

**THE POLITICS OF MEMORY: THE ROLE OF THE CHILDREN
OF HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS**

by

LIANE NATALIE LURIE

**submitted in part fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of**

MASTER OF ARTS IN CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: PROFESSOR F J A SNYDERS

JANUARY 2007

Student Number:
3617-325-8

I declare that

The Politics of Memory: The Role of the Children of Holocaust Survivors

Is my own work and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

.....

SIGNATURE
(MISS LN LURIE)

.....

DATE

SUMMARY

The Holocaust represented humanities first confrontation with unparalleled destruction and evil unchecked. It continues to impact upon the lives of survivors, their children- the second generation- and generations thereafter. The study aimed to provide the second generation with a voice. Their roles within their respective family systems and the impact of the Holocaust upon them are explored.

The theoretical framework is social constructionism. One-on-one in-depth interviews were conducted with three adults whose parent/s are survivors. The manner of analysis was 'Hermeneutic.'

The participants' narratives took the form of interview transcripts. These were analysed and themed by the researcher. Themes that repeated themselves were elaborated upon and later linked with the available literature.

The researcher hopes that the dissertation will contribute to existing research on the multigenerational effects of trauma in relation to familial and individual roles and memory.

Key Terms:

Holocaust; Survivors; Second generation; Genocide; Totalitarianism; Authoritarian Personality; Multigenerational transmission; Families; Memory; Silence; Roles; Theoretical framework; Methodology; Post Modernism; Social Constructionism; Qualitative research; Credibility, Ethics; Hermeneutics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude and thanks to the following people, without which this journey would surely not have been possible:

Professor Ricky Snyders, my supervisor. You are a scholar and a gentleman. Your patience, guidance, support and endless wisdom throughout the past two years have been invaluable. Thank you for giving me the space to find my own voice and position myself both as a therapist and a researcher. The knowledge and creativity, which you have so freely imparted, are gifts that I will carry with me forever.

To my research participants, as those who co-wrote this narrative with me. Thank you for granting me access into the place where memory and emotion co-exist. Your courage in reflecting on the impact of the Holocaust upon yourselves and your families is extraordinary. You have highlighted the indestructibility of the human spirit, and that light can indeed radiate from the darkness.

To my mother Ruth, my bastion of support. I will be eternally grateful for the sacrifices that you made so that I could realise this dream. The abundance of love that you have provided me with, has grounded me and enabled me to explore new worlds. The knowledge that there was always a safe, comforting place to return to when the going got tough, has seen me through. You have created an indestructible bond between us all. Thank you for believing in me and never allowing me to falter in my own self-confidence. I am proud to be your daughter.

To my Father Selwyn, a part of whom I will forever carry. You saw in me a world of possibilities and light, when my early educators never believed I would succeed. It is because of you that I seek to imbue my life and those of others with meaning. I miss you.

To my siblings Carly and Judd, and my brother-in-law Darren. Thank you for constantly reminding me that life's far too short to be taken so seriously. Your laughter and love are like layers of clothing I wear everyday. My couch is always available!

Finally to my classmates, my companions upon this journey. Thank you for the continuous encouragement and for being my cheerleaders when I'd forgotten how. May we continue to grow as friends and colleagues.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	i
Summary	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of contents	v

CHAPTER	PAGE
Chapter One: Introduction	1
A Personal Statement	1
General Introduction	2
Explaining the Title	3
Rationale	4
Research Aims	5
Design of Inquiry	6
The Format of the Study	8
The Presentation of the Study	8
 Chapter Two: Literature Review	 10
Introduction	10
PSYCHOLOGY OF GENOCIDE	10
Historical Overview	10
Toward Some Form of Understanding	13
The Perception of Danger	21
The Totalitarian Government	22
The Authoritarian Personality	25
Conclusion	27
POSITION OF THE PARENTS	29
Introduction	29
Survivor parents- their past their present and their future	29
Conclusion	35
MULTIGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF TRAUMA	37
The work of Murray Bowen	37
The Nature of Transmission	40
Alternative Formulations	43
Families of Survivors	48
THE POLITICS OF MEMORY AND SILENCE	56

The Role of the Second Generation	62
Conclusion	71
Chapter Three: Theoretical Framework and Methodology	73
Introduction	73
Post Modernism	73
Social Constructionism	75
Inquiry	79
Overview of Qualitative Research	79
Design of Inquiry	80
Sampling	80
Open-ended interview	81
Establishing Credibility in the Study	82
Ethical Considerations	86
The Role of the Researcher and the Participants	87
Analysis	89
Hermeneutics	89
Steps towards gathering data	94
Principles guiding the categorisation of Data	95
Conclusion	98
Chapter Four: Results	100
Sarah's Story	100
Introduction	100
Interview Setting	101
Holocaust as Part of One's Emerging Culture	101
Silence versus Openness	101
Protection and the Parenting of One's Parent	102
The Burdens and Blessings of Identity	103
Intellectualising versus Understanding	105
Frustration Inciting Healing	106
The Instillation of Values out of the Darkness- Facilitating Survival	107
Loss	108
Conclusion	110

Bill's Story	111
Introduction	111
Interview Setting	111
Silence and Openness leading to Disconnection Acknowledgment and Ambivalence	111
Loss and Detachment	114
Survival, Pride and Pain	115
Conclusion	116
Eli's Story	118
Introduction	118
Interview Setting	118
The Need for Distance	118
Silence versus Openness	119
The Generational Legacy of the Holocaust	121
Parenting the Parents	122
Loss of Identity versus Need for Recognition	123
Conclusion	126
Concluding Comment	126
Comparative Analysis	127
Introduction	127
A Holocaust Culture	129
Loss	131
Identity	135
Silence and Openness	138
Impact on Parenting, the Parent-Child Relationship and the Transmission of Values	143
Survival	147
Conclusion	151
Chapter Five: Conclusion	152
Introduction	152
Evaluating the research	152
Recommendations for Clinical Practice and Future Research	156
Conclusion- Reflections of the Researcher	160
Reference List	163

Appendices

172-224

A1-Letter of Information

A2-Consent Form

A3-Consent Form to be Autiotaped

B-Transcribed Interviews

B1-Sarah

B2-Bill

B3-Eli

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

I don't want to forget, I think it would be a crime to forget; and I am sorry for those survivors that have tried to do so. I have lived many lives, but they have added up to one rich life... I don't think a day passes during which the Holocaust doesn't come into our minds, into our conversation. It affects every part of your life, whether you like it or not.

(Rosensaf in Gill, 1988, p. 397).

A Personal Statement

As a Jewish South African, I am a member of two communities; - namely the broader South African society and the more insular, ethnic Jewish community. Like South Africans of colour who underwent a period of struggle during the apartheid era, so the Jews of Europe were prejudiced by the racist ideologies of Nazi Germany during World War Two. In making sense of who I am, I need to locate myself within both the particular and the general context. While my paternal and maternal grandparents were all born in South Africa, my great grandparents on both sides were immigrants from Eastern Europe, who lost siblings and other relatives in the Holocaust. My own questions are focused on how one, equipped with the knowledge of one's people's traumatic past, would make sense and conceive of such events in relation to the perception of oneself, the world and our respective place in that world.

This then is my point of departure:

When an event of such epic proportions as ethnic cleansing occurs, as it did in World War 2 causing loss on so devastating a scale: - is it better to remember or to forget? Perhaps to escape the ensuing nightmares it is better to push such thoughts and memories into the deepest recesses of the mind and engage in active repression. To remember might

well make the victim relive the torture and horror again and again. The individual, who has endured such inexplicable horror, might then also question how to communicate such experiences to his / her own children: - the second generation after the Holocaust. However one might also re-conceptualise the notion of the victim within a framework of remembrance and postulate the following: “If I as a victim actively choose to remember those heinous events which caused so much suffering to my fellow Jews and me, then I am no longer a victim, simply because I have taken back my power and become a survivor. For I have the ability to narrate my story, write it down, immortalise it, pass it onto my children and succeeding generations, in the hope that they will never forget, but rather remain inspired to stand up against inhumanity.” The offspring of survivors have found within the life experiences of their families, despair and preoccupation; many have found as well, determination (Krell, in Krell, Sudefeld & Soriano, 2003).

Perhaps my own hope is that in some small way, my research will form part of the tradition of remembrance, not as an obligation but rather as a natural desire.

General Introduction

The Holocaust and the events of World War Two irrevocably changed the lives of millions. Its effects continue to be felt up until the present day. It transformed humanity's conceptions of good and evil. Scholars and lay people alike began to question, how was it that such evil had a breeding ground? Academic and political efforts were directed towards formulating theories, so as to provide a “Why?” to the “How?” Genocide and totalitarianism became topics of interest and heated debates. For many survivors of the Nazi Genocide, their primary task became one of rebuilding their lives, albeit from nothing. The survivors became refugees, for their previous places of residence, along with most of their nuclear and extended families had been wiped out. Some left Europe and travelled with nothing more than the clothes on their back to countries such as the newly founded State of Israel, North America, South America, South Africa...any country that would grant them entry and hopefully sanctuary. The images that emerged from the concentration camps and the presence of the survivors themselves, ‘forced’ the

world to face the reality of the travesty perpetrated in the flesh. Fearing that such injustice might once again be committed against them, survivors retreated into their own worlds, either socialising only with other survivors or attempting to hide their Jewish identities. Two trends emerged amongst this population; there were those that spoke incessantly about their experiences and those that remained silent. Their children, those born after the Holocaust would receive their knowledge, and the impact of such events through various means, intuitively by way of what they picked up, verbally directly from their parents, and through a multigenerational transmission of emotions, roles and expectations within the family system. But those who came after the Holocaust, deemed the second generation had not directly experienced the horrors that their parents had. Yet, this event in world history nonetheless constituted an inexorable part of their cultural and familial history and religious identity. It is from this point of departure that the second generation, the sons and daughters of Holocaust survivors, have had to carve out a role for themselves. They have questioned and will continually question, “How do I remember?” “What do I remember?” “How have my parents’ experiences impacted upon me?” and “If I accept my identity as a member of the second generation, what then is my larger role?” The children of survivors share with their parents, stories of struggle and hope.

Explaining the Title

The title of this study *The Politics of Memory: The role of the children of Holocaust Survivors* will now be explained. The Holocaust has been referred to as the archetypal event of mass murder. It represents a catastrophe in which both life was destroyed and the meaning of life was threatened. The children of Holocaust survivors are the generation that came after the horrors of World War Two. These children form part of their parents’ endeavours to create something out of the nothingness and the vast grief they had personally experienced. The survivors had a tangible link to the past, the life they had lived they had lost. Their children however would learn about such events by way of what they were or were not told, through an intuitive kind of inference and by way of the impact of its aftermath. Unlike their parents they did not have something of their own to remember- hence memory becomes political and contentious. Their parents served as

their reference group; the group to which they would compare and position themselves in terms of important attitudes, opinions and values (Feldman, 2001) and even what they would choose to speak about. At the age that they became aware of the Holocaust, it is likely that they might have been too young to understand the complexities that confronted them. Their role as children of Holocaust survivors would in turn be influenced by the societies in which they were raised and the people with whom they associated. A vast range of profound philosophical questions faced them (Snyman, 2001). How was it that the so-called most civilised and educated nation in Europe could rationalise and implement the blueprint of ethnic annihilation? The role of the children of Holocaust survivors hence goes beyond memory. It is also concerned with how they would interpersonally position themselves in relation to such knowledge. They were confronted by existential questions around meaning, meaninglessness, death, the actions of others and their place in the world. Political, moral and social responses are barely able to satisfy such examinations (Snyman, 2001). Their roles were burdened and blessed with personal responsibility (Coleman, 2001) in relation to their parents and their race.

Rationale

I myself do not form part of that specific second generation, but I am still part of a larger collective - the Jewish Nation. As such, the loss of six million people has formed part of our united conscience. Events on the Jewish calendar, such as Yom Hashoah (Day of the Holocaust), a memorial ceremony to commemorate and honour the memories of those who perished or fought, are now entrenched in our culture.

It has become clearer to me as I have embarked on this research journey that meanings around the significance of being Jewish were, and perhaps in some way still are, bound in various time-periods in history. During Nazi occupation of the greater part of Europe, 'owning' a Jewish identity as journalist Jacobson (1994) observes, becomes a matter of life and death. Thus the individual, as part of both a family and the larger collective of a Jewish community, begins to have questions around which "parts" of the self are essential. They ponder what price they would have to pay to hold onto that part of their

Jewish identity and contemplate who they would be then if they relinquished those parts (Jacobson, 1994). It is at a juncture such as this that the child of the second generation enters. For his/her life worlds are perhaps composed of decisions centred around how much of their parents' experiences they will integrate into their own being.

The weight of such knowledge, that your people, your parents, were singled out for persecution purely on the basis of ethnic origin transformed the connotation of Jewishness (Jacobson, 1994). How then to make sense of what happened, or even perhaps to avoid making sense of what happened as a way of coping and carrying on are possibilities that need to be examined. Snyman (2001, p. 2) appropriately captures the research focus, "How do we- individually and in our living with others- account for a past that is not simply past? How do we live with our past?"

Research Aims

The researcher acknowledges that the experience of growing up with a parent who had survived the horrors of the Holocaust must have been both complex and at times difficult to negotiate. The researcher does not wish to impose a value judgement on influence of the Holocaust on the development of the second generation. The grounding of the research within a social constructionist theoretical framework will enable the stories of each participant to be placed in context. Gergen (1985) noted that the way in which we understand the world is a product of historically situated interchanges among people. The researcher is seen as responsible for creating a space in which a dialogical conversation can occur (Wick, 1996), while acknowledging both her own views and those of the interviewee. The aims of this research are as follows:

- + To communicate a depth of understanding (Locke, Myers & Herr, 2001) to those who are interested in the interface and relationship between a Holocaust survivor and his/her child.
- + To shed some light on the perceptions of second generation children as to their handling and experience of family dynamics and home circumstances, through the interview with the 'child' of the survivor

- + To explore the impact upon the second generation members on learning that their parent/s had undergone such trauma.
- + To further explore the possibility that trauma experienced by the Holocaust survivor might have been transferred to the next generation.

Design of Inquiry

A vast amount of the literature available on the children of Holocaust survivors is psychodynamic in nature. It tends to focus on the intrapsychic defence mechanisms of the survivors in response to trauma and how their offspring internalised such strategies as a means of coping. The manifestation of psychopathology in the form of depression, anxiety and even posttraumatic stress served as a central tenet of many studies. The researcher also found that many of the studies undertaken to assess the impact of the Holocaust on the second generation were quantitative in nature. Forced choice interview schedules and coping scales were largely employed to assess the perceptions of the second generation. The personal narratives of the offspring of survivors were in some way neglected.

Auerswald (1990, p. 21) believes that we each experience our families of origin as a “patterned set of powerful and complex lifelong connections that were first established well before [we] had learned the word family or system.” When our parents came together, they formed a couple, produced children and added a new domain of relatedness, “a new pattern of powerful connections to those that were there before. They have initiated the lifelong connections experienced by their children” (Auerswald, 1990). The provision in the literature review of a background of the rise of Nazism, theories surrounding fanatical systems and the position of the Jews pre, during and post World War two is in this vein useful. The research is oriented towards looking at one’s family and social system. The availability of such information provides a more appropriate framework from which we can position the children of Holocaust survivors. The function that they each fulfilled in their respective family units becomes clearer. The experience of the survivors’ child is complex. The meaning making around their experiences warranted

exploration in the literature and the data analysis, and in part provided a justification for the aim of the study (Henning, 2005).

The researcher employed a qualitative approach, so as to be consistent with the overall rationale and aim of the study. This enabled the researcher to explore the dynamics of the relationship between the survivor parent and their child, while providing sufficient space in the literature and discussion for an elaboration of the Holocaust's impact on both parties.

The interviews conducted were conversational in nature, allowing for a free exploration of the Holocaust experience. This kind of dialogical interchange is in keeping with the social constructionist idea that awareness develops between and amongst us. It recognises the communal participation of both researcher and researched in the process of knowledge creation (Bhana, 1999). The reality of the researcher and the participants is given importance. A respectful context is created in which the participant is able to think about and give voice to the painful and the pleasurable, without feeling judged or imposed upon, for he/she is the authority on their own life's narrative. The researcher was inquisitive, her role was to know with others, rather than about them (Bhana, 1999) as opposed to being detached from the so-called objects of investigation (Eagle, Hayes & Sibanda, 1999) as was the case in more quantitatively focused methods of inquiry. The participants' stories will ultimately be a co-composition of what the researcher brings to the process and the distinct reality of the participant (Henning, 2005). Establishing a trusting relationship so as to elicit meaningful data was therefore important (Eagle et al., 1999).

Specific information on sampling, data collection and data analysis, will be provided in Chapter 3.

The Format of the Study

The theoretical section of the dissertation will consist of a literature review, a discussion of the theoretical framework of the study and the research methods to be employed. The methods have been selected in coherence with the theoretical framework.

According to Kaniki (1999), a research project does not exist in isolation, but must add to what has been done previously. The researcher engages in a “dialogue” with numerous sources, including journal articles, books, individuals knowledgeable in the field, and ultimately the chosen participants, while still allowing a space for her own voice to emerge. Literature related to Nazi Germany, the persecution of the Jews, the psychology of genocide, the position of the survivor parents and later, their children, will be provided. Critiques around explanations offered for the Holocaust and the injunction “thou shalt remember” will be woven into the text, as they pertain to the survivors’ and second generations’ battle to make sense of what transpired. Henning (2005) notes that the literature survey is included as an alternative voice with which the emerging themes can be compared, rather than being confirmed or refuted. The literature and various theories discussed are one of many possible realities, when viewed alongside the worlds of the participants, bears within itself other possibilities (Bakhtin, in Parry, 1997).

The practically oriented component of the research aims at offering a voice to three, second generation members in relation to the respective impacts of their Holocaust heritage. Each of their accounts will be treated as precious and highly personal. The three accounts will then be compared so as to deconstruct into themes each of their stories in relation to one another.

The Presentation of the Study

Chapter 2 will comprise the literature review of the study. It will acknowledge that there are no better, or more or less appropriate, ways of remembering a traumatic past. Its aim will be to discuss the various contexts through which one’s history and consequent role

can be viewed and debated. The chapter begins with an analysis into the psychology of genocide, providing a historical overview as to the rise of Nazism, the aggressor's perception of danger, the existence of totalitarian governments and the authoritarian personality type. It then goes on to discuss the position of the survivors with regards to their past and their roles as parents in the present and the future. A critical look at the topic of multigenerational transmission follows. The 'characteristics' and patterns of relations in families of survivors is then explored. Thereafter the politics of memory and silence are given expression. Lastly, the role of the second generation in all its complexity will be investigated.

Chapter 3 will consist of a joint presentation of the theoretical framework and methodological approach of the study. The chapter begins with a brief examination of postmodernism as it relates to the inclusive position of the researcher in the study. This will pave the way for a discussion of social constructionism, which will serve as a grounding force throughout the research project. An overview of qualitative research as the frame of inquiry, as well as the actual design of the inquiry then follows. Finally an explication of Hermeneutics and its 'methods' of analysis will be given.

Chapter 4 will consist of the deconstruction of each participant's story in relation to their parents, childhood, adulthood, life's work and Jewish lineage. The stories will be retold by way of themes identified and discussed by the researcher. A brief introduction to the background of each participant is provided. The chapter will end with a comparative analysis across the interview transcripts where common themes are looked at and where possible linked with the literature. The themes have materialised through a careful analysis of the transcribed interviews (Appendix B).

Chapter 5 will comprise the concluding chapter of this research. Here the strengths and limitations of the study will be evaluated and recommendations for future research will be made.

Chapter Two

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

A study of this nature cannot begin without first grounding the reader in a history that may be perceived as a catalyst to the position, in which the second generation who came after the Holocaust now find themselves in. There are no adequate prescriptions for remembering or understanding a traumatic past. The most anyone with a vested interest can do, is to immerse themselves in available sources of information, and from there derive meaning, be it personal or collective.

My paternal and maternal grandparents were all born in South Africa. My great grandparents on both sides were immigrants from Eastern Europe, who lost siblings and other relatives in the Holocaust. Whilst I may battle within myself to explain the psychology of genocide, if I am to adopt a Social Constructionist stance I need to contextualise how it was that such evil had a breeding ground. The following section will attempt to situate the Holocaust within a frame of the events precipitating it, and include theories surrounding its perpetrators.

PSYCHOLOGY OF GENOCIDE

Historical Overview

To understand the origins of Genocide it is essential to consider societal conditions, the political system, cultural characteristics and the psychology of perpetrators alike (Staub, 2000).

It must be acknowledged that the Holocaust has come to be viewed as the paradigm of Genocide, revealing that both secular and religious traditions can be harnessed in the service of mass murder (Berger, 1988).

Shortly before the end of World War One, the Second German, Reich came to an end. William II was deposed and fled to Holland on 9th November 1918 (Gerassi, 1999). Chaos threatened and there were uprisings in Berlin, Munich and Kiel. The Social Democrats managed to seize power and the new government met in the city of Weimar on 6th February 1919 (Gerassi, 1999).

The Weimar Republic had one of the most democratic constitutions. It represented Germany's chance to join the family of democratic nations (Showalter, 2000). However, intense economic problems, extreme political conflict and great rapid social changes characterised the Weimar Republic. The German people had been confident of winning World War one right up until the moment that a surrender was signed (Gerassi, 1999). The myth of the invincibility of the German people was debunked. The idea that Germany had been stabbed in the back grew in national consciousness (Gerassi, 1999). Weimar was associated with treachery and the signatories of Versailles were dubbed the "November Criminals" (Gerassi, 1999, p. 1).

The leaders of the new republic were blamed for signing the humiliating Diktat of Versailles. Germany had lost one-seventh of her territory and one-tenth of her population, her agriculture and industry were paralysed, her army and navy reduced to a skeleton patrol- measures designed to render Germany helpless among the nations (Gerassi, 1999). The War Guilt Clause held Germany responsible for the total loss and damage incurred during the war, and she was expected to pay billions in reparations. The Treaty of Versailles and the attitude of the Allied nations undermined and crippled the new republic before it had a chance to prove itself (Gerassi, 1999).

The German people were also unaccustomed to a democratic form of government, with a multiplicity of political parties. They had lived under the semi-autocratic rule of William

I and William II since 1871 (Gerassi, 1999). A system of proportional representation ensured that no single party would be strong enough to govern on its own. The policies of this new constitution were also seen as the work of the Allies, for whom the German people harboured resentment. They also had an exaggerated respect for authority (Gerassi, 1999).

Weak government, political unrest, post-war economic problems exacerbated by the Great Depression of 1929 and a strong army presence despite German disarmament opened the way for a powerful leader in the form of Hitler (Gerassi, 1999).

A combination of such conditions brought the Nazis to power in Germany, and was therefore a starting point for the Holocaust (Staub, 2000). Hitler and his Nazi party were able to appeal to the downtrodden masses by promising debt relief, territorial supremacy throughout Western Europe, and providing a scapegoat for all the evils that had befallen Germany, in the form of the Jews, Gypsies, Homosexuals, mentally and physically handicapped individuals and anyone perceived as a threat to the new Aryan Race. The German nation was essentially promised a uniting ideology in an otherwise fragmented society. The ideology of the Third Reich thus promised a better life (Staub, 2000). After the Nazis took control of the government in 1933, the New Order was welcomed and accepted by every significant and influential group in Germany (Showalter, 2000). Clergymen, businessmen, military officers, academics, farmers, workers and women all found something to believe (Showalter, 2000). The Nazi party offered the ordinary man on the street an attractive alternative to the increasingly discredited Weimar Republic. To farmers, they promised government aid and protection; to small shop owners they presented relief from the competition of large department stores; to craftsmen they guaranteed measures against large industry and wage caps (Showalter, 2000). Any form of opposition or scepticism was submerged via a systematic campaign of propaganda (Showalter, 2000).

While some of the German population might have been coerced by the police of the Nazi state, the German army- the Wehrmacht- could never have fought the war it did, with

soldiers unconvinced of their cause (Showalter, 2000). Nor could the attempted extermination of European Jewry have taken place without individuals and bureaucratic organisations who were willing to implement the Nazi programme (Showalter, 2000). Racially exclusionary policies became law (Brannigan, 1998). The German people had now formed a relationship with their new government on the basis of assurances of stability. Hitler vowed to restore Germany's greatness, both at home and abroad, to cast off the hated 1919 Treaty of Versailles, and to most critically create a Volksgemeinschaft- a national community (Showalter, 2000). This even meant the enforcement of a doctrine of racial purity whereby German doctors murdered some seventy-thousand Germans with mental and physically congenital infirmities (Brannigan, 1998).

Leaders in other European countries allied with or occupied by Germany have also been implicated. The greater the pre-existing institutionalised anti-Semitism and the more the national and Church leaders accepted and supported rather than opposed Nazi policies against the Jews, the larger was the percentage of Jews killed in that country (Staub, 2000).

The systemic framework through which mass murder could be perpetrated was firmly in place. How 'ordinary' citizens became functionaries of that ecology is another matter entirely.

Toward Some Form of Understanding

Never was there a society so totally committed to an ideology of the total destruction of another people; never were the near-total resources and the organisational genius of a modern society devoted toward creating an actual "industry of death"; never were the tools of science and engineering harnessed so extensively for making more efficient deaths of civilians in assembly-line

machinery that transformed people into disposable refuse to be burned in ovens; and never were a people persecuted so relentlessly as sub-humans, degraded, and tortured cruelly and systematically for long periods of time on their way to their tormented “appointments” with death (Charny, 2004, p. xiv).

The staggering suffering endured in any genocidal event is in the eyes and hearts of those who experience it “beyond belief” and beyond anything that any other civilised people could have endured (Charny, 2004). The shocking horrors and tortures that were to be visited on those perceived as “impure” by the perpetrators of genocide, were in the minds of such men, validated and just. We hence see a clash of realities, between the victims and victimisers, as humanity grapples to come towards some form of understanding. How was it that fear of another and nationalist pride escalated to the point of genocide?

The children of Holocaust survivors have battled to come to grips with the personal horrors their parents have undergone. This feeling of the inexplicable is heightened by a realisation that it is almost impossible to expect others to empathise with a “strange” people who have suffered a horrifying extermination of their innocent men, women and children (Charny, 2004). However, within Western consciousness the Holocaust, as the single most terrible event of genocide, has almost become the archetypal statement of mass murder, referring not only to its own implausible events but now also serving as a reminder of other instances of genocide (Charny, 2004). Perhaps then what survivors and their families battle with is how human beings of a so-called developed world have been and still are capable of destroying different peoples en masse (Charny, 2004). Simply put- how and why could something of this nature have happened to their parents and grandparents, the people closest to them?

As the children of survivors grew and matured, it is possible that their sense of belonging and identification was called into question. It is the developing personality which suddenly becomes aware of the personal associations to which one was born by chance of one’s family, tribe or nation (Charny, 2004), and the history associated with that

connection. The child suddenly becomes aware of the delicate balance between existence and extinction; that had their parents not survived, the children themselves would never have been born.

This child, equipped with a semblance of what happened to their family, at some point may ask whether the rest of the world knew what was happening. At the opening of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Wiesel (in Todorov, 1999, p. 90) asked why the Hungarian Jews were not warned? Why were the railways to Birkenau not bombed? Why was there no public outcry? Why were the fighters in the Warsaw ghetto and other ghettos not aided? And how is it that man's silence was matched by God's? These seem to serve as chilling questions towards a conceptualisation of what happened.

In trying to reach an understanding of the psychology of genocide might we then try to explain the phenomenon of evil and step into another reality? The extremity that was the concentration and death camps has not been associated with acts of virtue but rather with the outbreak of evil unparalleled in magnitude (Todorov, 1999). However, evil on this level seems almost resistant to explanation (Todorov, 1999) or conceivably to comprehension. Todorov (1999, p. 121) asserts that we cannot understand the evils of the concentration camps by interpreting them in the linear terms of abnormality unless we define abnormality as the behaviour in question. Nothing about the personalities or actions of the authors of evil, aside from this behaviour, enable us to classify them as pathological beings. Many of those deemed perpetrators voluntarily joined the genocidal movement and many were selected for their roles based on their ideological orientation (Staub, 2000). We question what personality characteristics do genocidal leaders such as Hitler have that allow them to effectively lead their respective nations into committing mass violence? (Woolf & Hulsizer, 2005). The variables that have been correlated with leadership include: charisma, a desire for power and dominance, self-confidence, self-direction and intelligence (Woolf & Hulsizer, 2005). These might be linear if not recipe-like formulations. The ecology against which such a genocidal leader and his followers arose would make for a more appropriate description. One might also interrogate the concept of intelligence. Does this human capacity create a greater proclivity towards

good or is it a catalyst towards mass destruction? Camp survivors, as primary sources, appear to agree that only a small percentage of guards could legitimately be called sadists and thus abnormal (Todorov, 1999). Those who acted by way of instinct, passion or some thirst for pleasure were a small minority. The servants of the Nazi regime were in some way seen as mere functionaries earning their pay (Ginzburg in Todorov, 1999). Who were the exceptions then? For the most part they were the individuals scarred by physical defect, grave psychological handicap or simply vicious fate (Todorov, 1999, p. 122). Or is this simply an easier way for humanity to grapple with the atrocities, which occurred at the hands of ordinary men? If such men were so ordinary, it is conceivable that survivors have questioned their own capacity to commit such heinous deeds.

One would imagine though, that the means by which a survivor understood that which occurred, and the manner in which their offspring have come to comprehend such events, are vastly different. Whereas their parents themselves had lived through the horror, the violence and atrocity and could somehow understand what happened to them as actuality, the generation after- the children- would receive its first knowledge of such inhumane events with only childish instruments of perception, and as a kind of fable (Hoffman, 2005). For whilst the adult survivor will first ask, "What happened?" and from there follow a route towards the inward meaning of the facts, even grappling with the tensions between good and evil, those who are born after such a tragedy sense its most inward meanings first and have to work their way outwards towards the facts (Hoffman, 2005).

Nonetheless, scholars have immersed themselves in the personal histories of the Nazi leaders, hoping undoubtedly to discover the causes of evil they created and accordingly banish its presence (Todorov, 1999). Reinhard Heydrich, for example, the deputy chief of the Gestapo, who originally supervised the "final solution," is hypothesised to have been part Jewish, and Hitler, too; they had to compensate, the story goes (Todorov, 1999). Goebbels walked with a limp; Himmler and Hitler had bizarre sex lives (Todorov, 1999). Are we then attempting to explain mass evil as a reaction against impotence? It seems that apart from the fact that there is nothing particularly pathological or exceptional about

such traits, they pertain only to a few individuals. Whereas the evil that needs to be accounted for was the business of millions (Todorov, 1999). It is the common men who according to Levi (1965) are more dangerous than the monsters themselves.

It would seem then that the various theories we have to explain the psychology of evil and the genocide that followed are in some way inadequate. Many individuals believe that what occurred in the camps represents an overall collapse in the social order and a reversion to a Hobbesian state of nature. Yet torture and extermination have not even the remotest equivalent in the animal kingdom nor was there any civil breakdown of the social contract in the camps (Todorov, 1999). The guards who tortured and killed were 'simply' obeying the laws of the country and the orders of their superiors (Todorov, 1999). Another apparently useless explanation is that the concentration camps were a direct outgrowth of ideological fanaticism (Todorov, 1999). While there were fanatical Nazis among the camp guards, proportionally the fanatics were no more common than the sadists. The chief category was that of the conformist, who was willing to serve whoever wielded power and who was more concerned with his own welfare than with the victory of doctrine (Todorov, 1999). For up and down the ladder of power one finds only pragmatists and cynics. Those who knew Mengele used to say of him that he was a cynic, not an ideologue. Even Adolf Eichmann, who committed some of the most heinous crimes, has been described as an average man of middle-class origins and normal middle-class upbringing, a man without identifiable criminal tendencies (Von Lang & Sibyll in Feldman, 2001). Albert Speer spoke similarly of Hitler, that he was a pragmatist, not a fanatic (Todorov, 1999, p. 124). It is also possible as Lifton (in Staub, 2000) suggests that Nazi doctors at Auschwitz dealt with their participation by means of "splitting" themselves into an Auschwitz self and a non Auschwitz self. Is it conceivable that these men carried a victory banner home every night as opposed to the stench of death?

Social scientists at one point seemed to offer two highly simplistic, extreme and basically unusable models for the explanation of man's proclivity to destroy (Charny, 1988). On the one hand, the psychoanalytic school stated that at the level of his basic nature in the unconscious structure of personality, there raged diabolical forces that sought to create

death in fulfilment of a primordial drive towards completion of the inevitable process of death that awaited each living creature (Charny, 1988). This appears to be a far too linear, if not murder sanctioning, explanation. The alternative explanation offered by social scientists meant aggression arose out of man's frustration towards his environment. Given economic privation, sociological pressures such as discrimination, ecological limitations such as overcrowding and psychological deprivations such as the absence of love or a lack of support for one's dignity and self-confidence, man responds with the machinery available to him in nature: to attack and fight (Charny, 1988, p.192). This elucidation became known as the frustration-aggression hypothesis. The former instinctual position implied that man was helpless and would never be able to restrain the destructive forces that were the essential constituents of our being (Charny, 1988). The latter social interpretation, that humanity could live in peace given non-frustrating conditions and structures also failed, given the impossibility of society being spared any stresses or frustrations (Charny, 1988). Furthermore, history is filled with instances whereby certain militant groups have killed meaninglessly without being incited towards extreme aggravation (Charny, 1988).

There can be little reservation that the vast majority of Germans went along with the Nazis and even shared elements of their ideology, to the extent of propagating political goals (Pegelow, 2000). Pegelow (2000) nonetheless asserts that it would be a mistake to characterise them as willing supporters. Their compliance rested on socio-political pressure to conform to the dictates of the Nazi regime. Might such an assertion then negate free choice? Perhaps it alludes to an "adapt or die" type mentality. One cannot argue that the widespread fear created by the masterminds of the Third Reich was a catalyst to widespread Genocide. It is a wonder though, how basic moral and humane tenets to save others were oppressed.

In trying to reach a conceptualisation of genocide, perpetrators might claim obedience to authority- that they were only following orders. This conviction is based on three factors: the legitimacy of the system, the legitimacy of the authorities or power-holders within the system and the legitimacy of their demands (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989). The legitimacy

of the system is based on the degree to which an authority group that holds sway over a person, such as a soldier in Hitler's army, is seen as appropriate and rightful (Feldman, 2001). Hence one might argue that the Third Reich was able to command obedience both due to its position in society and the masses' view of its position in society. The legitimacy of the authorities or power-holders is largely based on the way those individuals come to hold their positions (Feldman, 2001). In Hitler's case it was in a climate of social and economic upheaval whereby the German people were looking for a saviour. Finally the legitimacy of the power-holder's demands refers to a person's perception that what is being demanded fits within the framework of a valid, justifiable request (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989). Authoritarian leaders are able to promote destructive ideologies within their own cultures (Woolf & Hulsizer, 2005). Such ideologies, as was the case with those of Hitler's initial *Mein Kampf* were presented as moral, highly idealistic, and for the greater good (Woolf & Hulsizer, 2005). Leadership is then a transactional process, a relationship between group and leader (Staub, 1989, p. 23). This social psychological framework, however, does little to placate the emotions of survivors and their offspring alike. For how could one, equipped with some semblance of free choice, not know that what they were asked to do went against all biblical, if not moral dictates of thou shall not kill. In this case perhaps the Führer (leader) was mightier than any God. Hitler was perceived as being beyond any problems or wrongdoings experienced and perpetuated by the regime (Showalter, 2000). He was a leader, in that he was able to respond to the needs of his followers and in this way manipulate the context for his own success (Woolf & Hulsizer, 2005). Hitler and other Nazi leaders were able to use the growing popularity of the eugenics movement in Europe and North America to begin their campaign of racial hygiene (Woolf & Hulsizer, 2005).

Perhaps it is because some of the most advanced "contributions" to mass killing have come from the so-called intellectual aristocracy (Charny, 1988), that these posited theories have failed to satisfy our quest to understand what and how it happened. Scholarly attempts at dissecting genocide as a phenomenon, are often rational in language, factual in report and devoid of emotion. It is no wonder that they have done little to provide survivors and their offspring with answers or emotional containment.

Middle-class support for Hitler might not have been unanimous (Showalter, 2000). Their attitude however, was largely indifferent (Kershaw in Showalter, 2000). They did not willingly support Nazi violence against the Jews. Their perception of the Nazi party as brutally enforcing the regime's racial policies, coupled with traditionally held anti-Semitism, however did not lead any discernible number of middle-class Germans to protest against these crimes (Showlater, 2000).

It would appear then that traditional explanations of the extremes that occurred have failed. We need to advance towards a somewhat higher order of thinking.

Charny (1988) maintains that the key to the continuing activity of some perpetrators may not be an enthusiasm and passion to destroy, but instead that they are carried along blindly by the lawfulness of human behaviours that are beyond their control-incredible as it sounds. This, however, in no way guards against the fact that human beings and societal organisations must be held responsible for their actions even if these are embedded in natural aspects of the human condition (Charny, 1988). Charny (1988, p. 193) maintains that:

Murder of an innocent human being, cruelty, torture, slaughter, persecution, all-consuming programmes of mass destruction must be defined by an intrinsic ethical imperative as evil, so that even a being faced with structural dynamics and an ecology that would naturally lead to him being a concentration camp functionary, or government policy maker for genocide, must be held liable before a higher court of civilisation.

The existence of higher international legal tribunals should theoretically prevent the senseless slaying of millions. Fear, however generated through propaganda is blind and the victimiser fails to see himself in the 'other.'

The Perception of Danger

It is apparently human nature to differentiate others on the basis that they are strangers, look different, speak a different language, engage in a dissimilar way of being in the world or pray to a different god (Charny, 1988). We are seemingly afraid of difference and hence may assign those perceived as such, dehumanised identities (Charny, 1988). This serves as a technique of neutralisation, whereby victims of heinous crimes such as genocide are identified by perpetrators as lacking human characteristics and consequently as being unworthy of equitable and considerate treatment (Sykes & Matza in Feldman, 2001). Gross (1988) punctuates from a psychodynamic frame and notes that the very nature of the anti-Semitic ideology was one of projection and identification, which resulted in splitting. Germany had many problems as a nation, before the rise of Hitler, he Nazi anti-Semitic ideology projected all of these problems onto the Jews (Gross, 1988). The German leaders had externalised their problems. If they could get rid of the Jews, then their problems would similarly disappear (Gross, 1988). The German leaders viewed themselves as a pure, superior race and at the same time viewed the Jews as a corrupted, inferior race (Gross, 1988). The Jews and others perceived to be impure, were thereby scapegoated and placed at the opposite end of the spectrum to their fellow men (Gross, 1988). However, xenophobia alone seems like an unsatisfactory account of what occurred. One is tempted to ask whether any societal or moral checks and balances existed to safe guard against the mass killings of so many? How was it that the concentration camps became the emblematic killing institutions of the regime from the start? (Brannigan, 1998).

Hitler's Judeophobia comprised all the well-established and virtually universal stereotypes: Jews were corrupt and predatory materialists, lacking in patriotism and feelings for others, and they advocated subversive ideas such as liberalism (Niewyk, 2004). Hitler interpreted history as a struggle between the inferior and superior races (Niewyk, 2004). The problems that had befallen the German nation were largely attributed to the Jews. The Nazi party used anti-Jewish propaganda opportunistically, playing it up or down depending on the responses they received (Niewyk, 2004).

It would appear then that those committed to Hitler's Nazi party embraced the higher ideals of their ideology, developed extreme devaluative orientations to their victims and focused on their tasks (Staub, 2000). The Nazis might be portrayed as "strong, aggressive, omnipotent, inhuman, brutal, sadistic, blond-fair skinned and superior (Gross, 1988, p. 218). Perhaps it is correct to assume that those killed became reified, as a means to an end. The Jews by contrast were perceived as weak, victims and powerless (Gross, 1988). After the humiliation created by the Weimar Republic, any threat of return to such a fragmented society became impetus enough to send "the different" to their deaths. Are we to believe that the Germans were misguided by a different cognitive-moral framework; that their sense of agency was taken away? (Radtke, 1998). Might one go so far as to contextualise the totalitarian regime under which a society found itself as a further way of grappling with a psychology of genocide?

Bar-on (1999) notes that the scale of atrocities transpiring during the Holocaust could not have taken place, without the social network of many more individual people, entire groups, who had turned a blind eye or who had actively involved themselves and assisted, and who ardently helped to silence them thereafter. This took place within an autocratic framework of power relations.

The Totalitarian Government

Totalitarianism is the extreme form of political life; it is the opposite of democracy and is in no way egalitarian (Todorov, 1999). The central trait, which characterises this phenomenon, is incontestably horror and terror (Todorov, 1999). Totalitarianism is seen as a new form of government totally different from dictatorships and tyrannies (Boesche, 1996). Hannah Arendt (1961) believes that three features made totalitarianism a new form of government: loneliness, ideology and terror. Totalitarianism came into the world when all the bodies of belonging such as classes, communities and families were on the decline (Boesche, 1996). The individual felt alone and this rendered them easily susceptible to both ideology and terror (Boesche, 1996). The ideologies of the Third Reich were able to invade the private lives of men and women and manipulate their

thinking (Boesche, 1996). Racial extermination in the case of Nazi Germany (Boesche, 1996) became a higher ideal for which many could strive. This fact alone, according to Arendt (1961) transformed totalitarianism into a new form of government, for no tyrant before was willing to discard all human interests in favour of a fictitious ideal. The third trait of this new form of government is terror, which was used to excessive lengths during Nazi rule (Boesche, 1996). Terror and death camps made up the key elements of this new regime (Boesche, 1996). The camps represented the excessive lengths of Hitler's totalitarian regime (Todorov, 1999). In an attempt to grapple with the heinous deeds committed at the hands of the Nazi's, we find that traditional explanations leave us wanting. Such crimes require new explanatory concepts (Todorov, 1999). Hannah Arendt's use of the phrase "the banality of evil" (Todorov, 1999, p. 124) in reference to Eichmann represents one attempt in that direction. This she places in the context of totalitarian governments, one of which was the dictatorship of National Socialism after 1938 (Boesche, 1996). Arendt was among one of the spectators at the Adolf Eichmann trial in Jerusalem (Todorov, 1999). When faced with Eichmann the man, the individual, she had to recognise that despite the prosecution's attempts to demonise him, this person, who was to blame for one of the most shocking evils in human history stood before the court a profoundly average, indeed common human being (Todorov, 1999). This corresponds with ideas that so many were like Eichmann, neither perverted nor sadistic, but rather terrifyingly normal (Todorov, 1999). "According to Arendt, then, Eichmann had done evil not because he had a sadistic will to do so, nor because he had been deeply infected by the bacillus of anti-Semitism, but because he failed to think through what he was doing -his thoughtlessness"

(<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/biography/arendt.html>.) Like most citizens living in mass society, Eichmann is said to have confused the moral duty of citizenship with doing one's job well, as authority decrees (Ingram, 1999). Those who survived such horror and the generations thereafter though are bound to wonder, what then would lead ordinary men to extreme deeds? Arendt does not mean to trivialise this evil by calling it banal. Precisely what made this evil so dangerous was that it was easy and no exceptional human qualities were required for it to come into being (Todorov, 1999). Perhaps it would be easier for the survivors and their offspring if they could pin such

malevolence onto a particular personality type. Engaging in the drawing of such distinctions might enable one to believe that goodness in its pure form still exists. Todorov (1999) points us in a direction that might satisfy the need for explanations. He asserts that in order to explain an evil of this magnitude we must look not to the character of the individual but to that of the society, which imposes such militaristic categorical imperatives (Todorov, 1999). Todorov's (1999) feeling is that the explanation, which will suffice, will be political and social, not psychological or individual. In this way the discussion of the psychology of genocide becomes more ecosystemic and social constructionist as opposed to linear and positivistic. We are cautioned however against treating such social theories as an end point. They should rather serve as a point of departure (Todorov, 1999). The culture and politics of mass society reflect the loss of purpose experienced by individuals in search of self-preservation (Ingram, 1999). Under such conditions it is the state as opposed to the individual, which takes control for integrating the life of the community (Ingram, 1999). Hitler managed to skillfully achieve this, by identifying the Jews as the impediment towards German reunification and greatness. The private and political life of the ordinary German citizen became meaningful. The masses were mobilised towards the realisation of the Third Reich, with individuality and free choice taking second place. The value of human life was made totally superfluous with totalitarianism representing the epitome of radical evil (Ingram, 1999). We have already witnessed man's capacity to destroy in other regions of the world. It is not the intention to group all genocidal happenings under a singular banner, thereby minimising their impact. It is perhaps important to acknowledge though in light of Arendt's discussion, that the men who have perpetrated such evil are no different from any others; what sets them apart is the political regime under which they lived. Does such a discussion not sanction evil, given adequate societal conditions? Arendt refused to see the "Final Solution" as being anything more than normal and Eichmann's actions and thoughts as reflecting the anti-Semitic ideology of National Socialism (Cohen, 1990). She believed that he had been reduced to a Nazi bureaucrat, who was unmotivated by particular anti-Semitic feelings (Cohen, 1990). However "the so-called bureaucratic murderer compels a rethinking of the nature and extent of the contemporary problem of evil" (Berger, 1988, p. 59). Arendt's opinions have sparked vociferous debates among

laymen, journalists, intellectuals, jurists, social scientists and historians both Jewish and non Jewish (Cohen, 1990). Many feel that she too easily excuses Eichmann's behaviour, attributing it to one man's predicament in the face of totalitarianism (Cohen, 1990). Eichmann, like so many others appears to have too effortlessly embraced the killing process (Berger, 1988). If he could murder, why is it that so many others, who in Jewish culture have been termed "The Righteous Gentiles" could have risked their own lives to save those of others? There is nothing ordinary about these heroic acts, nor for that matter is there anything normal or banal about the cruelty and murderous acts of the self-styled pawns of a regime. It is ironic how a precious few Christians risked their lives and those of their families to shelter, hide and rescue Jews in need, whereas those who professed to be of the Christian faith were murderers, accomplices and onlookers (Berger, 1988). Survivors and their children see a vast distinction between perpetrators of the Holocaust and its victims. Ascribing everyday personality characteristics to men like Adolf Hitler, Heinrich Himmler, Adolf Eichmann and the like do little to placate anti-Nazi sentiments. Death camps, gas chambers, ovens and crematoria (Berger, 1988) are far from banal phenomena. The master craftsmen of the Nazi regime were all "advanced" products of German universities. They became "technically competent barbarians" (Little, in Berger, 1988, p. 60). The argument that many foot soldiers of the regime were unaware of what they were doing and for what purpose amounts to denial and a failure to take responsibility for less than ordinary acts.

Individuals are systems in interaction with larger societal systems. We need to delve further into the structure of the individual which somehow made the 'choice' to harm others an easier task.

The Authoritarian Personality

In a study undertaken to discover the origins of prejudice, the construct of the Authoritarian Personality was created (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunskwik, Levinson & Sanford, 1969). The original studies aimed to apply so-called scientific method in the cause of seeking solutions to this problem (Adorno et al., 1969). Prejudice, like the ensuing anti-

Semitism and subsequent genocide were elusive phenomena for which everyone had a hypothesis but no adequate response. Science was meant to serve as the mechanism through which society's understanding was enriched- as if science had all the answers. The rational tools of human understanding had failed to come to grips with the phenomena of genocide, and this study represented yet another attempt to regain control over the chaos that had arisen. The individual was no longer viewed in a vacuum. His behaviour was explained rather in terms of social antecedents and concomitants (Horkheimer & Flowerman, 1969). The ordinary man on the street was placed in a context whereby research focused upon the problems of group pressures and the social determinants of roles in given social situations (Horkheimer & Flowerman, 1969). The 'success' of Hitler's army rested on the power of such social forces, which were able to shake democracy at its core.

The authoritarian personality was conceptualised as such: He was seen as possessing a particularly strong and rigid adherence to conventional rules. This provided a motivational basis for anti-Semitism. Those who were seen as violating conventional rules, such as the non-Aryans of the Third Reich were subjected to authoritarian aggression. They were punished, persecuted or put to death in the name of some moral authority. There was a certain disposition towards authoritarian submission; to glorify, to be subservient to and remain uncritical towards authoritative figures (Adorno et al., 1969). Against the background of the murder of millions, such personality types were seen as ethnocentric (Adorno et al., 1969). Are we to believe then that every man who participated in the realisation of the Final Solution possessed the stable and enduring traits of an Authoritarian Personality? German police and government bureaucrats who defined, identified, assembled and deported the Jews were not always fanatical, Nazis or anti-Semites (Niewyk, 2004, p.132). Many were seen as careerists, efficient and professionally dedicated to following instructions and improvising solutions to problems in the spirit of their superiors (Niewyk, 2004). It may be viewed that such individuals were more subject to influence thereby giving over their control and responsibility for his or her actions (Radtke, 1998). Radtke (1998, p. 673) asserts that prejudice and discrimination were normalised through their incorporation into cognitive models of

motivation and action. Those who according to Goldhagen (1997, p. 675) were Hitler's "Willing Executioners," were able to selectively attend to social information, by forming stereotypes, which offered over-simplified representations of the persecutory object (Radtke, 1998). Jews were collectively reified as having big noses, large bank accounts and as the obstacle that prevented Germany from reaching its nirvana. Superstition and stereotypy consequently manifested in ways, not least the disposition to think in rigid categories (Adorno et al., 1969). Goldhagen (1997, p. 9) acknowledges that history and culture were relevant enabling conditions, however 'Germans' anti-Semitic beliefs about the Jews were the central causal agent of the Holocaust.

Authoritarianism in interaction with other socio-cultural dynamic processes expressed itself in the form of ethnocentric opinions, attitudes and behaviour (Adorno et al., 1969). In this way, authoritarianism is seen as a possible contributing factor to the genocide committed. The Holocaust represented large-scale man upon man destructiveness as expressed by hostility and the vilification of other human beings (Adorno et al., 1969). Such individuals were seen as extreme conventionalists who could not bring themselves to articulate any real criticism of accepted authority (Adorno et al., 1969). Those who were seen as violating the rules and values of the National German Socialists were condemned, rejected (Adorno et al., 1969) and sent to death and concentration camps under the pretext that these were labour camps. The generals in charge of such 'institutions' as Auschwitz-Birkenau, Buchenwald, Dachau, Treblinka, Westerbork, Bergen-Belsen and so forth are illustrative perpetrators of such a personality type. In the minds of the survivors and the second generation they chose to be cruel when they could have acted otherwise (Radtke, 1998).

Conclusion

Whilst all the explanations in the world, may do well to satisfy the curiosities of the masses, they fail to bring back those who were massacred. Survivors and their offspring will forever ask, "how did this happen? Why did this happen?" This becomes a fruitless endeavour. For they are unable to reverse history and the facts buried in mass graves or

enshrined in memorials to the dead. It happened and all its ramifications and impact are from where we take our departure point. Explanations need to be viewed in another light perhaps. If we are to advance from an intrapsychic to a systemic perspective then the field of observation and research must acknowledge socio-cultural variables, be they family, upbringing, education, religion and the pervading political climate.

We are curious beings by nature; our search for knowledge and answers is endless. One study or piece of research created, ultimately gives rise to others, until some body of scholarly research is generated. Against this backdrop, a new context is created through which the discourses of healing and helping can begin.

If we only psychologise the actions (Radtke, 1998) of the perpetrators of genocide then we engage in linear formulations. We must take it a step further by also situating the actions that have made genocide possible within their historical, moral and socio-political context (Radtke, 1998).

From here the second generation might move forward, having explored and engaged with the horror that was, in order to create meaning for themselves and their families. Perhaps it is the teaching and writing about such events, which brings clarity and hope as opposed to an overwhelming sense of sadness, confusion and opaqueness (Hass, 1990).

Conceivably this is where the second-generation takes their cue. Hitler might have hoped that the culture and tradition of the Jewish people would also find its way into the gas chambers. The children of survivors then are imbued with a sense of urgency, to learn as much as they can about the lives and narratives of those who died. Those who perished are then no longer seen as “lambs to the slaughter” but rather as ancestors who hold the key to a wealth of knowledge, history and tradition.

We have considered the characteristics of the perpetrators as well as the system in which they found themselves. We now turn our focus to the ecology of the survivors and their families, tracking their struggle from prisoners to parents.

POSITION OF THE PARENTS

Introduction

If we are to somehow understand the position of the second generation, the children of Holocaust survivors, it might be useful to familiarise ourselves with the parents' responses to their own experiences (Hass, 1990). Historians, philosophers and clinicians have felt challenged in their attempts to understand the efforts of Nazi Germany and its allies to exterminate the Jews and other selected groups (Glicksman, Haitzma, Mamberg, Gagnon & Brom, 2003). The difficulties of trying to comprehend past events, pale in comparison to attempts at predicting the future consequences of the Holocaust on those who survived (Glicksman et al., 2003). This is not a discussion, which can singularly form its own section. By virtue of the research focusing largely on systemic views the experiences of the survivor parents will be given voice here and elsewhere. The second generation member cannot be divorced from the people who gave them life.

Survivor parents- their past, their present and their future

Hoffman (2005) notes that the survivors of the Holocaust infrequently thought of themselves as survivors until the term became routine, almost colloquial. The term "survivor" represents specific meanings associated with shared memory, identity and legacy (Hoffman, 2005). In the concentration camps the prisoners, had no special identity, aside from a number tattooed on their forearm. They were nameless and by the Nazis were seen as just another Jew. They had however, been separated from the rest of the society and in this way were different. Post-Holocaust, the ushering in of a new category, denoting membership to the survivor population, only served to underscore this separation. The tensions of a fragmented society were lumbered upon them. They were hence designated as the identified patients. Once the war was over the titles of survivor and identified patient became synonymous. In an attempt to rid themselves of such labels, they remained silent.

The history of the Jews in the Western world is usually written as a chronicle of a people who were never in control of their destinies (Bauer, 1973). The Nationalist Socialist rise to power confronted the Jews with unprecedented trials and dilemmas (Dawidowicz, 1976). Jews were accepted or persecuted, given rights or deprived of them, without being able to influence the course of events (Bauer, 1973). While many appeared to react with fear and despair, many Jews held steadfast, believing that political sanity would be returned to Germany (Dawidowicz, 1976). In the initial months of the German dictatorship, Jewish leaders believed that it would be feasible to negotiate with the government to elucidate the position of the Jews and ensure a foundation for their continued existence in Germany (Dawidowicz, 1976). The Zionist Federation in Germany even went so as to draft a memorandum requesting the status of a protected minority for the Jews in Germany within the framework of a racial state (Dawidowicz, 1976). It becomes apparent that such pleas fell on deaf ears. Most Jewish public servants, teachers and professionals were deprived of their livelihood and harassment became an everyday occurrence (Bauer, 1973). Families experienced a transition between being able to peacefully conduct their everyday lives and the constant atmosphere of terror that now existed. Those seen as hurdles to Hitler's dreams were deprived of the most innocuous pleasures such as attendance at movies, theatres and public establishments (Parmet, 2004).

In 1935 the Nuremberg Laws established a category of second-class citizenship to which all Jews were relegated. By 1938 open violence against the Jews became common place (Bauer, 1973). The Jewish individual and the community had been deprived of any resources through which they could create a meaningful existence. Their lives were dominated by habitual states of tension and fear, never knowing what tomorrow or the even the next hour might bring. A critical event was that of November 9 Kristallnacht-night of the broken glass; synagogues everywhere were burned and some thirty five thousand Jews were thrown into concentration camps (Bauer, 1973). The Nazis aimed to drive the Jews out of every country they occupied by heaping indignities and brutalities upon them (Bauer, 1973) thereby making it impossible for them to live in harmony and safety.

The systematic destruction of European Jewry has radically altered our understanding of the human condition (Berger, 1988). The twelve year war against Jews and Judaism, the only battle that Hitler won, has had continuing repercussions for Jews and non-Jews (Berger, 1988).

Hitler aimed to change the world. He dreamed of creating an empire that would last a thousand years and decreed that millions of Jewish men, women and children would have to be murdered to bring it about (Boas, 1995). All his life he was obsessed by the thought of a holy war against the Jews, whom he perceived as the “Host of the Devil and as the Children of Darkness” (Dawidowicz, 1976, p. 26). The destruction of the Jews was inextricably tied with the war Hitler planned and finally initiated (Dawidowicz, 1976). On the anniversary of his accession to power, on January 30, 1939 in his speech to the Reichstag he prophesied the destruction of the Jews (Dawidowicz, 1976). Jews were not the only victims. At least ten million other defenceless Poles, Ukrainians, Greeks, Russians, Yugoslavs, Gypsies, Homosexuals and mentally infirm individuals were murdered (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989).

The psychological after effects of the survivor’s trauma, as the research will show, are in some way mirrored in the attitudes, perceptions and fears of their offspring (Hass, 1990). Adopting such a stance however presumes that in some manner there has been a transgenerational transmission of the legacy of the Holocaust. The experiences of Holocaust survivors must not be seen as a unitary phenomenon, for the experiences of individual Jews varied markedly during the war (Hass, 1990). This stance can be seen in much of the literature available. Many articles have focused on the people who survived the concentration camps, without asking whether the long-standing effects for those who were in hiding or with partisan groups might be different (Glicksman et al., 2003). Perceptions of the Holocaust have also been shaped by the person’s age- a child saw things one way, an adolescent in another and an adult in a different way (Glicksman et al., 2003). The taking into account of events after the Holocaust, such as the attitude of the societies in which the survivors settled, is also important in assessing the survivors’ mental state (Glicksman et al., 2003).

Most survivors experienced the murder of immediate and extended family members (Hass, 1990). Those interned in concentration camps experienced unparalleled hardships. Some survivors report “watching helplessly as other prisoners were drowned or hanged and meaningful friendships terminated in death by typhus and other horrendous diseases” (Parmet, 2004, p. 1). The camp inmates lived with a stench from no toilet facilities, enduring hunger, like cattle tightly herded together and with the suicides (Parmet, 2004) of fellow prisoners who had conceivably reached the extremes of hopelessness. Many prisoners had little or no clothing (Parmet, 2004) as all their life’s possessions had to be abandoned when they were rounded up for deportation. They suffered through the freezing-cold and sometimes as punishment had to sleep in the ever-present snow (Parmet, 2004). The camp prisoners and those who survived in hiding lived in the constant shadow of death (Parmet, 2004). The fear-provoking odours from the crematoria as corpses were incinerated, the death marches and the dead bodies on the way, were surreal realities (Parmet, 2004). Entire camps were often divided into groups and marched to the outskirts of towns and villages so that the inhabitants would not see them (Rylko-Bauer, 2005). One had to learn strategies for survival. Bartering became a condition for staying alive (Parmet, 2004), as did mentally dissociating oneself from a world devoid of kindness. Dysentery, diarrhoea, lice, torture and starvation were everyday phenomena (Parmet, 2004). How was it possible for a human being to emerge sane and sound, from places where they had been psychologically and physically broken due to frequent beatings and humiliation? (Parmet, 2004). After the war the survivor was required to ground him/herself in a new reality. The task of creating a fresh start, separated from recent trauma, was to become a hardship in itself.

The war and subsequent murders had caught people at different ages and developmental periods (Hass, 1990). All these variables combined to shape not only the survivor’s reactions during the Holocaust and their post-war adaptation, but also their future parenting (Hass, 1990). If one wanted to engage in categorisations, there were good, bad and adequate mothers and fathers among survivors of the Holocaust (Hoffman, 2005). We cannot dispute that most of them meant well. Some of them are said to have failed in

providing for their children the basis that happier families may furnish (Hoffman, 2005). Others are reported to have generated open, nurturing and stable home fronts.

In a landmark study Niederland (in Hass, 1990, p. 8) proclaimed the existence of a “survivor syndrome: Chronic anxiety, fear of renewed persecution, depression, recurring nightmares, psychosomatic disorders, anhedonia, social withdrawal, fatigue, hypochondria, an inability to concentrate, irritability, a hostile and mistrustful attitude toward the world, a profound alteration of personal identity and in many cases hallucinations and depersonalisation” characterised the persona of the survivor. This does not necessarily imply that by virtue of having survived the Holocaust, one would experience all or any of the above symptoms. A study of this nature could nonetheless not be discounted. Early research conducted with Holocaust survivors contained an unstated assumption that the experience of the Holocaust had to have a pathological effect; it was simply an issue of identifying what that effect might be (Glicksman et al., 2003). Regardless of the survivors’ best intentions or desires, whatever the precise mode of communication, the emotions harboured by the survivors were often of a deep-seated intensity, and they were transmitted to their offspring very directly (Hoffman, 2005).

It appears that many people had survived by learning to adapt and manoeuvre between life and death (Wardi, 1992). A fierce will to emerge from the ensuing nightmare kept many people alive (Parmet, 2004). The strategies of adaptation and survival would forever form part of the survivor’s interaction with the world. Some Jews spent their time in hiding, whilst others posed as gentiles; others lived in ghettos and concentration camps for periods of varying duration whilst others fought in forests as partisans (Hass, 1990). Some survivors attribute their continued existence to luck (Rylko-Bauer, 2005). Luck alone was an insufficient condition for surviving (Linn in Rylko-Bauer, 2005). Factors such as knowledge of dangers and risks, practical skills, relationships and networks, as well as determination also played a role (Rylko-Bauer, 2005). It appears that the majority of Germany’s and Austria’s Jewry did manage against extreme odds to get out while they could (Bauer, 1973). Some could still not bring themselves to make the move, because in

the face of everything, they remained profoundly attached to the country where they and their ancestors had lived for so long (Bauer, 1973). The very thought of trying to create a new heritage in a place which, for them had no roots was unfathomable. They, like the rest of European Jewry, were to suffer both psychological and physical victimisation at the hands of the Nazis (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Most of the free countries during the 1930's did not understand the danger the Jews faced (Bauer, 1973). These countries were not eager to permit the Jews to enter through their borders, lest they contribute to the economic slump they were already facing (Bauer, 1973). If the world had turned its back on the Jews then, unwilling to hear their voices, why then would they want to hear their stories post World War Two. Should the survivor come to possess a new passport and new citizenship, he still felt like a refugee. Emigration involved major adjustments, including for many the loss of their prior means of livelihood (Rylko-Bauer, 2005). The survivors' qualifications and whatever they had done in the past no longer mattered; they were immigrants and had to take what they could in order to yet again, survive (Rylko-Bauer, 2005).

After the liberation the survivors left the extermination camps, hideouts and forests and began to wander about (Wardi, 1992). Many reached the displaced persons' camps that had been set up throughout Europe hoping to find lost family members (Wardi, 1992). This expectation resulted in bitter disillusionment (Wardi, 1992) with many experiencing new levels of trauma. All the hope that the survivors had carried throughout those years had amounted to nought. They now had nothing. The knowledge that they would never return to their birthplace, that their houses and communities had been destroyed was no less harsh a blow than the loss of their families (Wardi, 1992). The fear of recurrence of the Holocaust and attempts to deal with that fear appeared to permeate their everyday existence (Brom, Kfir & Dasberg, 2001).

The very thought of loving or trusting again was often perceived as a betrayal of the dead (Wardi, 1992). Nevertheless new relationships were formed and many of the survivors married, many out of the loneliness and in an attempt to allay feelings of mourning, depression and fears of abandonment (Wardi, 1992). The unspeakable experiences in

many ways dominated the lives of the survivors (Brom et al., 2001). In the process of forming these new relationships and once again building a family, the course of coping with the past became part of family life (Brom et al., 2001). Such descriptions are prone to painting an overly grim picture of the new reality of the survivors, yet many were able to successfully create stable and nurturing homes. As survivors settled into their new lives with their new families, there was a growing desire to portray themselves as people who had triumphed over adversity, rather than as pitiful victims of a treacherous event (Glicksman et al., 2003). Some survivors chose to retell their Holocaust stories to their children, perhaps as a way of assuming an active and important role in the family, in a country where neither the language nor the culture belonged to them (Glicksman et al., 2003). Others chose to remain silent, trying to push such memories aside. Many survivor parents had a determined orientation towards the future, as means of coping with huge past losses while adapting to a new life in a strange place (Rylko-Bauer, 2005).

The fact that these new survivor families were built on losses cannot be ignored. If asked to construct a genogram- a structural diagram of a family's three generational family relationship system (Danieli, 1993)- the picture constructed would consist of patterns of losses related to natural causes but more prominently to murder. It is apparent that the massive catastrophe of the Nazi Holocaust not only ruptured the survivor's sense of continuity but also all the individual's previous support systems (Danieli, 1993). The survivor has had to live with an evident degree of mourning and familial fragmentation for there has been a broken cycle of the generations and ages (Danieli, 1993). The survivor is also deprived of a natural mourning process, for he/she is unaware of the exact dates when a family member perished, nor is there an evidential grave site to visit (Danieli, 1993).

Conclusion

The pertinent question remains open- whether survivors were able to raise their children without transmitting the traumas of their past, providing the next generation with new opportunities to develop in a balanced way (Bar-on et al., in van Ijzendoorn et al., 2003). The answer to such a difficulty is not simply 'yes' or 'no.' Nor is there a linear

relationship implying that the parents have caused their children to suffer. The literature surveyed hopes to explore the cultural, historical, political and personal factors that have ecologically combined and set the stage for the identity of the second generation.

MULTIGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF TRAUMA

The work of Murray Bowen

A large body of multigenerational family research is based on the original work of Bowen (1978). Much of his theory and practice grew out of his work with schizophrenic individuals in families (Corey, 2001). He believed that families could best be understood when analysed from a three-generation perspective because patterns of interpersonal relationships connect family members across generations (Corey, 2001). The family does not exist in a vacuum, they appear at the centre of concentric circles- those of the extended family, the community and the nation (Wardi, 1992). On a meta-level they are also a link in the chain of generations, representing the long-term family continuity (Wardi, 1992). In the present it is impossible to divorce the family from its past or future. The family must also be viewed as an emotional unit (Corey, 2001). In trying to understand how trauma, loss, hurt and even survival can manifest from one generation to the next, the theoretical basis of Bowen's work is discussed.

Emotional illness is said to arise when individuals are unable to adequately differentiate themselves from their families of origin. Differentiation of self refers to an individual's ability to be emotionally controlled while remaining within the realms of emotional intensity of one's family (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). The individual has insight into his/her own emotions and those of the larger family system. It also refers to the psychological separation of intellect and emotion as well as independence of the self from others. Hence, the differentiated self is able to think 'objectively' about emotionally loaded issues within one's family (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). The need to re-parent one's parents is a prevalent theme within second-generation literature and perceivably might have fostered a high degree of emotional intensity and fusion between the survivor parents and their children. Children of Holocaust survivors might have attempted to integrate their parents' experiences in order to maintain family ties (Williams-Keeler et al., 1998) and guard against future catastrophe. Under such conditions differentiation becomes difficult. Differentiated individuals are able to choose

between being guided by their thoughts or their feelings (Corey, 2001). Conversely, undifferentiated people experience difficulty separating themselves from others and tend to fuse with dominant emotional patterns in the family (Corey, 2001). This might have taken the form of silence, traumatic reactions to minor occurrences, over protectiveness, sense of a foreshortened future and depression in the family of a Holocaust survivor. The literature indicates that survivor parents often try to reconstruct a feeling of identity through their children (Wardi, 1992). They relate to their children as an offshoot of themselves, thereby preventing the children from individuating and creating a unique identity (Wardi, 1992). The boundaries within such a family system are tightly organised like a ghetto, lest the children leave or disaster enters through the gates.

This process of fusion is said to interfere with the differentiation of self from one's family. Objectivity is sacrificed, and the individual is overwhelmed by the thoughts and feelings of their family (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). Autonomy is forfeited and these individuals react emotionally (Corey, 2001) without being able to connect their outbursts with the context in which they occur. The person will then engage in some form of intellectualisation in order to justify the acting out of such emotional immaturity (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). Whilst such behaviour might be deemed pathological according to Bowen's theory, within the context of a household of survivors and their families, it was almost a natural phenomenon. It is unlikely that the child would have been consciously aware of what he/she were doing. "Clarity of response, in Bowen's theory is marked by a broad perspective, a focus on facts and knowledge, an appreciation of complexity, and a recognition of feelings rather than being dominated by them" (Papero in Corey, 2001, p. 400). This clearness and intelligibility might have been difficult to achieve if a survivor family circle was dominated by the discourses of silence and mourning. The second generation child would colour the empty spaces with intense emotion and tormented visualisations.

Nonetheless, fusion in families is said to result in an undifferentiated family ego mass (Bowen, 1978). This pattern tends to carry across generations. Those who are fused to their family of origin according to the theory tend to marry others to whom they can

become fused (Corey, 2001). There is consequently a conglomerate of emotional oneness that exists at all levels of intensity. Unproductive family dynamics of the previous generation are transmitted from one generation to the next through such a marriage (Becvar & Becvar, 1996). The more threatened or insecure the family feels, the more they will tend to fuse (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). According to family systems theory the key to being a 'healthy' person encompasses both a sense of belonging to one's family and a sense of separateness and individuality (Corey, 2001). In the case of the Holocaust survivor it is likely that the more distressed they felt, the more they sought the oneness that results from family fusion (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). To this end Bowen (1978) hypothesised that chronic distress can produce emotionally ill individuals who are unable to differentiate themselves from their family. Anecdotal reports by children of survivors express how attachments in their families were found to be tighter and family members were described as more closely engaged, with separations being more difficult than in other families (Kellerman, 2001a). If the second generation members were able to adequately differentiate from their family of origin, they would then be able to accept personal responsibility for their thoughts, feelings, perceptions and actions (Corey, 2001). However, within such an overwhelming family assembly the tendency was to become overwhelmed.

Ultimately fusion between people relieves tension by involving vulnerable third parties who take sides and who essentially provide stability (Corey, 2001). Fusion in this way gives rise to triangulation (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). Triangles thus make differentiation from the family difficult, as the parents, for example, may need the child to maintain a stable system (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). Furthermore, the multiple losses suffered by the survivor parents are often assumed to create child-rearing problems around attachment and detachment (Kellerman, 2001a). This is conceivable, if we concede that, although triangulation may lessen the emotional tension between the original pair, the underlying conflict is not addressed (Corey, 2001). If a fused couple from undifferentiated families of origin had unresolved and intense conflicts related to their prevalent Holocaust history, they might choose to refocus their attention on a problematic child (Corey, 2001). The position that the child occupies forms part of a

family history characterised by a traumatic past (Wardi, 1992). If a particular child is 'designated' the status of the identified patient- scapegoat, he/she is able to serve as the transgenerational link that connects their parents with what was lost.

Danieli (1993) has also hypothesised that the children were called upon to be the mediators inside the home when there was conflict between the parents. A frequent occurrence in survivors of the Holocaust were "marriages of despair" (Danieli, 1981a, p. 7). The act of recreating a family and raising children were concrete acts to compensate for their losses. The parents' marriages were often dominated by complaints about their mutual disappointments (Danieli, 1981a). The words "I would never have married you, had it not been for the war" (Danieli, 1981a, p.8) were common.

Since triangles are said to occur across generations, severe psychopathology can develop from a multigenerational transmission process (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). The implication for the child of a survivor or survivors is that he/she would emerge from the family with a lower level of self-differentiation. Furthermore, the intergenerational transmission of trauma is so strong that Holocaust-related influences can even be seen in the "Third Generation", children of the children of survivors (Katz, 2006).

The Nature of Transmission

Theories of trauma transmission from survivors to their children exist in abundance, yet there is no definitive explanation of the exact nature of what is transmitted.

Intergenerational transmission occurs through a process whereby an earlier generation, purposively or unintentionally influences a successive generation psychologically (Van-Ijendoorn in Mazor & Tal, 1996). Various researchers have proposed that since many Holocaust survivors suffer from PTSD, their offspring will also suffer from a syndrome of similar dimensions but to a lesser degree (Williams-Keeler, McCarey, Baranowsky, Young & Johnson-Douglas, 1998). The issue might be somewhat more complex. If we hypothesise that the child of a survivor was raised in a household characterised either by an obsessive-retelling of events (Williams-Keeler et al., 1998) on the part of the parents,

or an all-consuming silence (Williams-Keeler et al., 1998), then parental communication becomes a likely means by which trauma could be transmitted. Terminologies such as vicarious, empathic and secondary traumatisation have been used to refer to intergenerational trauma transmission (Williams-Keeler et al., 1998). The concept of transmission is complicated by the fact that Holocaust survivors suffered directly from the injustices of the Nazi regime. However, the next generation were not directly exposed to the brutal realities of their parents' generation, and yet there is considerable evidence that many of the offspring suffered from secondary exposure to the ordeal their parents faced (Williams-Keeler et al., 1998). The second generation do not struggle with survival as their parents had; they grapple with sorting out their confused feelings about their parents' experiences and how this affected their own (Fuchs Winik, 1988). The words of Hoffman (2005, p. 7) are appropriate in capturing the dilemma of the children of Holocaust survivors, "We who came after do not have memories of the Holocaust. Even from my most intimate proximity I could not form memories of the Shoah (Holocaust) or take my parents' memories as my own." Whereas their parents themselves had lived through the horror, the violence and atrocity, and could somehow understand what happened to them as actuality, the generation after- the children- would receive its first knowledge of such inhumane events, with only childish instruments of perception, and as a kind of fable (Hoffman, 2005). The children hence bear the scar but without the wound (Albeck in Williams-Keeler et al., 1998). Together survivor parents and their children engage in a recursive cycle of wound patching. Survivors of extreme prolonged stresses are more susceptible to enduring physical and psychological impairment (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). They experienced threats to their physical well-being and witnessed the suffering and torture of countless others. Depression, anxiety or chronic physical illness in one parent is likely to impact upon the spouse and children (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Both generations often tried to protect each other from the pain and truth by not talking about it (Fuchs Winik, 1988).

Survivor parents in an attempt to give their children the best, taught them how to survive (Danieli, 1993). In the process the parents transmitted to their children the life conditions under which they had survived the war (Danieli, 1993). One finds children of survivors

who psychologically and sometimes literally live, like hermits, in hiding (Danieli, 1993). Others are always mobilized towards escape or continuously run from commitment requiring situations, be it a relationship, a career or place of residence (Danieli, 1993).

According to Bowen's theory, intergenerational relationships within the family system are highly enduring. During the course of the family life cycle, these relationships are seen as both restoring the past into the contemporary family and constructing new relationships which make change and development possible in the family (Mazor & Tal, 1996). Such new relationships within survivor families might become stuck. They are representative of the future, yet the survivor parents remain fixated on what was lost. The family rules and boundaries consequently become rigid and natural developmental transitions are not easily negotiated. There also appears to be a division of labour, which appears again and again within families of survivors. It is 'typical' for one child to remain emotionally tied to their parents, serving as the healer and liberator, (Wardi, 1992) thereby enabling any other siblings to cast off the duties of remembrance and perpetuation.

Mazor and Tal (1996) acknowledge that there is an inherent difficulty when writing about intergenerational transmission. The intergenerational effects of the Holocaust involve the simultaneous existence of two vastly different realities (Mazor & Tal, 1996). One reality is that of the survivors themselves. It is filled with agonizing atrocities, massive death and the annihilation of almost every form of human life, including one's developmental past, one's family and one's community (Dasberg & Lifton in Mazor & Tal, 1996). The other reality is that of the relational dynamics between the survivors and their children in a post-war ordinary society, which functions in a way that is detached from the survivor's traumatic reality (Langer in Mazor & Tal, 1996).

There has been considerable disagreement between clinicians and researchers as to the existence or non-existence of specific or general manifestations of psychopathology in the offspring of Holocaust survivors (Kellerman, 2001b). The more general materialisations of psychopathology in children of survivors "caused" by so-called

developmental deficiencies rather than by direct transposition were assumed to manifest in the controversial and imprecise “Second-Generation” syndrome (Kellerman, 2001b, p.39). This syndrome was described according to diagnostic nomenclature as either representing an anxiety disorder, identity-related problems or a personality disorder, because of impaired social and occupational functioning (Kellerman, 2001b).

Albeck (in Williams-Keeler et al., 1998) has reframed the notion of the manifestation of psychopathology in the second-generation. We are instead asked to focus on second generation psychological meaning, the appropriateness of the children’s psychological response toward the trauma of their parents. Based on this observation, trauma may be transmitted but the offspring are still able to become healthy effectual adults (Williams-Keeler et al., 1998, p.248).

Conversely were a second generation member to attribute life struggles to their parents being a survivor, they might seek a more intrapsychic conceptualisation.

Alternative Formulations

The way in which trauma is transmitted across generations remains in some way elusive. According to a Post Modern approach, no one version is correct. There appears to be a multiverse of possibilities. It is impossible though to gloss over the inherent frustration contained within such an approach. For if one could somehow isolate the means by which such painful narratives manifest trans-generations, might one put a stop to such occurrences? Perhaps it is best to give voice to the differing viewpoints, while still sustaining a broader, if not topographical, systemic view.

Thus while Psychoanalytic formulations of trauma transmission from one generation to the next will not form a central tenet of this research, considerable literature using this paradigm appears to exist. It is therefore worth considering some of the formulations mentioned, albeit briefly.

Much of the Psychoanalytic literature on the multigenerational transmission of Holocaust trauma is largely based on clinicians' observations of patients in analysis. From a systemic, post modern and social constructionist perspective we cannot discount the therapeutic relationship. The meanings attributed to the free associations of a client are significantly based on the inferences of the analyst. The way in which clients interpret a therapist's comments is also grounded within their own response styles. The reported themes, aetiology and phenomena in this body of literature cannot be taken as absolute. It is rather one version among a multitude.

The clinical study of Holocaust survivor's offspring began with clinical case reports by psychiatrists and psychologists who were treating the children of survivors (Wiseman, Barber, Raz, Yam, Foltz & Livne-Snir, 2002, p. 371). It was proposed that the psychiatric distress of these youngsters reflected a "survivor syndrome" (Niederland in Wiseman et al., 2002) that is transmitted and perpetuated from one generation to the next (Barocas & Barocas in Wiseman et al., 2002). Kellerman (2001c, p.39) went so far as to name a "Second Generation Syndrome" related to excessive displays of anxiety, identity problems, personality disorders and social and occupational dysfunctions. From an ecosystemic perspective the naming of such a syndrome would be seen as linear, positivistic and reductionistic. Exploring the dynamics of a family system as well as the role occupied by a child would provide insight into patterns of emotional expression within the family.

Additional psychoanalytic case studies referred to the characteristic conflicts and so-called recurrent patterns of the second generation such as guilt, depression, aggression, interpersonal problems and conflicts around separation, individuation and identity (Freyberg, Gampel, Kestenberg, Kogan, Pines & Wardi in Wiseman et al., 2002). It has become clear though that such work was largely psychopathology focused, as opposed to considering the interpersonal and emotional aspects of the individual within their family system.

As a result of prolonged periods of extreme violence and destructiveness, survivor parents lost their ability to cope with their own instinctive needs and those of people close to them (Shoshan, 1989). “Primal dependency, instinctive love or hatred, libidinal needs and demands were replaced by withdrawal, suspicion and repression of strong feelings” (Shoshan, 1989, p. 198). The survivors experienced a threat to their own physical well-being and simultaneously lost close family members. Survival and mourning however could not co-occur (Shoshan, 1989). Psychoanalysts hypothesise that the new born infant saw in his mother’s eyes these repressed emotions and absorbed the reflections of sadness, excessive concern or simply the parent’s emotional absence (Shoshan, 1989). Mothers are particularly overwhelmed by anxieties deriving from their experiences of persecution by the Nazis (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Such unresolved anxieties lead to difficulties for the second generation, who experience problems in establishing their own identity and separating from their parents (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989).

One theory posits that the second generation are immersed in their parent’s trauma as a result of a process of transposition of trauma (Kestenberg & Kogan in Weiss & Weiss, 2000). This essentially means that the second generation live aspects of their parents’ trauma as if it were their own (Weis & Weiss, 2000). In such families members were symbiotically tied to each other and could not achieve separation-individuation (Mahler, Pine & Bergman in Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Such a phenomenon might be further explained by the child’s need to in some way connect with the life world of their parents. Furthermore, the intimate knowledge that one’s protectors and guardians were in some way, vulnerable to destruction, might additionally traumatise the child. Consequently the child felt guilt at disappointing their parents or causing them additional worry (Shoshan, 1989). The child learnt to protect their parents from sorrow and to regard their own problems and anxieties as unimportant compared to the terrible experiences their parents had lived through (Shoshan, 1989).

Hence such psychodynamic formulations assessed central relationship patterns (Barber & Crits-Christoph in Wiseman et al., 2002) as a means of intergenerational trauma

transmission. The construct of central relationship patterns refers to our characteristic ways of relating to others, which will be carried through into subsequent relationships (Bowlby in Wiseman et al., 2002). Patterns of familial communication have been considered as etiological factors in trauma transmission. An intergenerational communication pattern deemed the “conspiracy of silence” has in this way been found to be rife in families of survivors (Danieli in Wiseman et al., 2002). If the parents could in some way shield their children from the trauma they experienced, then perhaps the children could grow up conventionally. We see here a recursive cycle however, whereby the silence of the parents in turn created a respectful silence in the children. As a consequence a “double wall” of silence developed which appears to be mutually supported by both generations (Bar-on in Wiseman et al., 2002, p. 372). It is also easy to appreciate that the possible depression resulting from the parents’ trauma as well as their efforts to repress it, was transferred to the children by virtue of their living together (Shoshan, 1989).

It had also been hypothesised that those who constitute the second generation will differ according to their parents’ kind of Holocaust experience (Danieli in Weiss & Weiss, 2000). Consequently the children of partisan survivors are said to differ from camp survivors who in turn are said to differ from those whose parents had been in hiding (Weiss & Weiss, 2000).

It would be far too linear to adopt a cause and effect stance. For it is impossible to discern that because one’s parents endured the horrors of the Holocaust, then they by consequence would manifest certain signs and symptoms. However there do appear to be certain threads running through the families of survivors regardless of the ‘type’ of survivor the parents were. The research in no way aims to impose a self-fulfilling expectation on the second-generation members who will constitute participants. It is the unique ways in which each child as a member of a broader system experienced their family life growing up that is of primary concern.

Nonetheless in an attempt to document and perhaps make sense of the Holocaust and its ramifications, many researchers have engaged in categorisations. Schwartz (in Weiss, 2000) in his study of the transmission of psychiatric symptomatology from Holocaust survivors to their offspring, distinguished between two kinds of non-genetic transmission: direct specific transmission and indirect general transmission.

In the former children will learn to think and behave in disturbed ways, akin to their parents (Weiss & Weiss, 2000). In relating to such individuals one might form the impression that they themselves had lived through the Holocaust (Weiss & Weiss, 2000). The latter formulation attempts to isolate the survivor parents' diminished parenting abilities as a causative factor (Weiss & Weiss, 2000). Parents in an attempt to purge themselves of the ensuing nightmares, memories and feelings associated with the Holocaust, are said to engage in some form of projective identification (Weiss & Weiss, 2000). In essence then the experiences of the parents become those of the son or daughter (Davidson in Weiss & Weiss, 2000). It is additionally the parents' high level of anxiety and depression that is said to result in major difficulties for providing an adequate maturational environment for their children (Fossion, Rejas, Servais, Pelc & Hirsch, 2003). From an early age, the child's need for absolute dependence could not be met, for the mother is seen as being unable to create a containing atmosphere for the child (Shoshan, 1989). The child absorbed his/her parents' distress without having the tools to deal with phenomena such as the constant expectation of disaster, parents' screams at night from recurring nightmares and parental tensions following an inability to openly express aggression (Shoshan, 1989). The second generation also came to fear special occasions such as birthdays and barmitzvahs at which the absence of the dead was more poignantly felt, and their once stoic parents had difficulty controlling their emotions (Shoshan, 1989).

These are all very plausible formulations, with abundant clinical evidence in support. There might however be other systemic mechanisms in place that maintain a multigenerational trauma transmission.

There is further evidence in family therapy literature of trauma transmission in the third generation- grandsons and granddaughters of Holocaust survivors. It is again important to note that these symptoms are also not clear-cut and like the second generation may include many manifestations. However families that have presented for therapy presented some specific patterns in their relationships (Fossion et al., 2000). This again emphasises the need to consider the family system in context. It hence becomes evident that the transgenerational transmission of Holocaust trauma cannot be separated from the family's history (Fossion et al.,2000). Thus whilst the children of survivors and hence the children of children of survivors were not directly exposed to Nazi persecution, it is conceivable that they experienced the effects of trauma indirectly through their parents references (Fossion et al.,2000). Whilst each successive generation has chosen what they will or will not give voice to, that which one intuitively picks up on or imagines cannot be ignored.

It is in this vein that the families of survivors warrant discussion.

Families of Survivors

Whilst handbooks on effective parenting exist in abundance, they tend to be linear in their formulations. It is therefore with caution and an ecological perspective that this discussion is undertaken. There is no recipe as to what constitutes normal or correct parenting. That which is functional for one particular system, might disturb the homeostatic mechanisms of another. There is furthermore no definitive evidence to suggest that Holocaust-survivor parents were very different in their child rearing practices from other parents (Kellerman, 2001a).

It must be noted that research on the adjustment of Holocaust survivors and the ensuing impact on family relations and mental health do not yield unequivocal results (Sush, 2006). Some studies indicate an increased rate of mental health issues whilst others have not yielded any negative findings regarding the psychological health of survivors and their children (van Ijzendoorn, Bakermans-Kranenburg & Sagi-Schwartz in Sush, 2006).

In line with the tenets of Social Constructionism it is also important to place the discussion in context. Survivors of the Holocaust endured conditions whereby they were robbed of any and all forms of stability and predictability. They lost their businesses, their places of worship, their homes and most often large parts of their families. Their belief in humanity and trust of others was further challenged. It is therefore conceivable that the impact of such experiences would generalise to the survivors' establishment of their new homes.

Survivor parents experienced the natural excitement accompanying the birth of their post war children as what Shoshan (1989, p. 197) has deemed an "earthquake warning." They had to ensure that painful, deeply buried yet still so fresh memories did not break loose (Shoshan, 1989). The infant represented joy but simultaneously evoked a form of emotional intensity in their parents. This new and precious life had to be protected, lest some future catastrophe manifest.

To this end Danieli (1985) suggests that survivor parents attempt to teach their children how to survive in the event of further persecution. Children of survivors have hence been observed to act out the Holocaust survival behaviour of their parents (Danieli, 1985). In this way Holocaust survivors have often been described as inadequate parents (Kellerman, 2001a). The parents have been regarded as too anxious, depressed or pre-occupied with mourning their losses to be able to provide an adequate maturational environment for their children (Kellerman, 2001a). The perception of what constitutes such an environment is again a matter of debate and more dependent on the views of those inhabiting the system.

Danieli (1981a, p. 7) identified four subtypes of families of Holocaust survivors: victim families, numb families, fighter families and families of "those who made it." By no means does this intend to designate a linear typology of survivor families. It is worth discussion, in that it further contextualises the role of the second generation.

In numb families, both parents were often the only survivors of their individual families (Danieli, 1981a). They were effectively drained due to their exposure to stress and they could not relate warmly to themselves or others. The home atmosphere was characterised by pervasive silence and a depletion of all emotions (Danieli, 1981a). Rarely did the children know the exact details of their parents' past, yet they intuited that their parents were caught up in what went before (Danieli, 1981a). It was common practice in such families for the parents to protect each other and the children to protect the parents (Danieli, 1981a). Such children were often expected to take care of themselves and not cause their parents too much concern. They were loved because their parents went to great lengths to support them financially (Danieli, 1981a). It was difficult to elicit any emotional reactions from their parents. They grew up accustomed to an interpersonal void. The multigenerational implication of this, is that they often sought spouses who would serve as the protective parents (Danieli, 1981a) they never had.

The victim families express themselves as depressed and anxious, unable to tolerate too much stimulation albeit pleasurable or painful (Danieli, 1981a). They fear a recurrence of traumatic events even if they find themselves in a secure environment. They create conflict and are guilt inducing in their relationships with others. These families were primarily concerned with physical nutrition and material survival for fear of another Holocaust (Danieli, 1981a). The family was organised around suffering and endurance. One member was usually sick with the others serving as rescuers (Danieli, 1981). It is worth noting that within such families, physical problems were far more acceptable than psychological troubles (Danieli, 1981a). The latter destabilised the survivor parent's need to deny the long-term emotional impact of the Holocaust, which was perceived as evidence of Hitler's victory (Danieli, 1981a). Within such an environment the second generation had to pretend that life was perfect. Amidst a climate of perpetual double messages, psychotic behaviour was common. Guilt served as a potent means of control in victim families (Danieli, 1981a). It enhanced the emotional distance between survivor parents and the next generation. The children were prohibited from asking their parents about their war experiences, expressing anger towards them or exhibiting any form of emotional pain (Danieli, 1981a).

The term fighters was chosen to convey either the way such survivors described their physical or spiritual role during the Holocaust, or the attitude they adopted to neutralise the image of the victimised Jew. They adapted a confronting and challenging stance in their dealings with the world (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). They failed to tolerate perceived weaknesses in themselves, others or their children and pushed themselves and others to achieve (Danieli, 1981a), determined that the Holocaust would never happen again. There was little room in such homes for surprises, uncertainty or disorganisation (Danieli, 1981a). The children of such parents learnt to be autonomous, preferring to take charge both in their interpersonal and professional relationships (Danieli, 1981a). Passivity and helplessness were not an option (Danieli, 1981a). If one were to belong to such a family and later differentiate, a careful use of the role of the fighter was needed (Danieli, 1981a).

“Those who made it” were often socioeconomically successful. They tended to distance themselves from the traumatic events of their past. Another part of this group, may have offered substantial financial or personal support, but tended to vaunt their contributions (Danieli, 1981a). Children in such families often felt that they had to achieve in order to receive the attention, recognition and validation of their parents. Some survivors in this group devoted much of their resources to commemorating the Holocaust (Danieli, 1981a). “They used their Holocaust experiences as a means to understand the roots of genocide, to find ways to prevent its recurrence, and to aid victimised populations in general” (Danieli, 1981a, p.34). This approach of creating meaning from tragedy generalised to many members of the second generation. Such children often find themselves in the professions of teaching, medicine, psychology, politics and research.

The implication of the aforementioned family categories is that if there is a heterogeneity of responses by the parents, there will automatically be a heterogeneity of psychic realities for the children (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Whilst it may be useful to keep such a typology in mind, it should not be all encompassing and limiting. Families present with their own unique stories, adaptations and interpretations of the events which constitute their history. The descriptions which second generation members may use for their family have evolved within a context of conversations with significant others. “The

circumstances in which children are raised may actually give them the impetus to assume responsibilities maturely, to be active, creative and socially aware” (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989, p. 25). Survivor guilt, often prevalent in survivors and their children is not necessarily pathological. It can provide a link to the past, a sense of continuity with the Jewish people and a sense of identity (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Any taxonomy presented for the categorising of families of Holocaust survivors and their children is not intended to imply pure and mutually exclusive types (Danieli, 1981a). It is aimed at criticising the positivistic discourses, which aim to group individuals as “survivors” who are all anticipated to display a single “survivor syndrome” (Krystal & Niederland in Danieli, 1981a, p. 35).

There are nonetheless certain patterns which have been noted in the literature. When the survivor parent was the father, the following might have resulted. The mother was likely to become depressed because their debilitated spouses were unable to fulfil their roles as husbands and fathers (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). They required nursing instead. Mothers are hypothesised to have triangled in their daughters to provide the care and comforting (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989) they lacked. The mother-daughter dyad became a substitute for the mother-father parental dyad. Daughters consequently paid a price for this in their own development (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Certain gender differences have been reported. Sons were at times spared such developmental difficulties, since their fathers were perceived as heroic survivors (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). It is conversely possible that fathers experienced immense difficulty in re-establishing their role as head of the household (Danieli, 1981a). During the Holocaust they had neither been able to secure the physical means for their family’s survival nor prevent them from enduring a horrifying fate (Danieli, 1981a). Within the countries of their refuge they were rarely able to engage in their pre-war activities or professions (Danieli, 1981a). Their identity as a caregiver, provider and guardian was in a state of flux. It is important to nonetheless concede that the way in which parents present themselves to their children, regardless of their degree of impairment, as well as the manner in which children perceive their parents, may determine the quality of intergenerational effects (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989).

Reports on the culture of a Jewish home are largely anecdotal. Whilst the typical “Yiddishe Mammeh” has been portrayed as overprotective, overfeeding, engaged in infinite sacrificial practices (Kellerman, 2001a) and generally over-involved, the impact of the Holocaust survivor parent’s behaviour and emotion appears to have manifested differently. Here, the overt messages were described as containing a more desperate and anxious undertone (Kellerman, 2001a, p. 59). Many children felt that they could not cut their familial bonds and distance themselves from their parents’ home without completely experiencing the same orphaning their parents had (Shoshan, 1989). Families were thus depicted as more or less dysfunctional in terms of structure, relational patterns and the handling of intimacy, control and conflict (Kellerman, 2001a, p. 59). The home atmosphere was described as weighed down by tension, sadness, conflict, distrust of strangers and extensive worries of something terrible happening (Kellerman, 2001a, p. 59). Holocaust parents were also described by their children on a bi-polar scale. They were depicted as either too involved or too neglectful and as either too rigid or too permissive (Kellerman, 2001a). Children of survivors often manifested a sense of emptiness, depression and apathy (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989) as their own identities were fused with the pain of the family. Parents might frequently have been so pre-occupied with their own depression and mourning that little time was left to give to the children (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Families were then described as being either too enmeshed or too diffuse in their structural organisations.

It must be noted that such portrayals are largely based on the perceptions of the children of survivors. Such descriptions are post fact. It is therefore understandable why such generalisations have been criticised for painting an overly grim picture of Holocaust survivor parents in general (Kellerman, 2001a). Many voices constitute the second generation population. There are many who might be averse to being viewed through a psychopathological lens. The age and the gender of the second generation individual are also important variables influencing sentiments held towards one’s parents. It is not so unlikely that many of the second-generation were raised in a climate of much warmth and love, where an appreciation of life and moral values was transmitted. Gay et al. (in Kellerman, 2001a) found that Holocaust survivor parents rated high in positive

involvement and child-centeredness. Kellerman (2001a) found that Holocaust survivor mothers and other mothers were seen as similarly caring and protective, and survivor parents in general were felt to be dependable and responsible. However, much of the surveyed literature appears to be deficit focused.

A general question exists amongst families whose members have endured the Holocaust. It tends to centre on how the experience of the Holocaust affected not only the lives of one's grandparents, but also one's parents and generations thereafter (Sush, 2006). It would seem that the knowledge that those before you endured such trauma, is both a burden and a blessing: A burden in light of trying to find ways to make sense of something apparently senseless; a blessing, however, in that such knowledge has instilled in many second-generation children the need to teach and help others, so that such suffering was not in vain.

After the Holocaust many survivors attempted to re-establish their lives by starting new families and creating new foundations and roots (Sush, 2006). One can only imagine the experience of the child within this new family, upon learning that one or both of his/her parents had other children, other spouses- a whole other life before this one. Many survivors were afraid to burden their families with their painful memories and instead chose to remain silent with the intention of protecting their child's well-being (Sush, 2006). It appears then that one issue faced by the Jewish second-generation of Holocaust survivors is the inherent need to reconstitute a vanished, often repressed, past (Goffman, 2003). Thus many have engaged in a journey of both historical and personal reconstruction (Goffman, 2003). This journey is highly dependent on that which their parents, the actual survivors, were willing to share. Rosenheck and Nathan (1985) hypothesise that secondary traumatisation was supposed to be caused by the disturbances of the survivors who as parents would be unable to protect their children from the aftermath of the Holocaust. Secondary traumatisation refers to traumatic effects of events that did not take place in the lives of the second generation themselves, but in those of parents who may or may not have communicated their experiences in a verbal or non-verbal way (van Ijzendoorn et al., 2003) In their endeavours to separate their past from

their present and newly founded family life, the survivors would help create a “conspiracy of silence” that indirectly traumatised their offspring (Danieli in van Ijzendoorn et al., 2003, p. 460). Albeck (in Williams-Keeler et al., 1998, p. 248) however has made use of the term “empathic traumatising” to describe the offspring’s attempts to understand their parents’ wartime experiences and pain as a means of establishing a connection with them. The child’s lack of understanding of their parent’s struggle was not simply forgotten, but in its place substituted by childhood fantasies portraying atrocities that were, in many cases, more severe than the actual past experiences (Sush, 2006). The child would attempt to intuit that which was not mentioned but was somehow felt. It is not unlikely that such children would imagine Holocaust scenes, which they attempted to successfully escape or survive (Williams-Keeler et al., 1998).

The issue arises, do we choose to remember that which we are told or that which we imagine? Do such acts occur out of a sense of moral duty, out of choice or are they born of a tradition?

THE POLITICS OF MEMORY AND SILENCE

A story from lived experience marks the boundaries of a journey. Every story by virtue of being a story is implicitly a narrative of survival. Whatever was experienced can now be told with coherence and perspective. Whatever transpired, it was somehow gotten through (Greenspan in Rylko-Bauer, 2005, p. 7).

The lives of families of Holocaust survivors are dominated by stories. Certain of these accounts have been languaged in such a way as to depict tragedy, whilst others might be dominated by themes of survival. Social Constructionism and Narrative approaches to therapy emphasise the power of these central discourses. White (in Corey, 2001) believes that a dominant culture is designed to perpetuate viewpoints, processes and stories. It is likely that one of the prevailing messages in a survivor household took the form of “thou shalt remember.” This was not a simple dictum. This section will attempt to explore the interaction between memory and silence, as it pertained to survivors and their children carrying on with the ‘task’ of living.

Remembering the atrocities that characterised the Holocaust is a difficult endeavour. There are those who do not voluntarily choose to remember. They are constantly visited by flashbacks and nightmares of those events. The children of survivors, as those who were born after the Holocaust, seek ways in which they can connect with this aspect of Jewish history. It is natural for individuals to construct the meaning of life in interpretive stories, which are then treated as truth (Corey, 2001). The construction of meaning can occur monologically, by oneself or dialogically, with others (Corey, 2001). The second generation member found him/herself in both these worlds- alone and with others. Their task was and has been to find ways of remembering, that fit uniquely with them as individuals and simultaneously with the needs of their greater Jewish community and family. The various stories of the Holocaust and its aftermath have been carried over

from generation to generation. It is obvious then that the process of living one's story is not simply metaphorical. It has far reaching effects in family and societal systems (Corey, 2001).

It is conceivable that people averted their eyes from the horrors of the death camps and the survivors that remained, in order to rebuild their own lives (Nordstrom, 1995). The tradition of silence that set in and continued for decades (Nordstrom, 1995) was perpetuated not only by survivors but also by the various new contexts in which they found themselves. This does not mean that if one was silent, one did not remember. I wonder whether silent memories were more painful than those vocalised?

There was a clear separation between the public and private spheres. In the latter, the pre-Holocaust world and even the events that characterised World War Two might have been remembered with Technicolor detail or not at all. In the former there was no room for such talk. Even if the survivors had wanted to talk, there was no one to listen (Rosenbloom, 1995). It is natural for any parent to want to pass on a beautiful heritage to their children, so that they might pass this legacy onto their own children one day. How could a survivor parent transmit this kind of knowledge to their children? Would a parent even want the child to listen to such truths? The second generation was raised amidst a mix of narratives- "you must remember, you must not forget but be cognisant of the contexts in which you choose to remember." We note that remembrance does not only consist of allowing memory to breathe. The memory of what occurred is often associated with a sense of guilt, shame and stigma, which very often got passed onto the second generation (Rylko-Bauer, 2005).

The countries in which the second generation were to be raised had their own politics to worry about. The plight of the survivors was not to occupy prime position. For a long time the Holocaust was a taboo topic, people spoke little about it and wanted to know even less about it (Rosenbloom, 1995). It was as if an iron curtain of silence had been draped over what had transpired. A sense of guilt existed in that many countries who were initially aware of what was unfolding in Europe, were not willing to offer refuge or

haven (Rosenbloom, 1995) to those wishing to escape. Remembering might be perceived as tantamount to an admission of guilt.

The second generation has sought to find and establish such stories. They aim to find something they can remember, or a greater purpose for remembering. It is likely that past events get interpreted and reinterpreted over time, and with each successive telling a certain version seems to become etched in memory and is converted into the memory that is shared with others (Rylko-Bauer, 2005). Parents, who have been able to resist the inner forces that so often have silenced them, speak of family members and places unbeknownst to this second generation. The child of the survivor has in their minds a category of “those who came before me,” yet no real way to tangibly connect him or herself to that, which is departed. This may have been additionally compounded by the family’s resettling in countries where the Holocaust was not considered a part of that region’s history, aside from such an event comprising our collective human history. Social constructionism in this vein is antirealist. It holds that there is no objective reality that exists beyond our stories (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). We can familiarise ourselves with the content of history books but we cannot entirely know history (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). It is important that people, like survivors and the subsequent generations reclaim their right and freedom to tell their stories (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). “His-story and her-story is the reality of each [survivor and their children]- unique, personal and subjective” (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999, p. 445). Understanding and remembering the Holocaust, from its causes to its impact on Jewish identity have provided the second generation with a greater sense of control over life (Hass, 1990). They can now choose models for personal expression, and place that era with its consequences in a useful, as opposed to solely painful perspective (Hass, 1990).

Today the prior silences have in many ways been broken. Continuing public awareness has led to a tremendous amount of writing on the subject. Children of survivors have also joined the ranks of academic and clinical professions and have turned their attention to the experience of their parents (Glicksman, Haitsma, Mamberg, Gagnon & Brom, 2003). Holocaust knowledge has been included in both school and university curricula

(Rosenbloom, 1995). It is important though, that we do not only remember the Holocaust, but also have to engage with the historical events leading up to, so that we may somehow comprehend the psychology of genocide. Dr Deborah Lipstadt proves with documented evidence how the Holocaust deniers have attempted to twist the truth of the Holocaust beyond recognition and attempt to rewrite history (Edelman, 1995). Holocaust deniers do their work based on the premise that no idea is too erroneously false that you could not find even a university professor to believe it (Edelman, 1995). Many survivors report that for many years memories kept them prisoners of the past, powerless to free themselves because the wounds never healed (Edelman, 1995). However it was the work of the deniers, which made their grieving a luxury they could no longer maintain (Edelman, 1995). Knowledge and memories are the extraction of liberty; persecution is a consequence of forgetfulness and ignorance (Edelman, 1995).

By engaging with the questions around what actually happened, we locate ourselves within what Novick (1999) calls historical consciousness. This endeavour focuses on the historicity of events, which took place then and not now and grew out of circumstances different from those that now prevail (Novick, 1999). Memory, by contrast has no sense of the passage of time, it negates the past tense of its articles and is adamant about its continued existence (Novick, 1999). If we jump to a level of collective memory, then an event is meant to universally symbolise some essential truth for a group (Novick, 1999). The Holocaust, though commonly defined as a tragic event, holds many different meanings for many individuals, groups and families.

Remembrance is a very personal exercise. There are no better or more appropriate ways to commit to memory what occurred. The very ways in which people define the act of remembrance are open to discussion. Some may perceive memory as imposed whilst others see it as chosen (Novick, 1999). The following questions seem to be ever present: “How should we think about the Shoah (Holocaust) from our lengthening distance? What meanings does it continue to hold for us, what kinds of understanding can we bring to it or garner from it as it recedes from looming view and actual memory into the more remote realm of the past and history?” (Hoffman, 1998, p. 155).

Realistically speaking, only a percentage of lived experience can be storied, expressed and remembered at one time (White & Epston, 1990). A great deal of this lived experience inevitably falls outside the dominant stories about the lives and relationships (White & Epston, 1990) of the storytellers. Those elements of lived experience that do not occupy prime position provide a rich and abundant source for “the generation or re-generation of alternative stories (White & Epston, 1990, p. 15). The second generation are not the primary historical sources to whom the world looked for answers, as to what had transpired in those chaotic years. They however, were the closest to the survivors that anyone could come. They too, became the collectors of such knowledge. What was revealed to them necessarily had personal import. They had to find constructive ways in which to story and re-story such events so that some form of meaning might emerge from the abyss of tragedy. The second generation had to grapple with their own guilt in trying to capture the stories of their survivor parents. Many report worrying whether they were causing their parents more anguish, dredging up painful memories and re-opening old wounds (Rylko-Bauer, 2005).

One’s experience of problems and perception of the world is partly a function of the stories we have constructed (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). The resolution of such problems according to a Narrative approach emerges from being able to deconstruct such stories and consciously construct new more liberating ones (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). The second generation has been called to re-socialise the narrative by placing it within broader social and historical contexts (Rylko-Bauer, 2005). The narrative it taken beyond glimpses of suffering, violence, dehumanisation and displacement, if one is able to contextualise the story of a survivor (Rylko-Bauer, 2005). The story becomes a way to examine what it means to be a survivor (Rylko-Bauer, 2005). Many children think of their parents and other adults of their universe as all-knowing omnipotent beings. The realisation that they had suffered or that many others had perished challenges this youthful perception. The second generation have had to find ways to remember the dead and the living in honourable ways so that the suffering endured would not overshadow dignity and courage.

The second generation member is called upon to construct in memory, a multigenerational family tree. This task is both an honour and a burden. Many of the second generation report wanting to desperately undo the Holocaust for their parents and themselves, by becoming the carriers, replacement members and future “resurrectors” of the family tree. (Barocas & Barocas in Danieli, 1993, p. 893).

It follows that remembrance is not a passive enterprise that solely occurs in the recesses of our minds. It involves systematic study and vociferous debates. The use of memories often serve to heal family wounds (Danieli, 1993), by giving voice to members that never had a chance to be part of the family’s current life. This “rebridging” (Danieli, 1993, p.893) has allowed survivor families to go on with the task of living.

We further hope that in remembering some moral truths will be cemented into global consciousness. By remembering we acknowledge the consequences of blind conformity to authority and the abdication of individual responsibility (Rosenbloom, 1995). We remember not only as a way of amassing historical facts but also as a resource for creating meaning (Rylko-Bauer, 2005).

Remembering amplifies our position as social constructionists. We realise that the old English adage of “the pen is mightier than the sword” holds true in initiating acts of genocide. The Holocaust highlights the dangers inherent in defining whole populations as superfluous or expendable (Rosenbloom, 1995). We are sensitised to use our words and construct meaning carefully. The misuse of modern language after all enabled Hitler to conceal murderous objectives; words such as evacuation, resettlement and special treatment contained unspoken genocidal implications (Rosenbloom, 1995). Physical violence might often be the end result of verbal violence (Brown, 1995).

Today we not only remember the Holocaust for Holocaust’s sake alone. We commemorate in order to acknowledge the pain, courage and suffering of the most tragic victims of the war (Nordstrom, 1995). We remember so that somehow we may confront a world in which Neo-nazism is on the rise, and grapple with the ethnic cleansing that has

occurred in the former Yugoslavia, Somalia, Rwanda and Burundi (Nordstrom, 1995). We remember so that we may recount what happen but also to help heal the “victims.” Remembrance serves as a tool for working over and working through a particular remembered past (Rylko-Bauer, 2005).

Remembrance might also be conceived of somewhat differently. The need to leave testimony appears to be shared by survivors of all kinds of perilous situations (Rosenbloom, 1995). It serves as a functional coping mechanism. It would follow that remembering aids the second generation and those thereafter to cope with the integration and understanding of such events into their cultural and religious histories. They could not have protected their parents from enduring such hell. The second generation has to cope with this sense of helplessness. Remembering helps them to achieve a semblance of mastery over an overwhelming barrage of emotions. Narrative is always a story about the past and not the past itself (Ellis & Bochner in Rylko-Bauer, 2005). Many of the second generation report feeling a strong need to help and heal others. Many have embarked on their own pilgrimage to better the world. Through them, we are reminded to somehow bear witness to suffering in all its forms, as the possibility of human cruelty is constantly with us (Nordstrom, 1995).

The act of remembering comes to form a multigenerational project. If trauma can be transmitted from one generation to the next, so too can healing. The aim is perhaps to bring a family full circle, seeing this venture as a validation of their history and acknowledging the power of such stories (Rylko-Bauer, 2005).

As the generation of survivors nears the end of their lives, the role of the second generation in such endeavours and projects is amplified.

The Role of the Second Generation

Children of Holocaust survivors find themselves in a position that perhaps warrants discussion. The spearhead of the Nazi’s war against the Jewish people was directed

against its continued existence, against its potential for reproduction (Wardi, 1992). Many survivors considered the creation of new families a response to this critical element in the Nazi plans (Wardi, 1992). The second generation are seen as the post-war generation. Their births heralded a victory over the Nazis (Wardi, 1992). Such children had to possess qualities representative of strength, stamina, intelligence and bravery. They were to be a race far stronger than the so-called Master race. Their function in the world was and is multifaceted. It is conceivable that they have been thrust into a role whereby the duty of remembering, that which occurred to their relatives, is placed upon them. They report feeling different from others, being afraid of non-Jews, trying to protect their parents from more pain, a desire to make up for their parents' suffering, conflictual relationships with their parents, experiencing the loss of grandparents they never knew, possessing a keen sensitivity to other people's suffering and a need to actively rally against social injustice (Fuchs Winik, 1988). That which they inherit carries great responsibility and may be felt to be without choice. They hence have to grapple with a family history that is almost beyond belief (Goffman, 2003). Their universe is composed of trying to accommodate what their family and those like them suffered; in other words the question of, "How do I remember?" (Krystal, 2006).

It appears then that the role of the second-generation is dynamic and constantly renegotiated. The urgency to assign a role of remembrance gains impetus though as the generation of survivors disappears. As a result the question of what role their descendants must play in the coming years takes on a new meaning (Franklin, 2003). It is the contention of this research that this role however was taken on much earlier, for the children could not always rely on their parents to ground them in the history of their people/family. They react to the lack of memories and absences of dead family members and as adults embark on an overt search for better understanding and knowledge (Shoshan, 1989). The second-generation has in many ways taken over from their parents. It has become their need to now speak of the atrocities that occurred. Krystal (2006) argues that if one cannot speak of it, then one cannot understand nor remember it. Accordingly the act of remembering serves as a means to connect with one's heritage (Krystal, 2006). The second generation inherited the Holocaust directly from their parents

who had survived it, and whether spoken about or not, it always seemed to reverberate in the family (Fuchs Winik, 1988). As the generation that came after they somehow had to 'ensure' that all their parents' suffering and efforts to survive were not a worthless sacrifice (Wardi, 1992).

The knowledge that one's parents had survived the Holocaust is a critical influence to be considered in the lives of children of survivors (Prince, 1985). Their comprehension of the range of parental experiences entailed by having survived varied greatly (Prince, 1985). Most parents appear to be deeply ambivalent about allowing their children to participate in the knowledge of their past lives (Prince, 1985), for sharing the past is tantamount to stirring up painful memories. The situation may also have presented itself differently. Parents may have desperately needed to share their suffering, thereby ensuring the continuity of their own lives by making the children privy to such events (Prince, 1985).

However, if one's family, like countless others were either murdered or died in a concentration or death camp an alternate argument exists. The survivor or child thereof is either "entitled" or "not entitled" to keep their distance from such knowledge (Krystal, 2006). Remembrance is thus a choice. It is unlikely however that the members of a survivor's family could "successfully" dissociate themselves from the family's past. The stories whether given voice or not, somehow had a way of creeping into the consciousness and dreams of those who inhabited a household. While some children had vivid dreams of horror and death, most always sensed their parents' pain and discerned not to cause them any more (Fuchs Winik, 1988).

It is nonetheless apparent that the tradition of remembrance among second generation children is not a universal one. There are those who want to learn as much as possible about what happened to their parents and grandparents, whilst other prefer to avert their eyes (Krystal, 2006, p.38). Prince (1985) noted that most children of survivors, even if they were not comfortable with it, chose to live without ascertaining the mysteries of the

past. By contrast, some have made a point of memorising the exact chronology of their parents past (Prince, 1985).

It is also conceivable that the survivor parents did not speak of what occurred for that would represent a regression of sorts. Finding themselves in a new country, their so-called duty was to adapt and move forward. Any allusions to the past would symbolise death in a context where they were trying to get on with the task of living. Even if the children of survivors managed to unearth a connection to the past, it would still only be a representation. Although children and adults may still learn to speak and read Yiddish, it is a different language from that spoken by their parent's generation; it is made up of words and is hence not a way of thinking and being (Krystal, 2006, p.38). Are we then to believe that to remember is to engage in a fruitless enterprise? It seems rather simplistic if not cowardly to distance oneself from various phenomena on the basis that one was not there and can thus never truly understand what happened. If such a proposition were adopted then the teaching of and inquiries into history would be null and void. We instead have to step inside the hermeneutical circle and immerse ourselves in the voices that constituted an era. For whilst we try and live in the present, we cannot deny the impact and influence that the past exerts. Despite the fact that an unthinkable horrible era in human history permeated the globe more than fifty years ago, its impact is still felt in the lives of survivors, their family members, and the descendants of those who were annihilated in ghettos and concentration camps (Kaslow, 1999, p. 615).

The following must also be considered. Neither those survivors who remained silent throughout the years, nor those who spoke incessantly about their experiences could willingly describe the explicit details of the separations from their families (Shoshan, 1989). It is as if by their silence, they could hold their loved ones near (Shoshan, 1989). Whereas if they ventured to speak of the last moment they saw their families, they would truly lose them forever.

It seems that the growth of the second-generation's identity has often been overshadowed by the memory of that which was lost. It is in this way that historical restoration remains

critical (Goffman, 2003). “Many survivors felt a compelling urge to immediately create a new family in order to emphasise the reality of their survival” (Shoshan, 1989, p.197). To the parents of the new generation, they are often not seen at that unique child but rather as the individual who can fulfill the lost potential of another. The survivors felt obliged to rebuild their lives; almost as a memorial testament to those who were murdered (Shoshan, 1989). The survivor parents were able to vicariously experience their own lost lives or childhood through their children. Epstein (1979, p. 51) expresses how she was “more than a leaf in the future for her mother, she could recapture the best of her past.” If one were named for a relative that died in the war, then one’s life came to represent the past and a present and future, never realised. The role of the second generation is complex. Instead of designating them the position of the family’s emotional repository, Wardi (1992, p.30) feels that perhaps it is more appropriate to call them “memorial candles.”

Prior to the Holocaust the survivors family’s had an intricate chain of belonging composed of their extended families, their communities, their surroundings, other Jewish people and generations of parents and children that had come before them (Wardi, 1992). The Holocaust is perceived as having destroyed these chains. The memorial candles often take it upon themselves to reestablish these links (Wardi, 1992).

Many recall the comprehension that long ago, in another lifetime their parents had other spouses and children and hence make reference to the burden of being replacement children for those destroyed by the Nazis (Goffman, 2003). If the survivors could successfully build new families, then they had triumphed over the “Final Solution” (Shoshan, 1989).

The survivors had however experienced a fall from grace per se. In their countries of origin they had often occupied the positions of respected community members, successful business people and cherished family men and women. However in their new homes, they carried the status of refugees. It is understandable then, how their determination to guard against similar occurrences was experienced by their children. Children of

survivors often report how there was a tremendous expectation put on them to excel, to recreate a new world (Fuchs Winik, 1988), a burden that they had to bear.

In trying to communicate the extent of that which occurred or in trying to conceal it, survivor parents unwittingly articulated that something beyond all our imaginings had transpired. It is almost impossible to try and understand the unfathomable that was the Holocaust, particularly if your own parents were among the very few that survived (Fuchs Winik, 1988). The children though, equipped only with their intellect and psyche, had to then try to make sense of this grand narrative. That which the child often visualised was far scarier than anything their parents might have communicated. Hence such imaginings often led to nightmares. Additionally though, the second-generation has had to also accept that most of the horrible things their parents saw and endured would never be shared with them (Blumenstyk, 2004). This can in part be attributed to the anguish of having to tell such stories (Blumenstyk, 2004) and on another level to the inherent difficulty in transmitting this kind of knowledge to one's children. It has only been when their parents are nearing the end of their lives, that a sudden urgency to give voice to the silence arises.

The traumatic impact of the Holocaust upon those who survived gave way to a tradition of silence among many. Their hearts had been paralysed by the horror that was and it therefore seemed impossible to give it a voice. Many survivors additionally carry an immense sense of guilt. They question their right to be alive (Epstein, 1979) and so each day that very heart aids in providing breathe, is both a blessing and a struggle. The survivor somehow carries on, moves forward and builds a life. There is however no tangible connection to the past- only photographs and memories- and even those fade into obscurity. On the other hand, such historical remnants create memories in the minds of the second generation. One child of a survivor reported, "I have actual memories of the children that were killed because I would see photographs in my parents' albums.... and then I would invent in my mind, these little playmates that I had that would come visit me at night" (Fuchs Winik, 1988, p. 273).

Historical recovery does not only serve the ‘purpose’ of answering unanswered curiosities. It can instead lead to hopelessness, to anger toward God and utter cynicism regarding the human race (Goffman, 2003, p. 379). It is in this way that the second-generation learns to tread gingerly with questions related to the past, knowing that any memories they manage to elicit are entangled with the pain of loss (Blumenstyk, 2004). For it is here that the personal becomes the historical (Blumenstyk, 2004). Hitler in this way managed to eliminate any possibility that post-Holocaust generations could truly understand what was lost (Krystal, 2006).

There also appeared to be an additional phenomenon among survivor families. Some arrived in their new countries, changed their names and sent their children to Protestant Sunday schools (Epstein, 1979). One couple, like others who did not wish to pass on a stigma to their children, refused to have their son circumcised and only told him he was Jewish when he turned thirteen (Epstein, 1979, p. 97). It is debatable however whether a change in name is really tantamount to an erasure of identity. There were conversely areas dominated by survivor populations where children grew up thinking that everyone’s parents had endured the concentration camps (Epstein, 1979).

Among such communities and elsewhere it was common practice for the second generation to play the part of the ‘good child’ lest they cause their parents more anguish. They appeared to be imbued with a need to “make it better” for watching their protectors suffer was too unnerving to bear. Whilst there were those who developed an insatiable curiosity around what had transpired, there were those whose silence matched that of their parents. Thus many children of survivors were raised in an environment where all efforts were aimed at diverting attention away from questions about the parents’ past and the absence of an extended family (Kaslow, 1999). Many children somehow internalised the message that they were not supposed to be too happy about anything lest they be prepared for the advent of some terrible calamity (Kaslow, 1999). Furthermore they came to interpret their own happiness as somewhat of a sin. If their parents had suffered and were still experiencing such mental pain, in order to relate to them, they too had to grieve.

However the child, as was perhaps developmentally appropriate would become curious. It was not for a lack of caring and empathy, for they possessed those qualities in abundance. They somehow intuited that certain occurrences were perchance extraordinary and thereby adopted an inquisitive role. Their survivor parents were thus subjected to an incessant stream of questions: “Who put the number on your arm? Why do you keep it? Why won’t it come off?” (Epstein, 1979, p. 47). The survivors nonetheless will forever feel inadequately equipped to provide absolute answers to indefinable phenomena. Thus whilst they might try and explain as best they could, they would often find themselves hindered by their own emotions. It was again natural for the child to then adopt the role of a parent to their parents, and so the cycle of silence and a vague history was perpetuated.

It is conceivable then that such children felt different growing up. The lightheartedness that permeated other non-survivor children’s homes somehow did not sit comfortably with them. This might be due to their parent’s feelings that the countries they now inhabited, on some level still remained alien (Krystal, 2006). These hospitable and sometimes unintelligible worlds could never truly take the place of the platzes, boulevards, shtetls and ghettos they knew before the war (Krystal, 2006). Their world was rather one where the absence of grandmothers, grandfathers, aunts, uncles and cousins was never questioned. One second-generation member describes a routine question from her gynaecologist, had anyone in her family had breast cancer? - She thought for a moment and to her shock she realised that every single woman in her family, excepting her mother, had been killed in the war (Goffman, 2003, p. 378).

However, the families of survivors were still families like all others. They too had their customs, secrets, taboos and private jokes (Franklin, 2003). Their parents still managed to raise their children as best they could and provide for their mental, emotional and physical needs. Whilst their childhood may have been “normal” in many other ways, there is no denying the cloak of tragedy that somehow must have been ever-present.

Despite this, their parents also endeavored to pass on moral values to them and rarely spoke of evil men. They hence grew up with a heightened sense of the importance of helping others, the significance of family ties and the message that one must be educated. For in the final instance, everything can be taken from one aside from their sense of self and that which they have learnt.

It is probably not possible to pinpoint a precise moment or specific person who held that the legacy of the second-generation was to remember. It appears to rather be a phenomenon that they intuited. Consequently part of the collective task articulated throughout a large portion of the second-generation community is the deliberate remembrance of the vile past for the sake of a better future (Goffman, 2003).

It would seem that common practice nowadays is to focus on the loss and tragedy that occurred at the hands of others. The Holocaust is no different. Memorials and exhibitions dedicated to the six million Jews contain maps, photographs and information that details the suffering endured. The psychic and physical wounds carried by survivors can in no way be ignored. Perhaps though, how we connect with such events requires reframing. Krystal (2006, p. 41) noted the following:

One thing we might do is remember not only how the living died but also how they lived. To take the full measure of what the Germans did, we must learn about what was lost: the ordinary and the humdrum, the pleasures and peculiarities of home and work, all the taken-for-granted routines that once made up life in a city, village or shtetl. We ought to familiarise ourselves with the modulated voices, the accords and discords, the diversity of opinion disseminated in letters, diaries, books and plays. Not one kind of Jew was destroyed, not one voice, or one account, or one perspective, but a rich and vibrant culture and everything that culture contained and might one day have contained.

The second generation has had to fulfill the lost potential of others. They are fast becoming the closest connection to the Holocaust, as the generation of survivors nears the end of their lives. Many second generation members have endeavoured to construct a meaningful life, where both remembrance of what was and the construction of new stories oriented in the present and simultaneously towards the future are emphasised.

Conclusion

The Holocaust and other events of genocidal proportions will continually form a basis for discussion, debate, research and concern. How we as individuals locate ourselves within such discourses, is most critical. I am a Jewess, I cannot separate my history, my education, my emotions and identity from an academic inquiry into the role of the second generation. Nor am I asked to. Each of the various theories espoused throughout the literature to explain genocide, might well represent the internal struggles of those particular writers, to comprehend what no one ever thought possible. These individual battles might represent a collective consciousness that takes the existence of goodness to be a given, and is shocked and overwhelmed when evil prevails.

World War Two was the war to end all wars. The Final Solution that Hitler set in motion destroyed the lives of millions upon millions of the innocent. Neither historians, nor politicians, nor philosophers, nor researchers, nor clinicians, nor members of the second generation can reverse that fact. It was brutal, it was dehumanising, and it was deadly. We therefore come to know the limits of our inquiries.

There are no fruitless exercises if we locate such activities within a context of healing, reframing, truth and reconciliation. Though it is at times painful to immerse oneself in the facts and feelings of the Holocaust, much can be done through open forums.

Rothschild (2000, p. 53) herself a daughter of a survivor, believes that through honest dialogue, the second generation can “metabolise” the pain and the guilt into responsibility and transformation and thereby halt the transmission of trauma.

Those who would regard themselves as part of the second generation formed the focus of this piece of research. The opportunity to interview three such ordinary individuals with extraordinary stories was a privilege and an eye opener. Their narratives have come to form the core of this piece of research and will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter Three

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The following chapter will detail the theoretical framework and research inquiry of the study. A brief explanation of post modernism will be provided as a grounding to the development of social constructionism, “which specifies the nature of the relationship between the researcher and the study” (Henning, 2005, p. 68). This will be intertwined with a discussion of social constructionism’s relevance to the present study. The qualitative research approach will then be discussed, as it pertains to the research design and the role of the researcher, sampling, data collection and the data analysis carried out in this study.

Post Modernism

Postmodernism is seen as a reaction against the certainties, methods and practices of modernism. (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). The observer is perceived to be part of that which is observed, and hence may only describe observing systems. Reality is a construction of our belief systems. The focus also aims at an experience as well as the context in which it is rooted, as described by both observer and the observed. We do not discover behaviour, we create it. The language we use to describe something is of critical importance. (Bevar & Becvar, 2006). Postmodernism appears to have arisen as a reaction against the modernist stance. The modernists are said to be guided by reason and logic as opposed to passion and inspiration. The answers to the ailments of society are hence to be found in Science and the knowledge of objective experts who supposedly possess the Holy Grail about a reality that is “out there.” The researcher is in this way perceived to be a social engineer. Postmodernism, however, undermines the belief in an objective knowledge system that proposes concepts such as absolute truth. It believes that our notion of reality is inherently subjective and that we inhabit a multiverse that is constructed through the acts of observation. Research participants must be seen as possessing perspectives that are of equal value to one another and there is consequently no Platonic concept of the

“most correct.” (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). The researcher must approach each experience, text and discourse with humility, respect and an inquiring stance.

Post modernists believe that in the process of perceiving and describing an experience, whether to ourselves or to others, we construct not only our personal knowledge base regarding reality, but also reality itself. Therefore the way we look at things is a function of our belief systems. For that reason, we cannot know the truth about people or other worldly phenomena in an objective way. The existence of a reality, “out there” is denied. A person can only know that which he/she constructs of others and the world (Becvar & Becvar, 2006).

It is the task then of the postmodernist to deconstruct that upon which our assumptions, ideologies and values are based and to look upon our constructions regarding life and living with a certain degree of scepticism and even humour (Becvar & Becvar, 2006).

Granted, at the heart of human experience is a central self, an “I” who thinks, feels and acts as well as interacts in various relational contexts. However to be consistent with post modern thinking we need to concede with the argument that our most private thoughts and emotions are not actually our own. This is partly because we think in terms of languages and images, which we did not invent but which were handed to us by society (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). Reality is created by the self, and in interaction with the world in which we live. There is an indestructible link between one’s knowledge and personal experience (Owen, 1992). All that we can know is in the five senses through which we perceive the world and communicate with others (Owen, 1992). “Knowledge, including every day understandings, is the series of specific judgements, conclusions and generalisations about what we have felt, heard, seen, smelt and tasted” (Owen, 1992, p.390). Knowledge and personal experience are united and form the basis of a social constructionist enquiry (Owen, 1992).

Social Constructionism

Social Constructionism as part of a Post Modernist tradition arose as a reaction against the linear and positivistic principles underlying the Modernist era. It spoke up against the modernist idea that a real world exists that can be known with objective certainty (Hoffman, in Wick, 1996). It advanced the idea that no story is more real than any other (Penn, in Wick, 1996), giving voice to that which had previously been silenced. It would make sense then that human systems are language generating and concurrently meaning generating systems (Anderson & Goolishian, in Wick, 1996). Language is not merely a reporting device for our experience or representationalism; it is rather a defining framework (Becvar & Becvar, 2006).

Social Constructionists believe that psychological knowledge is historically and culturally specific. We are therefore urged to extend our enquiries beyond the individual into the social, political and economic realms in order to gain an adequate understanding of the evolution of an individual's psychological and social life (Burr, 1995). We are further cautioned against looking at "once-and-for-all" definitions and descriptions of people or society, since change appears to be the only constant (Burr, 1995). Humans are seen as social beings who operate within and are influenced by the societies in which they live. Such ideals then appear to be underpinned by the theoretical orientation of Social Constructionism, the approaches of which are linked together by the following set of common characteristics: 1) Social Constructionists adopt a critical stance toward taken-for-granted knowledge; 2) Individuals understand the world based on their cultural and historical contexts and environments; 3) Knowledge is sustained by social processes and 4) Knowledge and social action go together (Burr, 1995).

Thus, whilst we are born with the freedom to choose our attitude in a given set of circumstances, such a belief might be perceived as somewhat superficial if not naïve, when presented to the individual who has lost their home, livelihood and more critically their family in a man-made disaster such as the Holocaust. It is only with hindsight and deep reflection that such a victim might be able to reconstruct a semblance of meaning.

Social Constructionism then provides us with an adequate point of departure. It is able to provide a platform from which therapeutic discourses of healing can be constructed, while the hurt and pain inflicted through power and victimisation is acknowledged and deconstructed.

Constructionist thought places a strong emphasis on the freedom of human beings, on each individual's ability to language his or her attitudes, purposes, values and actions (Stevenson & Haberman, 1998). Perhaps it is here then that we might locate the second generation. For in not having directly experienced the atrocities of the Holocaust, they have more freedom *per se* to choose what to do with this traumatic past- to find out from the victims the effect on them, to perpetuate the memories of those who perished, to remember or just as easily forget. They also have the privilege and combined pain of listening to the stories of the survivors, their parents and creating a language from which they are able to make sense of events. For it is Constructionism which holds that the human life-world is fundamentally constituted in language and that language itself should therefore be the object of study (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). The language in which survivors have chosen to retell their stories and by consequence the various ways in which the children of such survivors will make sense of such language, will form an integral part of this study. Social constructionism also questions the assumption of the separation of the subject-object relationship between the knower and the known (Wick, 1996). According to Constructionist ideals, it is we who live in a world of conversational narrative, where we will understand ourselves and each other through changing narratives and self descriptions (Anderson & Goolishian, in Rapmund, 2005). The role, background, opinions and emotions of the researcher in creating a dialogical space for herself and the members of the second generation are hence given importance. It makes sense then, in light of this study, that Constructionism does not treat language as if it were neutral and transparent, but rather as a tool that aids in constructing reality (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). After the atrocities of World War two, the European Jewish community had to in some way decode and reconstruct (Hoffman, 2005) what had happened in order to create a present and a future. It is here that we find a further fit with Constructionism in terms of its concern with the broader patterns of social meaning encoded in such language (Terre

Blanche & Kelly, 1999). Whatever importance survivors and their children attached to the language of being Jewish, their Jewishness came to serve two functions: namely - the way others perceived them and the way they experienced themselves (Jacobson, 1994). They were forced to language their plight and ask, "Who am I and how important is being a Jew to who I am?" (Jacobson, 1994, p. 9). A change in language, in this case would be tantamount to a change in experience (Becvar & Becvar, 2006).

Social Constructionism is also concerned with knowledge as power, believing that "cultural specifications" wield a real impact on people's lives (Dickerson & Zimmerman, in Rapmund, 2005) and it takes a stand on the overpowering effect of discourses (Rapmund, 2005). Constructionism acts as a metatheory that is capable of demystifying so-called normalised beliefs by examining their history and social context (Wick, 1996). The ideologies of Hitler, his Nazi party, the Third Reich and present day crusades of Holocaust denial are representative of such discourses. It is from this point of departure that survivors and generations thereafter have had to reconstruct a semblance of meaning to challenge those dialogues that serve to oppress and disrespect the experience of others.

The stories of survivors and those of their children do not stand in isolation but rather represent a collective history. This falls in line with Constructionist tenets that ideas, words and signs have meaning by virtue of standing in relationship to other signs (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). The social world is further interpreted as a kind of language, as a system of meanings and practices that construct reality. The Jewish ceremony of Holocaust remembrance, Yom Hashoah (Day of the Holocaust) forms part of such a reality. It appears then that the everyday talk of Holocaust survivors and the generations thereafter will help to create and maintain the world in which they live. (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). A Social Constructionist perspective then will locate meaning within an understanding of how ideas and attitudes are acquired and developed over time within a social, community context (Dickerson & Zimmerman, in Rapmund, 2005). Each individual "is born into and assimilates pre-existing forms of language in a culturally created linguistic system" (Becvar & Becvar, 2006, p.93). It is impossible to speak in a language separate from that of our community (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). Knowledge exists among

people and is created in their social interactions; the terms in which the world is understood are the result of historically situated interchanges among people (Gergen, in Wick, 1996). It additionally makes sense within the world of Social Constructionism that representations of reality, practices and physical arrangements are structured like a language, a system of signs (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). As such, they construct particular versions of the world by providing a framework or system through which we can understand the world, its objects and practices, as well as who we are and what we should do in relation to these systems (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). Holocaust museums such as Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, which commemorate the lives of those lost as well as those who risked their lives to save others, and foundations that teach Tolerance education such as the Vulindlela Network in South Africa serve as such a lens through which we may perceive ourselves, our world and our position in that world. We can therefore take the Social Constructionist viewpoint that the content of our consciousness and the manner of relating that we have to others, is taught by our culture and society (Owen, in Rapmund, 2005).

The self is not seen as an isolated, autonomous being, but rather takes form and colour in relationship to others (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). There are a multitude of narratives that document the lives of survivors and their families. These have not been written in seclusion but perhaps as a need to give breath to the many people who constituted the self of the survivor.

It is the hope of the researcher that the paradigm chosen will do justice to the experiences under investigation. Social Constructionism is fitting as it prefers stories based on a person's lived experience rather than on expert knowledge (Doan, in Rapmund, 2005).

Inquiry

Overview of Qualitative Research

Qualitative research focuses on the meanings of lived experiences and to this extent involves observation and data collection in natural settings as opposed to contrived ones, where the incorporation of context, complexity and diversity are essential (Breakwell, Hammond & Fife-Shaw, 1997). Qualitative research is therefore appropriate for the purposes of this project in that it will not be possible to quantify the rich and complex experiences being explored. The qualitative research paradigm rallies against the reductionist stance that quantitative research has towards human experience (Henning, 2005). The words, experiences and emotions of a survivor and their families cannot be reduced to statistical equations, lest the researcher lose sight of the human side of life (Henning, 2005). The researcher has a personal interest in the topic under investigation; the qualitative paradigm therefore facilitated an element of interactivity between participant and researcher. Qualitative research enabled the researcher to gain insight into how people perceive, understand and explain the world in which they live and whether such perceptions and beliefs are subject to change (Breakwell et al., 1997). Miller and Crabtree (1992) have likened qualitative research to “Shiva’s Circle.” Shiva is the androgynous Hindu Lord of Dance and Death. A constructionist inquirer must enter an interpretive circle and be loyal to the performance or subject, must be simultaneously separate from and part of the dance, and must always be rooted to the context (Miller & Crabtree, 1992). This type of circular approach is seen as appropriate for the purposes of story telling. It is conceivable, in line with the present research that the cognitive schemata through which the participant viewed his/her own life world were subject to review as she/he gained more knowledge of her family’s experiences throughout his/her lifespan. It is hoped that both qualitative approaches as well as a Social Constructionist paradigm added value to the meaning attributed to a given situation by different individuals each with their own backgrounds and experiences. In the endeavour of studying people qualitatively, we gain access to personal knowledge of them, their experiences, their hopes, fears and struggles (Henning, 2005).

Design of Inquiry

This research utilised a non-experimental, qualitative, individual interview based format. The researcher has a particular interest in the experience of having grown up with a parent or parents that survived the Holocaust and factors associated with that ordeal. As a result of this research being non-experimental, it also may be deemed somewhat correlational (McBurney, 2001) in that it aimed to examine the relationship between being the child of a survivor and the associated feelings that were experienced. These relationships could not be examined in isolation. The acknowledgment and examination of the context of the family system, cultural, historical and political background was of equal importance. It must however be noted, that this approach was appropriate in that the researcher was not looking to establish causation. It was important to the researcher that the texts generated were able to ‘speak’ for themselves, without the researcher imposing positivistic expectations of what themes would arise.

Sampling

The researcher was primarily concerned with the experience of being a child of a Holocaust survivor and the factors associated with that occurrence and its impact. In this vein purposive sampling provided the most appropriate sampling method. The researcher also had to employ snowball techniques since she had found that the sample of interest was a difficult-to-get-to population (Breakwell et al., 1997). Thus one member of the target population, who had already been selected for participation in the research, was asked to introduce the researcher to other potential members. Participants who were willing to speak about their roles and experiences as children of Holocaust survivors were selected. The sample consisted of three adult participants, two women and a man, who were born after the Holocaust. One or both of their parents was a Holocaust survivor. Specific information on each of the participants will be provided in the results chapter.

Open-ended interview

The data was collected by way of individual interviews with specifically chosen participants that had been contacted by means of convenience sampling. The justification for this was that for the most part, the research conducted focused on the experiential aspects of being a second-generation survivor. The interview was unstructured with a series of open-ended questions and prompts where appropriate, such as: How the second generation member was first introduced to the concept of the Holocaust, how they went about making sense of what happened to their parents, how the Holocaust has impacted upon the parenting they received, and how the Holocaust has become part of their identity. These questions were 'designed' to assess perceptions, feelings and opinions of the experience in question, so as to maximise chances (Breakwell et al., 1997) of collecting adequate, satisfactory and hopefully novel data, from a text which had to be allowed to yield its own insights. The respondent was thus able to expand on given answers quite spontaneously (Campbell, in Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). The interviewee's responses were tape-recorded by way of a Dictaphone and transcribed. This allowed for more efficient and clearer later thematic content analysis. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. Sarah was interviewed first, Eli second and Bill last. Sarah was interviewed at her workplace. Eli was interviewed at the home of a relative, as she does not live in South Africa. The interview with Bill was conducted at his home in Johannesburg.

Consideration was also given to the fact that responses within the context of face-to-face individual interviews are both verbal and non-verbal in terms of body language and eye contact. Therefore even though structured interviews by contrast probably would have provided more comparable responses, (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991) the researcher hoped that this method yielded fuller and deeper replies (Bradburn, 1983 in Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991) as opposed to those of a forced-choice interview schedule. The questions posed were largely unstructured so as to facilitate the conversational nature of the inquiry. Each participant was given the space to reflect on their experiences in a manner in which they felt comfortable.

The research questions were formulated (Breakwell et al., 1997) according to the surveyed literature as well as according to the curiosity of the researcher. However, utmost attention was given to ensuring that issues dealt with were sensibly related (Breakwell et al., 1997) to the original research questions.

Establishing Credibility in the Study

Atkinson and Heath (1991, p. 161) note that reservations about qualitative research often centre around contentions that “since qualitative methods are so subjective and uncontrolled, the results of qualitative research are not valid and reliable.” Qualitative research does not purport to be objective and scientific, if such domains really exist. These inquiries allow the voices of the people in the compilation of research to resonate. They are monistic and grant a space for both the perspective of the researcher and that of the participants to exist. Speed (1991) contends that reality exists, however the filters through which we perceive reality are unique. Certainty is hence a construct and truth a heuristic. It is impossible for any observer to have privileged access to what really transpires in the social world by uniformly applying a specific method of observation (Atkinson & Heath, 1991). The observer becomes part of that which is observed and together they co-create a particular ecology of ideas (Bateson, 1979).

It would therefore be somewhat jarring for this piece of research to outline so-called scientific principles aimed at establishing the trustworthiness of insights or explanations (Atkinson & Heath, 1991) in terms of their reliability and validity. The researcher felt it was more appropriate to position the ideas presented within a framework of, dependability, credibility and trustworthiness. The quality of ideas generated within qualitative research have more to do with the intuitive and imaginative abilities of the researcher than the specific method the researcher was employing when the idea came to her (Atkinson & Heath, 1991). It would in this vein be difficult to refer to a quantitative generalisability of results. The researcher prefers to refer to the concept of “transferability” as discussed by Guba and Lincoln (1989) in referring to the applicability and usefulness of the research for other contexts and a wider population. Bateson (1979)

noted that one could never step into the same river twice. Contexts change, as do the meanings attributed to them. If another researcher were to transfer a study of this nature into other contexts, taking note of the time, place and culture (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) in which data was to be generated would be crucial.

Stiles (1993, pp. 602-607) provides a framework by which dependability can be attained:

- + “Disclosure of orientation” refers to the researcher’s preconceptions, values, expectations for the study and theoretical orientation. With an orientation in mind; perspectives and themes are placed in context. The theoretical orientation for this particular study was Social Constructionist.
- + “Explication of social and cultural context” refers to the process of making implicit cultural assumptions explicit. It is also important to provide information on the context under which data was gathered. This helps to ground the researcher and the reader in the perspectives from which the phenomena were viewed. Henning (2005) believes that it also includes clarifying the reasons for conducting the research, as this influences the way in which participants and their stories are viewed. This research was in part conducted for academic purposes. The researcher also felt it necessary to add to the stories of the children of survivors.
- + “Description of internal processes of investigation” inevitably form part of the investigation’s context. It also relates to the impact of the research upon the researcher in terms of emotional difficulties with subject material, areas of revelation and transformation in ideas. This was facilitated in this study by inclusion of the researcher’s opinions, feelings and reflections on the subject material throughout the study. The researcher feels that her understanding of the culture in which she was socialised has been enhanced.
- + “Engagement with the material” conveys the researcher’s immersion in the material in which she is interested. The researcher needed to find appropriate literature on the Holocaust and the second generation so as to provide herself with a starting point for the study, and a basis for the interviews she would conduct. It was also important that the researcher established rapport and trust with the participants with whom she was working (Henning, 2005) so as to better

- appreciate the participants' viewpoints in depth. It was vital that the researcher immersed herself in the texts generated so as to better understand the life world of her participants. The requirements for intensive engagement as noted by Stiles (1993, pp. 604-605) include a reading and rereading of transcripts, underlining promising ideas, excerpting key passages and moving back and forth between excerpts and unabridged versions. Engagement is said to foster a more compassionate view of human experience, both emotionally and cognitively.
- + "Iteration: Cycling between interpretation and observation" which according to Henning (2005) refers to a continual process of being a part of and apart from the process of interpretation. The researcher was able to "achieve" this by reflecting her understanding to the participants during the interviews (Stiles, 1993). Participants are thus given an opportunity to correct or negotiate the meaning of the observations.
 - + "Grounding of interpretations" necessitates linking the content and context of the interviews, narratives or stories with their more concrete observations or interpretations. In this study including excerpts from the interview transcripts substantiated the themes identified by the researcher.
 - + "Ask 'what' not 'why' questions" is pertinent to systemic practices. "What" questions are said to elicit material of which clients have direct knowledge, whereas "why" questions provide post hoc justifications for what clients think or do. The participants in this study knew what it was like for them to be raised by a Holocaust survivor parent. "What" questions are able to call forth stories imbued with richer meanings and interpretations.

Credibility in qualitative research can be achieved via the following (Stiles, 1993, pp. 608-613):

"Triangulation" involves seeking information from multiple sources and multiple perspectives. Kelly (1999) believes that making use of numerous viewpoints and ideas enables the researcher to clarify his/her own position. The research presented here is not one-dimensional. Efforts were made to include and link various

perspectives based on the inquiry available literature review, the interviews conducted, the themes discerned by way of the researcher and as (Henning, 2005) notes engaging in conversations with the supervisor of the research.

- + “Coherence” refers to the quality of the interpretation and the ability of a story to engage its readers. It also points to the relation between elements such as the chosen theoretical framework, methodology, surveyed literature and interpretations of interview transcripts. A study is regarded as coherent if it gives voice to both the researcher and the researched.
- + “Uncovering; Self-Evidence” refers to the process by which our own concerns and interests are addressed. Through this uncovering the researcher’s perspectives are said to emerge. This process takes place in conjunction with the conversations held with the research participants. The researcher felt that her own motivations for pursuing this topic became clearer as the research progressed.
- + “Testimonial validity” refers to the particular person whose experience an interpretation purports to represent. This serves as a reminder to the researcher that her reading of a particular transcript is one version of events and may not necessarily serve as an accurate depiction of a subject’s experiences. The researcher formulated basic questions for the interviews based on the literature she had gathered. These served only as a guide. The interviews were a co-construction of the researcher and each second generation member. The researcher has chosen to include the original interview transcripts as an appendix, should the reader want to make further sense out of a particular theme.
- + “Catalytic validity” refers to the degree to which the research process reorients, focuses and energises participants. In other words we question whether our participants will be motivated to engage with the material presented or not. The relevance of a particular subject area for a participant is also important. The research aims to empower participants through an exchange of ideas, and perhaps provide a different meaning to a particular experience. The Holocaust represents an ecological event-shape (Auerswald, 1990) that will continue to influence the life of survivors and their children for generations. The researcher hopes that in

- some way, the participants' involvement in the research will assist them in languaging their families' story and allowing memory to exist in the open.
- + "Reflexive validity" refers to how the data has impacted upon the researcher's epistemology. The researcher's interpretations form part of the hermeneutic circle that engaged with the phenomena of interest.

Guba and Lincoln (1989) also highlighted the importance of confirmability and taking note of researcher bias. Unlike the positivistic notion of objectivity, confirmability asks that the values, motives and biases of the researcher be acknowledged. Data in this way becomes self-referential in that one can make sense of the various sources, which constitute a final product. The ability of the researcher to be surprised, to change her mind and to arrive at new understandings also demonstrates that her values, motives and biases were not immutable (Stiles, 1993). The researcher also felt that social constructionism as a theoretical framework provided a place for her preconceptions and opinions as opposed to presenting herself as a "tabula rasa" (Colman, 2001, p.728).

Ethical Considerations

The ethics of the research are closely linked with the dependability, credibility and confirmability of the research. The research would not have been possible without the constituting voices of the research participants.

Owing to the sensitive nature of the issues that are under investigation, the welfare of the participant was of utmost importance. Therefore the participants were thoroughly informed of the purpose of the research by way of written and verbal correspondence before the commencement of the actual interview, and via the provision of a letter of information. The researcher also obtained the consent of the participant to take part and to be audio taped.

The researcher also took care to ensure that participants did not feel compelled to respond to questions that touched on anxieties or emotions, not otherwise adequately reflected

upon, pertaining to the experience of the person as a child of a Holocaust survivor. From the outset of the study, the interviewee had the option to withdraw from the research at any time (Breakwell et al., 1997), regardless of whether prior consent to participate in the research had been given. Due to the personal nature of the experiences under investigation only the analysed data was used in this final research report. The original raw written transcripts and audiotapes relating to the participants' experiences have been safely stored with only the researcher having access to it, and the participant being fully informed of this (Breakwell et al., 1997). Every attempt was also made to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of subject and material, via the substitution of the participants' names with pseudonyms.

The Role of the Researcher and the Participants

Research in the field of psychology almost always involves an interaction between a researcher and those who have agreed to take part. The research would not be possible without their willingness to enter into a conversation with the researcher, and share their stories. There are narratives they may choose not to impart. The richness of the data gathered is dependent upon the interviewing skills of the researcher, the choice of the participants to disclose or hold back and the context in which the interview takes place.

In qualitative research projects the researcher is encouraged to use the self as an instrument, for the purposes of interacting with research participants and collecting and analysing data (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). They are required to do what we naturally know as human beings by virtue of being able to look, listen and speak (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). Henning (2005) notes that the presence of the researcher is necessary to develop rapport, foster the flow of conversation between the participant and the researcher, and to observe details in the social setting. The researcher also has a cultural, religious and historical background of their own. It is important that the researcher is aware of their own attitudes on the topic of interest, as well as being willing to learn more. The researcher is encouraged to adopt a humble and inquiring stance, while he/she co-constructs experiential stories with the research participants. Social constructionism

adheres to the belief that knowledge develops in interaction with other systems. The world of the researcher and that of the subjects' come together to form an elaborate narrative tapestry.

Breakwell et al. (1999) indicated that the characteristics of the researcher, such as age, gender and profession would influence the respondents' willingness to participate and answer questions posed. The interview took place in the relationship between the researcher and the participants.

In this study the researcher provided each participant with a letter of information on the nature of the study and also spoke to them about her personal interest in the topic. She disclosed to them that she had been educated at a Jewish school. A large amount of her Holocaust education took place in that environment. Her paternal step-grandfather, as the only paternal grandfather she has known is also a Holocaust survivor. However she does not know the full details of his life's story. She has never spoken to his children about the impact that their father's Holocaust trauma has had upon them. She revealed to the participants that while she has had occasion to listen to the accounts of many Holocaust survivors, she has never heard a child of a survivor speak out about their role, as the post-war generation. She therefore felt that it was important to give them a voice, providing them with a space to share their struggles, beliefs and opinions.

The participants were seen as the experts on their lived experiences. They had first hand knowledge of their family system, and the impact of the Holocaust upon them. It was important that they were treated as such, without feeling judged or viewed through a psychopathologic lens. The researcher was therefore sensitive in the phrasing of each of the questions she chose to ask. The researcher gave each participant the space to talk about their role as second generation members in a manner in which they chose. The researcher informed the participants that they had the right to withdraw at any stage of the study and also had the right to have access to the research once the study was complete. She informed them that the interviews would be treated with confidentiality and that their names would be substituted with a pseudonym.

Analysis

Hermeneutics

The word, hermeneutics is thought to derive from Hermes, the Greek messenger god and trickster, who carried messages from the gods to the people. (Addison, 1992). His role was to interpret these messages and render them comprehensible to humans (Addison, 1992).

The data gathered was analysed by way of 'Hermeneutic analysis.' Kelly (1999) has referred to Hermeneutics as the practice of interpretation in all its forms. It is a process, which begins with listening and observing, and gathers momentum as the researcher progresses through thematising, coding and writing a final interpretive account (Kelly, 1999).

The researcher felt that hermeneutics together with social constructionism would serve as an appropriate framework for the research project as whole, and not only for the purposes of data analysis. Hermeneutic understanding cannot be applied from the outside; it is assumed that the interpreter 'knows' to some extent the phenomena he/she seeks to understand (Reason & Rowen, 1981). The researcher has Jewish roots and in some way felt that she had knowledge of the material under consideration. The research has however provided her with a depth of new insights she could never have initially fathomed.

Hermeneutics is an ancient discipline, which was originally concerned with the interpretation of early religious texts (Reason & Rowen, 1981). It was seen as a method for discovering the 'correct' meaning from several different versions of the same text (Reason & Rowen, 1981). Placed within the context of social constructionism, we are aware that reality and hence its experiential products are multiverse. It is impossible to discern with complete accuracy what a particular occurrence meant to another person. The best we as therapists and researchers can do is to formulate a tentative hypothesis, so

that we may enter the world of another with curiosity and respect, uncovering and co-authoring meanings as we proceed. The goal of hermeneutic research is to use the interpretation of lived experience to better understand the political, historical and sociocultural context, in which it occurs (Miller & Crabtree, 1992). “Trying to understand, taking meaning from, or making intelligible that which is not yet understood is not only the central task of hermeneutics, it is a central aspect of our being in the world” (Gadamer & Heidegger, in Addison, 1992, p. 110).

It was Dilthey who suggested that the interpretation of texts, or hermeneutics is the appropriate model of inquiry for the human sciences (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). The stand point of modern hermeneutics is that an interpretive method is not an extraordinary process, totally separate from everyday human understanding ; it is simply one example of a daily course through which people make sense of their world (Reason & Rowen, 1981). It is a method such as this one, which enables researchers to immerse themselves in the elucidation and perception of meaning, while simultaneously giving the text its own voice. This was suitable for this particular enquiry in that the researcher hoped to view the phenomena from within the context of children of Holocaust survivors in an empathic manner (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). Human experiences are also meaningful, both for those involved in them, and also for those who study them systematically (Reason & Rowen, 1981). Hermeneutics has as its starting point the fundamental belief that we cannot apprehend human experience without understanding the factors, be they social or linguistic, which give it shape (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). All understanding is hermeneutical (Reason & Rowen, 1981). The research consequently had to adopt a holistic stance, taking into account the many temporal, familial, cultural and historical features, which played a part in the life of a child of a Holocaust survivor. We are historical beings; it follows then that our understanding would be an historical process (Reason & Rowen, 1981). This serves as a justification for the provision of literature outlining events pre, during and post Holocaust. An approach such as this is hopefully able to ground the researcher and the reader within the contexts in which events took place. If hermeneutics has a starting point, that we are historical beings; then our historical understanding is strongly influenced by our culture and by our

place within it (Reason & Rowen, 1981). Hitler's army was generated in part by a culture of hate and fear, one that aimed to create a master race. While this does not serve as an excuse for the genocide committed, we are provided with a systemic backdrop against which we can enlarge our field of observation and view the behaviours in question.

The broad aim of hermeneutics is to become aware of meaning and thereby achieve greater awareness and understanding (Wilson & Hutchinson in Rapmund, 2005). It takes into account that people attach significance to that which happens in their lives, which has implications if others are to understand their actions and behaviour (Rapmund, 2005). It further aims to look beyond the overt, outside of that which is only expressed verbally. To this end it takes into account that the meaning giving process is informed by factors such as the immediate context, social structures, personal histories, shared practices and language (Addison in Rapmund, 2005). Thus individuals looking for meaning within a particular body of work also have their own history, view point and set of assumptions, which must be considered during the process of interpretation. Understanding might be perceived as a synthesis of two perspectives: that of the happening itself; and that of the interpreter, positioned in his or her own life, in a larger culture, and in a historical point in time (Reason and Rowen, 1981). It makes sense then that this is an approach that does not conform to the belief in an objective reality (Rapmund, 2005), preferring rather an interpretation which is "intersubjectively valid for all people who share the same world at a given time in history" (Reason & Rowen, 1981, p.133). The researcher in this way needed to approach the texts generated with a level of 'verstehen,' that is to understand a human phenomenon as it is lived in its context (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999).

At its core hermeneutics has certain basic tenets. These aim to help us make explicit what implicitly was already there before us (Reason & Rowen, 1981). The first tenet is that of the *autonomy of the object* (Reason & Rowen, 1981, p. 134). This refers to the principle that the meaning of that which we study must not be projected onto it; it must come from the phenomenon itself. (Reason & Rowen, 1981). Participants of research give meaning to their actions and these meanings are important in understanding human behaviour (Addison, 1992). In light of this research it was important that the interviewee was

allowed to answer questions in such a way that their stories and lived experiences were brought to life. The second tenet holds that the interpretation should put together the *phenomenon in maximally reasonable terms* (Reason & Rowen, 1981, p. 134). To this end the complexity and historical roots of the phenomenon must be explored and articulated, so that the researcher and reader may be engaged in a form of consciousness-raising (Reason & Rowen, 1981). Furthermore, meaning is not only that which is verbalised; it is expressed in actions and practices (Addison, 1992). We can understand human behaviour by looking at these practices and not solely beliefs about such practices (Addison, 1992). The third tenet is that the interpreter must reach the *greatest possible familiarity* (Reason & Rowen, 1981, p. 134) with the phenomenon in all its complexity and historical connectedness. This fits with the notion that an inquiry has little validity unless it is embedded in the experiential knowledge of those actually involved (Reason & Rowen, 1981). It was important that the researcher dialogued with children who were raised by one or more parents who had survived the Holocaust. These members of the second generation had first hand knowledge, feeling and experience of the impact of the multigenerational transmission of trauma. Hermeneutics also ascribes to the idea that the meaning and significance of human actions is rarely fixed and unambiguous (Addison, 1992). Meaning is constantly negotiated in ongoing interactions, over time and in various contexts (Addison, 1992), even those between researcher and research participants. Over and above the tenets explored, the interpreter must also demonstrate *meaning of the phenomenon for his own situation* (Reason & Rowen, 1981, p. 134) and hence its personal relevance. Whilst the researcher might have chosen many other topics to explore, the role of children of Holocaust survivors had personal relevance in terms of her own culture, religion, history and family.

As a methodology hermeneutics prescribes what is known as the ‘hermeneutical circle.’ It is assumed that there cannot be any development of knowledge without some fore-knowledge, implying a dialectical approach (Reason & Rowen, 1981). In the interpretation of a text, the meaning of the parts should be considered in relation to the meaning of the whole, which itself can only be grasped in terms of its essential parts (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). Understanding is a circular and spiral process whereby

the relationships between what is known and unknown and between the phenomenon and its wider context are explored (Reason & Rowen, 1981). Therefore in the final analysis of the interview transcripts it was incumbent upon the researcher to look at the relation between the meanings of particular experiences such as being raised by a Holocaust survivor, and the meanings of themes discovered that according to Terre Blanche (1999) reflect a coherent, clustering or ordering of themes of experience.

Hence the data gathered was analysed by way of hermeneutic analysis. This is in line with the tenets of Social Constructionism in that it aims to be sensitive to the systems of knowledge and meaning to which it gains access. The focus of this piece of research is upon an experiential aspect of human functioning, in terms of having the identity per se of being the child of a Holocaust survivor. This would by consequence justify the use hermeneutic analysis, which by its very nature is exploratory (Krippendorf, 1980). Thus the common focus within such applications of qualitative methodology is therefore the interest in human subjectivity (Eagle, 1998), bearing in mind that the chosen methodology still required an open-minded (Krippendorf, 1980) orientation, especially since the researcher was personally involved in the process from start to finish. Hermeneutic analysis was in this vein even more appropriate in that it allowed greater 'independence' in exploring the impact that the story of the Holocaust has had upon the interviewee. This allowed that which the respondent had expressed to be given life and colour, while still being cognisant of the context in which such ideas might have arisen. This in effect recognises the importance of the hermeneutic circle.

In view of this research, aspects of human subjectivity might pertain to an element of self-consciousness (Eagle, 1998) in terms of how the second-generation as a community of individuals has made sense of their experiences. The researcher as one who was personally involved in the analysis of the interview transcripts, still brought her own ideas, emotions and understandings to the themes that were identified and discussed. Thus certain themes such as feeling responsible for their parents' well-being and happiness, anger at a people for inflicting such pain, devastation and confusion were revealed per se by way of the chosen methodology. It is hoped that both the content of the

interview as well as the personal inferences of the researcher, enabled such themes to emerge. Hermeneutic analysis therefore served as an illuminative representation of the meaning of the issue (Eagle, 1998) and afforded the researcher the freedom to adequately deal with a large body of interview material (McBurney, 2001). The researcher endeavoured to work in collaboration with the text, so as not to adopt the stance of the expert. Thus if another researcher were to review the interview material, that which they discovered would be representative of the ideas that they bring with them. It must be noted in this vein that both social constructionism and hermeneutic analysis “transcend conventional notions of content as an object of concern and are intricately linked to more recent conceptions of symbolic phenomena” (Krippendorf, 1980, p. 10).

Hence, while the investigator may not have had direct access to the phenomena of interest, that is not having directly experienced the Holocaust herself; as a researcher she hoped to be able to make inferences about the described experiences (Eagle, 1998), whilst looking at the latent content so as to make inferences about the existence of a particular theme (McBurney, 2001). Krippendorf (1980) has shown that the application of this method led to an escalating positive reception and constructionist acknowledgment of the context within which communication took place; in this instance the encounter between parent as survivor and child as part of the second generation.

In view of this methodology it was therefore important to examine both manifest and latent content. The former stage to take place according to specified guiding principles (Eagle, 1998) while the latter was guided by the researcher’s insight, intuition and imagining as a generally accepted process (Eagle, 1998) to draw inferences about covert content.

Steps towards gathering data

The researcher made use of the following steps outlined by Rapmund (2005) and Terre Blanche and Kelly (1999, p. 139-144) in order to obtain the data to be analysed:

- + The research participants were informed of the purposes of the research by way of a letter of information. The researcher then obtained the permission of each of the participants to participate in the study and to also be audiotaped. A copy of the letter of information is included in Appendix A. Copies of the consent forms of participation and consent to be audiotaped are included in Appendix B.
- + The researcher then transcribed the interviews herself so as to ensure the confidentiality of the material. The transcribed interviews have been included in Appendices B, C and D.
- + The researcher then familiarised herself with and immersed herself in the texts generated.
- + The researcher then engaged in a thematising of the each interview transcript on the basis of what stood out for her the most.
- + The researcher thereafter provided a comparative analysis of the experiences of all three participants. Where possible this was related to the surveyed literature.

Principles guiding the categorisation of Data

The actual method of hermeneutic analysis does not have a set of prescribed techniques (Addison in Rapmund, 2005). It rather involves the following steps, delineated by Rapmund (2005) and Terre Blanche and Kelly (1999) to which the researcher adhered:

Step one: Familiarisation and Immersion

During this stage the researcher immersed herself in the texts generated via the one-on-one interview process. In this way she concentrated on the world created by the text (Rapmund, 2005) so that she might try make sense of the world of the child of a Holocaust survivor and become familiar with the way in which they had language their answers and experiences. A careful listening of the corresponding audiocassettes enabled

the researcher to discern the underlying emotional tone of the text (Henning, 2005). The step of familiarisation and immersion can also be said to contain another element, that of unpacking. It involved listing all that came to mind when reading and thinking about the texts the researcher was studying (Terre Blanche & Kelly, 1999). This list of themes thereby enabled the researcher to generate an overall idea of what she had gathered (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999) and later group the themes into broader categories. It was also important that the researcher worked with one participant's story at a time (Henning, 2005) and only later engaged in a comparative analysis, so that each story could be punctuated according to its uniqueness.

Step two: Thematizing

Once the researcher had immersed herself in and become familiar with the interview transcripts so as to better understand the life worlds of her subjects, she attempted to infer themes that underlay the research material (Rapmund, 2005). In order for the researcher to fully grasp the complexity of the experience under investigation she needed to 'unitize' (Krippendorff, 1980) the data: that is to break it down into sampling, recording and context units (Krippendorff, 1980). The sampling unit being the interview transcript that was obtained from the interaction between researcher and second-generation survivor. The sampling units were not independent as far as the phenomenon of interest were concerned, (Krippendorff, 1980) that is, consideration needed to be given to the context in which the interviewee had lived- the experience of growing up with and being raised by a parent or parents, who had endured such an experience. Recording units on the other hand are regarded by Holsti (in Krippendorff, 1980, p. 58) as 'the specific segment of content that is categorised by placing it in a given category' Thus the specific emotive expressions (Eagle, 1998) of the interviewee as well as the thematic units comprising a sentence, a statement or a group of statements (Eagle, 1998) about a particular topic or issue raised by the questions posed comprised the recording units, and subsequent themes. Of final concern with regards to 'unitizing' (Krippendorff, 1980) was the definition of the context units. In relation to this research, these were delineated on the

basis of whether in terms of location, a response was obtained in reply to a leading question (Eagle, 1998) or the use of a probe if deemed necessary by the researcher.

Step three: Coding

The researcher then endeavoured to group similar instances together under the same theme (Rapmund, 2005). This was facilitated by way of coding sections of the interview that were applicable to the themes under consideration (Henning, 2005).

Step four: Elaboration

During this stage the researcher engaged in a closer exploration of the themes that were generated (Rapmund, 2005). She tried to maintain an inquiring stance. This hopefully provided the researcher with deeper insight than was feasible from the original coding system and expanded on incomplete understandings (Rapmund, 2005). It was important that the researcher was able to negotiate between what she read, while taking into account the contexts in which the research subjects found themselves (Rapmund, 2005). It was again important that the researcher had an element of self-consciousness, so that she could consider her own ideas that ultimately had a bearing on data gained and the subsequent analysis and elaboration. Commonly reported arguments and ideas presented in the surveyed literature pertaining to the Holocaust itself, both survivors' and children's' reaction to it, in conjunction with its handling and the impact of such an experience upon the child, could hopefully now be complemented by a text that was able to speak for itself. It is thus hoped that such a thematic analysis did justice both to aspects of the research questions and to concerns of the interviewee- (Eagle, 1998) with the process and subsequent categorisation of data being intuitively guided by the initial research interest- (Eagle, 1998) which aimed to explore the role of the second-generation: Children of Holocaust Survivors, in terms of remembering such a traumatic past.

Step five: Interpretation and Checking

During this stage of data categorisation the researcher tried to relate the final data gained to the original research questions (Rapmund, 2005). This took place by way of a thematic analysis whereby common themes identified were substantiated by way of excerpts from the interview transcripts (Rapmund, 2005).

Conclusion

There can be no substitute for lived experiences, for these carry the gateways through which we will gain insight into another's life world. The stories, which have constituted the lives of Holocaust survivors and their children, cannot in any way be quantified. The measure of the impact of that horrendous period in history can be felt through the voices of those who remain to tell what transpired.

The qualitative research paradigm, the social constructionist epistemology and the hermeneutic method of data analysis form a circle of interpretation. This circle enabled the researcher to see this part of world history both as part of her identity. She was also able to enter into the life world of another with respect and empathy. To this end she became that which Walzer (1987, p. 40) has referred to as the connected critic with the "standards available to her that are internal to the practices and understandings of her own society, and at the same time were properly critical" (Walzer, 1987, p. 40). In this way the knowledge to which the researcher had access also involved an apparent circle, so that that each part could be understood only out of the whole to which it belongs, and vice versa' (Schleiermacher in Van Veuren, 1995).

The history, culture and life shaping events of each participant were given breath through a series of unstructured questions and appropriate elaborations where necessary. The interview transcripts and subsequent data analysis were illustrative of the subjective nature of the study. This is in line with the social constructionist tenet that there is no objective reality out there, waiting to be discovered. One cannot hope to understand the

object or the truth of something in a few sentences and by solely objective methodology. One must therefore be able to take into account all that constitutes the reading and in this way a text or ideology is no longer a separate agent, it becomes a subject. This gives impetus to the role that subjectivity plays in interpretation for ‘in the human sciences life interprets life, so that nothing can be present in the objectifications of life that is not already present in the mental life of the interpreter’ (Van Veuren, 1995, p. 121).

Understanding and eventually critique should be viewed as a melting and a merging of many horizons. For “one’s historical and linguistic situation [in reality] presents no barrier to understanding but is rather the horizon or perspective from which understanding” (Warnke, 1987, p. 82) and subsequent critique of the self, ideology and the texts themselves first become possible.

If only the Nazi’s had a hermeneutic circle of insight available to them, through which they could criticise their own ideology. The lives of many millions of different ethnicities might have been spared. The picture is not entirely bleak for if one immerses themselves in the narratives generated from this era, themes of hope, survival, determination and triumph of the human spirit are ever present.

The themes elicited by way of the interviews held with three members of the second generation are illustrative of this, and find expression in the chapter that follows.

Chapter Four

RESULTS

Provided here is an elaboration of the themes that emerged from the one-on-one interviews that were conducted and subsequent analyses of the interview transcripts. The researcher felt that it was impossible to isolate the theme of ‘memory.’ The title of this piece of research, accords memory a political status. The implication is that its influence is pervasive. The way in which one attends to loss, gives voice to trauma, albeit by remaining silent, constructs one’s identity, interacts in their relationships and makes sense of the world can be perceived as the many rituals of memory.

For the purposes of confidentiality, the research participants’ names have been substituted with pseudonyms.

Sarah’s Story

Introduction

The themes communicated here arose out of the interview held with Sarah. Sarah’s father was a Holocaust survivor, whilst her mother was a refugee from Poland. It is apparent then that both her parents had been displaced from their countries of origin. She appears to have been the child in her family who adopted the role of the ‘curator of such knowledge.’ This has been translated into a need to spread the lessons of the Holocaust and the awareness of the genocides that are still occurring today. To this end she has been instrumental in forming a teaching network that undertakes such projects locally and throughout Africa.

Interview Setting

The interview was conducted at Sarah's workplace, 'The Vulindlela Network' in Cedar Lakes Johannesburg. Sarah warmly greeted the researcher upon her arrival. She provided the researcher with a tour of her workplace, introduced her to a few of her work colleagues and explained the nature of the work that they do. The interview took place in the privacy of Sarah's office. The environment in which the interview took place appeared to be comfortable. This facilitated the co-construction of a meaningful dialogue between Sarah and the researcher.

Holocaust as Part of One's Emerging Culture

It seems that the Holocaust and notions thereof were as intrinsic to Sarah's youth as the very air that she breathed. She relates how the children of survivors are "born to it in many ways." In addition, she places the way in which she was socialised per se in context, by locating herself and her family within the emerging independent State of Israel. It appears that there, the Holocaust formed an integral part of the nation's culture in all spheres. She describes how, "there was always music, sad music, the siren, (sounded throughout the country on certain days to commemorate the six million people who died) everyone is talking about it, the school is doing something about it ...you cannot escape it. It's there and it's there in your consciousness basically from the start." It is ironic to note that those who had survived the death camps were, as Sarah expressed it, "enslaved by the haunting memories of the past, even when they were supposedly free." She says that, "in survivors' families it was clear from quite an early age."

Silence versus Openness

Sarah's knowledge of the Holocaust was gained from persistent questioning of survivors. From the interview however, it would appear that survivors were not forthcoming about their experiences and only spoke about them when pushed for details. The title of this

theme, Silence versus Openness refers to the contrast between the way the survivors chose to deal with the past, as opposed to Sarah's need to verbalise the stories she had been told. Perhaps her father and her uncle's silence was because the horrors they had endured were too awful to speak about. Sarah explains how her father "did not speak when I (she) was youngish." This contrasts with the basic information that was made known to her, such as a "granny that died, aunts that died" (in the Holocaust) As a result she was aware from a young age that what she knew was like an incomplete painting, lacking in details that she was conceivably too young to grasp. "Early childhood details were there but sketchy", she says. Sarah does nevertheless articulate how later in her life, her uncle started to open up and relate very personal accounts through the sharing of both his memoirs and poetry. From this it appears, "that is where a lot of the knowledge was accumulated." Yet in spite of this, there is no clear line between that which remained unspoken and that which was verbalised. As Sarah so poignantly communicated,

There is a lot of stuff I don't know and maybe will never know... My father is dead, my uncle doesn't speak about it or doesn't want to speak about it, so there will be stuff I will never know and I'm accepting that.

This flux then between what is documented on paper per se or etched in the psyche and that which is shaded in darker hues appears to have in part spurred Sarah's quest for knowledge. In a sense, it has provided her with the key to the closed door in the form of questions she unceasingly asks. In this vein she emphasises that. "We don't ask enough. I didn't ask enough, for many years, and now I'm asking too much."

Protection and the Parenting of One's Parent

Intricately tied to the notions of 'silence versus openness,' appears to be a broader overarching theme of 'protection.' Perhaps it was because Sarah's father could not be protected from the horrors of Nazi Germany as a boy, that he endeavoured to protect and shield his young children from the full accounts of what he and his family had actually endured. She says that her father "had nightmares and he was screaming at night." It is

possible that her father, like so many other survivors battled to make sense of what had happened; and as such struggled to relay the details to his young children. Nonetheless, it seems that amidst the nonverbal, Sarah's intuition was heightened. She seems to have felt an intense need to parent her father and also to protect him, to "run after him and ask him if he's alright because I must make it alright." She explains that even though she "didn't know it was going on, she (I) just did it naturally from a very, very young age." There is a further possibility that the notions of protection relating to the Holocaust were carried through into Sarah's parenting of her own children. For she too, does not want to, "give too many details, too soon." Her son "knows that his grandfather was a Holocaust survivor", however she points out that, "I do not say anything to him about Schindler's list," on the basis that she believes he is too young. Conversely, Sarah relates how her older child, a sixteen year old daughter, accompanied her to Poland to join "March of the Living" (an international program, that brings survivors, their children and non survivors together in a march from Auschwitz to Birkenau, - the largest concentration camp complex built in World War 2) in May 2005; to see "the camp where her grandfather was." In some synchronistic way it appears that the adults in Sarah's childhood world along with those in her own children's world have unconsciously decided that age is a prerequisite for exposure to weighty awareness. One cannot place a value judgement on this, since the need to protect and preserve the innocence of the young is easily understood.

The Burdens and Blessings of Identity

Sarah seems to have perfectly captured the complexities of identity. She eloquently articulates that there is great value in the components of which we are comprised, albeit our names, gender or religions. However what she also conveys is that owning one's identity often involves a very painful growing process. She grew up in Israel, where many of her friends were the children of native born Israeli's. As such they escaped the encumbrances that came with having a parent who was a Holocaust survivor. Sarah's awareness of the suffering her father had endured and atrocities he had witnessed, made

her feel compelled in some way to take responsibility for his well being and happiness. Unlike the majority of her peers, whose identities were simply Israeli, Sarah's identity was more complex in that it was comprised of elements that stemmed from those who were persecuted in Eastern Europe. Most significantly, all of the female members of her family were exterminated during World War 2. She recounts that in the second generation, "I was the only girl representing all the women that were murdered." From this it seems logical to infer that as a child, her female identity carried a huge weight. In accordance with the Jewish custom of naming babies after deceased family members, she was given the second name of Helen, "after his (her father's) sister who was sixteen when she was murdered." At the time the name was a huge burden, given the need of children to fit in with their peer groups. She describes how, "as a child, you are hiding the name...in Israel Helen...it's not an Israeli name." Thus in addition to being inescapably linked to the deceased female members of her family, Sarah's second name implied a differentiation, that in a sense prevented her from entirely aligning herself with fellow Israeli born children whose lives were more carefree. Alongside this, she provides insight into what it possibly was like for her brother as the male child. She describes how, "he never understood why she got all the attention and love." However it seems logical to surmise that in the process of Sarah coming to accept her identity and see it as the "blessing" she now does, she was simultaneously able to lift the burden of her brother's identity. She says, "When I explain it to him ... he didn't know and he didn't think about it, it really sets him free a little bit."

On another level however, the knowledge of her family's history enabled her to avoid stereotyping people on the basis of national or ethnic identity. Her family was persecuted and tortured by Germans on the basis of being Jewish. Yet, Oscar Schindler, a non-Jew saved her father and her uncle on the very same rationale. "Schindler was a German," and while many Jewish survivors and non-survivors vehemently equated everything German with Nazism, Sarah's family regarded Schindler as a saviour and hero. Sarah says, "because Schindler came and Schindler saved (my) her father". With this awareness she was able to reframe the notion of identity or a label, in the belief that "not everyone is bad or good...people have choices, Schindler had a choice."

In a very real way it seems that the multi-faceted identity that Sarah carries has empowered her with the sense of purpose that motivates the interracial, non-denominational healing and teaching projects which have become her life's work.

Intellectualising versus Understanding

In the wake of such epic catastrophe, it is conceivable that those left with the task of making sense of it, would start with that which was recounted by those who survived. Sarah appears to be no different. She chose history as one of her school and university subjects, on the basis that she, "was trying to learn more...finding out more details...and building more of a knowledge base." This need for intellectual knowledge to underpin experiential understanding, may further elucidate her chosen career path. She "taught Holocaust studies at the College of Education" and "in the last years is lecturing a lot about it, reading a lot about it." Her brother evidenced similar leanings, there was "a period in his twenties where he tried to learn everything and know everything" and after a period of twenty years when he was disinterested has again started taking an interest. Sarah does however caution that this is not a phenomenon that occurs across the second generation of survivors, nor "does it happen exactly the same, even in the same family...my cousin is also not interested or shows very limited interest."

Being equipped with first hand factual accounts, augmented by the study of historical fact does not necessarily enable the reality of what had happened to be adequately internalised. Intellectualising on the one hand pitted against truly understanding on the other, appears to be a many layered process. Sarah captured the essence of this conflict when she expressed how,

You go to Auschwitz and you stand there and you think that if you'll go to Poland you'll understand more and you'll absolutely get it and it will be in colour it will not be black and white and if anything it's opposite, because it's so... the sheer size of everything...even though I'm a Holocaust scholar or you know I speak about it and I supposedly know a lot about it I know very little, because it was, it is very detailed and it is huge and enormous and many times you feel it is so big.

Can you know everything? No, you cannot know everything? I don't think the greatest professors in the subject know everything. And that is on the one level. Also on the level of suffering there is no ways that I can know what my father went through. No ways, I can hear the stories, I go to Poland and see where he was born, see where he worked in this concentration camp and where he was tortured in that concentration camp but still, there is no way, I don't feel it. I, I was protected I was born in Israel, I live here I have a privileged life. So there's no way, no way you can really grasp it.

It is further pertinent to note that this so-called grasping of suffering does not seem, for Sarah to be limited to the genocide of World War Two. Granted, she would, "go and stand in Auschwitz and see the ash, see the crematoriums and (you) she didn't get it" but her journey has continued as she explains how, "I was in Rwanda last year and I don't get it. You know I stand in a church and I see four thousand skulls and bones and I still don't get it."

Coming to grips with suffering in any form, does not appear to be effortless. Whether one relies on the process of rationalisation or tries to access the deepest of human understanding, it seems to be a phenomenon that will continuously elude our grasp. Perhaps then one also has to live with 'not knowing' as frustrating as that might seem.

Frustration Inciting Healing

It seems that coupled with an intense desire to understand what had happened to her family, is a sense of frustration that the world has not learnt from the atrocities of the past. Sarah grounds us in the present with her opinion on how

you turn on the radio here and you hear that in Delmas, that is half an hour from here, people are dying from typhoid and we are in South Africa in 2005...How dare we stand by and not rush there with water...we as human beings are struggling to learn the lessons.

However whilst this sense of frustration has the potential to render one helpless, hope still survives. Thus whilst it may “be impossible to be involved in everything” and to save the entire world as it were, Sarah’s own conviction to make some sort of difference has perhaps been born out of her own background. She has recognised the “need and the urgency to do more.”

This need to heal and to make things better not only for one’s own family members but for others as well, is a recurrent theme that Sarah has seen played out in those close to her. She surmises how

a lot of Holocaust survivors’ sons and daughters are in the fields of healing and of trying to do something, teaching a lot...even Math teachers, it doesn’t really matter but they are in the teaching and healing or people’s sort of avenues,

because as she so beautifully encapsulates, “that is the need of so many of us, to change it somehow.” For whilst they were not able to prevent their parents from enduring such horrors, they have the power to help others today.

Thus one might infer that for Sarah, only remembering the Holocaust is simply not enough. It is the way in which one uses their knowledge to the benefit of others that really counts.

The Instillation of Values out of the Darkness- Facilitating Survival

It would seem reasonable to expect that someone who had been subject to such horrors and torture as Sarah’s father had been, would emerge from his ordeals with hate and bitterness. She concedes that her father underwent immense trauma, and describes how “one of his tasks at one of the camps was to...open the mass grave and to take the bodies out and burn them.” At this juncture it seems feasible to postulate how it is possible for such a person see any goodness in the world, to survive and carry on? Yet, in stark

contrast, like the immortal words of Anne Frank, who wrote in her diary that; “In spite of everything, I still believe that people are really good at heart” (van der Rol & Verhoeven, 1993, p. xi), Sarah’s father, “in spite of everything, still believed that people are really good at heart”. This was a principle which he passed on to his children, and Sarah acknowledges that these “values were very much instilled verbally and nonverbally to us as children and honesty and integrity and not vengeance were very much there.” Such values then might be conceptualised as forming the building blocks of a new life within a new country. His belief that people have choices was something, which Sarah’s father applied to both his life and those of his family. Whilst he had undoubtedly “suffered at the hands of the Germans”, he had also been saved by one. In his freedom years, he then “worked in a German company in Israel.” Thus for Sarah “this is nonverbal, this is a value where you don’t generalise and you say, you know we have to build something together, and this is very powerful.”

Sarah has also been able to make sacred spaces for the instillation of values within her own family unit such as the “side of social responsibility and our role in what you do after the Holocaust and...your responsibility in South Africa.”

Therefore the taking of a disaster and reframing it in terms of lessons and life principles is something that resonated throughout the interview with Sarah.

Loss

Loss is a theme that seems to permeate the text both at content and a process level. It is communicated both in Sarah’s words and in the silent way in which she holds the experiences of her family. Loss is thus not limited to loss alone but weaves its way into many different facets of the narrative that Sarah shared.

Her father was robbed of his innocence at age fourteen, when he was separated from the vast majority of his family and taken to a concentration camp. Here he was “beaten up, (had) no dignity, starving, hunger, saw people dying, shot...so definitely not a normal upbringing.” Loss in his life shifted between the emotional and the physical. Every female member of his family was murdered, thereby leaving him and his brother to fend for themselves. Therefore any potential for a livelihood in the country of their birth was lost. As a consequence with only “a few dishes, plates and clothes” they made their way to Israel. Sarah’s mother too epitomises ‘loss of the familiar,’ for though she was not a Holocaust survivor, she was nevertheless still a refugee from Poland who came to Israel. There is also a sense of loss in that which Sarah verbalised. Whilst it would be impossible to precisely define what constitutes a normal childhood, Sarah’s youth seems to have been fraught with its own complexities. Her father and his family had endured such an ordeal that there was no conceivable way they could have emerged, “unscarred so their parenting could not have been normal.” Her intense need to take care of her father, and later her mother when her father died, in a sense robbed her of a carefree time when all your childlike needs are catered for. Thus whilst Sarah was aware that her presence in this world was a gift, the gift itself carried a huge price- a reminder to her parents that they had survived whilst others had perished. So perhaps then part of the joy that a child is capable of giving others was depleted. This desire to care for her father might also have been spurred by a desperation to gain access to a part of her father’s world to which she was denied access, for her “father did not speak” and so she cared for him “from a very, very young age.”

It is nevertheless important to contrast the notion of loss with that of the immense abundance of love and warmth, which Sarah describes as being characteristic of her family- a climate that her parents endeavoured to create against the backdrop of intense struggle.

Conclusion

Sarah epitomises the belief that the teachings of the Holocaust are not a means to an end but rather a beginning. She has been inspired by the enlightenment of her father. She regards Oscar Schindler as a righteous individual. She takes this humanity and uses it to facilitate healing and dialogue. She has endeavoured to transmit such values to her own children.

Bill's Story

Introduction

The themes that follow are based on an interview held with Bill, whose parents are both Holocaust survivors. Bill appears to have a need to both connect with and distance himself from this part of his heritage. He feels as if the details of the Holocaust are something that he intuitively knows, without necessarily having to read or be narrated to about them. He is a judge by profession and acknowledges that, "Every judicial officer is informed by your own human and life experiences... no judge sees things exactly the same way as another judge sees it. And I will see it through a Jewish lens, a Jewish Holocaust lens." He thereby acknowledges the context from which he comes as painful as such a recurrent realisation often proves to be.

Interview Setting

The interview took place in Bill's home in Glenhazel, Johannesburg. Bill and his wife greeted the researcher upon her arrival. The researcher and Bill sat in Bill's lounge. Bill appeared to be quite curious as to the nature of the research as well the researcher's motivation for conducting the research. The researcher provided Bill with the letter of information, and told him about herself in relation to her Jewish background, her current course of study as well as her interest in the topic of study. This conversation appeared to enhance the trust between Bill and the researcher, and yield a thought provoking and meaningful dialogue for both parties.

Silence and Openness leading to Disconnection, Acknowledgment and Ambivalence

Both of Bill's parents were Holocaust survivors. The phenomenon of open remembrance was not universal in his household. He relates how:

My mother spoke, my father didn't speak. He was in concentration camps. She was in various ghettos throughout the war but he was in Dachau he didn't speak much. My mother did most of all the speaking in fact, most of the speaking.

It appears that what began as a curiosity about his mother's background transformed into a frustration as stories of the Holocaust were served for "Breakfast, supper and lunch." His own attitude towards speaking about the Holocaust is in some way a mirror of his father's stillness and his mother's frankness. The contrasting forces in Bill's life are apparent as he relates his interactions with his father:

I used to ask him and then he would tell me, some pieces of information but he wouldn't... to the point that you don't really know too much about your family even, he wouldn't tell you too much, he's suppressing all these things you see.

His mother by comparison did not edit or censor the realities that she had experienced. When a young Bill questioned her as to the absence of extended family members she would candidly say, "Well they were killed in the War... died in the war, murdered by the Germans."

It is possible that amidst such a confusing mix of messages Bill developed his own ambivalence towards the subject. There was a time in his life when he was enveloped by "anger and annoyance" at the Germans. He attempts to prevent such painful feelings from emerging by gravitating towards a more, "objective view of the Holocaust...as a very empirical subject." However even he, as the rationale man, adjudicating over the destinies of others, cannot divorce himself from the personal imports of the Holocaust. He tries not to watch too many war related documentaries and will choose an art museum over a Holocaust memorial. Yet he acknowledges, "I know too much and it brings up the pain, it brings up an uncomfortable sort of feeling."

As a Jew, he feels imposed upon to remember; and because he has heard the stories, "repeated so frequently and it's different permutations as the years go on," he is "tired of it, to say the least." Consequently he reports that he has "no particular desire to go on any of these current tours that go off to Auschwitz to learn of my roots." The wall that Bill tries to erect between him and the Holocaust is not impermeable. It is likely that he also experiences a sense of guilt over needing to protect himself from the impact of his

environment and history for, “it does impair or effect your emotional state, your psychological state.”

The ambivalent patterns of silence and openness that manifest through Bill may also be a function of his feeling marginalised. The impact of the Holocaust on the survivors themselves has been at the centre of Bill’s emotional world. The impact of the Holocaust on him as part of the post-Holocaust generation has not been given a voice. He likens his mother and her survivor friends to “Joan’s of Arc or martyrs...specialising in dramatising...expressing it, drawing attention to themselves.” This seems to frustrate him as the survivors tend to “concentrate on their experiences...don’t have a holistic picture of what’s going on...it’s only their experience essentially and they treat them as if that is the total Jewish experience.”

The struggle in finding his voice has also become a battle with regards to integrating the Holocaust into his identity. Those members of the Jewish community who hearken back to on unrelated occasions aggravate him. He is aware of the gravity of the event and feels that such rambling “erodes the integrity, or the ability of people to understand how serious an event it is, you undermining it, taking something away from it and using it for the wrong purposes.” The question of how the Holocaust could be utilised for the “right” purposes remains.

Despite professing insensitivity and disconnection, Bill on some level is aware of the strength and understanding that the Holocaust has imbued his life with. The need to see justice done, an attentiveness to the struggles of South Africa’s oppressed and an insight into the effects of discrimination all inform his professional practice. He is also not so desensitised that the travesty of an event such as the “Katlehong massacre [where] fifteen young boys were decapitated and disembowelled” does not haunt him. It is probable that such encounters will always have personal resonance as he likens those photographs to the “photographs you see when the Allied forces invaded the concentration camps [where] the bodies are dropping.” The understandable discrepancy however is that it is easier to connect with the details of an event being related in his court than it is with the

details of his Jewish history for he, “immediately switch(es) off... become(s) quite cynical... say(ing), look well it’s overkill.”

Loss and Detachment

Bill in some respects was no different than the children of other Holocaust survivors. Family dynamics were such that “you didn’t have the grandparents, you didn’t have the big broad family circle.” Had he been raised in a country predominated by survivors, perhaps such an overt occurrence would not have been quite so obvious. There was an acute awareness that his family was different and that an extended cohesiveness was missing for he expresses:

Your family tree goes a bit short...you as a child are aware of it in a sense that you see other South African families, you know this one’s a cousin of that one, this one’s related to that one, everybody’s here brothers, sisters, uncles and the grandparents. You were aware of that and that I remember quite clearly, I couldn’t relate to a grandparent, there are no grandparents, so you couldn’t, this idea of bobba, zaida is foreign. I could never understand how a grandchild felt sort of a strong attachment let’s say to a grandparent, something I don’t really know about.

It is likely that the part of his history to which he might have wanted access, was denied. There were no family elders to consult or gravesites to visit. This sense of loss might also have been perpetuated by his father’s silence, who felt that his “children mustn’t be exposed to this sort of thing.” Bill’s father had also endured losses of his own of which Bill appeared unsure. He relates that, “you didn’t know too much about his family, you didn’t know too much about, I believe that he may have been married at the time of the war; I think his wife may have disappeared.” Bill’s father had forever internalised such losses and chosen not to give them voice. He had lost the potential of fulfilling his dreams with another, so how could he bring such pain into a present demanding survival? It is possible then that Bill never felt completely in touch with or attached to his father, a man who had been detached from all that he knew.

If Bill never knew what it was like to relate to or experience love for a grandparent, then a similar occurrence can be discerned with his own children. He experiences his mother as cloaked in a coat of coldness with “an inability to really form these strong, sort of close relationships with her children, grandchildren. She doesn’t form these types of relationships... to her grandchildren she doesn’t relate.” This seems to sadden Bill. Unlike him, his children have a living, surviving grandmother from whom they could gain so much. Yet she is lost to them and in her psyche carries the message, “don’t always assume that life is so pleasant that everyone has everybody.” She was cruelly and eternally separated from her parents early on. She lost her home, places of education and worship, her sense of safety, structure and predictability and innocence early on; in the shadow of all that she had to disconnect and survive. To regain that sense of connection with post-Holocaust generations is apt to be an unimaginable task. Bill was able to sense the burden that his mother carries, one which in his eyes has not rendered her a fully functional person. She is likened to a:

Car battery where you have six cells and one of the cells is somehow a bit dead, so you functioning on five cells, it’s not getting full power...there’s a disconnect a little bit, which I’ve always felt was, to me seems like an emotional, which I call the battery, that cell seems a bit dead.

Survival, Pride and Pain

In losing all that one had and everything that was familiar, one had to equip oneself with means of survival. Many were only able to escape death by means of assuming a new non-Jewish identity. Bill’s mother owes part of her survival to her music professor who, “managed to procure her release with false papers.” Survival also meant discarding practices that had been an integral part of religious Jewish life. Bill illustrates how:

Till about four years old, till I went to nursery school my parents never lit Shabbos candles for example and I went to nursery school and told my mother, “Why is it that everybody else lights candles?” and she started lighting candles since then.

In assimilating into the culture of a new country, it is likely that Bill's parents were initially fearful to reclaim their religious affiliation. This was however short-lived with the family becoming "members of a shul and...celebrat(ing) all the festivals."

There was much left behind in Poland by Bill's parents, but there was a great deal that they carried with them. Bill vividly remembers his mother:

Waking up oh shouting and screaming in the night and my father having to calm her down. And I remember as a kid... what's going on over there all of a sudden, shouting in her room, it was just her having sort of nightmares.

The impact of such recurrences appears to have greatly affected Bill. On one level he recognises that his mother has been unable to cope by "normal" means as, "she's taken sleeping tablets to this very day, she never falls asleep without tablets, I mean I think she is a tablet addict." On another level, he seems to have a profound need to portray his mother as "a very capable survivor." This need is generalised to his portrayal of the second generation as "to a large extent very successful. You won't find too many that are not professionals." This urge might in part explain Bill's overall struggle to engage with material related to the after effects of the Holocaust. He is both unaware of how his life would have been different had his parents not been subjected to the Holocaust, and sometimes painfully aware of the subtle and profound ways it has influenced his life. It has enabled him to "somehow cope with life" and provided him with what he regards as a "more compassionate insight very often, but also an ability to... see things in a much more objective and perhaps fair way."

Conclusion

Bill has created for himself a protective casing around the subject of the Holocaust. He approaches it tentatively and with a solemn respect. Whilst he does not state it overtly, it is possible that he would like a re-authoring of the narratives that have been prominent in his life. Knowledge of pure facts is safe and devoid of associated pain. It is likely that he

will move towards a place of integration where the coping mechanisms he has derived are seen as emerging out of the emotional darkness.

Eli's Story

Introduction

The following themes are based on an interview conducted with Eli, a documentary filmmaker. She has made it her calling to travel around the world, collecting post war, post Holocaust stories. It was interesting to observe how she jumped between the general details of another's life and the specific moments related to her own throughout her interview, never dwelling too long on the personal. It is likely that the work she does is cathartic, enabling her to connect with her own experiences, as painful and sweet as they may be.

Interview Setting

The interview took place in the apartment of Eli's relative in Killarney, Johannesburg. The researcher was welcomed into the lounge, where she was introduced to Eli's mother, who is a Holocaust survivor. Eli and her mother explained the nature of their visit to South Africa, with regards to interviewing survivors and their families for the documentary they are producing. Eli and the researcher sat in the privacy of a separate section of the flat. The conversation between the researcher and Eli appeared to flow quite easily as Eli spoke of her work, her family and the impact of her Holocaust lineage upon her.

The Need for Distance

Whilst there was never one specific event, which made Eli aware of the events of the Holocaust, it was something of which she was acutely and intuitively aware. It filled the spaces and experiences of her everyday life. She recalls a pertinent moment when she witnessed her mother breakdown in sobs and exclaim, "You're my flesh and blood, you're my daughter, you understand me." Amidst the pressure of such emotional intensity Eli has had to find a way to manoeuvre for distance, thereby maintaining her

sanity and sense of control. The work she does documenting the lives and experiences of others serves as such an instrument. Upon embarking on her current project she had decided, “I wasn’t really going to involve my family.” The personal is too painful. Whilst Eli and her team have managed to capture the stories of countless families, unearthing the impact the Holocaust has had on her generation has been arduous. She relates that they “have fifty hours worth of South America and my sister actually participated...that was very difficult, I couldn’t do that.” Eli has developed her own way of coping. She endeavours to “channel all these very negative and desperate feelings into something positive” lest the impact of the Holocaust drive her away from her own origins.

Silence versus Openness

Eli was raised in an environment and culture where the lines between permitted and taboo conversation were blurred. Words such as, “Why can’t you put a lid on this, forget about this, move forward, nobody’s interested, nobody cares, nobody wants to know” were easily brandished. Her mother and so many other Holocaust survivors came to countries like South America, to escape Nazi persecution and create new lives for themselves. The overarching belief was that if you never spoke about what had transpired, then your chances of leading a ‘normal’ life were maximised. This imposed silence has carried through into the psyche and thoughts of so many second generation members who say, “enough already, people are tired of hearing us say that we’re complaining, people want to hear the rosy side...” Eli has adopted a counterstrategy, both within her own family and the outside world, for she has seen how the need to not “want to be associated with any of it... has carried through the family.” She has met with resistance both internally and relationally. In documenting the stories of other families she has often been unsure of how her work to include many generations would be met. Whilst preparing to interview a grandmother in Sao Paolo, she found herself in a room filled with the woman’s grandchildren. She remarked how, “suddenly I was paralysed, I thought, Oh my G-d what do I do? If I ask this woman you know... why would the children know anything about it... I thought the grandma would jump up and strangle me.” Yet Eli was flabbergasted at

how much these children actually knew, because the facts as experienced by their grandmother had not been hidden from them.

It appears in a sense to have been easier for Eli to elicit openness in the families of others as opposed to her own. There has been a myriad of things that she has wanted to make sense of, and yet she is aware of the havoc that such openness can wreak, as the boundaries of silence and family rules are infringed upon. She relates how there was an incident in her own family that “absolutely tore us apart.” It is possible that Eli felt she had no one within her own family system with whom she could truly be open about what she was experiencing. The moment that she chose “to break away from it ... was very difficult.” Her family seems to have reacted with suspicion and anger, “Who’s this woman, we don’t know her... oh you go to a psychiatrist who changes your mind and has terrible influences on you and tries to break you away from the family.” An outsider was perceived to be the enemy. He and his influences were not seen as a means towards opening the family up to healing.

Eli’s struggle of negotiating between silence and openness on some level seems to be a lonely one. When her daughter was diagnosed as battling with Anorexia Nervosa, “no member of my family would accept it... and my mother-in-law she wanted to keep it secretive.” This battle has conversely imbued Eli with empathy and intuition, sensitising her to the pain of others, enabling her to “tune into it very quickly.”

Eli appears to realise that she cannot be prescriptive about how one deals with family history. She wavers between wanting the silence broken and being a standard barer of that very silence for, “that is not the kind of conversation that you have socially.” Some might have “promised my granny I would not speak”, whilst others are “dying to talk, bursting to talk.”

The profundity of this ambivalence is captured in the words of one of Eli’s interview subjects, “I realise now how important it is to know where you come from... maybe some people felt that by not telling their children they would be protecting them but they not...

so in fact the biggest protection you can give your children and family is to know where you come from, is to know where your roots are.”

The Generational Legacy of the Holocaust

Eli dispels the myth that one has to be verbally told about something to have intimate knowledge of it. The impact that the Holocaust has had on the children and grandchildren of survivors both within Eli’s own family and those of her interview subjects is tangible. Eli’s brother-in-law “never wanted to talk about being Jewish... because he didn’t know that he was Jewish until he was sixteen. His three year old son was nonetheless intuitive and “sensing that his aunty was very open about it...” asked her “what a concentration camp was and he also asked what a rabbi was.” Perhaps this is one of the nuances contained within the name of Eli’s project deemed, “Forever After.” A member of the second or third generation does not necessarily need to have “in depth information of what happened... it will be ingrained in the family’s DNA, there’s no way that in many generations to come, they won’t look back and say, that’s my prominence, that’s where I come from.”

Whilst Eli may recognise the knowledge inherent in the hands of post Holocaust generations, the theme of silence is also transmitted from survivors to their children and in turn to the grandchildren. She reconstructs the story of a seven-year-old girl, the granddaughter of a survivor, who was hesitant to admit she knew anything or conversed with her friends about the Holocaust. When she finally spoke, the revelation was overwhelming,

Well we speak about it all, we speak about starving and being scared and people coming after us and not having our parents and you know many of our friends grandparents are survivors and sufferers who were persecuted, so, but it’s a secret, nobody knows that we discussed this, its between ourselves, it’s a big secret.

Eli has come into contact with so many second generation parents who when asked, “do your children know anything... always say, well I don’t think so, maybe a little bit, but not much, I don’t think they know anything.”

It is against this backdrop that her work seems to have become a catalyst for healing and open dialogue across the generations, as one second generation member remarked

The Holocaust will impact my entire family forever, there's no way it can't be forever, and now I'm going to take all my children, I'm going to go to Czechoslovakia, cos I had no idea that they cared this much, that they were this interested and I will go on that journey of the past.

Parenting the Parents

Eli was the first child born to her parents after the Holocaust. It is as though she feels that her role has been to parent and protect those who should have nurtured and raised her. She seems to feel that this was a role thrust upon her, robbing her of the freedom to be a child. She appears to identify with and see herself in the stories of many second generation members who occupied and continue to fulfil the same function, “she was actually parenting her parents, probably from the beginning, as many of us did, but still parenting her parents...” On a rational level, Eli understands how it is that she became a surrogate parent to her mother and father for “most of us grew up... without uncles and aunts, we had no grandparents and most of us really had no one, nothing.” It is likely that she felt like a substitute for all whom were lost but in the process reports that she “had no childhood.” She renders her wounds around this sensitive area visible, through her work with others and a sincere dialogue. Whilst she in respect of her parents reports that, “I don't mean to hurt them,” it is possible that she derives catharsis from the exploration of this life facet. She expresses how, “very early on, I was trying to fill an emotional need and even though my father was not a survivor, he was still very emotionally needy so I sort of tried to fill in what was missing...”

If Eli had taken on the role of a parent, then the childhood ‘responsibilities’ of playing, being spontaneous and hours of laughter and imagination could not simultaneously exist alongside the adult world as she “had to grow up very quickly” and “was the one who,

G-d forbid anything happened, had to know where all the money was, how to administrate, how to look out for them... [so that she] might always be available in case they might need [her].”

Loss of Identity versus Need for Recognition

If Eli had to parent her parents, it is plausible that the child with dreams and aspirations temporarily had to be shelved. Her identity became one of the “child of survivors.” She appears to have engaged in a lifelong struggle between asserting who she was and what she needed and protecting her parents from “the grief that it would cause [them]” should anything happen to her. There is a sense of resentment in her at a world in which there were “never any aspirations for [her].” She was presented with double messages and hence immobilised.

I was told, yes, there were aspirations for me but as long as I did everything else for everyone else then I could do whatever I wanted... so by that time I had no more energy to do anything or if I did it, it was a huge sacrifice...

She has endeavoured to transform that role, in the here and now viewing herself as both activist and rebel.

It seems that it is only now that Eli feels as if she has been able to actualise her identity and destiny. She captures this journey by expressing, “I’m fifty-one now, it’s a long time I’ve been struggling, struggling a long time.” She attributes her artistic abilities and creative spark to her father and yet somehow feels that he prevented her canvas from being coloured. She had “wanted to be a filmmaker quite early on and they, they persuaded me that I would starve to death...” There is a strong feeling of entitlement and protectiveness over that, which Eli regards as her own, further translated into a need for recognition. She could not further her education, as she was needed elsewhere. She emphasises that

I learnt for myself basically I'm self-taught, I read books on how to make films, on how to be a producer and how to do fundraising and how to fund films, I mean basically I'm self taught, I had all the books you would get at school because I couldn't attend school.

Whilst Eli reports that she is the happiest she has ever been, the battle between choosing what she needs and respecting her parents' wishes is ever present. She has merged the identity of a filmmaker with that of a second generation member. She recognises the amazing narrative inherent in her parents' story of survival and meeting and has wanted to give it voice. This has at times been overshadowed by an intense need for recognition from her parents. Her younger brother and sister were perceived as, "brilliant...the professional...not for the home...too clever...[as] going to make a great career..." whereas her aspirations have been met with resistance for if "others do it, it's marvellous but if I their daughter does it, it's too personal." It is likely that she wants to make an impact on her family, lest she be forgotten. Her need to be included in the contract that her parents had with a young journalist writing their story is indicative of this.

Born of her struggles, Eli has contrastingly been imbued with a need to give her daughter the space and opportunity to pursue her goals. Eli and her daughter work closely. Her daughter had not accompanied her on this trip since, "She wanted to go to business school" and so Eli said to her, "You go and do your thing and I'll do this, there are plenty of people to help me and you must do exactly what you want to do."

Perhaps the above discussion of identity and recognition exists on the metaphoric level. There is another more literal layer, pertaining to the lives of survivors and their families, which warrants discussion.

Eli was 'fortunate' in that her Jewish ethnicity was consistent with the way her parents raised her with regards to the traditions, customs and rituals that were transmitted to her. Others whom she interviewed were not as lucky. Many grew up feeling a connection to something of which they weren't sure they were even a part. That segment of the second

and even third generation have thereby engaged in a “searching...searching for that part...desperately searching,” perhaps never fully understanding the risk their grandparents and parents took to baptise their children, lest the entire family be slaughtered. This theme is so beautifully captured in the words of a third generation member whom Eli interviewed:

You know I really wanted to be Jewish, ever since I was a little girl, even though my mother is Catholic and so I really shouldn't be Jewish, I really wanted to be Jewish and when I was five, my mother wanted me to be baptised and I didn't want to be baptised. I said mom I don't want to be baptised, I want to be Jewish, can I wait till I'm older to make up my mind?" And then she turned ten, and to please her mother she got baptised. And she said, "Well I really don't feel anything towards the Catholic Church." So I said to her, "Well what if you know, married a Jewish man, would you convert?" and she said "Ag there's no doubt" she said, "I feel Jewish, I feel Jewish, I have three Jewish grandparents, survivors, my entire family has been wiped out." And I said to her but, "Can you explain to me, why it's so important, why it's something, can you verbalise why it's important for you to be Jewish, and try give it some thought." And of course I knew why, but I didn't want to put the words into her mouth, I wanted to let her come out, and she came out with it and said, "Well, my entire family was wiped out, so this is my way of saving them.

When the familial bridge between openness and silence allows both forms of communication to simultaneously travel, as opposed to either or, then maybe the second generation and thereafter will experience identity integration. It is impossible to make value judgements as to the correctness of hiding one's identity. It is probable that the survivors who left Europe retained their non-Jewish identities out of fear of further persecution or being ostracised. "On her dying day..."a grandmother whom her grandchildren knew as Catholic asked for a Jewish burial. The grandchildren were unable to relate to this request and she was laid to rest in the family mausoleum. This occurrence seems to have constantly haunted one of Eli's interviewees. His grandmother's request was more complex than he realised for as Eli related to him, "she wanted to leave you a legacy... if you can't be who you are in life, and death at least if somebody comes searching they know who you are, what your identity is." The place of burial and the associated mourning rituals would serve as the ultimate sign of recognition.

Conclusion

Eli will continue to make sense of her world and where she comes from through the work that she does. The stories of others have become and are her story. She has found many kindred spirits amongst those who have similarly struggled between silence and openness and the claiming of one's identity. Her work sensitises us to the multigenerational impact of the Holocaust. She has been able to facilitate open dialogue amongst generations so that remembrance occurs in open forums.

Concluding Comment

The themes identified are in no absolute or to be taken as representative of every post-Holocaust generation's experience. Such themes developed in the interaction and dialogue between the second generation members and the researcher. It is understandable that this was painful subject matter with personal significance for both interviewees and interviewer. Each research participant has had many life experiences that have informed their thinking. The Holocaust as made sense of by them, is one such event. It can therefore not be taken as the sum total of their emotional world. This is but one strand in their systemic tapestry.

The original awareness that one's parents and people had endured such devastation is likely to have come as a shock. How one made sense of such information is determined by free choice, environment, societal messages, familial involvement, support, education and the like. For some it has been easier to distance themselves from such knowledge as Bill indicates, "I'll buy books but I won't read them." For others the search for comprehension and puzzle pieces has become a life long quest. There can be no value judgement. As the researcher I may proclaim that for me it is better to remember. I cannot impose this injunction on another. Remembrance may be both a silent or open act. Some may write the stories of the Holocaust down, others may choose to represent such events in film, photographs or sculpture. Whereas numerous others may simply choose to carry what they know and feel in their hearts and minds.

Comparative Analysis

Introduction

The practice of deconstructing and comparing the stories of each participant has much import. We are made aware of the socially constructed world of shared meaning making (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). As researchers and therapists we are called upon to place greater emphasis on context, the social constructions of individuals, groups and problems and on the formulation of narratives with the appreciation that ours is a storied reality (Becvar & Becvar, 2006).

The self is seen, not as an isolated, autonomous creature, but is rather constructed in relationship to others (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). The relationship that the second generation in their formative years, had with their parents would lay the foundation for the relationship they would have with the Holocaust. Personified, the Holocaust would serve as both an enemy and an educator.

Hass (1990) notes that a large portion of survivors experienced the murder of immediate and extended family members. Many lost a spouse or children. Some were fortunate enough to have retained a sibling or a parent. The war and consequent persecution caught people at different ages and developmental phases. These variables combined to shape not only the survivor's reactions during the war, but also the manner of their future parenting.

In attempting to provide a comparative analysis of common themes across interviews the following must be noted: The second generation do not constitute a homogeneous population. The perceptions, cognitions, emotions and histories that each are composed of are unique in constituting their life worlds and realities. Whilst reference may be made to a particular subject's life, this is solely for the purposes of illustration. It cannot be taken as a necessary representation of the other participants. The tendency has been to view the second generation through a psychopathologic lens (Solkoff, 1992). They

however reject this observation, preferring to both acknowledge the Holocaust's impact and imbue that which they struggled with, with elements of hope and persistence.

Central themes chosen form a circle of experience as each is linked to the other. The themes of identity, silence and openness, loss, the exploration of the parent child relationship and survival find their expression in the experiences, the culture and considerations of each participant, as well as in terms of what the researcher brings to the process.

.....

Presented here is a diagrammatic representation of the themes that emerged from the analysis of the interview transcripts. The table is intended to illustrate similarities and differences between each interviewee's experiences. While certain themes, may not have been overtly discussed in each of the participants' analyses, the researcher felt that in totality they resonated throughout, were seen as coinciding and hence warranted discussion. Furthermore, while the naming of certain themes grouped together appears to be different the researcher believed that there was a correlation between them.

	Sarah	Bill	Eli
Themes	Holocaust as Part of One's Emerging Culture		The Generational Legacy of the Holocaust
	Silence versus Openness	Silence and Openness leading to Disconnection, Acknowledgment and Ambivalence	Silence versus Openness
	Protection and the Parenting of One's Parent		Parenting the Parents
	The Burdens and Blessings of Identity		Loss of Identity versus Need for Recognition
	Intellectualising vs. Understanding		The Need for Distance

	Sarah	Bill	Eli
	Frustration Inciting Healing		
	Loss	Loss and Detachment	
	The Instillation of Values out of the Darkness- Facilitating Survival	Survival, Pride and Pain	

A Holocaust Culture

Hass (1990) maintains that the psychological after affects of Holocaust survivors' trauma are in some manner reflected in the attitudes, perceptions and fears of their offspring. Hoffman (2005) similarly argues that in spite of the survivor parents' most admirable intentions, regardless of the precise means of communication, the survivors carried with them an emotional weight, which was transmitted to their children very directly. This multigenerational transmission of trauma (Bowen, 1978) was perhaps coupled with the inability of the child to adequately differentiate themselves from their families of origin (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999) and create a unique identity (Wardi, 1992). Sarah, Bill and Eli all appear to have recollections of the nightmares their parents had. Kellerman (2001c) states that children of Holocaust survivors were prone to vividly associate about the Holocaust, becoming vicariously traumatised by their parents' horrific experiences, though they themselves had no first hand experience of it. Krell et al. (2003) similarly remarks that some had Holocaust related dreams themselves having absorbed sufficient imagery to produce their own nightmares. Hoffman (2005) aptly points out that whereas the parents themselves had directly experienced the horrors of war, and could grapple with the phenomenon as actuality, the children would receive this knowledge initially as a kind of fable. Nonetheless the absence of an extended family in each of their lives went far in terms of reminding them that they were being raised in the aftermath of such devastation. Eli was aware of the all-encompassing fear her parents held. She was drawn into this atmosphere and served as their protector. Sarah's home albeit a reportedly happy and nurturing environment was not without its struggles. Her father had lost all the

female members of his family and he and his wife were both refugees in the State of Israel. Sarah, it seems was intuitively aware of the tensions inherent in a culture of both mourning and survival. Bill would receive his grounding in what the Holocaust was, from his mother. His father's life was always to be shrouded in some mystery. Children of survivors would become part of the Holocaust culture in each of their homes and in turn would create their own, with regards to the roles they would occupy, how they chose to remember and the meaning they would attach to this part of their Jewish history. The dominant culture of which they were apart as Corey (2001) notes perpetuates viewpoints, processes, stories and traditions. This would have implications for the education and customs of subsequent generations- grandchildren and great grandchildren of Holocaust survivors.

Bill indicates that his children like him, have been told his mother's story innumerable. While the Holocaust permeated each angle of his childhood existence, he has endeavoured to colour his own family's world with other discourses. Sarah on the other hand undertook projects of her own in order to learn as much as she could about the Holocaust. Conway (1991) notes that such a determination is motivated by a desire to learn all possible lessons for the future, so that the Jewish people, and indeed humankind, should never have to experience again such a nightmare. This desire for knowledge has created a culture of learning amongst Sarah's children. The Holocaust according to her is not to be studied for "Holocaust's sake." She travels to war torn regions such as Rwanda in the hope that out of the darkness of genocide, a culture of forgiveness and concern for one's fellow man may be instilled. Eli similarly has visions for the generalisation of her work to other fields aside from the Holocaust. Children of survivors willingly or unwittingly become students of the Holocaust. Like their parents, they will at some point, become concerned with finding continuing meaning in the personal and political disasters of the past (Conway, 1991) and of a culture that somehow enabled such devastation to transpire.

Loss

A sense of loss was and is experienced by both survivors and their children on many levels. While survivors experience the loss of the world they had known, family members and friends directly, their children are born into its culture and learn to speak its language. Children of such families attest to the psychological presence of the Holocaust at home, both verbally and nonverbally (Danieli, 1982). Their parents had lost family members whom they interacted with on a daily basis. For generations thereafter, this would translate into a disconnection with forbearers of important knowledge. Danieli (1993) remarks that loss on this scale, ruptured the survivors sense of continuity as well as previous support systems. Life as the survivors knew it had changed irrevocably. Gone were the places of residence, worship, education and business. They had moved from a place of structure and predictability to one of dis-ease at what the future held. Parment (2004) has described the lives of camp inmates as having reached the extremes of hopelessness. After the war those that survived encountered more despair. The search for family members from whom they had been separated as Wardi (1992) notes resulted in bitter disillusionment. The survivors felt alone in the world. In the years that followed loss would have countless manifestations. The survivors took on the responsibility of preventing future losses. Danieli (1982, p. 406) observes that “the most tangible fulfilment of hope for the continuity and renewal of life was to bring a child into the world.” Children were often required to stay close to home, study hard or work conscientiously. Loss was to be avoided at all costs.

Loss ordinarily denotes absence; the loss experienced by Sarah, Bill and Eli had presence. It lived amongst the shadows of the new homes survivors and their families inhabited. It took form on occasions marked by developmental milestones, days specifically devoted to Holocaust remembrance and in the ordinary passage of time.

It was not unusual for Sarah and her peers living in Israel, not to have grandparents, uncles, aunts or cousins. Such a phenomenon was simply not the norm. The abundance of loss created sameness; in this sense Sarah was not alone.

Bill by contrast was raised in South Africa. The lack of central familial figures created a distance between himself and those children with no direct connection to the aftermath of the Holocaust. He could not say, "This is my uncle Harry, and uncle Sam and uncle Jerry" for the reality was that, "who your uncles were and what they are was somehow always a murky subject." The curiosity of a child around family and everyday experiences is supposedly to be greeted with rosy and candy coated answers. The kind of education Bill was exposed to did not leave room for innocence. Learning, as he did that the Germans had murdered his family was jarring and unnerving, "It doesn't sit well with children; it's not a good answer, but that has to be, it's reality there's no other answer in fact." It is possible that his childhood notions of a just and fair world were challenged fairly early on. Bill's mother's constant reference back to the Holocaust was not enough to fill the void he so obviously felt. Perhaps words and remembrance have served to emphasise the abundance of loss for Bill, rendering the Holocaust a subject to be tentatively approached with him.

Eli makes no direct reference to family members who perished during the war. Loss seems to have become her companion in other ways. It is likely that Eli became the substitute and representative of all whom her parents had lost. She took on the role of the guardian preventing loss. Her presence was at all times required at home. She had an intimate knowledge of the working of her parents' affairs, lest disaster strike and all be lost yet again. Sigal and Weinfeld (1989) note that the parents were seen to pressure the children to achieve goals that did not necessarily match the children's wishes or their abilities. Second generation children often believed that their own problems were too insignificant to warrant attention (Krell et al., 2003). Eli can be seen as having lost part of her childhood in having to assume an age-inappropriate parental role. The dreams and aspirations that she had for herself were shelved until she could renegotiate her function in the family system; a shift met with resistance and struggle. Gross (1988) mentions that

the survivors had been terrorised, humiliated and tortured; they had lost control over their fate. The excessive need to control the direction of their new lives, even if through control of their children, based on their history is understandable- not withstanding its impact upon children such as Eli. On the other hand, being faced with such restrictions, might also have served as a catalyst towards Eli's own strivings and achievements. Sudefeld (in Krell et al., 2003) indicates that survivor offspring often express their desire to break free through creative outlets. Personal risk is also lessened in the face of parental experience (Krell et al., 2003).

Sarah reports that there was an abundance of love and nurturance within her home and from her parents. The care freeness and innocence 'meant' to characterise a childhood was in some way lost to her. The vivid memory of her father experiencing nightmares created in Sarah an urge to heal him and fill the void he carried.

This perceived loss of innocence amongst the members of the second generation is likely to have become a multigenerational pattern. Bill's mother lost her parents at the age of sixteen; Sarah's father at the age of fourteen. It is conceivable as Sarah points out, "What sort of example do you have as a normal family?" given that you and your family had to endure brutality and eternal separation. If one had direct links with such a history, it is probable that your naive conception of goodness and purity would become tainted. Generations after the Holocaust, face a number of existential issues; comprehending the horrendous sufferings of the victims, grasping the motives and policies of the perpetrators and perhaps trying to decipher the actions or inactions of the bystanders (Conway, 1991).

The second generation is apt to regard themselves and their children as the last generations to have direct contact with survivors. Consequently if one does not ask questions or seek answers now, such opportunities will be lost. Sarah has immersed herself in a world of learning and teaching. She has created a context for herself where there is always a new avenue to explore. Her father has passed away, while her uncle is still alive. He appears to have maximised the opportunities available to him to transform his experiences into permanent records, "he wrote his memoir...he was videotaped by the

Spielberg project and he wrote poetry.” Sarah appreciates the opportunities she has available to gain insight out of the loss. She is involved in endeavours “to anchor the Holocaust in the historical consciousness of the generations that follow” (Conway, 1991, p. 287)

Eli’s curiosity has led her to explore the ways in which survivors and their families have grappled with loss. She indicates that she is primarily interested in the “post war story, and how it was...to pick up the pieces” that were left when all was gone. She poignantly relates the history of a young girl who lost two fiancées during the war years. Such was the impact upon her that she “never again had a relationship.” Loss has touched Eli’s family in past and present forms. The sense is that prior loss does not prepare one for the grief accompanying a new tragedy. The plaster is ripped off and a fresh wound is exposed. The death of her fifteen-year-old nephew in an avalanche presents its own heaviness and anguish.

The loss experienced by the survivors was on such an overwhelming scale that it morphed itself into a tangible fear, to be perpetually carried. Bill illustrates how his mother never allowed herself to connect with the post-Holocaust generations within her family in case she had to lose them again. He speaks of the possibility that his father had had a wife before the war. From the forced severance of ties with someone with whom you had formulated dreams for the future, to the task of carrying on, predominantly in a new country, must have been an exhausting challenge.

The loss of the physical constituents of one’s life, be it a house, residence in your birth country and a sense of familiarity with the world would create a need to renegotiate meaning. It is plausible that Bill’s parents had been active members of their Polish Jewish community. During the war they might have given up practices which would have identified them as being Jewish. They carried this rehearsed façade with them to South Africa and only began lighting Shabbat candles when Bill was four years of age. His family no longer lived predominantly amongst Jews. There is prone to have been an

assimilation of new cultural and societal practices coupled with questions around what it now meant to be Jewish.

Out of the loss Bill, Eli and Sarah all seem to carry a heightened sense of social responsibility. In the absence of humanity six million of their fellow Jews were murdered. The frustration that they each experience is that notions of “never again” appear to have been lost. Sarah captures their desperation in that “suffering is still happening...” This has spurred a calling towards the disciplines of teaching, healing and justice, so that loss is not an end in itself but rather a building block.

Identity

Sarah, Bill and Eli make sense of who they are and where they come from on the basis of their backgrounds and the stories of their parents. Their struggles and reconciliations around what to verbalise and give expression to, and what remains hidden come to form part of who they are. Each of their identities are inextricably bound up in their parents’ identities as survivors. Prince (1985) remarks that one of the few characteristics children of survivors share was the sense of having always known that their parents were survivors. Charny (2004) asserts that it is the developing personality, which becomes aware of the personal associations to which one was born by way of one’s family tribe or nation. Consequently their identity as the children of survivors, made them feel different, setting them apart from their peers. They consequently struggle and persevere through what it means to be a Jew after the Holocaust (Danieli, 1982). There is also a realisation as Charny (2004), maintains of the impossibility of others empathising with those who had suffered through such devastation.

In tracing each of their family backgrounds, the identity of the “wandering Jew” is prominent. Bauer (1973) illustrates how the history of the Jews in the Western world is a story of those who were never in control of their destiny. The literature indicates that many Jewish families did not anticipate an escalation in anti-Semitic sentiments and so chose to remain in the countries which they had called home. However as Bauer (1973)

indicates the Nazis aimed to drive the Jews out of every country they occupied by heaping indignities and brutalities upon them. It was impossible to live one's life in harmony or safety. Survivors that 'chose' to start their lives again, get married and raise children had new responsibilities and new arrivals to care for. They decided to leave Europe and find a safer place in which to settle (Danieli, 1982). Many, who had survived the war, adhering to Zionism, went to the emerging State of Israel (Danieli, 1982). Others who had relatives in America and elsewhere went there with the hope of recreating an extended family (Danieli, 1982).

Sarah, Bill and Eli acknowledge that they are Jewish, a multifaceted being in a multiverse of realities. The identity of their parents had shifted from being established community members to a persecuted group to "penniless refugees" (Danieli, 1982, p. 407) and if "fortunate" enough to that of survivors. There is also a realisation that the assumption of new identities by their families, facilitated survival. The literature mentions that some survivors turned away from their Jewishness out of anger and fear, whilst for others their continuing Jewishness became essentially bound to the horrors witnessed in the past (Hass, 1990). Major (1996) notes that most of the survivors studied after World War Two were Jewish immigrants; it is therefore difficult to evaluate which of their problems were concentration camp related and which resulted from the status of being refugees.

Sarah's parents left Poland, assumed the identity of refugees and became residents of Israel. Sarah later made a life for herself in South Africa. The question around what she would regard herself as remains open- a Jewish, Polish, Israeli, South African or an Israeli, Polish, South African Jew? She has integrated her family's Holocaust history into her being and way of life. This has not been an easy process. Answering questions as a child around the origins of her name, felt embarrassing and shameful. Her identity is not fixed. She chooses to use her background as a point of departure and not as an end, for the path that she has chosen and the work that she does.

Bill's parents were also Polish immigrants who later found their way to South Africa. He chooses to largely silently carry his Holocaust heritage. This is also a learnt process. As a

child he considered his status as the child of survivors, as a factor affecting his inclusion into social circles outside of his family. When surrounded by Holocaust exhibitions and memorabilia, he feels he learns nothing new. These are things that he intrinsically knows. One might say that his identity is in conflict- does the factual trajectory of the Holocaust inform who he is or are the feelings associated with the Holocaust more determinant of who he is? He has learnt to use his Jewish identity as a means of understanding his fellow countrymen even if they both come from “completely different backgrounds.” He acknowledges that he is a “Jewish Holocaust survivor child” and is still formulating the meaning around that. It has been suggested that ethnic affiliation can provide an adaptive coping response to Holocaust related matters (Sorscher & Cohen, 1997).

Eli’s lineage is similarly mixed. Her parents came from Holland, found their way to the United Kingdom and later to South America. Eli and her family now reside in Canada. Eli like her migrating family now finds herself travelling the world in search of the stories that characterise the identities of Holocaust survivors’ families. She is aware of how fragile one’s sense of self can be and endeavours to create an environment where post-Holocaust generations can be “who they are” without “judging them...questioning them...analysing them.” This might be a projection of her need to be recognised. It is possible that she had devoted her early years to pleasing her parents. Her desire to be viewed as a talented, independent and creative woman emerges strongly. This is a facet she has transmitted to her daughter.

The need to be identified as a capable, emerging woman may also be contrasted with the feeling of children of survivors not being entitled to happiness (Krell et al., 2003) or positive feelings of their own. They spend so much of their time in the role of caregiver to their parents, that any appreciation of their own needs leaves them feeling guilty. It is possible that Eli wished to reach a stage where she could both care for her parents and take ownership of her own contentment.

Eli also has a way of pinpointing the connections between one’s cultural and religious identity and one’s life experiences. Many of the individuals she interviewed had been

unaware that they were Jewish until much later in life. Some felt an unexplainable connection to the Jewish faith. To the man who did not regard himself as a practicing Jew she remarked, “You know maybe you don’t practice the faith but you know if Hitler were around, you’d be, you would not be spared.” In this way she highlights the inherent difficulty in associating one’s self with an oppressed people. The theme of linking one’s self with narratives of survival in this way becomes more understandable.

Sarah also touches on another aspect of identity that is gender related. She believes that it is possible that her brother was impacted upon differently by her parent’s “because he was a boy.” He did not feel that he received an equal amount of attention or love. This seems to have hurt him greatly. Research undertaken by Sigal and Weinfeld (1989) is supportive of this gender related identity theme. Survivor fathers were often seen as being debilitated, as requiring nursing and unable to fulfil their role as both father and spouse (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Mothers are hypothesised to have triangled in their daughters to compensate for the nurturing and care they lacked (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Daughters accordingly paid the price for this in their own development (Sigal & Weinfeld, 1989). Danieli (1981a) has also pointed to the inherent difficulty of a father, in assuming the role of head of the household, especially after enduring such powerlessness. Sarah’s brother’s realisation that his sister with her name, “Helen” was a living memorial to all the females that had died in his family sets him free. Sarah’s has viewed her identity as both a burden and a blessing. She served as that which Wardi (1992, p. 30) has deemed a “memorial candle,” representing the past, the present and a future never reached.

Silence and Openness

Survivors of the Holocaust and the generations thereafter will choose to be silent and open about who they are and their background in various ways. The perception of that which constitutes the former and the latter also differs. Patterns of communication also have implications for how one chooses to remember. Gill (in Conway, 1991, p. 230) notes that no matter how well adapted survivors appear to be, the journey that they make “back from hell” is a continuous one. Regardless of forms of communication, the ghost

of the past remains. These lingering memories according to Rylko-Bauer (2005) were often linked with a sense of guilt, shame and stigma, which was very often transmitted to the second generation.

Hass (1990) expresses that survivors differed in the degree and kind of emphasis they gave to the Holocaust in their post-war families. Some parents talked of their experiences and impressed on their children the importance of memory; others avoided mention of the Holocaust years and attempted to obliterate its influence on their later lives (Hass, 1990).

The literature indicates that many Holocaust survivors did not communicate with their offspring about their Holocaust trauma (Fossion, Rejas, Servais, Pelc & Hirsch, 2003) and were extremely reticent about talking about anything related to the past (Prince, 1985). Patterns of silence and openness were also linked to the environment in which survivors and their families found themselves. Danieli (1982) indicates that in general survivors' war accounts were too horrifying for most people to listen to or to believe. Survivors were also faced with the widely held myth that they had actively or passively participated in their own destiny by going like lambs to the slaughter and with the misconception that they had performed immoral acts in order to survive (Danieli, 1982). Nordstrom (1995) comments on society's aversion towards the survivors that remained. Perhaps contact with a Holocaust survivor reminded one of his or her own mortality. In an atmosphere pervaded by such attitudes it became difficult for the survivor to speak. One cannot not communicate. Silence would therefore serve as the survivors' only means of expression, resulting in a discontinuity in the historical legacy of the family (Fossion et al., 2003). Remembrance and the quest for knowledge may as Novick (1999) mentions, be perceived as either imposed or as a chosen path. Silence in many instances might also have compelled the children of survivors to seek out the stories that constituted their parents' world. The other alternative as Prince (1985) notes was to live without ascertaining the mysteries of one's parents' past, lest one stir up painful memories.

Eli perceived herself to be the rebel within her family system. She is the open one to whom her young nephews turned for knowledge, understanding and meaning. It seems

that it has been necessary for her to give voice to the pain when no one else would. White and Epston (1990) note that those aspects of lived experience that do not occupy prime position often provide a rich source for the creation of alternate stories. When Eli's daughter was diagnosed with Anorexia Nervosa, Eli once again rallied for the cause of transparency. Family difficulties and struggles are not to be shunned or hidden. Her curiosity and search for significance have given her access to the archives of her parents' lives. Her need to create a book around her mother's correspondence with Otto Frank, Anne Frank's father is illustrative of this. It is likely that her need for openness was experienced as insensitive on the part of her family. Her brother-in-law had wanted nothing to do with the Holocaust, and yet he and Eli's sister are featured in her pilot documentary. She expresses how her brother-in-law "didn't know that he was Jewish until he was sixteen... he just didn't want to be associated with any of it and that carries through the family..." Eli's parents were also reluctant to engage in a literary project that would expose details of their lives, thereby rendering them partially vulnerable. Danieli (1993) by contrast expresses how openness, along with the use of memories often serve to heal family wounds, by engaging with that which never had an opportunity to be a part of a family's current life.

There are however areas of grey. Eli's world does not function entirely by means of absolute dictates around being vocal or hushed. This is perhaps reflective of the type of environment in which she and other second generation members were raised- one characterised either by an obsessive retelling of events or an all-consuming silence (Williams-Keeler et al., 1998). Eli too, has resisted entering the spaces that might prove too painful. It was difficult for her to speak constantly about her family. She tended to express herself by means of other people's stories. It is also noteworthy how her own conflict seems to manifest in the initial attitudes of her film participants. They are reluctant to grant Eli right of entry into that part of their history and lives. She has had to temper her bull-headedness with empathy and an appreciation of the nature of the pain she evokes. This is conceivably one of her strengths. It has enabled complete strangers to enter into creative spaces and healing dialogues. Her warm presence and inquiring stance make way for an exchange of that kind.

Patterns of silence and openness also encounter conflicts around knowledge of facts and understanding of impact. Many survivors who are labelled, as “the one’s who do not speak” consequently fight internal battles. In their minds regardless of how frequently they repeat their stories, their family will never truly have a tangible grasp of what transpired. Passing on such knowledge might be seen as a fruitless endeavour. Bar-On (1999, p. 198) notes that the victim’s part in maintaining the discourses of silence originates from the indescribability of the traumatic events rather than from their intentional undiscussability.

This conflict has perhaps inspired Sarah to engage with the Holocaust. She has opened up many channels of learning in an attempt to understand what happened to humanity, her family and her nation. She has travelled to Auschwitz in the hope that the barbed wire fences and brick faced crematoria would speak to her. Such physical remnants are huge and overpowering and have only greeted her with cold silence. Wiesel (in Conway, 1991, p. 288) expresses that Auschwitz defies imagination and perception, “that between the dead and the rest of us there exists an abyss that no amount of perceptiveness can comprehend.” Conway (1991) believes that in certain instances silence is the only means that can guard against the danger of trivialisation or warped interpretation. Sarah is not deterred by such challenges and her quest has been ongoing. Krystal (2006) observes that if one cannot engage with the Holocaust and speak of it, then one cannot understand nor remember it. It seems though that the contest between understanding and intellectualising is one present in Sarah’s family. Her parents are survivors. On some level she feels that the knowledge that she has access to is more ‘pure’ than that to which her children have. Her age, maturity and knowledge of the field are also factors she feels enable her to grasp this cataclysmic event. In an attempt to be maternally protective and partially closed, she has shielded her children from the meaning attached to such facts and figures. With regards to her daughter Sarah is “not sure that she knows all the details.”

The tendency towards silence is likely to have become a multigenerational phenomenon as parents attempt to shield their children from the horrors that transpired. The child of the Holocaust survivor may in turn transmit to their own children a pattern of

undiscussability of certain issues in the family (Bar-On, 1999). This becomes a family rule, which is perceivably difficult to alter. A young man whom Eli interviewed relates the trauma he underwent upon learning of his families origins, “he realised that he would have been targeted... and it shocked him so deeply, it scared him so deeply that he went into years of therapy.” Major (1996, p. 450) describes a general lack of communication about traumatic events as a “family secret,” which might affect the family atmosphere, parental and child behaviour. Openness appears to have some therapeutic value. Eli relates how many of her research participants have been “bursting to speak.” The three generational gathering of survivor grandparents, their children and grandchildren has also been instrumental in helping families address their silences. Many of the third generation that Eli has interviewed intuitively know far more about the Holocaust than their parents have credited them for. An acknowledgment of this nature has removed the exhausting need to be silent and protective.

Bill believes that he has the facts; this is a story which has been relayed ad nauseum. He trusts that on some level, there is nothing more that anyone could tell him. He visits museums and listens to survivors deliver lectures. Yet, he is not surprised, he does not feel enriched. Conway (1991) observes that many survivors strove to recall every possible detail of their persecution as factually as possible, lest it be thought that such inconceivable horrors had been invented in the aftermath to engender sympathy with their plight. In an effort to shield himself from hurt Bill has allowed himself to become emotionally silent and desensitised. Robinson and Winnik (in Lichtman, 1984) reported that children whose parents spoke intensively of their Holocaust experiences were more psychologically unstable than those whose parents were less communicative of their experiences. Such findings were not conclusive. It has been suggested that a closer examination of parental style might be more telling (Lichtman, 1984). In Bill’s life, there is perceivably an openness around the overt facts; there is a silence over the pain such knowledge evokes. He battles to make sense of such feelings. Bill’s father did not speak much about his war experiences, whereas his mother spoke endlessly. Prince (1985) mentions that often when both parents were survivors, their styles of communication

were complementary. Perhaps Bill's father felt that his children should be protected from such knowledge. Bill is similarly protective over which facts he will derive feeling from.

Bill shares with Sarah and Eli the reality that they have not spend their life's majority countries where the narrative of the Holocaust predominates. One's ability to openly unwrap the pages of such history comes into conflict with other forces for, "We fear contamination from those who have seen the abyss, who remind us of what unlimited evil man is capable of, of the vulnerable thread from which our lives are suspended." (Rabkin, in Krell, 1984, p. 514). It may be that the women, whom Bill portrays as "martyrs" engendering sympathy, render him overwhelmed. He wishes that they would remain silent. This conspiracy of silence has in a sense narrowed the potential sociocultural support system (Danieli, 1982) available for Bill to express how he has been affected.

The offshoot is that he will buy books but they remain closed. He listens to his mother relate her memoirs and his ears are blocked. He engages in an internal dialogue in an attempt to find answers. It is possible that rationalisation and distance have served as his coping mechanisms. He is contrastingly in touch with the strength of understanding that the Holocaust has provided him with. Bill's acknowledgment of this insight is perhaps linked to a commemoration of the pain, courage and suffering (Nordstrom, 1995) of his relatives. When challenged around his comprehension of oppression, discrimination and resistance, he was able to refer back to a history so intricately a part of him.

Impact on Parenting, the Parent-Child Relationship and the Transmission of Values

There is no international standard as to what constitutes normal parenting. Hoffman (2005) indicates that we could easily engage in typologies, labelling parenting as good, bad or adequate. The perception of one's parenting is socially constructed by one's home environment, education, exposure to other domestic settings and the feelings one associates with their family. Many of the second generation would concede that their parents' Holocaust experiences had an impact on their parenting. Whether they would out

rightly choose to label any maternal or paternal practices, as being dysfunctional is another matter entirely. Krell et al. (2003) note that although survivor parents are more likely than their counterparts who had not experienced Nazi persecution to exhibit mild psychiatric symptoms, for most survivors such symptoms are clearly not disabling. Nonetheless many studies on Holocaust survivors asserted that they had difficulty in establishing close relationships, had lost a basic trust in people because of their own persecution and had difficulties “reinvesting in life” (Hass, 1990, p.9). The environment in which one is raised and socialised, for you becomes your norm, your reality. It might only be with hindsight and the experience of parenting one’s own children that certain patterns might come into question. While children of survivors may choose to complain about:

The poor quality of parental affect, relative lack of empathy, and the consequent problems that they themselves have with affect empathy, second generation members point out how obviously humane and human their cohort is and note its remarkable achievements and personal qualities (Krell et al.,2003, p. 504)

Holocaust survivors may often be described as presenting high levels of emotional disorders, psychosocial symptoms and posttraumatic symptoms (Fossion et al.,2003). Their elevated level of anxiety and depression were hypothesised to create major difficulties in providing an adequate maturational environment for their children (Fossion et al.,2003). On some level though, there is an acceptance by the interviewee’s of the way in which their parents related to them. There is a sense of sadness coupled with the recognition of parental limits when Sarah expresses, “I met hundreds of Holocaust survivors through my work and my life, if not thousands and none of them was unscarred so their parenting cannot be normal.”

Sarah’s father had the unfathomable task to, “open the mass grave and to take the bodies out and to burn them.” There is a deep understanding on her part, that her father could not have parented “normally” after being exposed to such deplorable episodes. Her father like so many other survivors experienced starvation and torture. The trauma of such

experiences is liable to have an impact on the way in which one relates to others in the future. It is also possible as Krell et al. (2003) remark, that the child who did not wish to inflict any more pain on a parent who had already felt such anguish, learnt to suppress the adolescent urge to rebel against parental views or authority.

It is likely that many survivors did not allow themselves to become attached, as they feared another abrupt separation (Hass, 1990). Sarah concedes that her parenting could not have proceeded according to an accepted standard; yet she acknowledges that there was an abundance of love and nurturing that enveloped her and her siblings. Her father also endeavoured to ensure that bitterness and hatred would not poison his young children. This served to ground Sarah, enabling her to explore the discourses of healing and helping, now so central to her life. Kellerman (2001c) remarks that the Holocaust legacy of the parents has influenced the personal lives of their offspring in a positive way, by making it more meaningful and by increasing their compassion for human suffering.

Eli was acutely aware of the prime position that she occupied in her parents' lives. It seems that this was not the kind of attention she would have liked. There is an impression that she felt suffocated and thwarted. Prochaska and Norcross (1999) indicate that this kind of emotional fusion interfered with an individual's ability to differentiate from their family of origin, resulting in an undifferentiated family ego mass (Bowen, 1978). It was not uncommon for survivors' children to learn to consider their own problems as trivial when compared to the problems faced by their parents (Krell et al., 2003). It is possible that Eli harbours some resentment towards her parents. She battles to address such feelings in relation to them. She mentions the hurt that it causes her parents, when she articulates that she "had no childhood" because she was parenting them. It is likely, as the literature indicates that the more distressed a Holocaust survivor parent felt, the more likely they were to seek the oneness that results from family fusion (Prochaska & Norcross, 1999). It is conceivable that the adolescence and sometimes adulthood of many second generation members would be marked by loneliness and responsibility, especially in providing the parents with happiness through their personal accomplishments (Shoshan, 1989).

In spite of the hurt she feels she has been able to channel such feelings into projects with educational value. She believes that it is essential to give voice to traumatic experiences and their impact. Shoshan (1989) writes that children of survivors react to the lack of memories and absences of deceased family members, by embarking on searches for more adequate knowledge and understanding. Her need to speak out and document what transpired has been transmitted in reverse back to her parents, who are now in the process of creating a book and film out of their Holocaust narrative. This is a theme that occurred recurrently throughout the surveyed literature. Goffman (2003) comments that this thirst for knowledge manifests itself as a need to reconstitute a vanished past, through projects of personal and historical reconstruction.

Sarah indicates that she had a need to always comfort her father. The literature points out that, children of concentration camp survivors are overly concerned not to hurt anyone and are acutely sensitive to another's pain and mood changes (Danieli; Pilcz, in Lichtman, 1984).

One does not get the sense that Bill was particularly close to his mother or his father. Kellerman (2001a) believes that the multiple losses suffered by the survivor parents may often serve to create child-rearing problems around attachment and detachment. Bill carries much frustration and some pain around the way in which his mother related to him, as an emotionally disconnected being. He casually comments that she is "much closer to my sister." The undertones of such a remark are clear. Bereft of the sort of intrafamilial interaction characteristic of their age-mates, the survivor's offspring were apt to view life not only as a very serious undertaking but one that would have to be navigated alone (Krell et al., 2003).

It is possible that Bill viewed his mother as having tunnel vision; using the Holocaust as her sole means of relating to him and later his own family. Bill would like his relationship with her to be different. It comes across that the energy he has to expend to include her in his life is at times draining, for he has to "constantly phone her, she won't come without an invitation, she won't phone you." The way in which he chose to

describe his father gives the impression that there was a similar disconnection between them. Kellerman (2001a) remarks that children of Holocaust survivors were apt to describe their parents on a bi-polar scale, as either too involved or too neglectful. The vagueness around the details of Bill's father's history and family serves to reinforce this distinction. To this end, despite the detachment from his mother, he nonetheless regards her as the "main figure."

Descriptions on the interactional styles of survivors vary. Some survivors are portrayed as emotionally blunted and numb. The so-called repression of wartime memories is said to have thwarted their ability to feel (Hass, 1990). Other reports indicate that survivors were preoccupied with mourning and ruminated excessively about their Holocaust experiences (Hass, 1990). Regardless of the route their emotional expression found, it must have been seemingly difficult for the child of survivors to relate to them on any other level but the Holocaust.

It would superficially be easy to read Bill's remarks as casting only a negative light on his relationship with his parents. On a deeper level, the home environment that they created fostered his emerging Jewish identity and consciousness. He speaks of the family's involvement in the "South African Jewish community" with pride. In the face of his frustration, he is also able to recognise the extent of the suffering his mother must have lived through, and admits that "it's a very nasty experience at the age of sixteen." Perhaps his own self-protectiveness around the subject of the Holocaust can be construed as a desire to now protect his parents from that which he was not alive to do so.

Survival

Krell et al. (2003) articulate that the wartime suffering of Holocaust survivors and the consequent loss of safety, led them to seek a maximally secure life for their children. In this vein the term 'survivor' carries many meanings. It may refer to the act of escaping death. It may describe the way in which an individual battled through oppression to achieve freedom. Hoffman (2005) associates the term 'survivor' with shared memory,

identity and one's legacy. Danieli (1982) comments that Holocaust survivor parents, in an attempt to give their children the best, taught them how to survive and simultaneously transmitted to them the life conditions under which they had survived the war. It is possible that survivor parents provided messages of extreme and imminent danger as well as restrictive imperatives (Krell et al., 2003), cautioning their children against suspicious outsiders. Conversely Glicksman et al. (2003) comment on the desire of survivors to portray themselves as those who had triumphed over adversity, rather than as piteous victims of a treacherous event.

For the interviewees the term, "survivor" carries the nuances of coping and carrying on. "For their parents, children of Holocaust survivors were a source of reassurance and a confirmation of survival" (Fossion et al., 2003, p. 2). Activities indicative of survival took on many forms and were often channelled through the second generation. Children were often expected to do well at school, present themselves as neat and polite (Fossion et al., 2003) and essentially fly the family flag.

Sarah, Eli and Bill form part of this post-war generation. One of the concerns of their narratives is conceivably about "picking up the pieces and carrying on." It is probable that their chosen professions of teacher, filmmaker and judge serve as a means through which meaning derives from tragedy, and suffering is not in vein. Sorscher and Cohen (1997) highlight the adaptive responses of children of Holocaust survivors who are portrayed as creative, altruistic, high in group affiliation and ethnic identification. Their respective societal positions of healing and helping stand in stark contrast to the roles assumed by the architects of the Holocaust. Hass (1990) believes that the teaching and writing of such events stimulates a sense of clarity and hope as opposed to an overwhelming sense of sadness and confusion. Hitler's blueprint was engineered to eliminate the possibility of survival. Eli, Sarah and Bill in their own ways take a stand against various forms of injustice. Major (1996) indicates that children of survivors are very often drawn to the health professions. This may be correlated with a sense of responsibility. From a systemic point of view, one might say that the second generation child had a helping role in the family from childhood and adolescence into adulthood

(Major, 1996). This was in turn transferred in occupational life to an interest within the health or social care or teaching professions; “a primary positive consequence of growing up in a survivor family” (Major, 1996, p. 451).

Bill seems to be proud of his mother’s ability to survive. He describes her as a “very capable survivor” even with the “certain coldness” that he experiences from her. He recognises that even she has had to build up defence mechanisms to facilitate her survival. He appears to follow suite and utilises similar means to persevere through difficult times. It is difficult for him to even imagine being viewed as anything less than successful. In this vein Danieli’s (1989) typology of interactional styles might be appropriate. Danieli (1989) refers specifically to the persona of the ‘fighter’ who fails to tolerate perceived weaknesses in themselves, others or their children and pushed themselves and others to achieve. Bill appears to be a fighter; passivity and helplessness have never been an option (Danieli, 1981a).

Survivor parents may often attribute the accomplishments of their children to a solid upbringing, while the children will often state that they are successful in work and relationships despite a flawed upbringing (Krell et al., 2003). Krell (1982) notes that the impact of parental trauma on the second generation is not always pathological. For some to be the child of a survivor is a source of great personal strength. Survivors might have chosen not to disclose to their children certain details, which might have portrayed them in a bad light, as vulnerable (Prince, 1985) and as anything less than a survivor.

While Bill has not had occasion to interact with other children of survivors his need is to portray “children of Holocaust survivors [as]...very successful.” He has been able to reframe the emotional challenges he encountered growing up. He feels better equipped to preside over heart wrenching court cases. He believes that whilst he can be insensitive he is even so able to be empathic, compassionate and insightful.

Eli is aware that the second generation are viewed as “whiners...as people who aren’t successful, people who’ll never accomplish anything in life.” She takes such perceptions

and works with them. She utilised her own fear around being stigmatised and choose to enter therapy as a means of better understanding herself and her world. She is hurt by those who see her efforts as fruitless, advocating that she would do better if she would “sell cars.” She has an intense need to be regarded as successful and talented. This appears to have arisen out of a home environment where her potential dreams and aspirations were overlooked in favour of her strength as a carer. Danieli (1981a, p. 34) asserts that children in families of what she deems as “those who made it” often felt that they had to achieve in order to receive the attention, recognition and validation of their parents. She derives huge emotional as opposed to financial rewards from her work. As Danieli (1981a) notes, many survivors and their children would devote much of their resources towards commemorating the Holocaust. Through her work Eli feels that she has enabled the stories of survivors and their families to survive for “Forever After.”

Sarah is acutely aware of the havoc that genocide and other man made disasters have wreaked. She has made it her calling to connect with other teachers and healers, in an attempt to “change it somehow.” The casualties of war and poverty disturb her. She is aware that she might be perceived as outspoken. It is her courage to challenge oppression and visit places such as Rwanda, which might facilitate the survival of those previously destined to perish. Sarah does not turn away from suffering, but instead can be seen as embracing it. She is acutely aware that the possibility of human cruelty is constantly with us (Nordstrom, 1995) and feels a strong need to help and heal others. She associates this passion with the teachings of her father. He worked in a German company after the war, relating to others on the basis of humanity as opposed to ethnicity. Her parents’ story is also one themed with survival and courage. They arrived in Israel with few possessions and from there built up a family. They had no money to purchase the “things we take for granted” such as a “pair of jeans” for Sarah. She has carried such memories with her and extracted the truths and lessons. She has transmitted some of these to her children in the form of concerns over whether “we learn tolerance? Do we learn that every human being has rights? Do we learn... not to hate?” This is admirable for such ideas will survive long after the people who thought of them and hopefully translate into beneficial practices.

Conclusion

For several decades the question of whether or not Holocaust trauma impacts upon the children of the victims has been open to debate (Brom, Kfir & Dasberg, 2001). The research participants as those with first hand contact with their parents acknowledge that such trauma has indeed had an impact upon them. In accordance with social constructionism we take heed of the courses through which Bill, Eli and Sarah have come to describe, explain and account for the world and themselves. The practice of deconstructing and comparing the stories of each participant has much import. We are made aware of the socially constructed world of shared meaning making (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). As researchers and therapists we are called upon to place greater emphasis on context, the social constructions of individuals, groups and problems and on the formulation of narratives with the appreciation that ours is a storied reality (Becvar & Becvar, 2006). The thematic patterns by way of which such experiences come to light are similar in their naming, but unique in the experience thereof. Perceptions and feelings around whether parents let one into their internal world, multiple losses incurred by survivors and later their children, who one is in the world, the urge towards caring for one's caregivers and ultimate survival developed within the contexts specific to Bill, Eli and Sarah.

Each of their parents took it upon themselves to form new relationships and build a family (Brom et al., 2001). The act of coping with the past becomes part of present family life (Brom et al., 2001). The acceptance and integration of the past and its subsequent impact, for the second generation comprises its own challenges.

Bill, Sarah and Eli speak in many voices. There is a tie that binds them. The Holocaust is not to be regarded as the beginning and end of all human catastrophes. Its lessons have universal applicability. The past can serve as an anchor, enabling one to move forward with insight and a need to do more. For "those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it" (http://www.wisdomquotes.com/cat_history.html).

Chapter Five

CONCLUSION

Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher will attempt to evaluate the research in terms of its strengths and weaknesses. Recommendations for clinical practice and future research will be suggested. The researcher will conclude by reflecting on the impact of the research upon her.

Evaluating the Research

The researcher set about to explore the role that the children of Holocaust survivors occupy. This problem statement might seem to imply that the answer would be one with relevance to all second generation members. It became clear that the manner in which each participant occupied and fulfilled this role had both similarities and differences. The researcher did not intend to generalise such findings. To do so would detract from the unique experiences and stories of each participant. Attempts have been made to document the testimonies of as many survivors as possible, through projects such as the Spielberg Foundation. Perhaps more initiatives giving voice to post-Holocaust generations would illuminate the way in which each copes and takes up this position, in relation to their family, their religion and the societies in which they function. The researcher feels that this dissertation constitutes one such effort.

The grounding of the research within a social constructionist theoretical framework served it well. It enabled the researcher to explore the contexts in which violence, dictatorship and ultimately genocide became possible. The lives of Holocaust survivors before, during and after World War Two was also given expression. This highlighted the inextricable link between the position of survivors as parents and the roles to be adopted by their children. The researcher was simultaneously provided with a space in which her own assumptions, feelings and questions could be woven into the text. The research in

this way becomes a co-construction of meaning, between the available literature, the thoughts of the researcher and the narratives of the research participants. Multiple realities come together to create a rich and interesting dialogue. It is not simply a reproduction of already completed projects.

It is apparent from the participants' stories that their ability to make sense of the Holocaust was "embedded in unique contexts and co-created by relationships they hold with others" (Henning, 2005, p. 205). Social constructionism rallies against the dualist principles which advocate a division between the self and other. We can only know ourselves in relationship with others. The connections that the second generation participants have with their parents, other children of survivors, their own children, their work colleagues, and now perhaps even the researcher, expands the repertoire that they have available to make sense of the past.

A large body of literature on intergenerational transmission of trauma has been punctuated from a Psychoanalytic paradigm, and employed quantitative research methodology. This research project acknowledged the contribution of such theories to our existing knowledge base, by providing a space for their discussion. However, it also expanded on these ideas by positioning the roles children of survivors occupy, the multigenerational legacies of loss, silence, questions around one's identity and ultimately how one remembers within a larger ecosystemic framework. The research was also qualitative in nature. This facilitated an exploration of the realities each second generation participant has constructed, without necessarily confining them to categorisations named on a particular scale.

The households in which each participant grew up in and was raised differed. The way in which they each remember and make sense of their childhood also varies. Without negating this uniqueness, there seems to be a pervasive conflict between silence and openness running through each of their stories. From Eli's point of view, she parented her parents. This view that she had of her reality clashes with that of her parents, who feel hurt and almost betrayed when such claims are made. Sarah felt guilt over her inability to

lay total claim to the origins of her name- that of a deceased aunt. The tensions between moving forward with life and honouring the past were ever present in the emerging State of Israel. Bill was similarly caught between loyalty to a mother who spoke too much and a father who hardly spoke at all. Social constructionism is in this vein appropriate. It is concerned with the stories and voices that are traditionally silenced in favour of the grand narratives (Doan, in Henning, 2005). This study has provided three members of the second generation with a chance to explore their roles as children of survivors. It has acknowledged that their roles are complex and associated with many levels of meaning. This process was facilitated by the researcher's ability to establish rapport and trust with the participants (Mouton, 2001). The collaborative and participatory nature of this research was able to minimise distrust and misgivings (Mouton, 2001) participants might have had. In this way the credibility of the research was further enhanced.

The research also had limitations. The researcher identifies herself as a member of the Jewish community. Her own life has been filled with Holocaust related narratives and ceremonies of remembrance. She had a personal interest in the topic under exploration. This would have necessarily impacted upon the structuring of the interviews and the subsequent interpretive process. However qualitative pieces of research are not subject to efforts of replication. The researcher is also not an objective, value and bias free instrument. Her role was to engage in a co-construction of meaning with her participants. In this way the impact of the researcher on the context of the study and on the development of the interpretive account was taken into consideration (Kelly, 1999a).

It may also be said that the chosen sample was too small. This would have impacted upon the results of the research, which may not be perceived an adequate representation of all second generation members. As Kelly (1999a) indicates qualitative projects are often criticised for attempting to draw conclusions from so few subjects. Henning (2005, p. 210) however notes "the nature of qualitative research though lends itself to smaller sample sizes because this methodology is labour intensive."

In quantitative pieces of research, researchers are urged to produce results, which can be generalised to a larger population, or under different circumstances. In qualitative endeavours we refer rather to the research's transferability in terms of its applicability and utility in other contexts and a wider population. The research has scope within the work of those who seek to bring relief to other traumatised populations and their families.

One of the strengths of a qualitative piece of research is that it is generative, meaning that it constructs new ways of understanding, or novel intelligibilities (Gergen, in Kelly, 1999b). This is made possible through the ability of the researcher to engage in a dialogue with her research participants. The researcher was in this way able to explore areas unfamiliar to her. It is possible nonetheless that the research participants would not necessarily agree with the themes uncovered by the researcher. She may as it were, be seen as an outsider (Kelly, 1999b) to the family system which the child of the survivors inhabits. However human systems "structurally couple" (Maturana, 1975, p. 313) by means of an exchange of ideas. The researcher could in no way determine the response of the receiving system, being the second generation participant, to the ideas co-created in their conversation.

It may also be said that the primary focus of this piece of research was on loss, suffering and the impact thereof. This might be associated with an assumption that the Holocaust had to have a pathological effect (Glicksman et al., 2003). The Holocaust however became a central topic of research, when many of their children began to join the ranks of the academic and clinical professions and began to question the experiences of their parents (Glicksman et al., 2003) and the impact their parents' ordeals had had on them. It is conceivable that the children of survivors would not choose to view themselves through a psychopathological lens. A greater emphasis on the ability of the survivors to triumph over adversity might have provided the research with a different slant. A focus on the cultural, educational and familial richness of their lives before the Holocaust would have contrasted what they lost with what they had. As Kelly (1999a) points out however, as a researcher, one can never say enough. It is clear that the ability to survive

and overall resilience is something many survivors have indeed passed onto their children.

It is also difficult to discern precise connections and establish causality between the Holocaust, and any specific later characteristics both among the survivors and the second generation (Krell et al., 2003). The research was not linear, or seeking to establishing cause-effect occurrences; it rather aimed to examine the relationship between being the child of a survivor and the associated feelings that were experienced within the context of the family system, cultural and historical background.

Despite its limitations the present research is able to contribute to the existing body of research on the impact of the Holocaust on the generation thereafter. It reminds us that we cannot ascribe specific experiences to each second generation member. We are asked to focus on how each constructs his/her reality in conjunction with the family system in which they grew up.

There is hence a never-ending supply of questions (Kelly, 1999a), which can be generated and further researched from a project of this nature. The researcher feels the research both fits with other interpretations and opens up other areas of understanding (Kelly, 1999a). Against this backdrop it has the potential to yield discussion and action in clinical practice.

Recommendations for Clinical Practice and Future Research

The process of interviewing children of Holocaust survivors has therapeutic import. It has enriched my growth as a trainee therapist, and opened up avenues which I believe have value for the profession.

The themes related to the second generation, that have been described in the research are not intended to imply or represent pure or mutually exclusive experiences, nor to distort the commonality of central issues that have faced Holocaust survivors and their children.

(Danieli, 1981a). The research aims to heighten our awareness, as therapists, that we cannot engage in linear groupings of individuals who are all expected to display a single “survivor syndrome” or “child-of-survivor-syndrome” (Danieli, 1981a, p.35). There is no singularly defined and proved method of facilitating support and containment for such systems. We would need to approach and join with each family, as a unique system, taking into account the ecological factors that make up their reality. Interpersonal factors, such as support structures and dynamics of the survivor’s family of origin, which formed a part of an individual or family’s pre-Holocaust/pre-trauma background, are critical to understanding post-ordeal adjustment (Danieli, 1981a). The development of the family is hence traced along a trajectory, while their strengths and struggles are concurrently mapped out. This is hypothesised to provide a greater sense of continuity and rootedness, which is often damaged by traumatic events (Danieli, 1981a). From a structural point of view, each family system presents with their own set of rules and boundaries that distinguish them from other systems. These dynamics to a certain extent determine the way its members enter into new relationships, negotiate developmental transitions, handle loss and disappointment and provide support for one another. Family dynamics are also influenced by the culture in which one is brought up. Research into this area has important implications for therapists in better understanding the varied client populations with which we will work.

Children of survivors are said to repeat their parents’ Holocaust or other trauma experiences in their own lives (Danieli, 1981a). Murray Bowen (1978) spoke of the Multigenerational Transmission of Emotional Illness. This becomes evident in the way in which the patterns of silence and openness, and multileveled loss are transmitted across familial generations from survivors to their children and in turn to the grandchildren. The creation of a therapeutic space where such patterns can be traced and spoken about in terms of their relational impact upon a family system is vital. The work done by one member of a system on this emotional level can have a far-reaching impact on the present family system and generations to come. Such work can be generalised to therapy initiated with victims of other kinds of trauma and sufferers of post-traumatic stress. The long-term harmful consequence of silence about such experiences (Danieli, 1981a) warrants

further exploration. The facilitation of dialogue between different generations within a family that has suffered through such distress, creates conversations of difference. It is possible that the system will be able to move from a sense of despair to hope, thereby changing their relationship to a tragic history (Rothschild, 2000). Rothschild (2000, p. 51) eloquently expresses that,

Perhaps such dialogues, like an alchemical process, can transmute the guilt and anger through recognition and understanding into something meaningful and productive and prevent our legacies from being passed on like a defective gene to the next generation.

Danieli (1981b) supports this tenet and indicates how an awareness of transmitted multigenerational processes will inhibit the transmission of pathology to succeeding generations. Kellerman (2001c) concurs that the extensive knowledge gained from studying children of Holocaust survivors can be utilised to better understand the children of other traumatised populations as well. The challenges faced by children of survivors are not necessarily unique to Holocaust survivor's families. They may be shared by families that have experienced other kinds of trauma (Krell et al., 2003). Pathways towards comparative research across varying ethnic, religious, cultural and geographic populations (Krell et al., 2003) are in this way opened up. The results could be important for the understanding and in some instances the treatment of children of other traumatised or at-risk populations (Major, 1996).

The research also highlighted that the grieving process is one that takes place on many levels and across a protracted time span. The contexts in which one grieves may also shift. Individuals also grieve not only for the loss of loved ones, but also for the loss of potential; the loss of a life that they could have had. Shoshan (1989) believes that many Holocaust survivors have not adequately mourned the loss of loved ones. This may in part be attributed to a not actually knowing what happened to relatives and to the consequent absence of a gravesite. The violent and total loss of those they considered

most important, at a time when their own physical existence was threatened, made it impossible to properly mourn the loved ones who were murdered (Shoshan, 1989). This is also applicable to survivors of other traumatic and life-threatening events. It is likely that this pervasive sense of loss and incomplete mourning would be passed onto the next generation. Therapeutically speaking much can be done to help children of survivors and survivors themselves to deal with the impact of their parents' "unfinished bereavement" (Shoshan, 1989, p.203). The creation of experiential workshops where the media of art, drama and literature are used to facilitate remembrance and catharsis has widespread applicability.

The creation of support groups for those who have endured suffering on account of natural or man-made disasters has significance. Survivors and their offspring often carry a feeling that nobody who has not gone through the same experience can really understand them (Danieli, 1981b). The availability of a therapeutic group provides what Yalom (1995, p. 19) has called the "corrective emotional experience." Individuals are encouraged to express emotions, thoughts, views and behaviours, the goal of which is to enable members to see how others perceive and experience them through feedback and discussion (Knight, 2002). This reinforces the idea that trauma experienced on a large scale can be meaningfully responded to in a collective fashion (Danieli, 1981b). This is applicable with regards to mourning, issues of identity after the event, and the relationship of the survivors and their children to the rest of the world (Danieli, 1981b).

It might be said that the categorisation of groups into victim and victimiser is somewhat of a linear categorisation. We cannot however negate the impact that the actions of an aggressor have had on the sufferers. We may contextualise such actions so as to have a better understanding of how they came about. Understanding nonetheless fails to bring those who have perished back to life. The facilitation of dialogue between those who perpetrated violent acts or their offspring and the victims and families of such acts has a liberating quality for both parties. The victim and the victimiser become seemingly more human, with a life, a history and emotion. This has relevance within the South African context. The psychological remnants of Apartheid are still alive and well. Those born

after the instillation of a new democratic South Africa have had to construct their identity on the basis of what occurred to their parents and grandparents. We have already witnessed with undertaking such as the “Truth and Reconciliation Commission” how dialogue between various stakeholders is important for both healing, reconciliation and understanding.

Conclusion: Reflections of the Researcher

This piece of research has truly represented a journey of both insight and exploration. My encounters with Sarah, Eli and Bill are truly ones I will not easily forget. Whilst it is evident that theirs are stories, which they in turn have told or been told countless times, it seems that with each retelling new truths are revealed to them. The study aimed to provide members of the second generation with a voice, through which their familial roles and functions could be explored. Avenues around how one chooses to commemorate loss and hardship were also investigated. Loss, the contrast between silence and openness, survival, the impact of the Holocaust upon one’s identity and the parenting of one’s parents were energies that all appeared to resonate. It is noteworthy that the theme, “parenting of one’s parents” was more clearly evoked in the interviews held with the two female participants, Sarah and Eli. One could hypothesise that as females they were more relationally and contextually sensitive to the needs of their parents. It is also possible that the expectations placed upon them as the potential mothers of future generations were far greater. The researcher however does not wish to cloud the participants’ stories with generalisations.

I feel that I have been provided with a new lens through which to view the stories of both Holocaust survivors and their children. I am now more acutely aware how each individual will construct and reconstruct his or her respective life narratives throughout the duration of his or her life spans. Childhood perceptions are often transformed when the child reaches adulthood. As children each was profoundly aware that one or both of their parents had suffered some terrible hurt - the depths of which they would only come to touch in their adult years.

The research provided me with a privileged opportunity to gain insight into how various members of a family may choose to make sense of a traumatic past. What struck me as particularly interesting was that whilst it is generally taken for granted that family history is a component of one's present, I have become aware that there are people who choose not to integrate the past into their current lives.

The adult need to protect the young and preserve optimistic childhood illusions about good, truth, justice and humanity was an ever-present theme. This however, appeared to disregard the innate insight and intuition of children. Sarah for example, has elected to shield her young son from the major details of his grandfather's past. It became evident however, that children intuitively and instinctively pick up on the nuances of their environments and translate them into explicable language in the process. Sarah's son is very much aware of what actually happened, - even to the point of experiencing his own nightmares. This leads me to believe that on some metaphysical or mystical level, a multigenerational transmission of knowledge and feeling, must certainly exist.

For me, this exploratory journey underpins the maxim that people need to know where they come from, in order to determine where they are going. Each participant has recognised that their need to be involved in the circles of teaching, healing and justice stems in part from their own history and that of their family's. In a more tangible sense, I now understand what it was that propelled me towards the pathway of psychology. The need for self-healing, and the desire to facilitate healing in those who form part of my immediate and extended contexts has been further acknowledged. And for this enlightenment I will be forever grateful.

Whilst I may not form part of the second generation, my family and I have experienced loss as well, through the passing of my father fifteen years ago. This is a loss, which has been viewed through varying perceptual and emotional lenses, as I have grown. My participants unknowingly opened me up to a world I was not entirely in touch with. Loss occurs on many levels and does not occur in isolation. It becomes embedded in the very

fabric of one's life, on special occasions, at developmental milestones and in the ordinary humdrum of daily activities. It is a phenomenon around which each of my family members and I have individually and collectively created spaces, for mourning, for communicating and for memory. It is perhaps that very first loss, which set me upon a course of meaning making and finding. I have learnt that we discover who we are in relation to others and the varying contexts through which we dance. When we lose that, "other" our sense of self, our identity is challenged anew. How we each pick up the pieces upon which our affective and cognitive universes are built is a narrative in its own right. This piece of research has opened a space for myself, and I believe my participants to write that story, if only in one's mind and daily experiences.

Reference List

- Addison, R.B. (1992). Grounded hermeneutic research. In B.F. Crabtree & W.L. Miller (Eds.), *Doing Qualitative Research*, (pp. 110-124). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. (Eds.). (1969). *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: W.W Norton & Company.
- Arendt, H. (1961). What is authority. In H. Arendt (Ed.), *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*, (pp. 91-142). New York: Viking.
- Atkinson, B., & Heath, A. (1991). Qualitative research and the legitimisation of knowledge. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 17(2), 175-180.
- Auerswald, E. (1990). Towards epistemological transformation. In M.P. Mirkin (Ed.), *The Social and Political Contexts of Family Therapy*, (pp.19-50). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bateson, G. (1979). *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Bauer, Y. (1973). *They Chose Life: Jewish Resistance in the Holocaust*. New York: The American Jewish Committee.
- Bar-On, D. (1999). *The Indescribable and the Undiscussable: Reconstructing Human Discourses after Trauma*. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Becvar, D.S. & Becvar, R.J. (1996). *Family Therapy: A Systemic Integration (3rd ed.)*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Becvar, D.S. & Becvar, R.J. (2006). *Family Therapy: A Systemic Integration (6th ed.)*. New York: Pearson.
- Berger, A.L. (1988). The Holocaust: The ultimate and archetypal genocide. In I. Charny (Ed.), *Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review* (pp.59-88). London: Mansell Publishing Limited.
- Bhana, A. (1999). Participatory action research: A practical guide for realistic radicals. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*, (pp. 227-238). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Blumenstyk, G. (2004). A mother's gift: Hidden letters from the Holocaust. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(33), 1-4.
- Boesche, R. (1996). *Theories of Tyranny: From Plato to Arendt*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University Press.

- Bowen, M. (1978). *Family Therapy in Clinical Practice*. New York: Aronson.
- Brannigan, A. (1998). The Psychology of Genocide. *Theory and Psychology*, 8(5), 675-686.
- Breakwell, G.M., Hammond, S. & Fife-Shaw, (Eds.), (1997). *Research Methods in Psychology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Brom D., Kfir, R. & Dasberg, H. (2001). A controlled double-bind study on children of Holocaust survivors. *Israel Journey of Psychiatry and Related Sciences*, 38(1), 47-57.
- Brown, D.A. (1995). To Auschwitz and back: A journey of remembrance. *Sojourners*, 25, 22-25.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Charny, I. (1988) (Ed.). *Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review*. London: Mansell Publishing Limited.
- Charny, I. (2004). Preface. In S. Totten, W. Parsons & I. Charny (Eds.), *Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and Eye-Witness Accounts (2nd ed)* (pp. xi-xviii). London: Routledge.
- Cohen, R. (1990). *Arendt Controversy*. Retrieved May 14, 2006 from the World Wide Web: <http://0-galenet.galegroup.com.oasis.unisa.ac.za/servlet/History/hits?r=d>
- Colman, A.M. (2001). *Oxford Dictionary of Psychology*. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
- Conway, J.S. (1991). Remembering the Holocaust. *Sewanee Review*, 99(2), 286-296.
- Corey, G. (2001). *Theory and Practice of Counselling and Psychotherapy (6th ed.)*. United States: Brookes/Cole.
- Crabtree, B.F., & Miller, W.L. (1992). *Doing Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Danieli, Y. (1981a). Differing adaptational styles in families of survivors of the Nazi Holocaust: Some implications for treatment. *Children Today*, September-October, 6-35.
- Danieli, Y. (1981b). The group project for Holocaust survivors and their children. *Children Today*, September-October, 11.
- Danieli, Y. (1982). Families of survivors of the Nazi Holocaust: Short and long-term effects. *Series in Clinical and Community Psychology: Stress and Anxiety*, 8, 405-421.

Danieli, Y. (1983). Diagnostic and therapeutic use of the multigenerational family tree in working with survivors and children of survivors of the Nazi Holocaust. In J.P. Wilson & B. Raphael (Eds.), *International handbook of traumatic stress syndromes* (pp. 889-898). New York: Plenum.

Danieli, Y. (1985). The treatment and prevention of long term effects and intergenerational transmission of victimisation: A lesson from Holocaust survivors and their children. In C.R. Figely (Ed.), *Trauma and its wake* (Vol. 1, pp.295-313). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Danieli, Y. (1993). Diagnostic and therapeutic use of the multigenerational family tree in working with survivors and children of survivors of the Nazi Holocaust. In J.P. Wilson & B. Raphael. (Eds.), *International Handbook of Traumatic Stress*, (pp. 889-898). New York: Plenum Press.

Dawidowicz, L.S. (1976). *A Holocaust Reader*. New Jersey: Behrman House, Inc., Publishers.

Eagle, G. (1998). *Male crime victims: The social and personal construction of meaning in response to traumatogenic events*. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. University of the Witwatersrand.

Eagle, G., Hayes, G., & Sibanda, T. (1999). Standpoint methodologies: Marxist, feminist and black scholarship perspectives. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*, (pp. 438-461). Cape Town: UCT Press.

Edelman, M. (1995). Remember, not to forget: Reflections. *The Humanist*, 55(3), 35-36.

Epstein, H. (1979). *Children of the Holocaust: Conversations with Sons and Daughters of Survivors*. New York: GP. Putnam's Sons.

Feldman, R.S. (2001). *Social Psychology (3rd ed)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Fossion, P., Rejas, M.C., Servais, L., Pelc, I., & Hirsch, S. (2003). Family approach with grandchildren of Holocaust survivors. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 57(4), 519-527.

Franklin, R. (2003). Breathing. *New Republic*, 229(20), 42-43.

Fuchs Winnik, M. (1988). Generation to generation: A discussion with children of Jewish Holocaust survivors. *Family Therapy*, XV(3), 271-284.

Gerassi, J. (1999). *The rise of Nazi Germany*. Unpublished paper. King David High School Victory Park: Johannesburg.

- Gergen, K. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266-275.
- Gill, A. (1988). *The Journey Back from Hell- Conversations with Holocaust Survivors*. London: Grafton Books.
- Glicksman, A., Van Haitsma, K., Mamberg, M.H., Gagnon, M., & Brom D. (2003). Caring for Holocaust survivors: Rethinking the paradigms. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, Winter/Spring, 148-153.
- Goffman, E. (2003). Second-generation voices: Reflections by children of Holocaust survivors and perpetrators. *An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies*, 21(2).
- Goldhagen, D.J. (1997). *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gross, S. (1988). The relationship of severity of the Holocaust condition to survivors child-rearing abilities and their offsprings' mental health. *Family Therapy*, XV(3), 211-222.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). *Fourth Generation Evaluation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Haley, I. (1998). *Postmodernism*. Retrieved June 30, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://www.canisius.edu/~valone/post_modern.html
- Hass, A. (1990). *In the Shadow of the Holocaust. The Second Generation*. London: Cornell University Press.
- Henning, D. (2005). *Courage under fire: Stories of adolescents who survive the destruction of divorce*. Unpublished MA dissertation. University of South Africa.
- Hoffman, E. (2005). *After such Knowledge- A Meditation on the Aftermath of the Holocaust*. London: Vintage.
- Horkheimer, M. & Flowerman, S.H. (1969). Preface. In T.W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D.J. Levinson & R.N. Sanford (Eds), *The Authoritarian Personality* (pp ix-xii). New York: W.W Norton & Company.
- Ingram, D. (1999). *Hannah Arendt*. Macmillan Compendium: Philosophy and Ethics. Retrieved May 14, 2006 from the World Wide Web: <http://0-galenet.galegroup.com.oasis.unisa.ac.za/servlet/History/hits?r=d>
- Jacobson, K. (1994). *Embattled Selves*. New York: the Atlantic Monthly Press.

- Kaniki, A. (1999). Doing an information search. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*, (pp. 17-28). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Kaslow, F.W. (1999). The lingering Holocaust: Legacies in lives of descendants of victims and perpetrators. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 30(6), 611-616.
- Katz, L. (2006). The effects of the Holocaust on the children of survivors. Retrieved March 30, 2006 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.about.com>
- Kellerman, N.P.F. (2001a). Perceived parental rearing behaviour in children of Holocaust survivors. *The Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences*, 38(1), 58-68.
- Kellerman, N.P.F. (2001b). Transmission of Holocaust trauma- an integrative review. *Psychiatry*, 64(3), 356-267.
- Kellerman, N.P.F. (2001c). Psychopathology in children of Holocaust survivors: A review of the research literature. *The Israel Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences*, 38(1), 36-46.
- Kelly, K. (1999a). Calling it a day: Reaching conclusions in qualitative research. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*, (pp. 421-437). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Kelly, K. (1999b). Hermeneutics in action: empathy and interpretation in qualitative research. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*, (pp. 398-420). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Kelman, H.C., & Hamilton, V.C. (1989) *Crimes of Obedience*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Knight, Z. (2002). Heal my heart: Stories of hurt and healing from group therapy. *The Indopacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 2(2), 1-15.
- Krell, R. (1982). Family therapy with children of concentration camp survivors. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 36(4), 513-522.
- Krell, R. (1984). Holocaust survivors and their children: Comments on psychiatric consequences and psychiatric terminology. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 25, 521-528.
- Krell, R., Sudefeld, P., & Soriano, E. (2003). Child Holocaust survivors as parents: A transgenerational perspective. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 74(4), 502-508.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

- Krystal, A. (2006). My Holocaust problem. *American Scholar*, 75(1), 37-47.
- Lichtman, H. (1984). Parental Communication of Holocaust experiences and personality characteristics among second-generation survivors. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 40(4), 914-919.
- Locke, D.C., Myers, J.E., & Herr, E.L. (2001). *The Handbook of Counselling*. London: Sage Publications.
- Major, E.F. (1996). The impact of the Holocaust on the second generation: Norwegian Jewish Holocaust survivors and their children. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 9(3), 441-454.
- Maturana, H.R. (1975). The organisation of the living: A theory of the living organisation. *The International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 7, 313-332.
- Mazor, A. & Tal, I. (1996). Intergenerational transmission: The individual process and the capacity for intimacy of adult children of Holocaust survivors. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 18(1), 95-113.
- McBurney, D.H. (2001). *Research Methods*. (5th ed.). United States: Wadsworth.
- Miller, W.L., & Crabtree, B.F. (1992). Primary care research: A multimethod typology and qualitative road map. In B.F., Crabtree & W.L., Miller (Eds.), *Doing Qualitative Research* (pp. 3-30). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Mouton, J. (2001). *How to Succeed in Your Master's and Doctoral Studies: A South African Guide and Resource Book*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Niewyk, D.L. (2004). Holocaust: The Genocide of the Jews. In S. Totten , W. Parsons & I. Charny, (Eds.), *Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and Eye-Witness Accounts (2nd ed)* (pp. 127-160). London: Routledge.
- Nordsrom, R. (1995). The Holocaust: We must not forget. *Families in Society*, 76(9), 567-569.
- Novick, P. (1999). *The Holocaust and Collective Memory: The American Experience*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Owen, I.R. (1992). Applying social constructionism to psychotherapy. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 5(4), 385-402.
- Parmet, H.L. (2004). Personal Testimony. *Judaism*, 53(1/2), 145-149.
- Parry, A. (1997). Why we tell stories: The narrative construction of reality. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 27(2), 118-127.

Pegelow, T. (2000). *The Nazi rise to power: Was the German nation a willing supporter of the Nazi regime?* Retrieved April 1, 2006 from the World Wide Web:
<http://0-galenet.galegroup.com.oasis.unisa.ac.za/servlet/History/hits?r=d>

Prince, R.M. (1985). *The Legacy of the Holocaust: Psychohistorical Themes in the Second Generation*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press.

Prochaska, J. O., & Norcross, J.C. (1999). *Systems of Psychotherapy: A Transtheoretical Analysis (4th ed.)* New York: Brookes/Cole Publishing.

Radtke, H.L. (2001). Goldhagen's psychological thesis: Goldhagen review symposium. *Theory and Psychology*, 8(5), 673-675.

Rapmund, V.J. (2005). *Qualitative Research*. Unpublished paper in the Department of Psychology, University of South Africa. Pretoria.

Reason, P., & Rowen, J. (Eds.). (1981). *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Rosenbloom, M. (1995). Implications of the Holocaust for social work. *Families in Society*, 76(9), 567-576.

Rosenheck, R., & Nathan., P. (1985). Secondary traumatisation in children of Vietnamese veterans. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, 36(5) 538-539.

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow R.L. (1991). *Essentials of Behavioural Research: Methods and Data Analysis*. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rothschild, M.H. (2000). Transforming our legacies: Heroic journeys for children of Holocaust survivors and Nazi perpetrators. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 40(3), 43-55.

Rylko-Bauer, B. (2005). Lessons about humanity and survival from my mother and from the Holocaust. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 78(1), 4-8.

Showalter, D. (2000). *The Nazi rise to power: History in dispute*. Retrieved April 1, 2006 from the World Wide Web:
<http://0-galenet.galegroup.com.oasis.unisa.ac.za:80/servlet/History/>

Sigal, J.J., & Weinfeld, M. (1989). *Trauma and Rebirth: Intergenerational Effects of the Holocaust*. New York: Praeger.

Slier, P. (2005) Interview with Tali Nates- Schindler's Lesson. *The Oprah Magazine*, (4)7, 107-108.

- Snyman, J. (2001). *The Politics of Memory*. Unpublished Paper. Rand Afrikaans University. Johannesburg.
- Solkoff, N. (1992). Children of survivors of the Holocaust: A critical review of the literature. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 62(3), 342-358.
- Sorscher, N., & Cohen, L. (1997). Trauma in children of Holocaust survivors: Transgenerational effects. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 67(3), 493-500.
- Soshan, T. (1989). Mourning and Longing from Generation to Generation. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, XLIII(2), 193-207.
- Speed, B. (1991). Reality exists O.K.? An argument against constructivism and social constructionism. *Family Therapy*, 13, 395-409.
- Staub, E. (1989). *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Staub, E. (2000). Genocide. In *Encyclopaedia of Psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 469-473). Chicago: Encyclopaedia of Psychology.
- Stevenson, L., & Haberman, D.L. (1998). *Ten Theories of Human Nature*. (3rd ed.) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stiles, W.B. (1993). Quality control in qualitative research. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 13, 593-618.
- Sudfeld, P. (2000). Reverberations of the Holocaust fifty years later: Psychology's contributions to understanding persecution and genocide [Presidential address]. *Canadian Psychology*, 41(1), 1-10.
- Sush, D. (2006). The transgenerational effect of the Holocaust. Retrieved March 30, 2006 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.about.com>
- Terre Blanche, M., & Kelly, K. (1999). Interpretive Methods. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*, (pp. 123-146). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Terre Blanche, M., & Durrheim, K. (1999). Social constructionist methods. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*, (pp. 147-172). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Todorov, T. (1999). *Facing the Extreme: Moral Life in the Concentration Camps*. Great Britain: Phoenix.

- Van der Rol, R. & Verhoeven, R. (1993). *Anne Frank- Beyond the Diary. A Photographic Remembrance.* New York: Penguin.
- Van Ijzendoorn, M.H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M.J., & Sagi-Schwartz, A. (2003). Are children of Holocaust survivors less well-adapted? A meta-analytic investigation of secondary traumatization. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 16(5), 459-469.
- Van Veuren, P. 1995. *Hermeneutic Positions on Scientific Rationality.* Pretoria: HSRC-Wetenskapbeelde.
- Walzer, M. 1987. *Interpretation and Social Criticism.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wardi, D. (1992). *Memorial Candles: Children of the Holocaust.* London: Routledge.
- Warnke, G. 1987 *Gadamer. Hermeneutics, Tradition and Reason.* Cambridge, Cambridgeshire: Polity Press.
- Weber, R.P. (1985). *Basic Content Analysis.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Weiss, M.D. (1988). Parental uses of authority and discipline by Holocaust survivors. *Family Therapy*, XV(3), 199-209.
- Weiss, M., & Weiss, S. (2000). Second generation to Holocaust survivors: Enhanced differentiation of trauma transmission. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 54(3), 372-386.
- White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative Means to Therapeutic Ends.* New York: WW. Norton & Company.
- Wick, D.T. (1996). Social constructionism groping toward this something. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, 15(3), 65-79.
- Williams-Keeler, L., McCarrey, M., Baranowsky, A.B., Young, M., & Johnson-Douglas, S. (1998). PTSD transmission: A review of secondary traumatization in Holocaust survivor families. *Canadian Psychology*, 39(4), 247-257.
- Wiseman, H., Barber, J.P., Raz, A., Yam, I., Foltz, C. & Livne-Snir, S. (2002). Parental communication of Holocaust experiences and interpersonal patterns in offspring of Holocaust survivors. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 26(4), 371-381.
- Woolf, L.M., & Hulsizer, M. R. (2005). Psychosocial roots of genocide: risk, prevention, and intervention. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 7(1), 101-128.
- Yalom, I.D. (1995). *Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy.* New York: Basic Books.

Appendix A1
Letter of Information.

Hello

My name is Liane Lurie. I am a student in the Master's programme in Clinical Psychology at the University of the South Africa. I have chosen to explore, "The role of the second-generation within Holocaust remembrance" as my research project. I am particularly interested in your experiences both as a child and as an adult in terms of the impact that the Holocaust has had upon you, in various ways. As such the method chosen will be an open-ended one-on-one interview, where questions relating to the above will be asked. I will be making use of thematic content analysis to analyse the data gathered. As such the interview will be transcribed, and with your permission, audiotaped. It is estimated that the interview will take approximately one hour.

As I am aware of the sensitive nature of this area, participation in this study is entirely voluntary. A decision not to participate will have no negative bearing on you in any way. Should you agree to participate, if the anxieties touched upon are too intense to handle, you may decide to withdraw from the interview at any stage, regardless of whether you had initially agreed to participate. You may also refuse to answer any of the questions posed during the course of the interview. However, I will endeavour to be as understanding as is possible to these concerns whilst the interviews are being conducted.

Every attempt will be made to ensure the confidentiality of the research participants. As such only my trainer Professor Ricky Snyders, and myself as the researcher, will have access to the informed consent forms as well as to the data gathered.

Looking forward to hearing from you

Regards

Liane Lurie

Contact Details: 082 392 0333/ (011) 888 4933 or rlurie@mweb.co.za

Further queries may also be directed to my trainer Professor Ricky Snyders

Contact Details: (012) 429 8222

Appendix A2**Consent form**

I have been completely informed regarding the nature of the study, as well as my participation in it. I hereby consent to participate in a one-on-one interview that is to be conducted by Liane Lurie, a Clinical Master's Student, under the supervision of Professor Ricky Snyders, at the University of South Africa. I understand that by taking part in this study, I incur no risk of harm to myself and that I have a right to withdraw at any given time during the study, without any negative consequences.

Signed.....Date.....

Appendix A3
Consent form to be audiotaped

I.....have been completely informed that participation in this research involves being audio taped. I am also aware that the researcher Liane Lurie as a Clinical Master's Student at the University of South Africa will ensure that my anonymity is kept, by restricting review of these tapes to herself and her trainer, Professor Ricky Snyders. I understand that these audio taped materials will be destroyed immediately once the dissertation has been accepted, to ensure my confidentiality and to further guarantee that my responses will not be identifiable, by virtue of replacing my name with a pseudonym.

Signed.....Date.....

Appendix B
Transcribed Interviews.
Appendix B1
Sarah Interview

L: How were you first introduced to the concept of the Holocaust?

S: Ah well I was born to it (laughing) in a way ah, to be born in Israel in the sixties where not only my family were Holocaust survivors, but really half of the class was, so you are born to it in many ways. First of all at home, your friends, people around you, many people don't have families, extended families so it's just there. Its very...no one's questioning, of course you don't have a granny, I mean no one has grannies, um, because of the Holocaust. So it was almost, I cannot tell you that there was one day I heard the word, you are born to it, you live with it, and of course in Israel don't forget that there is every year Yom Hashoah the Holocaust remembrance day, where the whole country is standing still, there is a siren, um in my childhood already even though there was no T.V.- T.V. in Israel was introduced quite late, but still the radio, there was always music, sad music, the siren, everyone is talking about it, the school is doing something about it. So living in Israel you cannot escape it. It's there and it's there in your consciousness, basically from start. And still is, by the way, I mean it wasn't only in the sixties. So still it was very much present. Even though my father did not speak much to start with, it was present, it doesn't matter if you speak or not speak, it's there, you cannot escape it. So I would say that is quite, um, quite common as well. I'm not only a special thing, especially in Israel, nothing very special, it was common, it was there; fathers and mothers that didn't speak, it didn't really matter.

L: You were aware of it?

S: Yes. You are aware of it. So like in South Africa as well, and in America and in Australia as well to Survivor's families as well it was clear from quite an early age.

L: At what point did you learn of your family's personal story of what had happened?

S: Um, details wise.... O.K let me just think.... My father did not speak, when I was youngish, like really young, he does when I was twelve, o.k., so he did speak a little bit, very little, I mean I would hear things like about his childhood, I knew about my granny

that died, aunts that died, I knew that one uncle that survived and there was a connection but no details, I would not know camps... no details whatsoever. Um my mom is not a Holocaust survivor; she was a refugee from Poland that arrived in Palestine in the late 1930's, um she spoke a little bit, but also did not speak much about family that was lost in early childhood. I think my father started to speak only after the Eichemmann trial that was in 1961, 62. I was born then, so he did speak to my mother, but not to me, because I was born in 1961. So I was just too young. But it was in the house, there were conversations in the house. So I probably picked up stuff quite early. Also, um I did pick up details quite early, and again it's not specific details but it's details quite early because my father was on Schindler's list and Schindler used to come every year to Israel and my father and mother used to go and meet Schindler once a year when he came, they usually had a few dinners and gatherings and things like that. And my father and mother will go to those occasions and I was too young and they didn't take me, but I used to have a babysitter, um I used to stay at an Aunt to baby-sit me, but I would know that I would stay there because Schindler came and Schindler saved my father. So, there was knowledge very early... how much of it I understood or not... but it was clear, you know, you go to the movies, I go and see Schindler, it was very very clear and there was no doubt. Schindler died the same year that my father died, so they both died in 1974 and um that was the end of that. So early childhood details were there but sketchy. Ah, more details I learnt much later through my uncle. My uncle is still alive, and he is eighty-five. Ah, he started to talk, definitely when I was in my twenties, thirties and now. He wrote about fifteen years ago or so, he wrote his memoir he shared with me. He was videotaped by the Spielberg project and he wrote poetry, and I would say in the last sort of twenty years, he is really really sharing... That is where a lot of the knowledge was accumulated, so learning still and I'm still discovering, I'm still finding out; last year I went back to Poland still finding out some details so uh, it's an ongoing journey.

L: Ongoing process?

S: Yes, very much so.

L: And as those links became clearer, your knowledge became clearer, how do you think you went about making sense of what had actually happened to your father and to your uncle?

S: Um, I think that's it's also a bit of a process because I was always interested, always interested in History, because of that I think. Uh I did it for school; I chose it for one of my subjects for matric, I chose it in university. At sixteen already, that was after my father's death, I went to Germany for a youth tour. We went to camps, we went to Bergen-Belsen we integrated with German youth, we had a Holocaust survivor with us and so on and that was when I was sixteen. And again I went after the army when I was twenty. I went again with a friend to Germany and this time also we went to Dachau and went to visit camps, it was always interest. Um, but that was again it's a process, because how much did I know I was sort of trying to learn more, speaking a bit more to my uncle, finding out more details, um but definitely interested and definitely building more and more um knowledge base. And then after finishing my studies in Israel, I got married I came here when I was twenty four, and did my honours here, whatever but then taught Holocaust studies in the College of Education and I think by teaching it, learning more about it, wanting to know more, its also sort of a process. I'm not sure, not sure that all second-generations do that, my brother didn't do that. My brother had a period in his twenties where he tried to learn everything and know everything and then was totally uninterested for about twenty years. He only got interested again last year when we went together to Poland. So it doesn't happen exactly the same, even in the same family. And my cousin, my uncle has one son, my cousin that is the same age as my brother so he's older than me, also not interested or very limited interest. So it's not the same definitely not the same. So I think again the journey sort of continues. Um, in the last years I'm lecturing a lot about it, I'm reading a lot about it, I took trips to Poland, I took groups to Poland for youth, all the time I'm getting more and more info and more information about it but still discovering new stuff in the last year and still discovering other angles and other ways to look at it. And a lot of stuff I don't know and maybe will never know. There is stuff... My father is dead, my uncle doesn't speak about or doesn't want to speak about so there will be stuff I will never know and I'm accepting that, it's alright. And my mother, also it's interesting, she's also speaking a lot more in the last few years. She came with us to Poland last year and really discovered a whole new side of the family that I didn't know...that is not directly Holocaust related, it's pre-Holocaust, but really very, very, very fascinating and interesting and a lot that they had to leave behind,

really richness in Warsaw and go to Palestine and live in a shed, and had nothing and uh, so that was quite interesting and not something I knew much about before, so I feel it's fascinating you can just learn all the time, you start.

L: Again and again?

S: It's wonderful. It's really wonderful. And to ask, I think sadly we don't ask enough. I didn't ask enough, uh for many years, and now I'm asking too much (laughs) but that's fine.

L: Do think that there was every a point where you discovered what had happened to your family and what had happened to the Jewish people and it just felt just completely inconceivable?

S: All the time. It's all the time. You go to Auschwitz and you stand there and you think that if you'll go to Poland you'll understand more and you'll absolutely you'll get it and it will be in colour it will not be black and white and if anything it's opposite, because it's so... the sheer size of everything, the uh...even though I'm a Holocaust scholar or you know I speak about it and I supposedly know a lot about it I know very little, because it was, it is very detailed and it is huge and enormous and uh many times you feel it is like so big, um can you know everything? No, you cannot know everything? I don't think the greatest professors in the subject know everything. And that is on the one level, also on the level of suffering there is no ways that I can know what my father went through. No ways, I can hear the stories, I go to Poland and see where he was born, see where he worked in this concentration camp and where he was tortured in that concentration camp but still, there is no way, I don't feel it. I, I was protected I was born in Israel, I live here, I have a privileged life. So there's no way, no way you can, you can really grasp it. I think my helplessness and my uh desperation is not so much about Holocaust, because that's sixty years ago you know and I can support the survivors now and I can teach it. My desperation and my helplessness is that suffering is still happening and it doesn't really matter where and to who, we are all human and there is no human that is more human than other human, that is the desperation that the world at the moment looks, not in a good shape. And uh, even though I work in that field its huge, you cannot save the world, you cannot save the world.

L: Even though you want to...

S: Yes so, (sighs)... That's where my need and desperation lies; it's not the Holocaust as such, even though it's enormous. I'll go and I'll stand in Auschwitz and you'll see the ash, you see the crematoriums and you don't get it but I was in Rwanda last year and I don't get it. You know I stand in a church and I see four thousand skulls and bones and I still don't get it. So, and actually my frustration now is, and you know I talk to the people here that you open the radio here and you hear that in Delmas, that is half an hour from here, people are dying from Typhoid and we are blady in South Africa in 2005 and how dare we stand by and not rush with water there, and you know that I think is more my frustration, that we as human beings are struggling to learn the lessons.

L: Yes, promises that, that kind of devastation will never happen again, have kind of fallen away...

S: It's, it's, excuse my French... Bullshit! So that's my irritation, and frustration and uh sometimes (sigh) helpless, not hopeless because that's the reason I have to work, so there's no hopelessness, yet, but there is definitely a need and an urgency to do and to do more, because of my background perhaps. And I think a lot of Holocaust survivors' sons and daughters are in fields of healing and of trying to do something, teaching, a lot of them are teachers, many of my friends in Israel are teachers, even Math teachers, it doesn't really matter but they are in the teaching or healing or people's sort of avenues because that is the need of so many of us, to change it somehow.

L: So it's something that has almost become part of your identity?

S: Yes, very much so. So that's where I am with that I think.

L: Do think what had happened to your father, affected the way you were parented?

S: There's no doubt. No doubt. Holocaust survivors in general and my father was definitely not an exception were not uh, were not people without problems...without, uh without problems I don't know lets just start generalising, I never met anyone that didn't have something or don't have something, I never, never met and I met hundreds of Holocaust survivors through my work and my life, if not thousands and none of them was unscarred so their parenting cannot be normal. So let's talk about my father: he was fourteen years old when the war started, he didn't have childhood, he didn't go to high school because he was fourteen, he was supposed to go to high school, the war started, uh he lost every female member of his family, his mother, his sisters, his grannies, his aunts,

his cousins. Um, the only ones that survived were the two boys, so what sort of example do you have as a normal family after the age of fourteen? That is problematic and then the torture to be fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, go through different concentration camps; being beaten up, no dignity, starving, hunger, see people dying next to you, shot next to you, um, that is to start and then to see goodness in such a way that you have you know uh Schindler who saves a thousand people and who saves your life, and he's a German and how do you make sense of that as a child? So definitely not normal upbringing. Normal, fourteen years before that, thank God. You know. He did have a very good family unit. His father died when he was two so he did not know his father, that was quite sad, and a loss and also not normal maybe upbringing. So that's on my father's side. On my mother's side as well, you know losing a lot of family members, coming as refugees, being from richness to poor, not knowing exactly what to do, and then the two of them meeting, getting married and struggling along and not having anything, having to build life, it's a hard, hard life. Uh from total poverty. You find that my father came to Israel in 1949, nothing, nothing- a few dishes, plates, some clothes, nothing. And then you try to build up a family and we were, we were poor to start with. My childhood was, I think my first pair of jeans I got at fourteen years old after he died, because there was no... everyone was wearing jeans already at that stage and I wasn't because there was no money. Things that we take for granted I mean, what's the problem...so I think that was part of childhood and parenting was difficult; there was no model, I mean none of us, I'm not a perfect parent, I mean no one is a perfect parent, I don't think your parents are perfect parents (laughing). And probably you will not be a perfect parent. But because there is no manual! You know we don't know. You know we try I mean they really tried their best; there is no doubt in my heart. I was a gift. My brother was a gift. Any life that came after that was absolutely precious. We knew it, we felt it, we felt the love; I felt the love very much. My brother is struggling, he knows the love he wasn't sure, it's difficult. And he (father) had nightmares, he was screaming at night, and we were kids, so it was difficult it wasn't normal atmosphere at home. And to ask someone with such trauma, I mean one of his tasks at one of the camps was to bury dead, to unbury, in other words to open the mass grave and to take the bodies out and to burn them. And he was I think at that stage seventeen years old. How are you then parenting a child, after that normally? I

don't know and I think he did a good job, I really do, and my mother also with all her trauma and with all my fights through teenager years and now as I look back... she'll be eighty in October, so I'm going to Israel for five days to celebrate, we had stormy, stormy relationships for many, many years and yet I look back, um of course it would have been stormy, she tried but she doesn't know how to do it, because of um, um where they came from and the guilt of surviving, oh it's, aagh it's so complex, I mean this is a PhD, it's really not an essay, it's so complex, so I really do think they very much tried their best and values wise as parents I got a lot of very good values. So if I reflect on that level, they were liberal, they were in Israel not hateful, they voted always to the liberal left sort of parties that were um not hating Arabs, o.k. My fathers um sort of learning from the Schindler saga was very much that you cannot generalise, not everyone is bad or good, Schindler was a German, people have choices, Schindler had a choice, we have choices. So those values were very much installed, verbally and nonverbally to us as children and honesty and integrity and not vengeance were very much there. My father um learnt to be a mechanic really, because he had no education so he had to have a profession, learnt it in Germany then came to Israel, and worked in garages fixing cars and then became a partner in a small business, a garage of Volkswagen. For how much a person that suffered in the hands of the Germans then worked in a German company in Israel. For me you don't have to say, this is nonverbal, for me this is a value where you don't generalise and you say you know we have to work to build something together, and this is very powerful, very, very powerful for me and for my brother. My brother is still working in that agency and he's, they grew a hundred times and flourishing and really doing very well; they went to Germany many times. So as parents again, it was I think not easy, many mistakes no doubt like everyone else but uh the best they can and many times, I said it many times and I'll say it again with second-generation in general and definitely in my case more than my brother, in my case as the little girl, because as I said before I had a huge burden because I was the only girl child, my uncle had a boy, my brother is a boy, and I was the only, I am the only girl. Now there are grandchildren, I have a daughter. For that generation I was the only girl representing all the women that were murdered. I was named; my second name is Helen, after his sister that was sixteen when she was murdered and um the burden on that level was for sure quite huge but now it's a huge

gift, I am so blessed to have that name and to be able to do that work. But as a child you are hiding the name. You know in Israel Helen its, people will ask you where that name's from, you know it's not an Israeli name, so its important and you have to explain she died and you don't want to speak about it: so on that level it's not easy and then for sure I was a girl I was very much parenting him instead of him parenting me, I was parenting him more than I was parenting my mother. I did parent my mother very much when he died; I slept next to her for a year. So it is very much a second-generation thing, you'll find it in the literature, it's there, you know it was researched quite a lot, parenting of the parents. Yes sure it was there to a large extent. It will be there looking after him if he's upset, running after him and asking him if he's alright because I must make it alright, very much a reversal of roles. I didn't know it was going on; I just did it naturally from very, very young age, really young age. I remember pictures of me like at six or seven or eight, like really young age of already making it better. So I think on that level there was that and it's interesting like I look at my daughter now, and she's also... Maybe it's a character as well because she's very mature, she was seventy-five years old when she was born, you know she's a character, you have that and she's many times more responsible than me, or Clive my husband. So sometimes it is a character and uh maybe I had that character to start with. But it is connected also I think with the second-generation and the fact that I was the girl and there was no other girl, also I think quite complex.

L: It's amazing how intuitive you were, a little girl, picking up on that.

S: Yes, yes, and you feel the need, you just answer to the need, I think that's what many times you do, just instinctively without thinking, and understanding and analysing and whatever. I'm in many ways grateful to that part, and he dies young and I was young so at least I have those memories that were not painful, they were good memories of me looking after him, (laughs) so they powerful, they good you know and its funny even with my brother and we discuss quite a lot of times, he didn't feel it because he was a boy, boys don't pander and of course he loved him, but when I explain to him that, that he didn't know and he didn't think about it, it really sets him free a little bit, because my brother, because he never understood why I got all the attention and love in his eyes, it wasn't the case, and he admitted this and he knows he was loved but there was, definitely there was a gap and I know it and it's not healthy but it was as it was. There's nothing

you can do, just accept it and forgive and uh, ja, I think on that level, it's quite again a work in progress and you reflect back and look at it. You try and forgive, for my brother I think it's quite a long process.

L: I suppose it's difficult because he doesn't want to make value judgments about it.

S: Yet, it's sore, it's painful because you do uh, you don't understand it as a boy why you just take it personally, he doesn't love me as much as he loves that sister of mine and I don't very much like her and why did she come without understanding of course what he understands now how complex it was, how not rational it was. It wasn't coming from the head; it was coming directly from the losses and from the heart. I think that is again process that goes on and will go on and now you reflect back and you learn all the time. So um I think that is more or less the story of the parenting I think.

L: And in terms of the way you have related this story to your own daughter?

(other children also.)

S: Um, I think. The Holocaust is there, because that is my profession, uh, shame my poor kids cannot escape the fact that I am in Rwanda and in Poland and everywhere. And on the one level, I think that they always knew, they accept me there is pride and there is irritation that I'm not home as it goes... I'm not giving too many details uh to soon only when they ask for it, or we talk about it I will, I don't want me to push it down their or shove it, I'm not hiding, it's there and if there movies we watching, it's never hidden, actually when I came back from Poland, my son is only in Grade three and the teacher asked me to come and tell the kids something about Poland, you know very wishy washy, but something about Poland and connected somehow, and I came and I spoke to them... you know it is young and it is fine and if they asked and that's what they asked I told them a little bit about it and he does definitely know a little bit about it. He knows that his grandfather was a Holocaust survivor, he never met him of course, he saw a picture. I don't say anything to him, you know Schindler's list or anything like that, no he's too young. Um but my daughter that is sixteen is very interested so she reads some books about the Holocaust, she watches movies, she went with me to Poland this year for "March of the living" so she saw the camp where her grandfather was. Ah but its healthy on her part, she's not obsessed with it, she's interested, I'm not sure that she knows all the details, no she doesn't know all the details, when she'll ask I'll tell her. Um it has to

be her need and not my need. But she knows enough she's interested, she does history for matric, but it will come if she's wants it. I think she's also getting very much this other side that I spoke of, this side of social responsibility and our role in what do you do after the Holocaust, and what you do here, your responsibility in South Africa and I hope that for me that is very important; what do they get, the messages rather than just Holocaust. Holocaust for Holocaust's sake is interesting, but for me it's not enough.

L: It needs to be generalised?

S: I'm not sure generalised, but you need to learn something from it, or else my granny just died. Ok so she died because she was Jewish, fine. But that happened sixty years ago, who should care about it, just Jews then we got nothing. Do we learn? What do we learn from it? Do we learn tolerance? Do we learn that every human being has rights? Do we learn, what do we learn not to hate? We don't learn so we have a lot of work to do. But I want the kids to learn, I would like the kids to learn that if anything. I think they do, they do, to a large extent. On that level I think I'm a bit more radical than other second generation but that's fine. Probably the community looks at me, and I know I did hear it before that I'm a bit controversial because I am going to Rwanda and I care about that. And I do work here in the townships but my thing is that if we learnt only that Holocaust is important and where was the rest of the world when the Jews died, we are hypocrites because where is the world now when people die in Sudan, so what we don't care because they are black and they are Muslim. So, ja that is for me more of importance than Holocaust studies.

L: Yes, we live in a country, on a continent where there is so many areas you can get involved.

S: Yes, and you cannot get involved in everything but something, try. So that's for me an obsession.

L: And I think it's amazing how you've spoken about your father, how he emerged from it without that bitterness weighing him down; how you've been able to take that and do something with it, be proactive and shape your life.

S: I think that with him, even though he was very traumatised, as I said nightmares and other issues, he still he had, had a good role model of someone who did something where perhaps I was very lucky to have that um, and my uncle's the same, but he will say he's

different, he was older, he saw things differently but still you know it's Schindler, the love for the man that saved his life and the fact that you can make a difference in other people's life not life and death you know, it is huge, I cant ignore it... I can ignore it but I choose not to ignore it (Laughs). And people will do whatever they can, you will do whatever you can and my brother will do whatever he can and you cannot judge... people will... you can just ask them to do, teach them to do, I cannot judge if they don't do as much as I would like them to do. Again a process, sometimes I judge, other times I don't, it's how you feel.

L: Great. Thank you.

S: You welcome.

Appendix B2

Bill Interview

L: How were you first introduced to the concept of the Holocaust?

B: (Long Pause). I don't remember but it must have been through my parents, I'm sure talking about it. I can't remember how I was introduced.

L: Was it something that was spoken about a lot in your house?

B: Oh yes, my mother spoke, my father didn't speak. He was in concentration camps. She was in various ghettos throughout the war but he was in Dachau he didn't speak much. My mother did most of all the speaking in fact, most of the speaking.

L: So were you aware of what her particular story of being a survivor was?

B: Yes, yes, no she has repeated that story endlessly for the last fifty years. The story, which has been repeated in different ways constantly. She'll constantly, often hearkens back to this story, sort of a big significant event in her life. So my father spoke really rarely, unless you challenged him about this.

L: So you had both sides of it at home?

B: Well I had both sides but essentially the versions that I really recall vividly were the ones that my mother kept talking about.

L: Can you tell me about her story?

B: Ooh it's a long story, in fact I can't, um there many things being written, in fact there's a book being written about her... fundamentally I uh you know, she was a young girl I think, she and her sister were about sixteen years of age, then um, at the time that the war broke out, she was a music student, I know she that she was in the Riga, um Vilna no Riga Ghetto, stayed there for quite some time and then her music professor managed to procure her release with false papers, so she was somehow smuggled out, landed up in Austria, then landed up in Italy and spent quite a bit of the War in Italy, but I would say, you know a good portion of it was spent in Ghettos really Ghettos and various subsidiary Ghettos, whatever they were. That in a nutshell is her story; believe me that's really a nutshell. But to give you each and every item of detail I would hate even to try. You know I've heard that story so often that I actually um developed a block. (Laughs)

It's repeated so frequently and it's different permutations as the years go on, you know so I really um I'm tired of it, to say the least.

L: From the literature that I have looked at, some members of the second generation who say that they want to learn about it, they can't learn enough and others who say, it's enough already.

B: Ja, because I think the tendency of a lot of the people, Holocaust survivors is to concentrate on their experiences and they don't have a holistic picture of what's going on and everything, you know they relate whatever happens, whenever they discuss these issues, it's only their experiences essentially and they treat them as if that is the total Jewish experience.

L: Yes, it's not universal...

B: It's not universal and you realise it's not and, and you know there is a limit as to how much you can listen to a particular version of events which does come up, um... What effect the Holocaust has had on her and on us is not an easy question, one doesn't know, you know personalities as you brought up, what factors played a role in your life to mould your personality or your mindset.

L: Do you think it had an effect on the way in which you were parented?

B: I think so, I think so...um I've sort of, you know till about four years old, till I went to nursery school my parents never lit Shabbos candles for example and I went to nursery school and told my mother, "Why is it that everybody else lights candles?" and she started lighting candles since then and we've been a very traditionally observant Jewish family, uh we've always been members of a shul and you know celebrated all the festivals. I mean we are really a... certainly we do not um, we are not frum (religious) or super frum as we call it today Jewish family. We are your traditional Jewish secular family that comprises the South African community in its former years until the charismatic movements came from abroad like Hyacinth attaching to the Hartebeesport dam and took root here in this part of Johannesburg and essentially divided the Jewish community, but that's another issue, you can hear that I've got a... it's one of my favourite subjects (laughs). So all I can say is, I think yes upbringing. I think it's the absence of grandparents which is probably the major factor, um also I think other Jewish people or other Jewish children didn't share the same background in a sense, those

brought up in South Africa with South African parents so they couldn't relate at all, so you felt you were different in that sense, um... I know with my mother she seems to be the main figure for some reason and my father was absolutely, it may be the way he dealt with matters and he truly went through a, I would regard as a far more difficult... although who knows, Ghettos and concentration camps were not particularly pleasant places either um... He hardly spoke but was always from a psychological point of view you realise that there was something behind this all; you didn't know too much about his family, you didn't know too much about, I believe that he may have been married at the time of the war; I think his wife may have disappeared. So he, you always never really got to know, you know whereas other people said, "This is my uncle Harry, and uncle Sam and uncle Jerry" who your uncles were and what they are was somehow always a murky subject for some reason or another or you know there simply wasn't clarity so there was always the family dynamics that you didn't have the grandparents, you didn't have the big broad family circle and to that extent you realise that you were different. As far as my mother is concerned I do often remember her, and this was an impact, jeeze and you know she's taken sleeping tablets to this very day, she never falls asleep without tablets, I mean I think she is a tablet addict, um she is addicted to the stuff and I often heard her waking up oh shouting and screaming in the night and my father having to calm her down and things like that. And I remember as a kid, what's going on over there all of a sudden, shouting in her room, it was just her having sort of nightmares and things like that I often remember, I'm quite sure that that has something to do with her experiences. Look she lost her parents at the age of fifteen, sixteen both of them she went to a synagogue, I know they were all rounded up in their town and then the women and men were separated and that was the last she saw of her parents, so it's a very nasty experience at the age of sixteen. It must have had an impact on her and I've also noticed that now that she is old, she is now eighty-two, um she is a very capable survivor let me tell you she, you know why she survived, I mean she is a musician she played, she even plays the violin to this very day but I think there is a certain coldness that you get, they never try to get to close to their children for some reason you know the way that I sort of feel that there's a, in case anything were to happen so as a self-defence mechanism, you know so don't always assume that life is so pleasant that everyone has everybody, and

everybody, that sort of thing, as self-defence mechanism I think... It seems like a battery, I liken it to a battery- a car battery where you have six cells and one of the cells is somehow a bit dead, so you functioning on five cells, it's not getting full power, sort of the analogy I've often felt, I'm sure that is an effect, a psychological effect of the war, I, I really do, an inability to really form these strong, sort of close relationships with her children, grandchildren. She doesn't form these types of relationships, she's much closer to my sister but to her grandchildren she doesn't relate in the same... you know you often see a grandparent are very much an integral part of... she's quite independent.

L: Disconnected?

B: Disconnect! Little bit of a disconnect, yes that's probably the right term, disconnected a little bit. You have to gauge, you have to, you know we have to constantly phone her, she won't come without an invitation, she won't phone you without, you know there's a disconnect a little bit, which I've always felt was, to me seems like an emotional, which I call the battery, that cell seems a bit dead. And that's all I can really say. It's difficult to say what really psychologically happened, how all of this has played a role, but I think it has um makes one a little bit harder, a little bit insensitive I think when it comes to watching Holocaust things. I think as a child, for many many years, just as my student days I didn't, I wanted little to do with Holocaust, but strangely enough I, I was, I as fate would have it, I was called upon by this 'Tolerance Foundation,' Kim Feinberg had that whole Holocaust thing, so I got onto the board, she put me on the board of this 'Tolerance Foundation' and I, of necessity had to learn some of the more modern developments about the Holocaust. I don't read too much about the Holocaust, I think really that's because it's been pumped, I don't feel like buying extra books to learn about this. People rushing off to Auschwitz, I've been to Dachau once when I was on a tour, I've no particular desire to go on any of these current tours that go off to Auschwitz, to learn of my roots or anything like that. I'm actually talking aloud really, because I'm thinking I know I've really little desire to rush off and have this Damascus experience out there in Poland.

L: Do you think it's because it's something you consider as part of you or it's just something...?

B: It's something I think I know, something that I know, I don't really want to worry, undergo it, I know it happened, I'm fully aware, I can visualise Arbeit Macht Vry, I can visualise the railway stations and the... I don't want myself to go there and sit around and relive this, maybe it's a fear I don't know, maybe a rejection, maybe it's a fear, I, it's not the way I'd like to spend time doing anything like that.

L: I mean it's painful stuff to unearth.

B: Ja, maybe it is, maybe that's what I don't want to have to repeat what I've been... because this whole Holocaust tale, has really I mean my mother has really been instrumental in repeating this, to the point that she's, there's this Nachum Keller, he was here recently and he's writing a book, and he's written about eight or nine chapters of her story and there's a couple of them, there's a couple of these ladies who specialise in dramatising the Holocaust. I call it specialising in dramatising, I'm not underestimating what they are doing I'm... that's their way of, throughout life, throughout the time that I have known them this is how they sort of self-martyrdom, portraying themselves as some sort of Joan's of Arc or martyrs. But that's their way of expressing it, drawing attention to themselves...

L: But it doesn't sit well with you though...

B: Not particularly, no, not particularly, um I used to go to the six million day memorial service, I still do occasionally, I won't go out of my way to go there. Um that's why I think I say there are psychological impacts, psychological effects I think if I were not a child or a product of a survivor I may have wanted to learn more about this, been more enthusiastic about learning about the Holocaust. I've been to the Holocaust museum in Washington and a few other places but every time you go to such places, it's nothing new in a sense it's something that's in you, you expect it and you not horrified by it for some reason

L: Desensitised.

B: Desensitised. That's it, desensitised. I don't know if you've heard that expression with other interviewees but that's it...ja it's a little bit desensitised, a little bit, at times I am interested I bought a few books here and there, I've even bought a few books but I don't read them, I never read them, they on the shelf upstairs but I don't. I must say though I think the Jewish people have undergone as far as the Holocaust experience is concerned a

change in attitude, I think, I think you getting some pretty good stuff coming out now, post Schindler's list approach to the subject I think, people learning about it more objectively, more scientifically, I think the pain is too much, too subjective for the first twenty or thirty years, too raw and I think everyone would just talk about personal experiences, instead of understanding if you can understand this mind boggling event, I mean it's a cataclysmic event, I don't know how people... but now I must say that people write you know I never wanted to read the writings of this, what's his name again celebrated Holocaust writer, I saw an interview with him walking down Auschwitz with Oprah Winfrey?

L: Eli Wiesel?

B: That's it, Eli Wiesel; I don't like to read, I can't sit down and read a book like that, I think maybe I'm just talking myself into some sort of insensitivity about this, desensitised.

L: Look; I think you can also look at it in terms of survival, in terms of carrying on...

B: Ja, I think it's got to do with self-survival or the whole thing builds up to a psychological self-defence mechanism somehow to cope with life, that's really what it's all about I think. If you talk about the impact of all of this, it's about how do you pick yourself up and how do you carry on and what happens to all of these thoughts because I know that I am a judge and I um do a lot of criminal work and we are often exposed to horrific photographs and one particular case I had in 1998 was with the Katlehong massacre, it was a, fifteen young boys were decapitated and disembowelled, I got those photographs in my office and I tell you the impact, the psychological impact of those photographs, pretty much like the photographs you see when the Allied forces invaded the concentration camps, the bodies are dropping, except these were in colour and I had to look at them for about nine months, and I know that it's constantly without, it's constantly I mean you need psychological debriefing, judges need debriefing... I don't know how you go about doing this, but you know I was once hijacked so-called debriefing you know, I really think we judges are at risk ourselves because we are exposed to too much horrific stuff, and I think that there is a measure of comparison here with the way you handle that, you sort of block it off in your mind, but it's not blocked off, you suppress it, I don't know you, those photographs are vivid to me it's amazing

actually and they live with me, and I've been a judge for ten years and they still there um, it informs your thinking actually when you see these types of things. I got a feeling that my parents would, simply didn't want to, my father, I don't know, he maybe didn't want to expose his children to all of this, kept quiet. (Getting frustrated, can't find his words) My mother on her own, that's her way of dealing with this, coped by talking, talking, talking and it's been like that ever since I've been a child, you don't have to talk about Europe or anything and she'll relate it back to the Holocaust, so there's this constant reference, no matter what you see you know, "oh yes we used to have somebody like that" you know any association, the language, some other foreigner comes from Poland or Russia, it immediately triggers off something and at times it can become quite difficult, at times you just ignore it and carry on. Ja I did that, where are we now, now we are in Riga, now we are moving to Austria wherever... so you become quite uh, what's the word?

L: Desensitised?

B: Ja, I think that's all I can really say about this. I've tried to think what effect the Holocaust has had with regards to our environment generally. I think I'm pretty tough emotionally, I think I'm desensitised, probably soft on the inside, but to all of this probably built up this nice psychological hard exterior.

L: Perhaps that's your coping mechanism

B: I think that's what it is, a coping mechanism, I sit in court very often, witnesses crying, with this problem and that problem. I think, for you it's a problem, for the Jews it wasn't a problem. You crying here about murdered this, you don't feel sorry for me... I think it toughens you up a little bit, you not a very soft and sensitive person after this or a balanced person. I can't think of any other areas in particular that...

L: The way in which you make sense of experiences. So what you are telling me is the way in which your father made sense of it was to protect you?

B: I think so. I used to ask him and then he would tell me, some pieces of information but he wouldn't... to the point that you don't really know too much about your family even, he wouldn't tell you too much, he's suppressing all these things you see, and he thinks it's the best thing, it's a new life here in South Africa, they came here after the war, the children mustn't be exposed to this sort of thing.

L: The feeling that you could leave behind what had happened

B: Ja, that's why, I may be speculating but I think that is true, it can't be that a person just, it's definitely a type of suppression, didn't want to recall or make a whole meal of this at every dinner table. It's had a major impact, psychologically on family life. The biggest lacuna that you see is the absence of grandparents and the absence of a wider cohesive family, you know your family tree goes a bit short...you as a child are aware of it in a sense that you see other South African families, you know this one's a cousin of that one, this one's related to that one, everybody's here brothers, sisters, uncles and the grandparents. You were aware of that and that I remember quite clearly, I couldn't relate to a grandparent, there are no grandparents, so you couldn't, this idea of bobba, zaida is foreign. I could never understand how a grandchild felt sort of a strong attachment let's say to a grandparent, something I don't really know about.

L: Was there a sense of something's missing something's...

B: Ja, why is it that we don't have? And my mother would say, "Well they were killed in the War". "Killed in the war? What war?" You know what I mean, sort of the child of a young age, whatever age, that was the answer, killed in the war, died in the war, murdered by the Germans. I remember hearing about this, 6,7,8- murdered by the Germans. It doesn't sit well with children; it's not a good answer, but that has to be, it's reality there's no other answer in fact.

L: She couldn't have softened it in any way.

B: I was going to say, but what other answer can you give? I think that must have been the experience of so many Holocaust survivors and their children. I've never really spoken to children whose parents were in the Holocaust, survivors of the camps, I've never had the occasion to speak to them. In any case, I was going to say, I think it's toughened me up, I'm not shaken by anything that goes on in our courts today, but I like it that way, because I think one tends to... I don't know what you are looking for, I can't cast any light on...

L: You talk about the profession that you've chosen...

B: A lot of colleagues and friends don't have that background and this is what they've chosen. That may be a purely personal thing. I don't really want to read too much about

it, I have no desire, it's not that I have no desire, I have a lot of interest in it, I'll buy books but I won't read them.

L: So the act of buying books is an acknowledgment.

B: It's an acknowledgment, let me go and buy some books, not wanting to go on tours like the "March of the living." I know, it's like with me, I know. I walk into a Holocaust museum, I know it's me, it's like *deja vu*, you expect it to be there, what you see doesn't shock you or... and you learn little, you go to museums as if you've seen this, you've heard about this. They can't tell you something new, you are familiar with... anything you are familiar with doesn't interest you so much...

L: Does that frustrate you?

B: No, not really. I think it's a sign of guilt, as a Jew you'd be expected to have a very serious interest in this. It's one of the most profound experiences that the Jewish people have faced in modern times, so um I feel a bit, well if I had a choice to go to a Holocaust museum or a other museum, I'd probably go to the latter.

L: Because there is almost this big question of who said, you have to remember and where did it come from?

B: Well I think my understanding and perspective has changed since childhood days obviously... I've actually gone through a period of anger and annoyance, I think as a kid, I became sort of angry at the Germans, you know what are you doing here, what have you done, I think that's an anger, now it's more of an accepting thing and more objective view of this Holocaust, but so are the Jewish people I think- the writers, I'm not talking about the anger, they looking at it as a very empirical subject right now...

L: If it's possible to separate your emotions from that.

B: Well I went, in Cape Town, I was there last year, I went to the Holocaust museum there. Well you know it's interesting, you go look at movies, you have a big Holocaust survivors talk. I just, I just think you see people sitting there fixed for hours listening to these tales, I don't want to listen to it. What you glean from that I don't know?

L: There's no universal phenomenon as to how people deal with it and carry on.

B: But there can be no question that the emotional reactions of, or it does impair or effect your emotional state, your psychological state, this whole thing. I really can't touch on anything more, I don't really make a point of self-analysing myself, to work out why you

are as you are and why I think the way I do. I don't know there are many things that inform me, all my life experiences.

L: This is one of them.

B: This is one, but it rears its head. I think it; I'm just thinking when you see a Holocaust movie or something on television, they used to have that "World at War" series and you what I'm saying, I don't, I don't look forward to, I don't watch those sort of things with any... if I do it's very casually, I don't know why it is, or why it is like that... I think it is that I know too much and it brings up the pain, it brings up an uncomfortable sort of feeling.

L: So you deal with the present.

B: I mean you have to think ahead, I... without forgetting the past, but I think you can't allow the past to envelop you completely, I think that's what happens to the survivors, the past tends to engross them and they feel sorry for themselves, they like to attract attention to themselves, they like to tell these stories to everybody or somebody, people are not interested in their stories, some are but these stories are bored and sundry.

L: A lot of the literature I've looked at, says as the generation of survivors are nearing the end of their lives, who is going to tell those stories, who is going to pass on those injunctions of, "Never again" and "We must remember" and "What happened?"

B: You know in two hundred years, I really don't think people are going to be wanting to listen to survivors' tales of people they don't know. It's going to be historical fact and the books that are written are going to be the only record of what's going on here, with movies and pictures and historical material, I really don't think they going to want to listen to old bobbas and zaidas in the United States and Israel and South Africa talking about what it was like when they arrived in Auschwitz, cos there's a sameness about everything. I'm afraid that's a fact of life, I don't think, whose it going to remember, the way we remember Tisha B'Av, (Jewish fast day commemorating destruction of Temple and other terrible events in Jewish history) Tisha B'Av, Holocaust it's not going to obliterated from memory, not from Jewish memory, but in a different way, I don't think it can be ever be remembered with physical contact with survivors.

L: And in terms of the lessons that we take from it or the lessons that you've taken from it?

B: Ja, I think so, I'm constantly aware of one thing and that is, how the most civilised people on earth can become barbarians in no time, how if propagandistic ideas are pumped into your head, even the most logical and rational people can become killers and that's the horrific part of that lesson, horrifying to think. We complain here, in our courts today black people are not behaving themselves in a certain way, man how do we compare ourselves, given our history and culture and other advantages that we've enjoyed over the years, attention and privileges and Germans who were in a perfectly good position- intellectual aristocracy, well perhaps they assumed that certain people were not untermenschen, people not worth living, they not people, so you agree to take them out, anybody can do it. I must say in the, when I see Hezbollah fighting, those horrific negative thoughts about civilians who seem to be... I'm not particularly, I can't relate to them well, whether it's a thousand dead or two thousand dead I'm also disconnected a little bit, I think war is a terrible thing. This current war gives you an example; the mere thought of a hundred Israelis dying is painful. It's amazing each morning of this Lebanese crisis I'd get up and think gee another twenty Israelis dead, I couldn't absorb that, I find that painful to listen to, twenty families lost young boys or so... that I could relate to, painful. I didn't treat that with disconnect, I can tell you, I was glued to the television day and night and I have this terrible insensitivity towards the people who are being bombed in Lebanon, but maybe that happens every war and has nothing to do with Holocaust, maybe that's just the way it is. I mean I just talked frankly about how I felt, I don't know if it has to do with Holocaust, but one still feels for your own.

L: Thanks very much.

B: Pleasure, I've got nothing else to add. It's a very complex business, I can't pinpoint to you, which parts of my thinking are informed by, but I can vouch for the fact that it has an impact, make no mistake about that, the trouble is it not only has an impact on the way you relate to other people but also how you see the Holocaust itself or the way you want to see the Holocaust, you want to disconnect a little bit, and that's where guilt feelings come in a little bit because you are supposed to, which Jews can say, "Look don't tell me about the Holocaust, I don't want to hear." You know that's a Jewish issue, you can't treat the Holocaust in that manner. You know what I am saying, and when my mother

raises it, I immediately switch off, it's a terrible thing, I'm become quite cynical I say "Look well it's overkill."

L: So we all deal with it in our own way and own time.

B: Ja well I. This Holocaust is a hot potato (laughs) you not quite sure how to handle it, at times you tolerant, at times you not willing to hear, at times you get angry about it

L: So there's no one means to survive.

B: That's what I'm saying, I think even for the person who's used to it already, it's a frustrating thing, it looms its head, it comes up again and it comes up again. I must say I don't like seeing people engendering sympathy out of the Holocaust, towards you or Jews in general... it's undermines the integrity of the Holocaust, or credibility or seriousness of what happened, it's not a bunch of excuses for what Israel does today from time to time, but people will say, "But it's the Holocaust that happened here." The more it's thrown up and used for other ulterior purposes to try and vindicate or explain your actions, the more it erodes the integrity, or the ability of people to understand how serious an event it is, you undermining it, taking something away from it and using it for the wrong purposes, as the race card so often is, you are a racist, you anti-Jewish, anti-Semitic... don't you understand I come from a people who went through the Holocaust, we know all this. I used the Holocaust very effectively I must say, I was interviewed by the Judicial service committee for appointment as a judge in 1996 and it's a very taxing interview by a whole series of politicians and judges and the one question that one of them put to me, which I expected was going to come up is a question that is put to all people, "What did you do in the struggle in this country to fight racism?" "Nothing, I'm a Jewish boy from King David, went to Wits university, went to the army in fact as everyone had to go in 1968, came to Wits did my Bcom and LLB degrees and that's it, and I've enjoyed the fruits of the Apartheid regime as a white privileged citizen of South Africa and I never participated in any struggle, I didn't join the ANC and I didn't do anything." But they said to me, "Haven't you understood, you are not really capable of sitting as a judge because you will never understand how we the oppressed felt, you want to be a judge in this country, you need to have an appreciation of what it's like to be a victim here." And I replied, "You don't have to lecture to me about being a victim or not appreciating the effects of human right's abuses on people, my parents are Holocaust

survivors, I have lived since childhood with the living effects of people who have been abused, human rights violations, who were discriminated against merely because they were a Jew and I have seen it day and night, I am totally sensitive and appreciative of the effects of racism and discrimination on people, and the same thing goes for black people, I fully appreciate that, so don't tell me that I don't understand that because I didn't fight in the struggle, I didn't pick up arms to against them..." And that's true and there I used it and I must say it's, I used it as a form of attack or a shield of defence when they were busy suggesting, I said, "I'm a Jew, Jewish people know." And that impressed them no end and they shut up after that, there was no more in the discussion about what I didn't do. But you know I used the Holocaust, I thought quite rightly so because we do have an insight into what it's like, to be subjected to oppression and discrimination first hand but I don't like um, well when Israel from time to time has to adopt painful defence measures, when some people in South Africa or wherever for example say, to justify for a start, saying "Remember we ourselves have a Holocaust background." But getting back to the survivors themselves, I find that a lot of them use, I call it literally abuse their experiences in the sense that they use it to attract sympathy. It's also understandable...

L: Perhaps they are looking for understanding.

B: They are looking for understanding, they looking for people to understand torture and I know people are concerned. They getting onto the lecture scene and I know it's fine teaching the Holocaust. Now I did work for this 'Tolerance Foundation' where we had not only Jews but also non-Jews, we had other Holocausts to deal with, the Rwandan Holocaust, the one or two million people, and then you start thinking well this is a very common theme here. I mean when you regard your fellow man as not worthy of living. I like to view the Holocaust in a positive way rather than a negative way, there's a lot of negativity that goes with this

L: It needs to be reframed.

B: Absolutely! And I think you doing a great injustice to the victims of the Holocaust by playing the Holocaust card, if I could call it that, maybe that's' the way to call it, inappropriately. But I've got some weird ideas hey? (Laughs)

L: Well you've also pointed out that it's not Holocaust for Holocaust's sake.

B: Well in this house it used to be Holocaust for breakfast, supper and lunch, there wouldn't be a meal that wouldn't pass without, "Oh in the war years this used to happen, in the camps we didn't have this sort of food around, you are a naughty boy you should be eating, you can't throw away your food." It crops up in all these little aspects of bringing you up, yes it's had a profound impact.

L: Yet you survive and you tolerate.

B: I think children of Holocaust survivors are to a large extent very successful. You won't find too many that are not professionals, they've been very successful. So there are positive sides to it, that you suppress and you move on and you cope and you go, it gives you the tools to cope. Sometimes they not very nice tools.

L: But they are your tools nonetheless.

B: Ja, they are very harsh tools because, I must say I often sit as a judge in court and you know you see parents, you see criminals and you have to impose very heavy sentences on people who have truly committed crimes and yet can now appreciate the wrongs of their ways but are murderers nonetheless and then you have to bring your mind and your emotions and your heart and there I think the Holocaust gives you that strength a little bit, to do that, to say well in Holocaust days people's lives were just taken willy-nilly, children were parted from parents so you will also be parted for twenty years or twenty five years from your family. Every judicial officer is informed by your own human and life experiences, you know we consequently talk about these things, you know no judge sees things exactly the same way as another judge sees it. And I will see it through a Jewish lens, a Jewish Holocaust lens. And I think that's what so challenging in this country about being a judge is that you have to judge people who live in, come from completely different backgrounds and how do you as a judge relate to the feelings and the emotions and the aspirations of the person living in Soweto, I mean you've been living here in north-eastern Johannesburg, subjected to a super-frum (religious) community to only talk about various subjects... but that's South Africa, you get black judges who now have to judge white people, so that is the challenge. But I think from my perspective I am the Jewish Holocaust survivor child that is adjudicating now not the South African. But I can tell you the Holocaust experience has actually enriched us, it actually enabled us to be good judges, better, because we really have a better insight into certain things, a more

compassionate insight very often but also an ability to cope and see things in a much more objective and perhaps fair way. You do what you have to do.

L: Thank you

Appendix B3

Eli Interview

L: Tell me about the work that you do?

E: Ah, my experience, I'll tell you from the beginning, the first place we went to was Buenos Aires. That was our first location and the reason that I was interested in going there was that the first time ever a conference on the Holocaust in Latin America, no such conference had ever taken place, so this took place last November 2004. And they had really, uh, such a positive and uplifting program so I knew they wouldn't let me into their workshops cos the workshops are private and really a place for people to come together and they don't want to be disturbed or filmed or anything like that and I knew that. But it was a great place to um find families cos it would have taken me years to find all the families that had gathered at this conference for the four days. So I wrote to them and of course they were very cautious, you know their initial response was always, "No" and then I sent them my project, I didn't hear back and anyway it was really coming close to the time and finally they said "Yes, yes they would concede" until I started asking them, you know which families did they know who might want to participate in these interviews and we started speaking by phone and email, back and forth and up and down and I really thought I had families in place. And we get there and what happens is that they have all the survivors lined up, ready to tell their story and I said, "But you told your story to the Shoah, the Israel foundation, and what I'm really interested in, is your post war story, and how was it for you to pick up the pieces, and how was it to have a family, and how was it, you know I want to know your post war story and I'd like your family to participate. Their initial reaction was, "No, they don't have time to participate, you know our children work, our grandchildren are at school, it's not gonna happen." And I said, "But listen I am here with an entire team from the United States, we're ready, we're ready to go, you know. So they said, "Ok" and they showed up the next evening with their families and their grandchildren and so I approached the second generation, a few of them and said, "I'd love to interview you and your children and your parents, separately and then all together." And they looked at me and they didn't say anything, all they did

was wave their finger at me and go, “No way, absolutely not, you’ve got to be crazy, there is no way we are going to do this.” And so I said, “Ok, I’ll do it” because I wasn’t really going to involve my family, cos I thought well maybe it would be too, uh, self, how to you call that... when you want to appear... but I didn’t know what to do and it was completely spontaneous and the other thing was that, one of our directors is very close to my family and he said, “You know I can do anything but you know I can’t handle your family, I’m just too emotionally connected.” But you know there I was, I said, “You know what you just got to handle it.” You know the moment I said that, that was the magical moment, the magical moment. From that moment on they said, “Ok, if you do it, we’ll do it.” And it was as if, you know, she’s one of us, she understands us, and if she’s courageous enough to it, we can do it to. And in the end we had more families than we can handle, it was really crazy. So we started out and I mean, the first person that I interviewed was a second generation and she was dying to talk, I mean she was just bursting to talk and you will see her on my pilot. And she talks about um being abused by her parents, both emotionally and physically, both her parents were survivors, (sighs) and um she also talks about, and we were also looking at post war history and what it was like living in that particular location, country and of course living in that particular location and country was living under oppression, under dictatorship, Nazi tactics. So she had this shocking story of having two fiancées and both were disappeared persons. So she was engaged to one but he disappeared and engaged to the other and he disappeared. So she never again had a relationship for, she just couldn’t bring it upon herself. She had lost too much, she had lost an entire family, and she’s second generation and then she loses, she just couldn’t handle the loss, so that’s very hard, very hard to listen to. It’s very interesting to see how her Holocaust heritage has had such an impact, had carried through on her life decisions and what happens. And I then spoke to her parents and that was very interesting and I spoke to her parents after I spoke to her and her father was very old and he couldn’t say much, but her mother was very verbose and the first thing she said, and she had not sat through the interview with her daughter, she said, “Yes, we didn’t know what happened, because our daughter was such a perfect girl and she was on top of her class, and she was so wonderful and so perfect and suddenly at sixteen she became a rebel, she became difficult and ah, I think that we made a lot of

mistakes, I think we did things we shouldn't have done, I think that we did things that we really didn't mean to do, we ourselves were so uh, lost, we had no family of our own here and it was so difficult, we were at a loss and we took out a lot of our frustrations (sighs) and you know on our daughter, and you know it was wrong and I think that she is suffering for it." So they actually acknowledged that they had been abusive and that was pretty difficult and then I brought both of them together and, and they were able to talk to each other and it was a sort of reconciliation and here was this daughter and she had, she was actually parenting her parents, probably from the beginning as many of us did, but still parenting her parents and she was the eldest, which was also difficult and she, she um, she was devoted to them, so it was, but they were able to reconcile, you know they were able to come together and that was one of the unexpected things of this project that in the end the families come and they thank us for doing this. So here were coming and we really worried that we might, you know cause a commotion or a fall out or the families might fall apart and here they are coming all together and thanking us for being there and giving them the opportunity to address issues they sort of had never addressed themselves and giving it to us on camera and giving us consent, which is almost like this desire that it be kept for eternity, that that it, you know comes out it the open and becomes a creative, safe environment I call it, where they know it can be shown publicly to the whole world but they, I think it's the environment that we create for not, psychiatrists, for not psychologists we not judging them, we not questioning them, we not analyzing them, we listening to their story and letting them be who they are! And that's very difficult because of course everybody judges and everybody has something to say but not, not with that, not with them we don't exchange any of that with them, and in the end that is what helps them come out with things. And we had an interesting experience and I really didn't think I would go that far, that young when I initially started out and I had causally commented with the director with Adam Reuben, and he's actually trained in feature films, he does feature films you know where you have casts and then we have Adrian Ballak and he's a documentarian, an Oscar nominated documentarian. And these two young men are top-notch professionals but they work differently. A documentarian wants to catch the moment, he doesn't care if it's really beautiful or aesthetically pleasing, But I wanted it to be aesthetically pleasing, that's why I put them together. You

know, people in the industry think I'm crazy (laughing) but I wanted something aesthetically beautiful and I wanted to put these um, I wanted to put these families um, I wanted to have them put. We create beautiful settings, beautiful portraits of these families, you'll see and we put them in such a dignified way, its almost like a, like an actual counter attack to what Hitler wanted to do which was the opposite. So we put them together, when we do it together, we always do it separately, also separately we try to make them look as dignified, we try to make them look as good as they possibly can with lighting and everything. But there are times when we want to catch content, and there many times when these two you know are at logger heads and I try not to interfere and then we have a phenomenal cinematographer as well, phenomenal. Very top notch professional, and they all there with me and this certainly, is not a money making, this is a labour of love, I mean you can't live off this. All of them have their personal motivations why they are involved in this and I'll probably be caught out eventually but I have yet to.

But, anyway, going back to where I had left off, I had mentioned casually to Adam Reuben, one of the directors, that my nephew who unfortunately I lost, he was fifteen years old in a terrible accident, an avalanche, that when he was three, he came to me and asked me, and I couldn't even understand what he was asking me because he couldn't even verbalise exactly what it was but he asked me, in the end I figured out, what a concentration camp was and he also asked what a rabbi was. And initially he said, "Wallah" and we're in Canada, and Wallah is a fish and he got really angry, he got really agitated and finally I figured out, why was he asking me, because my sister and my brother-in-law were both second generation, never wanted to talk about being Jewish- although my sister did, she was, she really wanted the boys to be Jewish but he had more of a problem because he didn't know that he was Jewish until he was sixteen, his parents hid everything from him. And the way he found out was that he was dating the daughter of a Nazi and that was a little too much for them. But irrespectively he just didn't want to be associated with any of it and that carries through the family and so the boys who were so young caught onto that, that's another thing that we know

L: They were intuitive

E: They were intuitive, they intuitively caught onto it and they knew that their aunty was very open about it and spoke about it and in a moment that they were together with me in the car alone, I was driving and I had the two of them in the back seat that was safe to ask me what this was all about. So it sort of struck me, so I mentioned and I had to find some way of explaining you know, what this was all about and um, I just casually mentioned it to Adam. And so were interviewing one of the families in Argentina and this was a woman who was a survivor of the Warsaw ghetto and so I let the guys do their thing, their visual thing and they take her and her four grandchildren who are ages like five to eight and there was a two year old running about and I thought he was just going to take time chatting and then he'll let the children go and I'll talk to grandma and then I'll talk to the parents and he comes to me and says, "We're ready, go ahead ask your questions." And for a moment there, I was paralysed, I thought, "Oh my G-d, what do I do? If I ask this woman, you know, you know if she talks to her... first of all I thought, why would the children know anything about it, you know and I don't know, I just thought the grandma would jump up so far and strangle me or would walk out in an angry way. Ok so you take that risk and I asked her, I said, "Well, tell me, do you speak to your grandchildren about your Warsaw Ghetto experience?" and she didn't even look at me, she looked at the children, from one side to the other, we have it on film "All the time children, don't we?" Tell Elizabeth what you know about Grandma's experience in the Warsaw Ghetto" and they just got off on a role and I was just flabbergasted, it was unbelievable, and we just role and role, we don't interrupt and then finally she says, "Well I'm really happy that my grandchildren know as much as they do but I don't how much they really understand, although I was five or eight or something when the Warsaw Ghetto was taken over and uh, so it's just a coincidence, just strange that you know my eldest grandchildren, I have two of the same age, would be the age that I was when it first started" (her pace of speech is much slower and her tone was lowered). And so that was really an amazing thing to catch, and they were, they were deep, they were concerned about racism, about hatred about why the people hated each other, they were frightened, they were concerned with what war means, but I asked one of them, "What does war

mean?” He gave me a full-fledged explanation and of course my team didn’t understand a word because they don’t speak Spanish. But it was hard, I mean I could just feel the tears going down, because it’s just so unexpected and I guess in a sense I thought that, that is what I would find but I wasn’t sure, that is not something, that is not the kind of conversation that you have socially. So it was interesting to discover that, because I actually gave the name of the project as, “Forever After” and my thoughts are I’ve heard third generation speak amongst each other, I actually sat in a reunion of third generation and they kicked me out, they told me I wasn’t supposed to be there, and I said, “well I’ll be very quiet” cos I would be like their parents, you know, I said “I’ll be very quiet” and the psychologist had to say to them, “Is it ok?” (laughing) And this psychologist had no background in Holocaust at all, she was an outsider and she was quite angry at me and I said, “No, no, I ‘d like to hear what they have to say, I’m curious” and I was shocked at how impacted they are and how knowledgeable they are and I, I studied the inquisitions very closely and one of the thoughts of, well I know so many families that come from that time period and they still talk about it. Now they don’t have in depth information of what happened, now today imagine how much access to information you have, so it can only be that it would be, “Forever After” that this will stay, it will be ingrained in family’s DNA, there is no way, that in many generations to come, the won’t look back and say, “That’s my prominence, that’s where I come from.”

L: Like cellular memory

E: So yes, we’ve had many kinds of experiences. We had a family in Sao Paulo, he’s a very accomplished lawyer, he’s a very good friend of my husbands and I’m sure he knew me when I was a child. And I called him from the States and I told him what I was doing and he said “Well I can look for families, but I’m not really, I’m not really um, I don’t really qualify” and I said, “Well what do you mean, you don’t qualify?” “Well, my mother was a survivor and my father isn’t Jewish” and I said, “Well religion doesn’t matter, what I’m looking for is, you know survivors.” So, in the end he agreed. So the story was, that in the end he was fully Jewish, his father was a survivor, his father’s mother is Jewish and his father’s father is Jewish and his mother is Jewish and everybody

is Jewish, so I said to him, “You know maybe you don’t practice the faith but you know if Hitler were around, you’d be, you would not be spared.” So um, it was very difficult for him, here he is, this high-powered lawyer, internationally renowned, and he just, he just poured out his heart and he thanked me so much, he couldn’t thank me enough. I mean this was not a part of his life that he’d been able to address and so we went back to Sao Paulo and we went to get more, we went to get his children. And one of the documentarians said to me, “Lizzy, why are you doing this? Maybe there’s nothing there, maybe you won’t find anything” and I said, “I don’t know”, because he made a comment about his daughter, his second marriage, and his wife of the second marriage, her father was a survivor and her mother is a Brazilian Catholic, but she never really had close contact with her father until she was about sixteen, because he divorced her mother when she was very young, but she’s been searching, she’s been searching for that part, it’s like she’s desperately searching. So she knows nothing about him, she knows he was put on a boat out of Austria, she knows his mother was abandoned by, by his father who was an Austrian and I almost believe they took the Nazi side, which is not Jewish and they completely abandoned her and then sent off this little boy of twelve and their story is very disturbing. So maybe in a sense there is this connection between the second generation, I mean between husband and wife, I really believe that there might have been, that there is such a strong connection because the two of them apparently, I didn’t know this went to Czechoslovakia searching for their history, for their past and they came back devastated, devastated. So they told us all about that, but then he let something slip because he had two children with first wife and two children with her, there’s a daughter and he said to me, “You know my daughter would really be Jewish at heart, fully Jewish.” And that’s all he said in that interview and that’s why I thought, “Hmm I want to go back and dig some more,” and that’s what we did. And so we go out for lunch and Natalie comes, she’s like fifteen years old and she looks at me and says, “I’m not saying anything to you, because I promised my granny I wouldn’t speak” and I said “Ok that’s fine, that’s perfectly fine then.” Well we had this very pleasant lunch, I mean she had met me before but not under these circumstances and next thing we knew, she was absolutely pouring out her heart, she said, “Well I’ve studied the Holocaust very closely and my grandmother, you know never wanted to speak about it because it was too painful and so

I promised her I wouldn't speak about it." So there is that sense of betrayal, you know that you promised and her grandmother is passed away and she says, "You know I really wanted to be Jewish, ever since I was a little girl, even though my mother is Catholic and so I really shouldn't be Jewish, I really wanted to be Jewish and when I was five, my mother wanted me to be baptised and I didn't want to be baptised. I said mom I don't want to be baptised, I want to be Jewish, can I wait till I'm older to make up my mind?" And then she turned ten, and um to please her mother she got baptised. And she said, "Well I really don't feel anything towards the Catholic Church." So I said to her, "Well what if you know, married a Jewish man, would you convert?" and she said "Ag there's no doubt" she said, "I feel Jewish, I feel Jewish, I have three Jewish grandparents, survivors, my entire family has been wiped out." And I said to her but, "Can you explain to me, why it's so important, why it's something, can you verbalise why it's important for you to be Jewish, and try give it some thought." And of course I knew why, but I didn't want to put the words into her mouth, I wanted to let her come out, and she came out with it and said, "Well, my entire family was wiped out, so this is my way of saving them."

L: Profound!

E: That's very profound, this is a fifteen year old. And I get told so many profound things from these, from these young people, whose parents just sit there when they hear this and the tears are just... And so he said to me, "You know what, I never..." You know when you ask the parents do your children know anything, they always say, "Well I don't think so, maybe a little bit, but not much, I don't think they know anything, I don't think they that interested." And then we interview the children separately, that's the third generation and then we bring them together with their parents and we say, "Would you like to tell your parents what you told us" and then they tell them and the parents are shocked, they shocked at what they know and how they feel and how they think and finally he says, "Well I want to give a final word, I want to say, you know I think that I, that the Holocaust will impact my entire family forever, there's no way it can't be forever and now I'm going to take all my children, I'm going to go to Czechoslovakia, cos I had no idea that they cared this much, that they were this interested and I will go on that journey of the past.

And he told me another story and he's told me the same story repeatedly every time I sit with him and it disturbs him profoundly. The first one is that, he never really knew, he, he, he knew that Yiddish was kind of spoken at home and they were Jewish but he didn't call them Jewish, he didn't know that they were meant to be Jewish, so didn't associate whatever was happening in his home with being Jewish. And then in the outside world he was Catholic, he was baptised and the reason is, to go to Brazil many times, you had to be baptised cos Jews were not allowed in so his mother was terrified, his parents were terrified so they, kept, they lead this double life. So he didn't really know what his background was and apparently when he was eleven he came home one day really proud and he told his mother, he said to his mother, "You know what mom, I beat up a Jewish boy." He was really happy, he's eleven years old and then his mother was very upset and that's when he learnt about his origin and he has never recovered, never, he has told me this story, I have it on tape again and again and again. And the other story that he's not recovered from and heaven knows what he'll do, probably he'll do it. His uncle bought a mausoleum in a cemetery, in um in Sao Paolo, very expensive mausoleum for the family, Catholic and apparently on her dying bed his grandmother begged to be buried as a Jewish person and she wasn't. And he said that at the time he didn't understand as the grandson, he didn't understand the fact, she never told us about it, she never wanted to be Jewish, so why on her dying day does she want to be buried...he didn't understand. But no, she was buried in this mausoleum and there she is, he feels so guilty, he can't (sighs) you know he feels so terrible. And so I worked with him, I said, "Well why do you think she wanted that, why, why do you think she wanted that?" "Oh because you know she had such a rich culture, such rich Jewish roots in Czechoslovakia, and you know, maybe that's why." And I said "I'm going to tell you what I think, I think she wanted to leave you a legacy." And he looked at me and he said, "I never thought about." And I said, "Well if you can't be who you are in life, and death at least if somebody comes searching they know who you are, what you identity is." And it would not surprise me, and this is just now, I would not be surprised if he actually had her body exhumed; he said, "You know I'm going to go talk to a Rabbi. And I thought he was joking but maybe he wasn't joking. So what's happening, the transformation, he kisses me, he kisses my hands, this relief, with his mother- I knew his mother, she was this granddame, she would never

admit to who she was and the great tragedy was that, and of course we not judging, we totally understand, we not saying, “Oh why did you do this? How could you do this? You betrayed her.” She fell ill, and she was ill for five years, I think she had dementia and her brain, and you would understand this studying psychology, got stagnated during the Nazi period and so she spoke in German, a language she never spoke and she lived, she lived in terror, for five years she lived in terror and her grandchildren and her children and not knowing- and one of her grandchildren, a twenty four year old from the first marriage he said to me, “The first time I knew that my grandmother was sick, she just, I suspected she was Jewish but I wasn’t quite sure.” He said “The first time, I always suspected cos you find” whether its spoken about or not somehow they all know and he said, “The first time I was sure that my grandmother was a survivor was when my mother, who wasn’t Jewish, first wife, went to see Schindler’s list and came back and told her about it, that she was just riveted and she (grandmother) turned round to his mother, his grandmother turned round to his mother and said, well you can have it, you know I lived through it, I don’t want to see it, I don’t want to know about it, you know I don’t want to speak about it, you know, you can, you can go watch and talk about it, I don’t want anything to do with it.” That was his, I mean although he suspected and at the same time when he was fifteen he was the studying the Nuremberg laws and the Holocaust at school and it was then that he said, that happened spontaneously, that he realised that he would have been targeted, because he hadn’t considered himself, you know his mother, and it shocked him so deeply, it scared him so deeply that he went into years of therapy. And that really surprised us that the shock was so great and he says, and you can see it in his body, “I realise now how important it is to know where you come from because you know, maybe some people felt that by not telling their children they would be protecting them but they not, because if anything terrible happens others know and they coming after you, so in fact the biggest protection you can give your children and family is to know where you come from, is to know where your roots are.” So we have stories and stories and stories and families and crying and joy and we got it all. And we just got it, we have fifty-five hours worth of South America and my sister actually participated... that was very difficult, I couldn’t do that. They included a piece about, in the segment and for me there’s a piece missing, I mean this is just the pilot and not the real film, we just, because

people, when I was talking about the project I thought I was being pretty clear, but in people's minds it's the survivors' story that counts. They were protesting, but no matter how much I explained that we moving on looking at the post-Holocaust story, in their minds it's them telling their story and that's it. So we thought, you know what, we really, we have to do a pilot, and that's been helpful because then we show people what we doing and then those who we have approached to help us, scout those families and then we have criteria depending on where they are... I mean it sounds terrible but you have to be selective. I think families are all equally important, hopefully its not about, one is better than the other but in terms of doing a project and engaging a general audience, which is a challenge, you need to kind of, select. You know we selected lots of local people helping us, we never know what people look like, that's not important, but they send us their background and then we end up contacting them by phone and when I go out here, I met somebody before and they got to know me and I got to know their history so when I started interviewing the questions would be... because we have like a basic framework and we tailor it. So what I'll do is, I'll be, I won't take notes not to interrupt their thought process, I jot down what I think is important, I let them finish and then I go back to what I wanna ask. So that's how we have been working out here. I think it's been pretty, pretty effective. And we learning, it's a very steep learning curve (laughs), I'm not a trained interviewer and I'm not a trained psychologist, so that's, that's what we doing.

But you know, we have tons of stories, we have a Rabbi in Sao Paolo who never spoke about his background. He was just bursting to speak, was in a very dangerous situation, he was hunted down many times by the police during the time of oppression. He opposed what they did and I you ask him why, I mean so much is written about him but from a political perspective his motivation was never, was never talked about and he'll tell you that his motivation in truth, was that he lost, he's a second generation, his parents are survivors, he was not going to remain silent he was distinctly not going to remain silent.

So quite amazing we have this nine years old, Tali's son- that was interesting, that was interesting! (My other research participant). Tali said to me, "Well, I have a fifteen year old daughter I'm sure she'll participate, she went on the 'March of the Living'", so you

know, well I don't know you can interview her, I'm sure it'll be interesting, but my son, well no, I don't think he knows much, I don't think, well you can talk to him, I'll be curious but I don't think he knows much..." I hear this all the time... so we said, "Well can we interview the children?" "Oh of course absolutely, but I don't think much is going to come out of it." I said, "Alright, we'll find out and we'll let you know." So we put the kids together and I asked little Johnny I said, "Well do you know anything about the Holocaust?" He said, "Well I know my mommy works with it all the time and my sister studies it but I don't really know all that much, you know not really." So I said to me, "Look we going to ask questions but if there's something that you want to say in between that's absolutely fine, just say, I want to talk, that's fine, you know there camera's rolling, it doesn't matter, just feel free." So I spoke to his sister extensively, about the "March of the Living" and about what happened to her and the fact that she studies and how this has shaped her views, she's got very strong views. And then he crops up, he says, "You know, I, I have something to say..." I knew he had something to say, I said, "Well tell me what do you have to say?" He said, "Well I do know about it." I said, "Oh?" He said, "Well I've seen those terrible images of the skeletons, those horrible bodies and the people suffering and going to the gas chambers and I have nightmares, I you know, I wake up so frightened and I think that I'm being sent to the gas chambers and as people are going, I don't fall, but people around me are falling before they even get there and it gives me, terrible feelings inside, terrible feelings and then I want to go to my sister's room and I'm half way down the corridor and then I turn back to my room, I think Oh well maybe I should know more about this, maybe this will help me to feel better, if I go to my sister's room and we look at the books and we talk about it, but then I get even more scared so I go back to my room, so then I, I um, I try not to think about it, but it doesn't go away, it's always there. So I jump on my trampoline and I play with my computer, well that distracts me, but it doesn't go away, it's always there." And so we took him and sat him with Tali and Clive, what we do, we get a lot of this, so we try and put the child in a safe place, so put them on the father's lap. So I said to him look, "You don't have to say what you don't want to say, its ok." I said to him, "Do you want to tell mommy and daddy what you told me?" He did and I mean Tali was just, I mean the tears were just streaming down her face and Clive was in a state of shock, he was shaking his

head and he said to me, “I, I never...” and I said to them, “Look, it’s not about blame, its not about blame, it’s, it’s...” And he (son) was so relieved and he talked more and more and asked his father, he said, “Dad if you were a little boy at that time, what would you be scared, what would you do?” You know, “And mom what would you do?” We get this a lot when you know, and then you know, Kim she said to me, “You know after the ‘March of the Living’ it was so terrible for me, I just become numb.” And I said, “Why do you think you become numb?” And she wasn’t really able to respond as to why she thinks she’s numb, but she said that she’s just numb to protect herself. And obviously she does that to think of her family and of herself and lots of views as well. I mean, Johnny had very mature views for a nine year old, “ Well you shouldn’t judge others and you should accept others for who they are and what they are war is a terrible thing and violence is a terrible thing and poverty is a terrible thing and we shouldn’t turn away and we should know what’s going on, we should try and help.” I mean this is a nine year old, a nine year old, that’s just like a little child, jumping up and down on a trampoline.

L: He’s not that innocent in other words.

E: He just looks it. He just looks it. And so you ask him, do you discuss this with your friends? “Oh yes but they cant understand so there’s not much point in discussing things with them.” And I was just thinking about Argentina which was really funny, not funny, funny but funny curious, a little girl also she sitting, she must have been seven and you see her look at the camera and you see her, listening, listening, listening and I had said to her, “Do you talk to your friends?” “Oh no, we never talk to our friends.” And then we were talking to her grandparents, her parents, her sisters and then suddenly this little voice pops up (Laughing), “Well I lied,” “What do you mean you lied?” “We do speak to our friends.” “Ok, you not telling a lie, it’s alright, you want to tell us now, what do you speak about?” “Well we speak about it all, we speak about starving and being scared and people coming after us and not having our parents and you know many of our friends grandparents are survivors and sufferers who were persecuted, so, but it’s a secret, nobody knows that we discussed this, its between ourselves, it’s a big secret.” And here we are sitting with the entire crew and it’s as though she is sitting alone...

L: But that pattern of silence is repeating itself.

E: Yes, yes and what we are trying to do is to break the silence because I think it's um, it's a healing process. I think it's also chronic, I think that the effects will be chronic, in fact it's a chronic illness, it's never going to go away so you have to find ways of living with it, so that's my opinion, in my opinion, people have different opinions. If people had to hear it they'd be against me I'm sure. They you know, the second generation basically says enough already, people are tired of hearing us say that we're complaining, people want to hear the rosy side. People want to hear, look, look at the miracle, you know how many of us are leading normal lives and we want to change our image. We are viewed as whiners, we're viewed as people who aren't successful, people who'll never accomplish anything in life and its like, where did that come from? That must be the American perspective. And that was one of the reasons; I mean I don't know if it's a general perspective because you can tell me that. They were really concerned; my peers second generation were concerned about me. They said, "No one will ever give you any money because they are sick of us, they are sick of us complaining." And I said, "We not complaining and we not blaming, we're trying to address, address the issue," I said, "We giving way, giving way to Hitler, you know in the end he's going to get his way, to get violence- he's going to break us apart, which is what actually happened in my family, we had an incident which absolutely tore us apart. You know it took me to reconcile, to, to realise hey wait a moment this isn't right. So, ya, I mean we have a lot of big problems; it didn't end when it ended. And I think there are a lot of positives stuff and I think myself I am positive, I, I channel all these very negative and desperate feelings into something positive, into something extraordinarily rewarding for me to be doing. I mean I don't make a cent financially and I really don't care to be in the public eye, all I want is for the project to be done and I've opened my own 'Forever After' project organisation and hopefully we'll able to um go into other projects which are similar, you know the Rwandan case, the Rwandan families, get together with Armenians, you know look at different kinds of tragedies and talk to the families afterwards. So it's not only, so we begin with the Holocaust and then there's a dot, dot, dot. So that's basically, whereby initially like everything people are... you know I had one man said to me, "Why didn't you just go and sell cars? Let it go, you wasting your time." And I said to him, "Well I

don't know anything about cars but I might be able to sell jewellery you know." And that's very hurtful, the guy was Jewish. And it's like one of the survivors was telling me yesterday um, she said, she came to South Africa and she wanted to raise money uh, for something, something to do with the Holocaust, keeping up the memory and memorial and education and uh, they turned around to her and said, "Why cant you put a lid on this, forget about this, forget about this, move forward, nobody's interested, nobody cares, nobody wants to know." So she actually wrote a dedication to me, I mean that was, you don't do this to be rewarded, but that was just the biggest reward one can get, you know thank you for doing this for the survivors. But there are many survivors who object, they like you are trying to take over, trying to tell our story, and I'm like, "No we didn't suffer what you suffered, no way." That's why I have a hard time dealing with you know 'second generation survivor.' I think that we are second generation, simply second generation.

L: You don't want to detract from what they went through.

E: I don't because I think that our suffering is a psychological one and I wouldn't want to, I think it has to be defined. I wouldn't want to because the survivors suffered psychologically but physically things that thank G-d we can't even begin to imagine. Our suffering is more in association with their suffering directly and then what happened to our families, families we never knew. We had no one, most of us grew up, you know as you would have heard without uncles and aunts, we had no grandparents and most of us really had no one, nothing. And so it's, it's more from that perspective and having to parent our parents, which is, which is so difficult. It's very difficult for a survivor to hear that, in fact you know, it hurts my parents but in fact its true, I don't mean to hurt them but I had no childhood. You know very early on I was trying to fill an emotional need and even though my father was not a survivor, he was still very emotionally needy so I sort of tried to fill in what was missing so I had to grow up very quickly. And I was the one who, G-d forbid anything happened, had to know where all the money was, how to administrate, how to look out for them, how to... and actually that role subconsciously was still there for a long time, until I went into, I went to see a psychiatrist and had therapy and realised that this was what was going on because everything that I wanted to

do in my life, supposedly I wasn't qualified, you know it wasn't important, "Why you don't need it, you don't need it financially, why bother, why, you don't know anything about this, you not thinking about this, this is a waste of time!" But it was, so that I would always be available in case they might need me. But you know with my sister, she's the second one, she's brilliant, she's the professional, you know we were all labelled, she's not for the home, you know she's too brilliant and my brother, oh he's too clever, he's brilliant, he really, is really going to make a great career, which he didn't unfortunately, he made a great career but he also lost everything, he's in a mess. And, and I sort of fell into that trap, I fell into that trap and my family members went along with that, it was very convenient until I had to break away from it and it was very difficult, it was very difficult, because they were like, wait a moment, whose this woman? We don't know her! We don't know her! And my mother, had a hard time, "Oh you go to a psychiatrist, who changes your mind and has terrible influences on you and tries to break you away from the family and what is he telling you?" and I was like, "No, this is my private business." Even if they knew they never paid a cent for it, I mean I've been independent for a long time and I just stood in, hung in, hung in. I actually speak about it for my interview, when I'm interviewed for the project that I don't hold it against them, that I don't hold it against them, I mean my mother's here with me, you know I have good relationship with her but we really had to, we had to, and it was really hard for them to understand, they were saying, "We don't understand, we don't understand, we'll come and do therapy with you." I said, "Ok" but it never happened. And I had to explain, you know you are um sort of making me feel that I am incompetent that I can't do anything, you know that I am dependent on you and my husband was the same way, he wanted me to feel dependent on him, that not that I could be an independent woman, which I was the whole time, uh, I don't know if it was a threat to his manliness, you know he looking after me. I mean even now with this project, he's not here with me. Apparently he wrote a very nasty email yesterday and he called me today and said, "Please don't open it, just delete it." I said, "Good I'll just delete it." He said, "Please don't look at it, I didn't mean a word that I wrote." But it's hard for him, he has to make that adjustment that you know it's a challenge, I mean I have these young film makers and they all men and I'm working with my twenty six year old daughter and uh that was a little difficult for them. They all

professionals to understand it's my show and I give them total creative freedom, I'm very creative myself and I listen to them when I discuss but the ultimate word is mine and they wanted equal say and I said, "You can have a say but it's not equal, what I say is mine." And that was, that really caused a... I mean so how you have there you know your position as a woman, you know your position as a child of survivors and how your problems and issues with family dynamics, you have it all. And it was a struggle for me to break away from that, it took a long time, I mean I'm fifty-one now, it's a long time I've been struggling, struggling a long time. You know I had a nervous breakdown when I was fifteen, I talk about that too because you know I don't know, I guess I just thought that the world was a rotten place and I wouldn't be able to do anything in it. And I think what kept me really, is knowing the grief that it would cause my parents and then I ended up searching, searching to channel all these frustrations and sadness as something positive, so I've been an activist ever since then, which is also troubling to them because they don't want me in trouble (laugh). Which in a way was seen as the rebel. You know all through my life I've been seen as the rebel, you know the wife of an executive of an American corporation; I've been known as the rebel. I didn't think that I was the rebel I mean I just tried to be me, an individual, not a projection of my husband. So we come to accept the consequences in our family. My daughter had the most terrible case of anorexia nervosa and I tuned into it very quickly and no member of my family would accept it and I was the only one who accepted it and desperately went out there to look for help. I mean I went to bed never knowing if she was going to get up the next day and I knew, and she talked about looking at me and how the family was interacting with me and then putting herself in my position. So I think in a sense I also knew that saving her I had to come out of that and make a change so that she could also make a change. So she never went into hospital although she was a case to be hospitalised and I, and I listened to the psychologists and my whole family was against it. And only psychology can help us. I mean, it's a mental illness, and I accepted it, it didn't do anything to my ego, what are you doing, you know you have to deal with things in life and she normal and healthy and she knows when things are going awry and when to look for help, I mean these are the tools that we've given her.

L: And not being scared to speak about things.

E: Yes, yes, openly, openly, you know my husband was terrified, he thought it would tarnish the family and of course they thought it was abuse. That was the first revelation, there was never any abuse, ever! Um but its hard, its hard, they would ask me if I was abusing my daughter and if my husband was abusing my daughter, no we are not. And she would say, “No mom and dad are not abusing me.” She has a very high IQ, she’s brilliant, brilliant beyond, really brilliant girl. So that was one of the things, first of all to accept that she was brilliant, again we had this men- woman thing, my grandma was very paternalistic so everything was you know her son, her grandson and there was never any aspirations for her granddaughters. In the same way as there were never any aspirations for me. I was told, yes, there were aspirations for me but as long as I did everything else for everyone else then I could do whatever I wanted. People would always say to me, Oh family would say you could do whatever you wanted and I would say, “Yes, after I had done everything for everyone else.” So by that time I had no more energy to do anything or if I did it, it was a huge sacrifice, I mean really so I think that’s pretty much changed now but uh, mother-in-law she wanted me to keep it secretive and I said to her, “How am I going to keep it secretive? She weighs thirty six kilos, she’s a metre-seventy, she looks like a skeleton, what am I hiding?”

L: And if you speak about it, help comes out of the woodwork, from the strangest of places.

E: Probably the idea that she would be treated by psychologists and psychiatrists, was like, “Oh my G-d, but this doesn’t happen in our family” but you know to go to the medical doctors for physical problems, I mean that you go everyday. You know there’s a ton of money for that. But when it came to the mental part, there was such taboo, I just couldn’t believe it. And here, you know I have a great aunt who was a professor in child psychology, she worked with Anna Freud and here’s my own mother who ended up with them after the war, sort of wondering whether this is the best way to go, but there was no other path. (Pauses) So that was an enormous burden on me, because I really had little support from any side. No one was too interested to know why this was happening, what is this disease, why it afflicts woman and of course we were in a very chauvinistic

environment and I'll never forget, she was ten she got on her knees and she showed her fist to me and she said, "Mom, I'm not going to be like you, I'm going to be someone, so something was definitely, she was catching on."

E: So tell me, do you have anything in particular you want to ask me, that has to come into...

Invariably, I think it's a terrible disease and one that I think my daughter is more than ready to speak openly about this. In fact she's been asked to speak where she works. But there was a time when the psychiatrist said to me, just let her be and now she's a real force, if she sees any young girl or woman or person that she suspects is suffering with this, I mean you have to look for help, she was lucky, she was twelve years old, the longer you wait, the lesser chance you have to recover.

L: So you've seen its been vital speaking up against it?

E: Oh yeh, I've never, yeh we are very close actually, we work together, we collaborate and its wonderful. She's very upset that she can't be here because she's like my partner and we share in the interviewing, she's very bright. She wanted to go to business school and so I said to her, "You go and do your thing and I'll do this, there are plenty of people to help me and you must do exactly what you want to do." I mean she does a lot, when I cant' do it then she steps in. And we hope that, you know, that the amount of people working with us will grow.

E: So tell me is there anything specific?

L: There's only one question, because you seem to have answered my other questions. Do you ever remember one specific moment where you became aware of the concept of the Holocaust or of what had happened?

E: I don't remember any specific moment like most second generation or even third, um but I think, I think there was actually one time and I must have been very young, um... I saw my mother break down in her bedroom, crying desperately and I had never seen her break down in front of anybody and she used to break down in front of me and she used to say, (lowers her tone) "You're my flesh and blood, you're my daughter, you understand me and she really, she told me a lot of stuff that she never told my father. She

protected him and he in turn protected her. And there was this protecting thing going on and I used to, I mean she spoke a great deal to me. She was one of those that only spoke and so I had fragments of stories and anecdotes and I'm still putting the stories together, I mean and I related to Tali and so many of us. I relate to so many of my peers, the second generation that say they learn something new, sometimes everyday, every week even if their parents are already deceased, their survivor parents are already deceased, you just, they all research. In my case, thank G-d my mother is still alive and she'll let things out and I'll and I'll say, "Wait a moment mom, repeat that, I didn't know that" and I think of course I think memories play their tricks and I try and record it, so I have interviewed her (Laughs) innumerable times. And I'm so glad that I can, I won't have to go back and say, "If only I had." And initially when I first did it, she really objected to it but now she's become so accustomed and she understands why it's so important and she... At the moment I'm working on and this was an enormous struggle, my parents are very interested in post-Holocaust because I think that so much has been done on the Holocaust but we have to move on because the story goes on and I hope that others will follow suit because I don't think that one person can do everything. And they corresponded um for two years between 1951 and 1953 between Sao Paulo and London. They met in London, my father was ready to go to Sao Paulo, Brazil because he had no more family, his parents had died of Cancer, he had no one there, the family would have had, not many were left and his Visa for Budapest had not come through and the Brazilian one had come through so he decided he would go down and try make a new life for himself and he lived with his aunt, his mother's sister. In the mean time he meets my mother, and the long existing story, but basically he wanted to marry her and there was no way she was going to marry him and so he leaves and she says goodbye and you know you'll find another woman there and they start this correspondence. But I had never actually seen the correspondence although she kept it, and uh my mother collaborated with Melissa Miller on the biography of Anne Frank and she collaborated because of me and that's a whole other story, it was an incident. I happened to be in Sao Paulo at the time visiting and my mother ironing because this is something she does, it's very distracting and mindless, she doesn't have to iron but it's mindless occupation. And I see letters coming through in Dutch in her handwriting 1944, no 1945, 1946, and I'm freaking out, you know what is

this, I'm just paling and my mother says, "What's wrong?" You know all these letters are just coming up and she looks at it and she says you know, "These are the letters that I, you know, my correspondence with Mr Frank" and then I said well, and then a note by a young journalist saying that she decided that she wanted to write the biography of Anne Frank because there was none and she had discovered through the foundation that my mother had been a colleague, she had been in the diary and she wanted to know, she would collaborate with her because her take on this would be one of telling the story about Anne not as the icon but as the girl, trying to tell the true biography as close to reality as possible and my mother said, "Ag I don't want anything to do with this, why are they doing this, this is an Austrian young woman, she's not even Jewish, why she prying into my life, what does she want from me, I want nothing to do with this." And I was sitting next to her and I said, "Mom, you know I really think you should collaborate because you know so much and this young journalist has been so sincere and um she has a take on it that I think is so much in line with what you would like to see written, because you have issues with the iconic, with the iconography of Anne Frank rather than one more girl like yourself, so I think it would be rather wonderful if you would agree? Why don't you look further into it? So she did and she did end up collaborating and when I read the biography and the style in which it was written and I thought, you know... and now I've become friends with Melissa Miller, we're very close, and two years ago, many years ago, I approached my parents and I said, "You know you have these letters and I've never seen these letters, but this is a post-Holocaust story and maybe you should share these letters with Melissa Miller and she can write your story because I love her writing style because she doesn't write in an academic way, she writes in a narrative which reads like a novel but it's non-fiction and I thought this was very effective. So it took a long time for me to persuade them and they agreed so we approached Melissa and all went well and so finally they dug out their letters and they had them put, they had them typed out and they had them scanned and put in DVD form and then Melissa and I got the letters and I read through them and they read like a novel they are unbelievable, five hundred, five hundred pages of unbelievable letters. So um, so they agreed and, and they wrote a contract, they got me completely involved you know, the contract and this and that and I'm not in the contract, I don't exist, I'm not there, I disappeared. I wasn't the

one who had the idea, I wasn't the one who brought it up, I wasn't the one... I felt completely ostracised, I felt terrible, I was, I couldn't believe it, it wasn't as though I wanted to make money off it or anything but you know I was collaborating with Melissa getting all this, I had the idea of how it should be presented and she went down to Brazil and I mean it was basically me, I disappeared, (quite angry). So I was very upset, anyway this caused quite a commotion, there was so much fighting there was so much, I was so, I was so unhappy, I was finished, I just couldn't understand it, why, why, you know... because you know Melissa had approached my mother, I wasn't seen, I had nothing, I had disappeared so it caused such commotion that in the end everything got shelved and um I, when I started to work on this project the documentary um, a young woman came up to me, she was in film, and I you know she has been recommended to help me with the documentary, give me some leads, meet me, this and that and we got talking and she's third generation and I kind of she's, from London and I kind of told her the story and she said, "Well I'm a script writer and I'm, I have a degree in writing," can't remember where from, but anyway she's qualified, she worked at the BBC, she's amazing, very young, twenty six and I was telling her the story and she said, "Well do you think your parents would let me read the letters?" and I said, "Well I don't know," I'd shelved it I wanted to actually, what I wanted to do was publish a book and then do a film, then do a script based on the book, was actually my project, my idea and the end it was so heart wrenching, I didn't want to handle, I just shelved it, I had many other projects going on and um after ward, I often, I don't know...I'm whatever here's their either email. And in the end she did and they agreed and she read their letters and um she said, "Well, can I write a script on this?" and I said to my parents "Well look..." and then my mother said, "I don't want anything to do with this, don't want anything to do with this, its caused too much grief." So I said to her, I never give up right, I said to her, "Well can I take this project over, but you'll have to give me legal consent." "I'm not giving my daughter legal consent, you know you are my daughter, you can do whatever you want." I said, "No mom I can't do whatever I want, this is your story, your material, your letters, you have to give me legal consent." So we actually had to sign a contract, she just, without them interfering because that would have been difficult. So we actually went through with that and I ended up hiring another script writer all the way from Los

Angeles and so here I have one writer in London and one in Los Angeles and we did very in depth research, very in depth research and we just ended up with just an amazing script, it is absolutely beautiful and is extraordinarily accurate, it's been fictionalised because it's too difficult it was my father didn't care but my mother... It was just too difficult and even though she doesn't have a say, I wouldn't want, I would want them to be happy with the end of course. So then we had people really interested and I'm yet to see the finalised script but it's taking two years, of...

L: Phenomenal!

E: I wanted it to be so I'm working with them, and Melissa Miller is going to get publisher's interested in Germany, is going to write their biography and um we'll see, we'll see where this leads. So I'm also involved, I'm also involved in the book and they have finally, finally accepted to let me, to let me go through with it. I finally exist again. But it just a coincidence. It was just too painful. People said to me, "Well why don't you write?" Because I'm also a writer and um I said "Because I can't deal with it." And it was really interesting because there was another book written by a second generation about his family and "He's put it in dialogue" and I mean he's tried to recreate the real situation with a lot of research but he's put in dialogue so "How can he know what was said?" But had I wanted to do that, they would have looked at me and said, "How dare you do this, you weren't there, what are you doing, how dare you." So it's really interesting, you know what, others do it, it's marvellous but if I their daughter does it, it's too personal. So it's been really interesting, they haven't seen my results. My father is very artistic and his letters are phenomenal and I think in a sense I take after him. I wanted to be a filmmaker quite early on and they uh, they persuaded me that I would starve to death and maybe they were right and I didn't, so I wasn't having any anxiety... it's really funny that now in my midlife I'm picking it up. So I learnt for myself basically I'm self-taught, I read books on how to make films, on how to be a producer and how to do fundraising and how to fund films, I mean basically I'm self taught, I had all the books you would get at school because I couldn't attend school, I lived between Chicago and Houston and my husband and my family and it's like, Oh what do you do?

L: You make it happen.

E: You make it happen so that's at the point I am in my life. I think I've never been happier, I've never been happier because I think it's really me and it's what I really want to do.

L: Your story is completely inspirational, thank you.

E: You are very welcome; I hope that this will be helpful to you.