.

Waldijk, Berteke. "Reading Anne Frank as a Woman." *Women's Studies International Forum* 16.4 (July/Aug 1983): 327-335.

Wildest, Robert. "Pride." *Jewish Identity* 13.7 (April 1933): 8.

Tal, Kali. "Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literature of Trauma." *Literary Reviews* 24.9 (Fall 1882): 562-584.