Master's Theses

Theses and Dissertations

1986

An Analysis of the Nazi Holocaust: Sociological Treatment of Intergenerational Effects

Michael S. Fleischer
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Fleischer, Michael S., "An Analysis of the Nazi Holocaust: Sociological Treatment of Intergenerational Effects" (1986). *Master's Theses*. 3436.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3436

AN ANALYSIS OF THE NAZI HOLOCAUST:

SOCIOLOGICAL TREATMENT OF INTERGENERATIONAL EFFECTS

by

MICHAEL S. FLEISCHER

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate

School of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

MAY

1986

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

VITA

The author, Michael S. Fleischer, is the son of David Fleischer and Marlene (Goldstein) Fleischer. He is also husband to Colleen Connors-Fleischer. Mr. Fleischer was born July 5, 1957, in Chicago, Illinois.

Mr. Fleischer's elementary education was obtained at the Sharp Corner Grammar School, the Highland Grammar School, and the Old Orchard Junior High School in Skokie, Illinois. His secondary education was completed in 1975, at Niles Township High School-North Division also in Skokie.

In August 1975, Mr. Fleischer entered the University of Wisconsin-Madison. There, Mr. Fleischer served as Mayhew floor representative and financial chairman of the Sellery Hall Dormitory Council in 1975 and 1976. In 1977, he was elected Secretary of the Madison, Wisconsin chapter of the Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity.

In September 1978, Mr. Fleischer transferred to Loyola University of Chicago. In 1979, he served on the Steering Committee of Loyola's annual World Hunger Project. In June 1980, Mr. Fleischer received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology at Loyola. He graduated Magna Cum Laude and was named to the Dean's list in 1979 and 1980.

Before he completed the Master of Arts degree in Sociology in 1986, Mr. Fleischer served as Graduate Representative on the department's Graduate Committee in 1982-83, and was granted department assistantships also in 1982-83, and again in 1983-84. Some of his responsibilites included assisting Dr. William Bates in the preparation and

presentation of the Sociology of the Holocaust course taught in Loyola's

continuing education program and summer session program.   In 1984-85,

and 1985-86, Mr. Fleischer was appointed as a statistical assistant to

Faculty Advisers to the Core under a Mellon Grant by Dr. Robert McNa-

mara, Dr. Paul Messbarger and Fr. Daniel O'Connell, S.J.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

UNDERSTANDING INTERGENERATIONAL EFFECTS OF THE NAZI HOLOCAUST

This thesis will attempt to establish a sociological framework to research intergenerational effects of the Nazi Holocaust. The purpose is to generate methodologically sound, empirical hypotheses properly grounded in sociological theory and principles from my (1984) field work and the related literature. The specific question addressed asks whether survivor offsprings' anger with parents, a consequence of deficiencies in the latters' communication of their Holocaust experiences, becomes reinforced later in the role relationships the former assume (as leaders or members) in children of survivors associations and, perhaps, ultimately threatens the continuity of their association.

The intergenerational literature is replete with psychiatric and psychological issues. Some research considers cultural and religious issues. Until now, few if any studies have focused solely on sociological issues[1]. It is necessary then to discern in the sections below

---

[1] Nevertheless, Freyberg (1980:94) and Heller (1982:260) respectively speculate on the importance of early socialization (child-rearing practices) and survivor parents' varying abilities to encourage a sense of self in their children. Fogelman and Savran (1980:96) speculate briefly on support groups' capacity to reduce alienation and anomie in survivor-offspring (c.f., Sigal et al., 1973:43, 320-27). Epstein (1979) notes, according to Leon et al. (1981:505) "a lack of systematic investigation of the family dynamics of survivor families." Finally, Hammerman (1980) and Lichtman (1984:922-23) report that "male, but not female, children of survivors who ha(ve) a greater knowledge about their parents' prewar experiences ha(ve) more fully developed identities than males who ha(ve) little knowledge." Perhaps wisely, they make no formal inquiries in these matters.

1

which concepts and processes in the literature lend themselves to formal sociological inquiry as well as figure prominently in intergenerational issues. A brief analysis at the end of this chapter simplifies these concepts and processes, examines their relationship and helps orient them to the formal sociological framework applied to my 1984 children of Holocaust survivors association data in chapter 2.

Aspects of "socialization theory" (Cooley, 1909), "self" (G. H. Mead, 1934), "anomie" (Durkheim, 1887) are some of the central sociological concepts addressed and applied in Chapter 2. When they are coupled with Berger's and Luckmann's (1966) concept of "social construction of reality" and Schmalenbach's (n.d.) concept of "communality" (c.f., PSNP 1965:336), sociologists possess the requisite tools to research important intergenerational issues of the Holocaust.

Applications of the sociological concepts above therefore distinguish the purpose and method of my thesis from the remainder of the intergenerational literature. Attending these applications in a manner consistent with Merton's (1968:155) "codification" procedure (i.e., the inductive and sagacious orientation of substantive findings to theory), for example, will help toward a better understanding of the "world" in which Holocaust survivors and their children live and interact.

Clinical and experimental research form the bulk of the related literature. Interestingly, the methods employed in many specific studies have drawn fire (c.f. Solkoff, 1981). A brief review of selected clinical and experimental research follows.

Clinical Research

Childrens' difficulty to emotionally "separate-individuate" them-
selves from possessive survivor parents is widely recognized in the
clinical literature. Lipkowitz (1973) who used psychoanalytic models
based on: (1) maternally-produced "persecution" of survivor offspring,
and (2) offsprings' fantasies about parents' escapes from concentration
camps failed, nevertheless, to modify the "schizophrenic-like" behavior
of a 16 year old son of two survivors. Lipkowitz attributes the models'
failure to their neglect of paternal influences in the separation-indi-
viduation process he believes stems from fathers' (emotional) emascula-
tion by Nazi persecution. He concludes that without effective therapy,
the "cycle of persecution" will perpetuate itself for several genera-
tions. Solkoff (1981:31) criticizes Lipkowitz for not providing any
details on "effective therapy" nor determining what proportion of the
population of survivor children suffers in comparable fashion (an issue
of generalizability).

Freyberg's (1980) study expands the purview of separation-individ-
uation into psyschotheraputic issues of "transference" and "boundary-
blurring." In the former, unanswered longing for love and approval from
parents, especially that of the mother, are displaced into preoccupa-
tions over special attention and positive feedback from therapists and
enormous concern for their well-being (c.f. Freyberg, 1980:89-92). In
the latter, overidentification with mothers' symptoms of withdrawal,
fear, detachment and depression (among other things), "precipitate(s) a
deeper sense of inner crisis, confusion about feeling states, and a real
loss of the autonomous self" (Freyberg, 1980:88,90).

Fogelman and Savran (1980:97), themselves children of survivors

and therapists in short-term offspring support groups, warn against the related dilemma of "countertransference." They cite Whitaker and Lieberman (1964) who describe countertransference as therapists' inability to remain objective and who "participate from within the group focal conflict." Therapists must also be aware of the "savior/persecutor syndrome." Patients alternately view their therapists as "deliverers" from pain and guilt or "issuers" of punishment when they are not understood or confront painful issues (c.f. Fogelman and Savran, 1980:105).

Kestenberg (1972) documents therapists' difficulty to handle offsprings' aggressions and inhibitions (i.e., "alternations between attack and feeling victimized"). Solkoff (1981:31-2) points-out, however, that she fails to: (1) provide information on the sample size of the analysts she consults, (2) identify how many replies were were received and from which countries (e.g., United States, Canada, England, Holland, Germany and Israel), and (3) actually use (not merely refer to) formal controls (e.g., comparison groups like Hiroshima survivor families) to support her belief that Holocaust survivors and their children are "special."

Other clinical studies (below) are criticized by Solkoff (1981:32-5) because: (1) they assume transfer of intergenerational maladies without substantive (empirical) evidence, (2) findings are non-generalizable (or are generalized to inappropriate populations), and (3) they generally lack supportive data.

Trossman (1968), using a sample of McGill University survivor offspring under treatment for academic and personal problems, postulates they are: (1) overprotected by their parents and therefore "moderately phobic" or "combative," (2) depressed and guilty from parents' affective

communication of Holocaust experiences, and (3) mistrustful, defeated or rebellious because of parents' suspicions and anger at the non-Jewish world and their unrealistic demands that children must justify and compensate their past suffering[2].

Barocas and Barocas (1973) postulate that a large number of offspring who seek therapy demonstrate their own versions of "survivor syndrome"[3] (e.g., fatigue, mistrust of others, depression and social isolation), "survivor guilt," (discussed later) and "death anxiety" which translate into feelings of worthlessness (c.f., Neiderland, 1968).

Solkoff's (1981) criticisms also hold for (1) Sonnenberg's (1974) claim that psychoanalytic theorizing will establish the uniqueness of childrens' problems (e.g. high delinquency, retarded maturation, impeded Oedipal resolution, and exaggerated display or rejection of Jewish identity), and (2) Klein's (1970) conclusion that intergenerational maladies can be offset by collective mourning in families and communities--even in those spread across the world (c.f., Solkoff, 1981:33-4).

Epstein's (1979) interviews with children of survivors are criticised by Solkoff (1981:35) as too "journalistic" and psychologically "superficial" to justify the assumption of offsprings' predisposal to "psychopathology." Solkoff (1981:35) even raises the possibility that "intrafamilial experiences," if tested properly, may help reduce offsprings' vulnerabilities and improve their competency and creativity.

---

[2] Aleksandrowicz (1973) notes that these children can also suffer test anxiety and impotence especially in households headed by a single parent.

[3] Phillips (1978) refers to this as the "child of survivor syndrome." Its most salient features are the child's overprotection, anger with his parents, fear and guilt.

Experimental Research

Some studies attempt to distinguish intergenerational effects among arbitrary categories of survivors and their offspring. For example, experimental and control groups are often differentiated by: (1) classifications of age (c.f., Sigal et al., 1973), (2) number of survivors in Holocaust families (c.f., Heller, 1982; and Rustin, 1971), and/or (3) types of survivors in Holocaust families (e.g., concentration camp survivors, ghetto dwellers, or even those who lost close relatives), (c.f., Leon et al., 1981; de Graaf, 1975; and Aleksandrowicz, 1973). These categories have been criticized by Solkoff as biased, non-comparable, and in some instances lacking appropriate control groups. In other instances, he criticises research for poor experimental design (e.g., misuse of appropriate instruments), incomplete or missing data, lack of substantive (statistical) support, and misleading, inconsistent or meaningless conclusions (e.g., untenable comparisons between clinical and experimental findings), (c.f., Solkoff, 1981:36-41). These criticisms not only apply to the research he reviews but also applies to some which post-date his (1981) study.

Rustin's (1971) comparison of adolescent survivor offspring with other comparably aged Jewish children failed to generate evidence to support his hypothesis of intergenerational psychopathology (e.g., guilt and hostility, etc.). Solkoff (1981:40) points-out, however, that Rustin reverses his position without confirmation in a (1972) study with Lipsig.

Leon et al. (1981:505-06, 514) concur with Rustin's (1971) conclusion. Interestingly, they exclude would-be participants whom they con-

sider "psychologically unfit.[4]" Variations in the socio-economic charac-
ter of the samples also bias their data (c.f., Leon et al., 1981:506,
511-12)[5].

One disorder summarily dismissed by Leon et al. (1981:514) is
"survivor guilt." Fogelman and Savran (1980:103) define this phenomenon
as "relating to individuals who have seen their families and friends
killed en masse, and hence are left with an often irrational but never-
theless tenacious sense of guilt about having survived."

Merton (1968:147-49) cautions sociologists (and others) against
sweeping "post-factum" interpretations of data based on selective appli-
cations (or exclusions) of theory and concepts onto observations. He
argues data should help generate fresh and testable hypotheses. Leon et
al. (1981) not only discount a phenomenon documented in the literature,
but also offer no valid and reliable means to support its exclusion. In
Merton's paradigm, they fail miserably.

Aleksandrowicz's (1973) comparison of offspring of Polish-born
survivors of middle or skilled working classes confirms high incidence
of psychological phobias and neuroses in children born into families
with at least one parent who survived severe persecution by the Nazis
(84%). Incidence of similar disorders in children born into families

---

[4] Leon et al. (1981:505, 514) selected their population from the
records of World War II refugees (and their offspring) processed through
a Jewish agency in one of three midwestern cities. Participants not
only lived in the "general community" and agreed to participate in the
study but also had no connection with guidance clinics and mental hospi-
tals.

[5] Experimental groups were "primarily lower-middle class," and the
"majority of the control group were...upper-middle class" (Leon et al.,
1981:506).

headed by two parents who survived forced hiding in the Soviet Union is significantly less (22%), (c.f., Solkoff, 1981:30).

· Sigal et al. (1973) find a greater occurance of psychological disturbances, ("alienation and anomie") in 15-17 year old Canadian survivor offspring than in other comparably aged Jewish children[6]. They also note survivor parents are more likely to perceive such disturbances in their children than their counterparts. Few occurances of these disturbances are found in 8-14 year old survivor offspring and their Jewish peers.

De Graaf's (1975) study of Israeli soldiers/survivor offspring reveals that the highest incidence of: (1) "neuroses" and "psychoses" occur in children born to parents who lost close relatives but who themselves were not victims of Nazi persecution. (2) "personality disturbances," "delinquent traits," and "parental dependency" occur in children born to parents who survived incarceration in camps or ghettos for at least one year, and (3) "maladjustment," interestingly, in children born to parents unconnected with the Holocaust[7].

Solkoff (1981:30) argues that "(D)ata are meaningful and useful only to the extent that they have been rooted in adequate research designs that employ appropriate and replicable methods." Based on the

---

[6] Leon et al. (1981:505) are among many in the literature who note that survivor-offspring begin to manifest psychopathology when they reach the age their parents were at the time of their imprisonment (c.f. Schneider, 1978; Rustin and Lipsig, 1972; Trossman, 1968; and others).

[7] Another interesting finding revealed in de Graaf's (1973) study is how incidence of psychophysiological disorders (e.g., coronary heart disease, hypertension and diabetes) in Israeli soldiers/survivor offspring born to camp survivors as well born to those who lost close relatives apparently vanish when their parents are "physically healthy" (c.f., Solkoff, 1981:37).

literature he reviews (and even for some he does not), Solkoff right-
fully concludes (1981:40) that investigators, in the future, should
adhere to "the canons of proper experimental design."

A spate of current research on intergenerational issues appears to
conform more closely to "the canons of proper experimental design."

Heller (1982) tested 1st generation (Jewish) undergraduate and
graduate volunteers at Harvard, Brandeis, Wellesley and Simmons. With
one exception[8] offspring of one or more concentration camp survior(s)
(high stress group) were presumed and found to be more culturally and
ancestrally sensitive and active[9] as well as more likely to oppose
interculture marriage than offspring of one or more (comparably aged)
European-born parent(s) who resided in Europe until at least 1935 and/or
survived other Nazi persecution and/or lost family (low stress group
)[10].

Porter (1983), a survivor-offspring, posits (without evidence) two
socio-political responses related to survivor-offsprings' skewed cul-
tural identification: (1) Religious vs. political particularism (e.g.,
adoption of Orthodox or Hasidic life styles vs. formal expression of
leftist or right-wing Jewish philosophies)[11]. (2) Religious vs. politi-

---

[8] Differences in cultural activity and opposition to interculture
marriage between males in high and low stress groups tended in the
hypothesized direction but were statistically insignificant (chi-
square), (c.f., Heller 1982:252-53).

[9] Heller (1982:249) defines "culture" as the "concepts, habits and
institutions of (the Jewish) people." "Ancestry," he writes (p. 249),
refers to "a person's family descent, lineage and forebears."

[10] On the other hand, Sonnenberg (1974) argues survivor-offspring
often exaggerate or reject their Jewish identity in response to "paren-
tal persecution" (e.g., overprotection and unrealistic expectations).

cal universalism (e.g., adherence to millenial or cultic movements vs. expression of radical socialist/Marxist philosophies or pro- ecological/ environmental/human rights/racial equality philosophies). Porter claims survivor-offprings' special (particular versus universal) interests are influenced by formal Jewish education, concern for Israel, exposure to Holocaust literature and the views of its writers, and their parents' similar interests.

Analysis

Even though a good portion of the literature suffers methodologically (c.f., Solkoff, 1981), it provides a sufficient foundation to develop a sociological framework to analyze intergenerational effects of the Nazi Holocaust. A sociological framework offers an important new dimension to understand not only how offsprings' relationships with family and friends facilitate the intergenerational transmission and manifestations of the maladies documented in the psychological literature, but also help explain how their conceptions of "self" and "autonomy," formed from valued judgments of "significant others" (parents, siblings, friends, etc.) in childhood later become ingrained in the "roles" they assume in adulthood. Ultimately, we are concerned how the problems they cite between association leaders and members--especially the anger with parents sustained--can be traced, explained and tested empirically.

Two kinds of patterns systematize[12] the mass of clinical and

---

[11] Porter lists the Jewish Defense League, the Revisionist Zionist Movement and Betar as some institutions in which survivor-offspring affiliate politically.

[12] Znaniecki (1940:177-78) advocates the use of the "purely utilitarian" principle of "scientific systematization" to order and explain

experimental research reviewed. These patterns help flesh-out relevant aspects of <u>socialization</u> theory applied to my 1984 association data in Chapter 2. The first kind of patterns synthesize and factor the <u>consistencies</u> which underlie the wealth of psychopathological concepts covered mainly in the clinical research. The second kind of patterns similarly treat the consistencies which underlie the <u>transmission</u> of intergenerational psychopathology and culture considered principally in the experimental research. This analysis concludes with a brief discussion of how Merton's (1968:155) "codification procedure" permits, for example, the development and orientation of these patterns to the sociological theory applied in Chapter 2, as well as facilitates the formulation of empirically-sound hypotheses outlined at the end of Chapter 2.

Psychopathology Reinterpreted

Two classes of psychopathology seem to differentiate the clinical research. In the first class, one finds intergenerational psychopathology "seeded" in survivor-offspring through a variety of early family encounters (e.g., problems of separation/individuation), (c.f., Lipkowitz, 1973). In the second class, the psychopathology "germinates" in survivor-offsprings' mid to late adolescence and continues through adulthood (e.g., problems of transference, boundary-blurring, counter-

---

most parsimoniously the "ever-increasing" accumulation of "facts" obtained through empirical investigation. ("E. Mach and his followers," he writes, "call it the principle of 'economy of thinking'").

The patterns introduced in this analysis attempt to reduce the great number and variety of <u>facts</u> generated in the clinical and experimental research with a couple of these convenient "systems." Even though they have no objective validity of their own and are completely arbitrary, they serve as useful "guides" for "intellectual orientation" (c.f., Znaniecki, 1940:177-78).

transference, savior/persecutor syndrome, etc.), (c.f., Freyberg, 1980; and Fogelman and Savran, 1980). The classes above are not only likely to be interrelated, but also have strong sociological implications--especially to the processes of primary and anticipatory socialization considered in Chapter 2.

Lichtman (1984), concerned with the "well-being" of survivor offspring also factors six categories of (early) parental communication: (1) Mothers' frequent and willing discussion of wartime experiences and transmission of factual information. (2) Guilt-inducing communication by either parent. (Both correlate significantly to offsprings' paranoia, hypochodriasis and low ego strength; the former also correlates significantly with anxiety). (3) Fathers' frequent and willing discussion of wartime experiences and transmission of factual information. (Correlates inversely[13] with depression and hypochondriasis), (4) Awareness of the Holocaust at a young age and its nonverbal (experiential) presence in home, as conveyed by either parent. (5) Indirect communica-

---

[13] Lichtman (1984:921-22) surmises the maternal vs. paternal inconsistency owes to what Kav-Venaki and Nadler (1981) suggest is mothers' tendency to emphasize "dimensions of victimization" in their recounts (especially to daughters), whereas fathers confer "toughness" and "the identity of a fighter" to (Israeli) offspring (especially sons).
    Gender, culture (and necessity) seem to determine to some extent then the willingness and type of "wartime" communication shared in Holocaust families. The candid paternal communication in Israeli families is more "culturally" suitable to rearing and maintaining an effective (and badly needed) military. In contrast, the absence of (or excessively emotional) paternal communication coupled with "unrealistic expectations" for offspring in American households encourages in (male) offspring a tendency to achieve higher levels of education and financial success (c.f., Solkoff, 1981:39; Aleksandrowicz, 1973). Female offspring, on the other hand, tend to suffer "negatively" (c.f., Lichtman, 1984:919, 922-23; Kav-Vaneki and Nadler, 1981; and Karr, 1983, who first postulated the difference in gender response to the intergenerational communication of Holocaust experiences).

tion about the Holocuast (i.e. references to events--although with little factual information), as conveyed by both mother and father. (Both correlate significantly with anxiety, paronoia, and low ego strength in offspring; the latter also correlates significantly with hypocondriasis). (6) Affective (emotional) communication about the Holocaust, as conveyed again by both mother and father. (Correlates significantly with lower sex guilt and total guilt for females; and significantly higher hypochondriasis and low ego strength in males).

Transmission of Psychopathology and Culture Reinterpreted

Two patterns of transmission merit close attention. Firstly, the frequency and intensity of intergenerational psychopathology (neuroses, psychoses, psychophysiological disorders, and personality disorders) seem directly related to Holocaust family type[14]. Families with at least one survivor of Nazi concentration/death camps generally demonstrate the highest frequency and intensity of intergenerational psychopathology. Families with at least one survivor of other Nazi persecution (e.g., forced hiding and ghetto living) seem to demonstrate the next highest frequency and intensity of intergenerational psychopathology. Finally, families with at least one parent having an indirect connection to the Nazi Holocaust (e.g., loss of loved ones) demonstrate, on the whole, the lowest frequency and intensity of intergenerational psy-

---

[14] The classifications are only valid for Holocaust families believed to be predisposed to intergenerational psychopathology. ("Predisposition" implies that the Holocaust families in question have a history of professionally-treated, physical and behavioral ailments), (see Sigal et al., 1973; c.f., Rustin, 1971, and Leon et al., 1981, whose findings indicate an absence of intergenerational psychopathology in "normal" Holocaust families).

chopathology. It is important to note that loss of loved 'one(s)[15] and/or incidence of parents' chronic (physical) illness (c.f., de Graaf, 1975) and/or offsprings' middle adolescent age (15-17 years; c.f., Sigal et al., 1975) tend(s) to spur intergenerational psychopathology.

Secondly, the frequency of cultural and ancestral sensitivity and opposition to intercultural marriage in survivor-offspring also seems to vary by Holocaust family-type above.

Merton's (1968:155) "codification" procedure makes possible the determination of the patterns above. "Codification," according to Merton, permits the _inductive_ orientation of hypotheses, variables, and assumptions to theory. When coupled with the "formal derivation of hypotheses" (i.e. the _deductive_ control of unrelated, undisciplined, and diffuse interpretations), it not only "facilitates the codevelopment of viable sociological theory and pertinent empirical research," but also "originates (by chance or sagacity) new hypotheses" (c.f., Merton, 1968:153-55). Merton (1968:155, 157) adds that "codification" helps "initiate," "reformulate," "deflect," (i.e., re-focus), and "clarify" theory. In chapter 2, these derivative patterns are inductively oriented to formal sociological theory in order to (sagaciously) formulate empirically-testable hypotheses from my brief study of a Chicago-based,

---

[15] Lichtman (1984) finds a strong, direct relationship between mothers' use of: (1) guilt-inducing communication, (2) experiential (nonverbal) communication, and (3) indirect (overheard) communication and number of immediate family members lost in the Holocaust. A similar relationship exists between the aforementioned kinds of intergenerational communication and survivor parents who also underwent the greatest degree of Holocaust trauma (_as perceived by their children_).

Lichtman's study reliably confirms Greenlatt's (1981) observation that a direct relationship exists between emotional turmoil in Holocaust families and incidence of guilt-inducing (wartime) communication (c.f., Lichtman, 1984:921).

children of Holocaust survivors association in 1984. The chapter also ends the thesis with a brief review of the developments reached in order to investigate and analyze sociologically the intergenerational effects of the Nazi Holocaust.

CHAPTER II

INTERGENERATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

The literature reviewed in Chapter 1 documents (with some objections) a variety of intergenerational disorders connected with the Holocaust. This chapter orients both the literature and the patterns derived in Chapter 1 to a number of principles of socialization theory needed to improve our knowledge of the Holocaust legacy. The orientation draws substantively from my 1984 association data. Enough background is provided to ensure readers' familiarity with the composition, structure, and purpose of this association. Additional references to Epstein's (1979) interviews with survivor-offspring help illustrate some sociological applications.

Relevant aspects of G. H. Mead's (1934) "self" and "role theory" (c.f., Znaniecki's concept of latter, 1940 and 1965); Cooley's "looking-glass self" (1902) and theory of "socialization" (1909); W. I. Thomas's (1951) "definition of the situation;" and Durkheim's (1887) concept of "anomie" flesh-out the sociological inquiries addressed superficially in the psychological literature.

Another avenue of sociological application addresses the socialization processes in the "larger society." Berger and Luckmann's (1966) "social construction of reality;" Schmalenbach's (n.d.) "communality" (c.f., Parson's et al., 1965:336); and Toennies (1957) theory of Gemeinschaft (community) combine to explain how the "social and cultural perpetuation (of the Holocaust legacy) is achieved" (Jette, 1974:274;

c.f., Elkin and Handel, 1984:7).

The first section of this chapter reviews the methodology of my (1984) study of a Chicago-based children of Holocaust survivors association. The next section reports some important findings. Although the research is not conclusive, the data gathered succeeds best to integrate the psychological literature and to shape large scale endeavors planned to study empirically the utility and continuity of children of survivors associations as well as the characteristics (role relations) of its members. The theoretical discussion in the third section emphasizes the ties between the respective avenues of socialization outlined briefly above with the integenerational communication of psychopatholgy and other patterns considered in Chapter 1. A brief section concludes this thesis with a review of the important dimension a sociological framework adds to our knowledge of the Holocaust legacy and draws-out a few hypotheses sociologists can use to empirically research intergenerational issues in the manner[1] prescribed by Merton (1968:155). Hopefully, the sociological vein added will improve our scientific knowledge of the Holocaust and man's capacity to avoid another tragedy of its kind[2].

---

[1] Merton's "codification" procedure is not unlike the "exploration and discovery" method Znaniecki (1940:178-90) claims modern "scientific observers" employ to generate "new knowledge." Znaniecki (1940:186) suggests the new breed of "inductive theorists" uses new and superceding theories of "empirical reality" to solve "new problems." He writes (pps. 185-86), "all science is inductive; deduction can serve only as an auxillary method in raising problems for inductive research, never as the ruling method by which inductive solutions of those problems have to be validated."
     Lopata (1969:285) uses a similar "deductive-inductive see-saw" method to help her generate a nine point social-psychological framework of housewife role involvement.

Analysis of a Children of Holocaust Survivors Association

In the spring of 1984, I began a sociological study of a Chicago-based children of Holocaust survivors association. I used field observations and interviews to generate the data in the study and found that this grounded-theory approach[3] best directed my efforts in contrast to classical- and operational-theory approaches (c.f., Bailey, 1982:56-9; Smith, 1975:29-30). Whereas the only variables and hypotheses utilized in the former approach are those that emerge in the data, (e.g., the role offsprings' anger with parents plays in association leadership/membership), the latter approaches construct research through stages beginning with (1) conceptualization of variable relationship(s), (hypotheses), (2) measurement (usually empirical), and (3) data collection and analysis. (Operationalism combines stages 1 and 2 above since "the concept is synonomous with the corresponding set of operations (measurement)", (Bridgeman, 1948:5-6; c.f., Merton, 1967; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Smith, 1975:29; and Bailey, 1982:55-59). Independent verification of grounded data is unnecessary--although not barred--since only those hypotheses generated are recognized (c.f., Bailey, 1982:56).

Detailed comments on the methodology employed in the study is discussed in the first subsection below. The second subsection considers

---

[2] In "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," (Die Revolution, New York, 1852: vol. 1), Karl Marx writes: "Hegel remarks somewhere that all facts and personages of great importance in world history occur, as it were, twice. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second as farce." Perhaps Jews all over the world today echo Marx unknowingly with the slogan, "Never again."

[3] Grounded theory, according to Glaser and Strauss (1967:2-6; c.f., Emerson, 1983:95-7), is defined simply as "the discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research" (emphasis added).

relevant applications of the psychological literature and interpretive sociological theory to the association data.

Methodological Considerations

With the assistance of a department professor, my access to the association, its president and members was made possible by the founder and president of the Holocaust Memorial Foundation of Illinois[4]. Two meetings with her--the second of which I was introduced to the association president--set the tone and parameters of my proposed research. It was agreed that I could participate and record field notes at monthly meetings of the association, held at a far north side synagogue, for the duration of the spring 1984 semester. In addition, I was free to arrange interviews with all interested members. There was no guarantee however on the number of interviews. A written statement of my research intentions was required for the association's monthly newsletter. This was forwarded early in the semester.

Subjects

Three of the four subjects _formally_ interviewed are single females, approximately aged between 30 to 35,

---

[4] I.R.B. approval for human subject study was obtained twice. On the first occasion (January, 1984), I.R.B. approval was granted to my instructor for course-related research. The second occasion (November, 1985) necessitated I.R.B. approval for use of the data in this thesis. A separate research proposal was filed with the I.R.B. application in the second instance.

[5] Consider some of the comments on the educational make-up of the association expressed by the respondents themselves. Note the distinction the first respondent makes between _members_ with _professional_ backgrounds vs. comparable _non-members_ who possess _business_ backgrounds.

well educated,[5] and all professionals[6]. The fourth respondent, inter-

_____

> I would say that the most common thread (in membership)...is educa-
> tional level. I don't know anybody who's not at least working on a
> master's degree. (Survivors who) talk about their kids who are not
> in the (association)...talk about the businesses (they) are setting-
> up. I can't think of any (members) _in_ the (association) who are
> involved in business. It may be that those...more involved in set-
> ting-up businesses may also be somewhat less...introspective (and
> are therefore less likely to join).

Interestingly, Lichtman (1984:922) notes "the greater the guilt-
inducing (indirect or experiential) the communication about the Holo-
caust (in survivor families), the greater the incentive for offspring to
achieve academically and financially." She argues the relationship does
not extend to females. (My data seem to indicate a similar tendency for
males _and_ females, however).

There remains, however, the unexplained and fascinating distinc-
tion made between association membership, introspection, and profes-
sional status versus non-membership, less introspection, and business
status. Perhaps the Karr (1973) and Kav-Venaki and Nadler (1981) stud-
ies offer an important clue with "cultural communication". Israeli mil-
itary "toughness," we know from before, owes in part to "open" and
"frank" (paternal) communication of wartime experiences. Education and
financial gain, American ideals, we may infer from Lichtman (1984:922),
are connected with the "abundantly affective" (emotional) communication
which may distinguish the "introspective" character of (professional)
association members from other, unconnected (business) offspring exposed
to less emotional--perhaps even an absence of--(paternal) wartime commu-
nication.

Compare the former excerpt with the next two.

> Most (members) have completed college in terms of education. One of
> them is getting a doctorate at Northwestern; one of them is an engi-
> neer; one of them is a teacher with a masters degree; one of them is
> a professor; one of them is in sales; one of them is an artist who's
> involved in the construction field; and then there's a probation
> officer I think you know.

"(A)n artist, a teacher, either a masters or Ph.D candidate; one
(is) a dentist."

[6] These respondents are college educated--two at the masters level.
One is a free-lance designer, another practices social work in a private
(religious) organization, and the third teaches business at a local uni-
versity.

It is necessary to keep in mind that the determination of the edu-
cational and professional composition of _this_ association is based on
the _subjective_ perceptions of the respondents. The _actual_ composition
of this association and others may differ _objectively_. Additional veri-
fication is needed for reliability.

viewed extemporaneously, is a single male, also aged between 30 and 35,

possesses an A.B.D. in psychology and practices social work in the Cook

County Juvinile Court system. He is an active member of the associa-

tion.

Two of the three females interviewed are also active association

members. The third female--although not a child of Holocaust survi-

vors--attends association meetings and claims several members as

friends. Other active subjects observed vary in age from mid-twenties

to early fifties. Some are single; others are married. (The actual

proportion of single members versus married members is not known. Esti-

mates should not be inferred from the characteristics of the respondents

interviewed).

Field Notes

Observations were planned for three monthly association meetings

(i.e., one meeting each in February, March and April, 1984). The April

meeting proved problematic however. Members were asked by the president

of the association to attend a Yom Hashoa (Holocaust Remembrance Day)

service at another nearby synagogue in place of the regular meeting.

Although a prior commitment precluded my attendance at the service, lit-

tle data was sacrificed since members' interactions were "religious" and

therefore outside the purview of the association. Nevertheless, my

observations were shortened to just two association visits. It became

necessary then to consider all exchanges inportant and to record them as

carefully and as accurately as possible.

My first set of field notes (2-13-84) more closely resembled what

Schwartz and Jacobs (1979:30-1) and Emerson (1983:120-24) label, "ana-

lytic memos." Analytic memos integrate theory with observations, reflections, preconceptions[7] and ideas. They are often used to confirm or deny recorded data and sometimes to synthesize new theory and/or methods of investigation. Consider the conjecture in the following excerpt[8]:

> It was not enough to be a Jew in this (association). Nor was it enough to show evidence of a linkage to the Holocaust by having had a relative perish in the camps. I had to prove my "credentials" by having had at least one parent survive the camps. Even one parent was a handicap to an extent since it was "better" to be the child of two survivors. In the latter instance, your membership or reason for becoming a member in the association was unquestionable. A "hierarchy" of member(ship) is (thus) created according to particular sets of "credentials."

At the time I wrote these comments, I had no concrete evidence such a "hierarchy" existed. Nevertheless, my suspicions were partially confirmed a little over two months later (4-18-84) when I recorded one respondent's belief that "members of the association could be hierarchi-

---

[7] Schwartz and Jacobs (1979:28), aware of the fact that researchers tend to have preconceived ideas before entering the field, argue that it is satisfactory to use such preconceptions as "sensitizing concepts" since they "give researchers things to do and ask immediately." On the other hnd,, they warn that preconceptions are not to be mistaken as "firm research orientations."

[8] This conjecture is based on comments some members shared with me following the (2-13-84) association meeting. Later, in a (4-18-84) interview, one respondent pursued a comment she and others raised after the aforementioned meeting concerning non-members who occasionally attend association meetings:

> There has to be some connection (between these people and the association). I don't really want to see (the association) open-up completely because it is a group for children of survivors. That's our real purpose. If we open it up too much, we start to get a lot of "gawkers:" people who want to see what's going on and what (we) are really like. (An association) has nothing to do with (people) coming and looking at the "freaks:" people (who have) heard strange things, who read a peculiar book about children of survivors. It's (that) kind of thing I'd really like to avoid at all costs because it makes us uncomfortable. (Emphasis added).

cally ranked according to: (1) length of membership, (2) country of parent(s) origin, and (3) number of parents who are Holocaust survivors."

On the very next day (4-19-84), another respondent vehemently denied the "hierarchy" thesis when I pressed the question. Having explained her familiarity and experience with "group dynamics," she replied:

> I don't see the "hierarchy" as you call it, in (our association) being any different that (that in) any other group. People who've been there longer have more status, more commitment. (P)eople who attend meetings regularly are more involved...this would be true in any group. As for whether you have two parents who are survivors or one, or where your parents are from, no one even asked me. So how would they know? So how would they know where to place me in an hierarchy?

Nevertheless, we know from the experimental literature considered in Chapter 1, (c.f., Aleksandrowicz, 1973; de Graaf, 1975; and Heller, 1982), that Holocaust families headed by two (death/labor/concentration) camp survivors communicate intergerationally, on the whole, more psychopathology and cultural/ancestral sensitivity than Holocaust families headed by a single survivor or survivors of other Nazi persecution (e.g., forced hiding and ghetto-living). From an organizational perspective, then, it would be worthwhile to poll and evaluate statistically whether membership in children of survivors associations is related to Holocaust family type and, if so, to note which members most frequently occupy leadership positions. A significant relationship might help explain, sociologically, how survivor offsprings' anger with parents is tied to effective leadership and problems of association membership. This issue will be addressed in greater detail later in this chapter.

My second set of field notes (3-5-84) conformed more closely to the routine, chronological log of observations made on persons, places, events and times recommended by Schatzman and Strauss (1973:94-6), and Lofland and Lofland (1984:62-8). Background was provided where needed and even a rough sketch of the association setting was attached. This particular set of notes generated useful information on the operation and organization of association meetings and how members interact.

Interviews

The goals set forth in the (2-6-84) proposal planned five to ten one-half hour recursive[9] interviews. What I had to settle for, in contrast, were three semi-recursive (structured) interviews[10] lasting approximately one hour apiece. What was lost in quantity, I hoped, would be compensated with quality.

Questions which addressed specifics on the association's structure, rules, and programs, etc., originally proposed, were later given less priority than questions which probed members' family backgrounds, association experiences and relationships. The latter yielded more fruitful and interesting possibilities from a socialization standpoint (e.g., how family dynamics in childhood affect role relationships survivor offspring assume later in children of survivors associations). Association members, therefore, not the association per se emerged as

---

[9] Recursive interviews rely on what has already transpired between researcher and respondent as well as other previous interviews to shape the content of subsequent inquiries (c.f., Schwartz and Jacobs, 1979:45).

[10] That is, planned questions were not introduced in a "checklist" fashion but rather in the normal flow of conversation when appropriate.

the primary units of analysis.

However, few members of the association cared to interview. Not only did a distaste with previous research vitiate members' willingness to participate in the study, but I found myself in competition with two other graduate students for interviews. Some who did express an interest to participate failed to return my follow-up calls to arrange an interview time and place. The aim of my interview with the non-member was to obtain her general impression of the association and how she believes it affects her friends who are members as well as her own relationship with them. Interestingly, this respondent offers an important reference to compare and contrast the data generated from association members below.

Finally, interview comments which either precede the text on separate cover pages or are offset in the text by parentheses add relevant background and help clarifiy ambiguous points. They neither add to nor detract from the information generated. In my interviews, comments helped me decide which points I wanted the respondents to elaborate, where to resume conversation following interruptions, and even qualify the text with records of respondents' emotions and vocal inflections (c.f., Lofland, 1971:88-91).

Findings

A downward trend in "active"[11] membership deeply concerned the respondents I interviewed. One respondent reported active participation dwindled from a range of approximately 30 to 70 members per meeting in

---

[11] Respondents concur that "active" membership implies consistent attendance and participation in the association.

1982, to a range of 6 to 10 members in 1984. My own observations reveal, however, a range of active attendance of 12 to 15 members for February and March, 1984. Nevertheless, this respondent estimated[12] that approximately 15% of the association's 70 to 100 members attended regular monthly meetings. (See reasons below).

Another important distinction is _paid_ membership. Not everyone who attends and participates meetings are paid members. Although non-members comprise a small fraction of active participants, they can be differentiated, arguably, from the large portion of paid members who do _not_ attend meetings regularly. Unpaid, active members are often tempo-rary visitors, like myself, who are not necessarily children of survi-vors but who nevertheless actively attend and participate[13] in meetings and/or engage in social scientific study from time to time.

Inadequate leadership, dull programs, poor outreach and public relations were cited by the respondents as underlying causes of poor attendance. Insufficient "networking," defined by the respondents as the formal _coordination_ of association members, associations (and other similar religious or secular affiliates and organizations) on the regional, national and international levels, also contributes widely to the problem.

---

[12] Although she could not cite exact numbers, the respondent believed that overall membership in the association _increased_ slightly in 1984, but is substantially less than previous years. Her pronounced concern in active and overall membership, in contrast to other respondents, stemmed from an interest to run (most likely unopposed) for association vice president in 1985.

[13] On one occasion (3-5-84), I was solicited by the association pres-ident to arrange, if possible, a lecture and presentation on one or more video tapes on the Holocaust I have in my possession. Unfortunately, no mutually convenient time would permit the program.

Perhaps more than any reason offered, inadequate leadership in the
association sparked the most emotion and controversy in the interviews.
Note the tone of the two passages below. Also keep in mind the consis-
tency of content:

> Well a lot of it is (the President). There are a lot of people who
> don't care for him much. He means very well...but he doesn't exe-
> cute anything. So we have unplanned meeting after unplanned meeting
> and people don't much like that...(they) just give up on him. (He)
> has an enormous amount of _anger_. I keep hearing him say, you know,
> unpleasant things about his parents, unpleasant things about other
> survivors. He can't sit through a survivors meeting because it just
> tears him up. It obviously reminds him of his parents. (Emphasis
> added).

> I think a very serious problem facing the organization is lack of
> leadership. I was not only surprised but shocked to not see (our
> President) at the Chanukah party, to not see him at other ancillary
> functions. I don't know how much time he puts into the organiza-
> tion. He may have a commitment to the organization but I don't
> think that he is able, and maybe he has emotional problems. There
> were more people at meetings under the previous president.

The relationship between leadership and membership, although not
likely an issue unique to this association, is perhaps the crucial point
needed to understand the association sociologically. Many of the causes
of inadequate membership identified by the respondents might be subsumed
under the leadership/membership relationship. Note how one respondent
ties leader's (poor) "delegation of responsibilities," in the passage
below, to the stability and continuity of the association:

> Time (is needed) for planning meetings and making phone calls and
> follow-up. (Time is needed) to find a way to get other people
> involved so that (a leader) can delegate responsibility. I think
> often when a leader accepts a job, the easiest (thing) is to (have
> him or her) do all the work. Unless (a leader) has an inordinate
> amount of time, (he or she) can't do that. The hard thing is to get
> people committed around (him or her) who are willing to put in their
> time. And unless there's a leader that's found that has that capac-
> ity, I wouldn't be surprised if the organization disappeared.

When I pressed the respondents to imagine what changes in the
association they would make if they were in a leadership position, they

noticeably concurred on the importance of the association's educational

and social appeal:

> .I think I'd like to see a broader outreach[14] for people, a broader
> acceptance of people within the group. I think that's important.

> Well, I think that I would like to resurrect those committees that
> were formed (i.e., the Speakers Bureau, a public relations commit-
> tee, the Social Activities Committee, etc.), and make them actual
> functioning committees. I would certainly have an agenda for the
> meetings; that everyone knows where the meeting is and what's going
> to be discussed; have interesting programs; reach people who don't
> know about the organization; (and) to really disseminate information
> about the organization.

Theoretical Considerations

Association leaders, it seems, find themselves in a precarious situ-

ation. It is possible (if not likely) for them to be unsure of their

responsibilities (c.f., Fogelman and Savran, 1980:105). This under-

standably absolves them of some of the problems of membership, but

equally permits us to understand how an association might stagnate and

perhaps dissolve--especially when confounded by leaders' own emotional

handicaps. The psychotheraputic dilemma of "countertransference" noted

by Fogelman and Savran (1980:97), for example, finds useful application

in this instance. Recall how they cite Whitaker and Lieberman (1964)

who describe the phenomenon as therapists' (leaders') inability to

remain objective and who "participate from within the group focal con-

flict." Although the respondents concur on the self-destructive nature

---

[14] "Broader outreach" for this respondent meant a change from an
"extended support group" capacity to one of "philosophical and histori-
cal" importance. Some programs she suggests include: (1) "How the Holo-
caust may reflect in (survivor offsprings') personal/ethical systems,"
(2) "How (survivor offspring) react to American business ethics or pro-
fessional ethics," and (3) "The difference between the ethics of chil-
dren of survivors and other Jews?"

and intensity of anger repressed in their association president, one respondent comments the condition in this case is "extreme." She adds, "there are a few like him but not terribly many." Nevertheless, the potential damage to the association from the president's inability to objectively "delegate responsibilities" is not only likely to interfer with the "focus" (purpose)[15] of the association, but also decrease the interest, participation and attendance of its members and, perhaps, detract from the kinds of programs desired. The very stability of the association is endangered.

The loss of "objectivity" which threatens (association) leaders and endangers membership does not escape the attention of Fogelman[16] and Savran in their analysis of their own experience as therapists-leaders of support groups. They write (1980:103-04):

> Our initial idea for doing the groups arose out of the feelings of empathy we experienced when reading anecdotes written by other children of survivors...After beginning our second group, we became aware of another motivating force in our work: survivor guilt. (Emphasis added).

Survivor guilt[17], we know from Fogelman and Savran (1980:103), is

---

[15] In one interview, I asked the respondent to summarize briefly the "intent" of the association. I inquired whether a written "constitution" outlined specific functions. The respondent replied that an "idealized" (impractical) "statement of purpose...to educate people about the Holocaust (and) provide a forum for sharing information with each other" sometimes appeared at "public events." One event cited was a (June, 1983) "Jewish Folk Festival." She added, however, that there were many instances when such "informational materials" were not available.

[16] Fogelman, at the time she and Savran wrote their article, worked in the Department of Sociology at Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachussetts.

[17] The best example of "survivor guilt" comes from a member's comments I recorded in my (2-13-84) field notes following an association meeting. The member recalled how his parents would say, "You will never

"an irrational but tenacious sense of guilt about having survived the Holocaust when family and friends were killed en masse." When this kind of guilt combines with the "depression, (death) anxiety, hypochondriasis and paranoia" Holocaust survivors often manifest and "communicate" intergenerationally, the result, according to Niederland (1961), is "survivor syndrome" (c.f., Lichtman, 1984:914).

Barocas and Barocas (1973), we also know, postulate that a large number of offspring who seek (and in Fogelman and Savran's case, 1980, administer) therapy (sometimes) demonstrate their own version of "survivor syndrome." Some symptoms include fatigue, mistrust of others, and social isolation (which may help explain why a large proportion of "available" survivor offspring remain unaffiliated with children of survivors associations).

---

know the smell from the fires of Auschwitz."

One need not be particularly insightful to reason, at least in part, that a pervasive, if not perverse, sense of "guilt" shrouds some association members (c.f., Epstein, 1979:16). The impact of children's "survivor guilt" is most likely multi-dimensional: (1) Most children probably never lived through (nor could fully understand) the atrocities of the Holocaust themselves. (2) Most children, at one time or another, must face their parents' agonies alone and, perhaps, feel unable to share in them and in their own agonies later (c.f., Fogelman and Savran, 1980:99, 103).

Trossman (1968) observes how some survivors use "destructive" pressure to coerce their offspring to justify (compensate) their desolate pasts. Barocas and Barocas (1973) comment the (pressure) often translates into survivors' unreasonable expectations for their offspring. A few members reported their involvement in the association (ironically) stems from a need "to re-educate their parents (of the Holocaust) who have created mental blocks and/or refuse to acknowledge their painful pasts." Not to share a "painful" past with children, it seems, can be just as agonizing to them as making them feel "guilty" about it.

Fogelman and Savran (1980:103) even extend the impact of the Holocaust legacy "to others who are not directly touched by it." This point is illustrated best by the few non-paying but active participants who share a personal and/or professional interest in the Holocaust but are not themselves children of survivors.

We are reminded by Phillips (1978) that among the most salient features of offsprings' "survivor syndrome" (which he appropriately labels "child of survivor syndrome") are offsprings' overprotection and anger with parents. Again we see how this association president's anger (this time under the "child of survivor syndrome" label) can further deteriorate the seemingly delicate relationship which ties effective leadership to association membership.

Fogelman and Savran also note the role "cultural identification" plays in the leadership/membership relationship. They write (1980:103-04):

> It is important for group leaders to be aware (if possible) of the influence of their own attitudes toward Jewish identification on their interventions in the group.

Clifford Geertz (1973:11), (citing Ward Goodenough, a behavioral anthropologist), suggests "culture (is located) in the minds and hearts of men." Geertz continues, "A society's culture consists of whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members." (Emphasis added).

Arguably, Holocaust survivors and their offspring are as much a "society" to themselves as each is independent of the other. Heller (1982:248), for example, points-out how few studies "sufficiently emphasize the cultural context in which survivor children respond to a legacy of massive trauma." He argues culture and history must be added to the model of (intergenerational) pathology to determine offsprings' reactions to the stresses of cultural intermarriage, assimilation, and extinction (c.f., Heller, 1982:248,254; Zborowski, 1954).

Porter (1983), we know from before, posits two socio-political extremes of survivor offsprings' Jewish identification: (1) religious

versus political <u>particularism</u> which respectively stresses traditional Jewish values and ideals in orthodox practices or political leanings, and (2) religious versus political <u>universalism</u> which widens the application of Jewish values and ideals into a variety of special interest (religious) movements and (social) causes[18]. Porter concludes that offsprings' Jewish education, concern for Israel, exposure to Holocaust literature and survior parents' views all influence their "particular/universal" tendencies. Association leaders and members are not exempt from these cultural influences. In fact, some may find themselves at "cultural odds" with others. Consider the following passage:

> I felt a lot of anger because of a lot of unpleasant things were said about people with (weak) Jewish identities--you know, people who don't keep Kosher and whatever. I mean they started bringing out a lot of hostilities at that meeting.

This respondent also observed that many "aspects" characterize survivor offspring. She elaborated that she, like other survivor offspring, do not feel "completely American" despite their American upbringing. She specifically referred to an incident when her Finnish friend, talking about Americans "this and this and this," said to her, "but not you, you're a European." The respondent candidly admitted she was indeed raised "as a European child would have been" (i.e., with little contact outside her home[19]).

---

[18] Interestingly, survivors themselves disagree on the scope of the Holocaust tragedy. Elie Weisel, noted historian and author, limits its impact only to Jews. Simon Weisenthal, famed "hunter" of Nazi war criminals, subscribes to its lessen for mankind.

[19] Epstein (1979:16) recalls an incident when her friend, Mary, a survivor offspring given a Christian name to help conceal her Jewish identity, once mentioned how her Polish parents not only would speak Yiddish at home, but also would rarely <u>leave</u> home for fear "it would burn down or be looted." Epstein writes:

Members face their own kinds of problems in associations. Frey-
berg (1980:89-92) notes that: (1) "transference," where survivor off-
spring substitute and displace their longing for parental love into pre-
occupations over special attention and positive feedback from (leaders)
and enormous concern for their well-being, and (2) "boundary-blurring,"
where survivor offspring "overidentify" with mother's (and/or father's)
symptoms of withdrawal, fear, detachment and depression, etc., "precipi-
tate a deeper sense of inner crisis, confusion about feeling states, and
a real loss of the autonomous self[20].

Fogelman and Savran (1980:104-05) observe that members alternately
view their leaders as "saviors" (who rescue members form their pain and
"survivor guilt") and "persecutors" (who sometimes "punish" members when
they misuderstand them or force them to "confront painful issues.[21]"

An example of this "alternation dilemma" occurs with the respon-
dent who vehemently denies the "hierarchy thesis" discussed beforehand.
Later in the (4-19-84) interview, she accuses the association president
of possessing "a chip on his shoulder" and finds contempt with his "con-
stant complaints." She claims other survivor offspring are also "dis-

---

All of our parents, the ones who had come to America after the war,
were eccentric in my eyes. They were not like Americans, and we
children were not like other American children. That fact was so
obvious it did not require discussion....Friends, like family, are
quick to shield each other from pain and although we all knew that a
great deal of pain pervaded the households in which we were raised,
we never addressed it by name.

[20] The concept of "self" is considered more fully later in this chap-
ter.

[21] Earlier, Kestenberg (1972) documented a similar phenomenon thera-
pists face when support group members alternate between "attacks"
(aggression) and "victimization" (inhibition).

gusted" and "outraged" with his "type (i.e., lack) of leadership." Yet this respondent admits, almost in the same breath, how she feels "power-less" to do anything about it because she does not want to run uncon-tested for office in an election she believes is a "joke" and "laugha-ble." The result of these "alternations" appears to be members' frustrations with leadership and, in this instance, a danger for mem-bers' apathy[22] since the association's noncompetitive "electoral pro-cess" incites disillusionment.

Finally, offsprings' anger with parents which factors into prob-lems of (association) leadership similarly factors into problems of mem-bership. Note some of the reasons given by one respondent for associa-tion membership:

> I think (membership) is somewhat dependent on (individuals') initial state of mental health. I mean there are people who come in and all they want is to find-out how to get rid of this great _anger_ they

---

[22] The dangers of "apathy" apply to survivor offspring in general. Just as the frustration and indifference of association members can induce their "alienation" (estrangement) from the group, so can survivor offspring become alienated from society (and its institutions).

The dissociation, according to Harmon (in Dushkin, 1974:9), arises from feelings of "powerlessness, normlessness (anomie), meaninglessness, depersonalization, isolation, and self-estrangement."

In _Suicide_ (New York: The Free Press, 1951), Durkheim argues the "organic" (heterogeneous and specialized) nature of rapidly _changing_, industrialized societies confuses for some the "norms" (standards) of society. In Chapter 1, Durkheim even discusses the connections which tie suicide to _psychopathic_ states. Ironically Jews, in contrast to Protestants and Catholics, exhibit the lowest rates of (anomic) suicide owing, in part, to the close (religious and cultural) bonds of marriage and family (c.f., Durkheim, 1951). (It would be interesting to know if the trend holds for survivor offspring).

Dissociation in Holocaust families may owe to "role-differentia-tion" whereby mothers, more than fathers, are entrusted with child-rear-ing. Fathers' "detachment," we know, occurs from severe Nazi victimiza-tion (c.f., Solkoff, 1981:31; and Freyberg, 1980:89-92). Survivor offspring, in turn, may grow to be more dependent on mothers. This situation, according to Harmon (in Dushkin, 1974:9), "sets the stage for one common cause of alienation."

have at their parents, or how to function in society and why the Holocaust did these terrible things to them. There <u>are</u> people like that. (Emphasis added).

Earlier, this respondent surmised that some members join "to know why they (are) so crazy, why their parents (are) so crazy, (and) why they (can't) get along with (them)." Interestingly, she forsees a time when members will solve these questions as they become more removed from their "families of orientation" (c.f., Scanzoni, 1976:7). She forcasts the association will "extrinsically reach-out" to educate all interested persons including "third generation offspring."

Sociological Implications

The theoretical underpinnings of the leadership/membership relationship offer intriguing sociological implications. Elkin and Handel (1984:62) note that in the process of "anticipatory socialization"[23],

---

[23] Robert K. Merton, in collaboration with Alice S. Rossi (Chapter X, "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior," in <u>Social Theory and Social Structure</u> (New York: The Free Press, 1968:308, 319-22)), applies the concept of "anticipatory socialization" to Privates who aspire membership in the Army hierarchy (c.f., S. A. Stouffer et al., <u>The American Soldier</u> 2 vols. (Princeton, New Jersey: The Princeton University Press, 1949)). Citing the "theoretic background provided by James, Cooley and Mead, Hyman, Sherif and Newcomb, Merton and Rossi write (p. 308):

> (The Privates) will tend to assimilate the sentiments and conform with the values of the authoritative and prestigeful stratum in the (hierarchy)...(a)nd the values of these "significant others" constitute the mirrors in which the (Privates) see their self-image and reach self-appraisals (c.f., the development of the "self-concept" (Cooley, 1902) from his theory of "the looking-glass self," discussed later in this chapter).

It would be natural for members of the children of survivor association to aspire similarly to positions of authority in their own "hierarchy." However, we have already observed how one respondent does <u>not</u> value these positions nor the ("electoral") process available to fill them. Moreover, she finds contempt for those in the "hierarchy" who subscribe to the notion that group "status" owes not only to length

children prepare themselves (at an early age) for roles[24] they might

---

of membership, but also to origin of parents' countr(ies) and number of survivor parents.

[24] "Role-learning," (Mead, 1934), shapes both behavior and personality. It begins in the family with children's comprehension of their "rights and obligations." Game-playing also helps children develop and clarify their role knowledge (e.g., the game "house" permits boys and girls to emulate their parents as "husband/father" and/or "wife/mother"), (c.f., Brinkerhoff and White, 1985:120-21).

Self-appraisals are influenced early by the judgments of "significant others" (e.g., parents, teachers, siblings and friends). As children mature, these appraisals are influenced by the "generalized other" (i.e., the composite expectations of all the other role-players with whom the individual interacts), (c.f., Brinkerhoff and White, 1985: 121).

The role as "performance" does not end in childhood but continues throughout life and continually defines one's "self-concept." "Role identities," (Burke, 1980:18), are composites of the multiple roles individuals assume in adulthood. More important roles are preferred and become central to one's definition of "self" (c.f., Stryker, 1981; and Brinkerhoff and White, 1985:121-22).

Znaniecki initially pursued the "role performance" thesis in The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940:14-17). He finds important distinctions between and among the "players." The "social person," being the prime player, participates (performs) his role within the framework of others which he labels, "the social circle." He writes (pps. 15-16):

The (social person) is conceived by his circle as an organic and psychological entity who is a "self," conscious of his own existence as a body and a soul and aware of how others regard him. If he is the kind of person his social circle needs, his "self" must possess in the opinion of the circle certain qualities, physical and mental, and not possess certain other qualities.

"Social persons" are thus assigned a "social status" based on certain (enforceable) "bodily" and "spiritual" rights recognized and originated from their "social circles." In turn, the "social person" functions to fulfill the obligations of his status in order to meet the needs of the "social circle." Neither "social status" nor "social circles" are static but change or are replaced or multiplied as "social persons" mature.

Survivor offspring form a type of "social circle" in a children of survivors association. The role performance of the President ("social person"), presumably enforced by his or her election to office, should meet the (educational, social, etc.) needs of the "circle" (members) who confer his or her "status." However, when a deficiency (e.g., anger with parents) innate in the "social person" is coupled by another deficiency in his or her "status" (e.g., the "laughable" elections), both

play in the future. They rehearse actions, values, and feelings before

they actually enter into a particular status or adopt a new role."

Erikson (1950), for example, divides the life cycle into eight stages,

each of which presents the person with a basic socialization[25] issue or

dilemma[26]. An understanding of a few of these stages finds particular

---

may interfere in his or her role performance and his or her (legitimate)
rights to the "status" conferred. It is not hard to understand then how
the "bond" which ties the "social person" (President) to his "circle"
(members) is weakened.

As we have seen, the deficiency in role performance may be contin-
gent on the "self-appraisals" the social person (and circle) formed in
their early interactions with "significant others." The dilemma is com-
plicated further by the deficiencies (psychopathologies) developed and
manifested amid the "multiple" roles survivor offspring assume and rein-
force later as a "generalized other." These deficiencies may also
explain why some association elections lack real opposition.

[25] Jette (in Dushkin, 1974:272) defines socialization as "the process
whereby individuals learn and internalize the attitudes, values and
behaviors appropriate to persons functioning as social beings and
responsive, participating members of their society" (c.f., Elkin and
Handel, 1984:4; and Brinkerhoff and White, 1985:118-19).

Socialization, in other words, is the process in which "selves"
and "self-concepts" (appraisals) are "moulded in primary groups later to
become (via continuing or anticipatory or even resocialization) 'social
selves' whose ambitions are formed by the common thoughts of groups"
(Emphasis added; c.f., Cooley, 1909 and 1962:35-6).

Families, peer groups, schools, the media, religion, workplace,
associations and networks are important "agents" of socialization. They
all have a profound effect on the development of the personality and the
social roles individuals assume (c.f., Brinkerhoff and White,
1985:132-37).

So far, we have seen how socialization figures into the intergen-
erational factors (psychopathologies) which influence the development of
survivor offspring (viz, association leaders and members). We will soon
see how socialization also helps explain the social and cultural perpet-
uation of society (e.g., how the continuity of the Holocaust legacy is
achieved and reinforced in a variety of institutions and associations),
(c.f., Jette in Dushkin, 1974:272-73; and Elkin and Handel, 1984:6-9).

[26] The socialization process also intersects with "developmental
theory" pioneered by Jean Piaget (1929, 1932). Piaget assumes there are
corresponding stages of "cognition" which tie directly to childrens'
physiological maturation. Advancement to the higher stages of "concrete
operations," (7 to 11 years), characterized by logical and numerical
thoughts and mental imaging; and "formal operations," (12 + years),

relevance for offspring of Holocaust survivors.

In the first two years of infancy, "helpless" newborns pass through the stages of (1) "(parental) trust versus distrust," and (2) "autonnomy versus shame and doubt." The infants, in the first instance, experientially learn whether their parents (especially "mother") have "become...inner certaint(ies) as well as outer predictabilit(ies)" (c.f., Elkin and Handel, 1984:63; Erikson, 1950). This crucial emotional attachment successfully "matures" only if the infants can let their (parents) out of sight without becoming "anxious and enraged."

In the second instance, the infants--"subjected to closer (parental) scrutiny"--must learn "self-direction" in order to overcome self doubt and "the sense of smallness" sometimes complicated by too much parental control. Weinstein and Platt (1973:34-5), psychoanalytic sociologists[27], point-out the interesting Freudian idea that:

---

characterized by formal and abstract reasoning (which not all adults reach), depend on the mastery of the lower "sensorimotor stage," (0-2 years), characterized by nominal organization of sensory experiences and symbolic problem solving, and the "preoperational stage," (2 to 7 years), characterized by the acquisition and (symbolic) use of language for (self-centered) representational thought and play.

Another "maturational model" is offered by Kohlberg (1980). It emphasizes the process of "moral development" through stages of: (1) preconvention (punishment and obedience/hedonistic rewards), (2) convention (importance of others approval and respect for authority), and (3) post convention (improvement of authority and laws, and philosophical positions).

Finally, proponents of the remotely related "behavioral theory model" assume that individuals "are motivated to avoid pain and receive pleasure" through conditioned (learned) responses to stimuli. We know how Pavlov and John Watson respectively "tested" the stimulus/response condition on dogs and infants. Skinner's (1948, 1971) "behavior modification theory"--although untested at the societal level--promises (not without ethical controversy) to remedy socially "undesirable" and/or criminal proclivities.

[27] Weinstein and Platt (1973) recast "psychoanalytic propositions" into "psychosocial terms" in order to examine at the social level affec-

Children are protected against the dangers that threaten them from the external world by...their parents; they pay for this security by a fear of <u>loss</u> <u>of</u> <u>love</u> which would deliver them over helpless to the dangers of the external world. Child(ren) are brought up to a knowledge of (their) <u>social</u> <u>duties</u> by a system of loving rewards and punishments; (they) are taught that (their) security in life depends on (their) parents (and afterwords other people) loving (them).

Here we can understand the basis for Freyberg's (1980) "transfer-ence" dilemma. More importantly, from the clinical model in the analy-sis of Chapter 1, we know that intergenerational psychopathology is "seeded" in survivor offspring through a variety of early family encoun-ters. Sociologically, then, there is no reason why childhood problems suffered in Erikson's first two stages of the life cycle are not remnis-cent of the "obstructions" Lipkowitz (1973) claim's children of Holo-caust survivors suffer in their 16th through 24th month of life in the "separation/individuation" process. At this critical period, survivor offspring theoretically do not receive the necessary support and

---

<u>tive</u> (emotional) behavior between and among individuals and groups. They write (p. 91):

(E)very relationship has an <u>emotional</u> component; that conscious and unconscious, positive and negative feelings are invested in <u>self</u> and others; and that, although at any given time these emotional compo-nents are internalized (on the psychic side) and institutionalized (in roles, on the social side), they are also subject to change (i.e., variations in the systematic evaluation and categorization of persons, social <u>statuses</u>, roles, and <u>group</u> <u>feelings</u>). In the sociological sense, affect is one basis for integrating individuals into social organization. (Emphasis added).

Survivor offsprings' anger with parents, "seeded through restricted encounters with "significant others," not only seems to influence the development of biased "selves" (personalities) and "self-concepts" (identity formations), but also seems to "germinate" <u>later</u> in the role relationships Weinstein and Platt believe "integrate (them) into institutions (viz, children of survivors associations) on the social level." Most importantly, however, is the potential Weinstein and Platt see for "social change" in newly defined relationships which can alter (grave) "group feelings."

approval ("trust") from their parents (especially mother-- or father, if

the family is headed by a widower), to achieve sufficient individuation

("autonomy") from their parent(s). The parent(s) are unable to provide

this needed love, support and approval because they fear losing the

children as they had once lost other close family and/or friends in the

Holocaust. The children at their tender age, on the other hand, cannot

comprehend their parents' inability nor accept it for what it is. In

Freud's terminology, they consider it evidence of "loss of (parents')

love." The likely result is survivor offspring never develop a sense of

"self" distinct ("separate") from their "parent(s).

The "self," according to Mead (1934), consists of a complex blend

of individual motivations, desires and wants (the "I"), and appropriate

responses to social demands (the "me"), (c.f., Brinkerhoff and White,

1985:119). The distinction and conflict sometimes apparent in the "I"

and "me," (e.g., the "I's" spontaneity and impulsiveness versus the

"me's" accountability as a social object), parallels to some extent

Freud's distinction between the "id" (basic impulsive nature) and the

"superego" (conscience or learned morality)[28]. However, unlike Freud,

---

[28] W. I. Thomas (1951) reduces some of the "individual motivations, desires and wants" of the "I" into four categories: (1) new experience (excitement/adventure related to anger), (2) security (predictability related to fear), (3) response (appreciation related to love), and (4) recognition ("enviable" status achievement essential to the development of "personality" and, in its absence, "the main source of those psycho-pathic disturbances which Freudians' treat as sexual in origin;" emphasis added), (c.f., Parsons et al., 1965:741-44). These (desires), Thomas adds, are regulated by rival "definitions of the situation," a life-long process in which individuals develop "personality" from "examination and deliberation of self-determined acts of behavior." The rivalry occurs between "definitions" individuals provide versus those offered by society (and significant groups). The fulfillment of the desires above depends on individuals' resolution of the competing definitions (c.f., Parsons et al., 1965:741-44).

Mead's "I" and "me" <u>always</u> emphasize "learned"[29] behavior <u>as</u> <u>well</u> <u>as</u> "innate impulses." Freud's "id" and "superego" emphasize the latter.

· Interestingly, "the looking-glass self," coined earlier by Cooley (1902), holds that "(individuals) <u>learn</u> to view (themselves) as <u>others</u> view (them)" (c.f., Brinkerhoff and White, 1985:120). Man's capacity for self-evaluation and role selection ("self-concept") is not "mechanical," but relies upon the <u>active</u> interpretation and reactions to the judgments of others. Gecas and Schwalbe (1983) argue further that individuals often select among potential "looking-glasses" by choosing roles and associates supportive of their "self-concepts,[30]" (c.f., Brinkerhoff and White, 1985:120; and Karp and Yoels, 1982:18).

We know children of survivors develop a sense of "self" and "self-concept" in their childhood encounters with "significant others." Lichtman's (1984) six-fold scheme of intergenerational communication, based on direct, indirect, guilt-inducing, experiential (non-verbal),

---

Interestingly, the respondent who reported limited activity outside her home as well as intimated the protective (European) nature of her parents, (which is suggestive of the "predictability" of her youth), <u>also</u> voiced her doubts over the legitimacy of the leadership status conferred by members of the association. Perhaps her "definition of the situation" (the implied deficiency in leadership status and performance) is colored by the fact of her (and others) restrictive upbringing(s), a past Thomas notes may have impeded "personality" development.

[29] The idea that the "self" is learned and evaluated through: (1) subjective negotiation (and selection) of roles, and (2) shared meanings of human acts and communication (words <u>and</u> gestures), is central to the theory of "symbolic interactionism."
    Symbolic interactionism, apart from behavioral and developmental theory, is a unique and important sociological theory which models "maturational development" (c.f., Karp and Yoels, 1982:15-16; also c.f., Blumer, 1969).

[30] Karp and Yoels (1982:17), quoting Becker (1962), write: "It is the human ability to engage in symbolic behavior that 'culminates in the organism's ability to choose what it will react to.'"

and affective (emotional) interchanges with parents, helps us understand more clearly the "mechanisms" in which psychopathology is "seeded" and can damage the delicate balance between the "I" and "me" in childrens' "selves" as well as their "self-concepts." We have seen how the reinforcement of these images and appraisals of "self" can be severely limited to a few close family members and friends--especially when offspring are raised in "European-type" households described earlier by one respondent. The problem is compounded, in some Holocaust families, when survivor offspring perceive their fathers as too weak to compete for what little may exist of mothers' affections: a result of fathers' humiliation by Nazis in the camps or elsewhere (c.f., Freyberg, 1980:89-92; and de Graaf, 1975). The effect, according to Freyberg (p. 92) is:

> (Survivor offspring) fear abandonment because they feel "bad" and "unlovable" as do all children who do not receive mother's (and/or fathers') love and approval; hence (survivor offspring) conclude (erroneously) that they are (somehow) at fault. (Emphasis added).

Later, when survivor offspring reach the "crucial period of adolescence," a period when Erikson (1950) believes "individuals must work out for themselves some integration of role models, values, norms, beliefs, and emotional feelings" in order to resolve the issue of "identity versus role diffusion," they may fail to find a "coherent sense of identity, adult statuses and roles that are both personally satisfying and socially acceptable." Even those which are acceptable may not necessarily satisfy (c.f., Elkin and Handel, 1984:64-5).

Unresolved anger with parents and other psychopathologies suffered not only "blur" the "boundaries of emotion and identity between survivors and their offspring and perpetuate a "transfer" (displacement) of

the latters' parental dependency onto others, but also may upset the balance of "integrity versus despair" which Erikson (1950) believes is the (final) stage when individuals develop a mature "love of one's parents, free of the wish that they should have been different, and an acceptance of the fact that one's life is one's own responsibility[31] (c.f., Elkin and Handel, 1984:64-5; and Freyberg, 1980:89-92).

In sum, the survivor offspring who have failed "separation/individuation" (Lipkowitz, 1973; c.f., Freyberg, 1980), and Erikson's (1950) stages of the life-cycle (especially parental trust versus distrust, autonomy versus shame and doubt, identity versus role diffusion, and integrity versus despair), also will have failed to realistically distinguish the trauma of the Holocaust inflicted upon their parents from their own ability to cope and function in society. It seems, then, the capacity survivor offspring (viz, association leaders and members) have to resolve their anger with parents they suffer may indeed be the key towards successful "maturation" (i.e., balanced conceptions of "self" and unbiased "self-concepts"), and consequently a successful association (i.e., free of the role problems which divide leaders and members).

On the societal scale, membership in children of Holocaust survi-

---

[31] Interestingly, Troll and Bengston, (c.f., Elkin and Handel, 1984:67), argue that socialization--although influenced greatly by families--is also influenced by "particular historical periods and specific events." Parents' efforts to socialize their children, then, are necessarily modified by new events to which both generations must respond.
Survivor offspring are not "carbon copies" of their parents. Certainly they are affected by the events of their own time. Nevertheless, when parental control severely qualifies the "time" survivor offspring spend away from home after school, for example, the likely result is to limit children's potential "looking-glasses" (role selections and associations) thereby reinforcing "biased self-concepts and selves" (appraisals, personalities and identiteies).

vors associations implies "the intimate, private and exclusive" character of communities[32]. Toennies (1957) assumes the "framework of relations" which typify the Gemeinschaft (community) are three-fold: (1) The relation between a mother and her child which is rooted deeply in liking or pure instinct and implies a long duration; (2) The relation between a husband and a wife (marriage) which is supported by mutual habituation and affirmation; and (3) The relation among brothers and sisters (fellowship) which, interestingly, Toennies believes is the most "human" relationship between people "where instinct plays only a small part and the intellectual force of memory is foremost in creating, conserving and consolidating this bond of hearts" (emphasis added; c.f., Parson's et al., 1965:193-94).

Schmalenbach (n.d.)[33] probably draws closest to Toennies (1957) idea of memory when he writes (c.f., Parson's et al., 1965:336-37): "the feelings founding a "communion" need not...refer to specific other members (but) the awareness that one's emotions are likely to be accompanied by a felt connectedness (to them)."

Interestingly, Klein (1970) tapped into the idea of "felt connectedness" when he observed that offsprings' intergenerational disorders might be offset by "collective mourning in families and communities--even those spread across the world[34]" (c.f., Solkoff, 1981:33-4).

---

[32] Compare with Toennies concept of Gemeinschaft (community), (1957); also in Parson's et al. (1965:191-201).

[33] See Die Dioskuren ("Die Soziologische Kategorie des Bundes," Vol. I, translated by Naegele and Stone in Parson's et al., 1965:331-47).

[34] Epstein (1979) also comments on this idea when she suggests that only other survivor offspring, like herself, who possess their own protected versions of her "iron box," (which contains the "ghostly" and

Berger and Luckmann (1966) subscribe to the notion that society is "constructed" collectively by individuals who: (1) "Externalize" (structure) mundane "reality" through (a) "typifications" (routine and mutual patterns of symbolic interpretation), and (b) "habituations"[35] (frequently repeated actions and behaviors); (2) "Objectification" (the stable and predictable organization of society through institutions) which Berger and Luckmann also tie to "role formation" (characteristic and expected social behaviors based on reciprocated ideas, meanings and values). Objectification is "legitimated" in history and tradition through common language and comprehension of accepted maxims, cliches, principles, behavioral codes and standards (e.g., laws), and distinctive

---

painful Holocaust legacy), can help her look inside and confirm "that those things (she) carries are real." She writes (p. 13): There (has) to be, I (think), an invisible, silent family scattered about the world."

In one interview, a respondent, I recall, spoke of an interesting incident involving some people (children of Jews unconnected with the Holocaust) who attended a panel discussion on offsprings' family lifestyles and relationships. She believes the incident helps distinguishes Holocaust families from other (Jewish) families:

> (The panel) talked about the importance of birth families when (survivor offspring) get into acquired families and how the parents have to be considered in a lot of ways they otherwise would not be considered. A lot of (the children of Jews unconnected with the Holocaust) were just saying, "Well you know Jewish families are all close." Well there's a "panicky" type of closeness that goes on in a children of survivors family that doesn't happen (in other Jewish families).

The respondent describes the "panic" as "this feeling that (if my parents) don't know what I'm doing at all times, (they won't be able to) control it; and it might get out of hand and 'God knows what terrible thing it could turn into.'"

[35] Interestingly, Tarde (1901a:276-86) probably best described the function of "habituations" (more than half a century before Berger and Luckmann) when he wrote: "All social behavior is learned by intermental (subjectively understood) communication that has been spread outward by imitation and repitition." (Emphasis added; c.f., Freidheim, 1976:77).

bodies of knowledge (disciplines) which give meaning to the social order; and (3) "Internalization" (the collective recognition, plausibility, and transmission of "objective" knowledge). Berger and Luckmann (1966) essentially argue that socialization is the instrument through which individuals come to know themselves firstly from "significant others" in the "nuclear family" (primary socialization), and secondly from adaptation to "new roles, vocabularies, routines, etc., necessary for "identity formation" in "new sectors of society or the subjective reality" (secondary socialization).

Children of Holocaust survivors, as a distinct "community" set apart from other Jewish offspring, exist in their own type of "constructed reality." Their reality is given impetus, in part, by membership in children of survivors associations and contacts with peers. The bonds which ensue among association members (even those between leaders and members) are likely to: (1) reinforce the "typical" and "habitual" routines, patterns, actions and behaviors (e.g., expressions of anger with parents) which originally "structured" ("externalized") their early family encounters[36], (2) become ingrained ("objectified") later in the ("institutional") roles assumed in adulthood (e.g., association leadership/membership), and (3) add predictability and plausability in the perpetuation and "transmission" ("internalization") of (parental) persecution and dependency (c.f., Lipkowitz, 1973). It is in this way, I

---

[36] Just as Holocaust family type (e.g., families headed by one or two survivors, etc.) "structures," in part, the types and intensities of intergenerational disorders (and cultural/ancestral sensitivities), so it is likely to "structure" the "typical" and "habitual" routines, patterns, actions and behaviors which influence the development of "self" and "self-concept" which are reinforced later in the roles offspring assume in adulthood.

believe, the tragic Holocaust legacy is <u>socially</u> and <u>culturally</u> (i.e., intergenerationally) transmitted and reinforced in adult roles.

Conclusion

The literature which investigates intergenerational effects of the Nazi Holocaust offers a number of clinical and experimental concepts which find <u>new</u> meaning when they are integrated into a <u>sociological framework</u>. Sociologically then the Holocaust legacy is certainly more that just a tragedy experienced and suffered on the personal level. Just as European Jewry was <u>collectively</u> targeted for genocide, so we must understand that survivor offspring <u>collectively</u> suffer in its aftermath. Children of survivors associations provide an important forum in which survivor offspring <u>share</u> their painful legacy.

An integrative, sociological framework suggests the "world" in which Holocaust survivors and their offspring live and interact can become for them a "constructed reality" (c.f., Berger and Luckmann, 1966). We know offsprings' childhood encounters with "significant others" (e.g., parents, siblings and friends, etc.) as well as their contacts outside home can be severely restricted. More importantly, we can understand how these early ("routine" and "mundane") interactions are likely to contribute to the development of unbalanced "selves" (personalities) and biased "self-concepts" (identity appraisals) as they become "externalized" (i.e., structured) into patterned, "definitions of the situations" (c.f., Cooley, 1909; Mead, 1934; W.I. Thomas, 1951; and Berger and Luckmann, 1966). The "individual motivations, desires and wants" of offsprings' "I" (e.g., their need for parental love, approval and trust) often go unfulfilled in the myopic emphasis parents give

their "wartime" (intergenerational) communication (c.f., Lichtman, 1984). As a result, offsprings' frustrations turn into anger with parents and consequently they may fail to develop a sense of "self" distinct from their parents.

In adulthood, survivor offspring can "objectively" reinforce these (predictable and stable) "definitions of the situations," and conceptions of "self" in the (leadership/membership) roles they assume in children of survivors associations. Their unresolved frustrations and anger manifest themselves, once more, (perhaps unconsciously) and ultimately threaten the continuity of their organization. Leaders, on the one hand, may be unable to confidently delegate responsibility and/or fail to objectively participate in group discussions. Members, on the other hand, can "attack" perceived weaknesses in leadership but also feel "victimized" by it. Perhaps the greatest tragedy of the Holocaust legacy is the "plausibility" that the cycle of persecution and anger will perpetuate itself (i.e., become "internalized") in successive generations (c.f., Lipkowitz, 1973; and Berger and Luckmann, 1966). Perhaps over time, as one respondent believes, survivor offspring will be able to forge for themselves new "definitions of the situation," ("variations of systematic evaluation of persons, social statuses, roles and group feelings," according to Weinstein and Platt, 1973), so they can finally "break" the vicious cycle and pursue their "social" and "educational" needs in associations free from the emotional burdens they carry.

The two "hierarchy" hypotheses, considered earlier, are available to sociologists who not only want to empirically test whether: (1) offsprings' membership in children of survivors associations is related to

Holocaust family type (e.g., families headed by one or two survivors, etc.), but also whether (2) a similar relationship exists between Holocaust family type and members who occupy positions of association leadership. We know from the literature that Holocaust families headed by two survivors communicate, on the whole, more intergenerational disorders, (an outcome not unrelated to the anger which ensues from offsprings' frustrations over unmet needs--e.g., parental trust--essential to "autonomy"), than families headed by a single survivor. Sociologists, in turn, would now be able to statistically measure and evaluate how anger with parents is tied to effective leadership and, consequently, the problems connected with association membership (e.g., poor attendance, etc.).

Another instrument available to sociologists is the "Twenty Questions Test" used to measure "self-concept." (Questions, for example, begin with, "I am..."). Responses are coded into (offsprings') appraisals which reflect: (1) "institutionalized roles and statuses" (e.g., "definitions of the situation" Thomas believes society provides), or (2) "personality characteristics" (e.g., Thomas's "self-determined definitions of the situation"). Verification of one or the other of these personal evaluations not only will help determine which one is more influential in the development of 'offsprings' "self-concepts,[37]" but also is likely to yield additional information to confirm or deny whether the anger with parents carried since childhood is in fact rein-

---

[37] Brinkerhoff and White (1984:122) note that Zurcher, (1977); and Snow & Phillips (1982), use the "Twenty Question Test" to confirm college students' shift away from "institutional definitions" of "self" towards "personal definitions" of "self" over the past 25 years.

forced later in the (leadership/membership) roles survivor offspring assume in children of survivor associations.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Bailey, Kenneth D. Methods of Social Research. 2nd ed. New York: The
    Free Press, 1982.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of
    Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City,
    New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966.

Brinkerhoff, David B., and Lynn K. White. Sociology. St. Paul: West
    Publishing Company, 1985.

Cooley, Charles H. Social Organization. Introduction by Phillip Rieff.
    New York: Schocken Books Inc., 1962.

Durkheim, Emile. Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Trans. John A.
    Spaulding and George Simpson. Edited with an introduction by
    George Simpson. New York: The Free Press, 1951.

Elkin, Frederick, and Gerald Handel. The Child and Society: The Process
    of Socialization. 4th ed. New York: Random House, Inc., 1984.

Emerson, Robert M. Contemporary Field Research: A Collection of
    Readings. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1983.

Encyclopedia of Sociology. Guilford, Connecticut: The Dushkin
    Publishing Group, Inc., 1974.

Epstein, Helen. Children of the Holocaust: Conversations with Sons and
    Daughters of Survivors. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1979.

Fogelman, Eva, and Bella Savran. "Brief Group Therapy with Offspring of
    Holocaust Survivors: Leaders' Reactions." American Journal of
    Orthopsychiatry, 50 (Jan. 1980), 1:96-108.

Freidheim, Elizabeth A. Sociological Theory in Research Practice.
    Cambridge, Massachussetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1976.

Freyberg, Joan T. "Difficulties in Separation-Individuation as
    Experienced by Offspring of Nazi Holocaust Survivors." American
    Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 50 (Jan. 1980), 1:87-95.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. The Discovery of Grounded
    Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. New York: Aldine
    Publishing Company, 1967.

Heller, David. "Theories of Culture and Ancestry Among Children of Concentration Camp Survivors." Psychiatry, 45 (1982), 247-61.

Karp, David A., and William C. Yoels. Experiencing the Life Cycle: A Social Psychology of Aging. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1982.

Leon, Gloria P., et al. "Survivors of the Holocaust and Their Children: Current Status and Adjustment." Journal of Personality ans Social Psychology, 41 (1981), 3:503-16.

Lichtman, Helen. "Parental Communication of Holocaust Experiences and Personality Characteristics Among Second-Generation Survivors." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40 (July 1984), 4:914-24.

Lofland, John. Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.

Lofland, John, and Lyn H. Lofland. Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis. 2nd ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1984.

Lopata, Helen Z. "Social Psychological Aspects of Role Involvement." Sociology and Social Research, 53 (1969), 3:285-98.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

Parsons, Talcott, Edward Shils, Kaspar D. Naegele, and Jesse R. Pitts, eds. Theories of Society: Foundations of Modern Sociological Theory. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Porter, Jack N. "Kin of Survivors Said to Seek Meaning for Existence." Martyrdom and Resistence, March-April 1983 (Adar-Nissan 5743), p. 5.

Scanzoni, Letha, and John Scanzoni. Men, Women and Change: A Sociology of Marriage and Family. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Schwartz, Howard, and Jerry Jacobs. Qualitative Sociology: A Method to the Madness. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Solkoff, Norman. "Children of Survivors of the Nazi Holocaust: A Critical Review of the Literature." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51 (Jan. 1981), 1:29-42.

Smith, H. W. Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1975.

Weinstein, Fred, and Gerald M. Platt. Psychoanalytic Sociology: An Essay on the Interpretation of Historical Data and the Phenomena of Collective Behavior. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Znaniecki, Florian. The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Michael S. Fleischer has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. William Bates, Director
Professor, Sociology
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Kathleen McCourt
Associate Professor and Chairperson of
the Department of Sociology
Loyola University of Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_4 / 17 84_

Date

Wm Bates

Director's signature