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It's like a tree grows; then you cut it down the middle. What grows again is not the same as it was.

Survivor

Because they did survive, there must be a purpose for it. It must have been to have us, and then I thought, 'Oh my God, what a burden; I'm supposed to do something great for the world.' Then I thought, 'maybe it is my brother or sister who were supposed to do something great.' Or maybe it is my children or their children?

Child of Survivors
This project is dedicated to my parents, Jack and Rose.
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ABSTRACT

ECHOES OF THE HOLOCAUST:
PREVAILING THEMES OF
SURVIVORS AND THEIR CHILDREN

by

Henri Mondschein
Master of Arts in Education,
Educational Psychology

Research on Holocaust survivors and their children has been traditionally conducted on clinical populations or those individuals or families being treated for psychological problems and difficulties. This study has attempted to broaden the scope of knowledge in this field by exploring some issues, problems and coping styles of a non-clinical population of Holocaust survivors and their adult children.

Ten families participated in the study. Within each family, one child and one or both parents whenever possible, were interviewed separately. Altogether, 10 children and 13 parents were interviewed. The children ranged in age from 19 to 32. The parents ranged in age from 50 to 70.
The purpose of the study was to learn whether disrupted youth in the survivors affected their own children's youth with respect to the specific issues of autonomy, guilt and coping. In their relationships with their parents the majority of children interviewed felt an uncomfortable closeness or a sense of being overinvolved with their parents and a perception of being overcontrolled by them. These were the autonomy-related problems of most concern to the children.

Guilt feelings and problems relating to guilt took the form of burdens of responsibility the children felt to their parents and their Holocaust heritage.

The children coped with these problems by setting goals and aspirations attainable through high achievement which in some cases, served as a permissible route to autonomy from their parents and through becoming concerned with serious issues and values pertaining to their parents' survival and their own existence.

The parents also shared an intense common concern relating to their children's autonomy and about their children marrying non-Jews. Parental guilt feelings were chiefly connected to unresolved mourning. The parents coped with these problems by seeking more closeness with their children and by expressing a desire for their children to enjoy the freedom of which they were deprived in their youth.
This study supports the thesis that a traumatically disrupted youth does appear to play a significant role in the relationships of a non-clinical group of survivors and their children.

These findings may have possible applications in the study and understanding of parents and children of other traumatized groups. These findings also support intergenerational outreach of supportive services to survivor families.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Nazi Holocaust of World War II proved to be one of the most devastating assaults against a race of people in this century. In a 12-year period, an estimated 6 million people or roughly 72 percent of Eastern and Central European Jewry was annihilated (Hilburg, 1961) primarily in ghettos and concentration camps. The effects of this enormous human destruction remained with its survivors for years to come. Most, if not all of them lost family members and all had their lives traumatically disrupted. Today, to varying degrees, these survivors are leading normal lives, but remain greatly influenced by the horrors of the past which live within them.

In addition to the immeasurable loss of family and a culture, these victims of the Holocaust were deprived as well of another critical part of their lives: their youth. While these formative years are normally characterized by physical and emotional growth, survivors spent these years abruptly separated from their families. They were incarcerated in concentration camps, crowded into ghettos, or living in hiding, all of which were inhuman conditions and controls.

Studies with clinical populations have shown that the impact of these losses and disruptions in life have not
only been a burden to the survivors, but to their children as well. These children of survivors are not adults themselves, most of them between the ages of 20 and 35.

The experiences of their parents has affected them in many ways. Some theories suggest that children of survivors tend to repress many normal feelings and behaviors associated with growing up. Among them is a reluctance to rebel against their parents because of a fear of hurting the already traumatized elders.

Still other children of survivors are plagued by feelings of guilt when they attempt to start lives of their own by moving away from their parents, even while still remaining in the same city.

Yet another dilemma presents itself when these parents set high expectations for their children, perhaps as a way to show a purpose for their survival or as an effort to have their children achieve the goals denied to themselves because of the war.

Nevertheless, one must not forget that a great majority of survivors and their children are faring well in society despite the heavy burdens of the Holocaust.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this research is to explore in a non-clinical population of survivors and their children some possible relationships between disrupted youth in survivors
and some psychological issues and problems common among the children. Examined are the parents' and childrens' experiences with separation from one another, particularly those of the children during their adolescent and early adult years. Also scrutinized are the specific concerns and problems pertaining to separation and the methods utilized in coping with these problems and other problems such as guilt feelings.

With the parents, the focus is on issues and problems in the survivors' lives which influenced their children's experiences with autonomy as well as problems pertaining to the parents' sources of guilt feelings and their strategies for coping with these.

It is my hope that this study will shed additional light on these problems and on how the traumatized past of the survivors has affected their children. In addition, these findings may be relevant to survivors and families of other persecution and catastrophic events in which the elders' suffering has a potential for affecting their offspring. Today, there are other groups of people who have endured long and intense trauma, such as Armenians and the Vietnamese refugees. These groups are now also raising offspring who must share the problems and past of their elders.

Much of the literature concerned with the psychological effects of the Holocaust is of a clinical nature and
focuses either on the survivors or the children. A lesser emphasis is seen on survivor families or both the parents and the children within a single framework. It is hoped that this study will encourage further explorations of problems confronting both survivors and their children.

A further goal is to utilize a fresh perspective from which to view the effects of the Holocaust by taking into consideration the period of adolescence and young adulthood as a theoretical foundation from which to approach the study of survivors and their offspring.

Definitions of Terms

Throughout these pages, a number of terms will be used which require some clarification as to their meaning. The definition of the terms used in this paper are as follows:

**Holocaust** will refer to the 12-year period of Nazi control in Europe from 1933-1945 (Dawidowicz, 1975).

**Survivor** pertains to one who survived the Nazi Holocaust persecution in concentration camps, ghettos or through hiding (Kestenberg, 1973).

**Child of survivors** refers to one who was born after the Holocaust to one or both parents who suffered persecution, internment or trauma during the Holocaust (Kestenberg, 1972).

**Survivor family** is a family in which one or both parents survived a concentration camp or persecution during the Holocaust (Krell, 1979).
Adolescence pertains to the developmental period in the human life span which takes place from about age twelve or thirteen to the early twenties and is characterized as the transition period from dependent childhood to self-sufficient adulthood (Muuss, 1965).

Limitations of the Study

Because of the nature of the problem investigated, the format of this study has been tailored to a case-study approach rather than an experimental or quantitative method. It is my viewpoint that the feelings and emotions of the subjects are best conveyed through face-to-face interactions with a trusted interviewer. But it is also my hope that the conclusions presented here would serve as a foundation or possible springboard for more elaborate work.

In pursuing this project, I have attempted to remain as objective as possible, particularly in describing the lives of the people who volunteered to participate in the interviews. But due to the lack of scientific controls in this paper, and the fact that I am a child of survivors as well, it is unlikely that this project is entirely free from bias. In fact, the very choice of this subject stems from a personal concern and interest.
Overview of Human Development and Family Theory

The premise of this thesis is that the trauma experienced by the survivors, who for the most part were hurt during their adolescent years, has influenced their parenting, particularly their ability to let go of their children, not necessarily in only negative ways.

In interviewing survivor parents, the goal has been to learn of their experiences with separation under traumatic circumstances and how this affected the way they subsequently dealt with the separation and autonomy of their offspring.

Likewise, in interviewing the children, the intent has been to glimpse at some ways in which they relate to their survivor parents and how they deal with autonomy and separation.

But in order to understand how these dynamics arise in the first place, one must have some familiarity with some of the theories pertaining to human development and the family unit.

Human development can be viewed as a lifelong process during which the person matures by encountering progressive stages of physical and emotional growth.

Erikson (1950) conceptualized eight epigenetic stages of development spanning from early childhood to old age. In his model, each stage consists of two polar opposites, with the well-adjusted individual functioning somewhere
in-between and integrating qualities from both.

The stages are Trust vs. Mistrust; Autonomy vs. Doubt; Initiative vs. Guilt; Industry vs. Inferiority; Identity vs. Role Confusion; Intimacy vs. Isolation; Generativity vs. Self-Absorption and Integrity vs. Despair.

In brief, the first stage relates to the degree to which the young child comes to trust or mistrust the world. It is the quality of the childrearing which influences the child's position between these two potentials. In extreme cases, a child may be too trusting or overly mistrusting.

Autonomy deals with the child's new motor and mental abilities and the child's desire to do everything himself. However, when his caretakers are impatient and do for him things he is capable of doing himself, they reinforce a sense of shame and doubt. If the child leaves this stage with less autonomy and a heightened sense of shame and doubt, attempts to achieve autonomy in adolescence and adulthood will be hindered.

In the Initiative stage, the child of four or five years initiates various motor activities and no longer merely responds to or imitates the actions of other children. Initiative is reinforced by parental approval of motor play such as running and by a parent's responding to a child's questions. Guilt results when a child is made to feel that his motor activity is undesirable or
that her inquiries and curiosity are a nuisance. Such a child may develop a sense of guilt over self-initiated activities in general, which may persist through later life stages, according to Erikson (1950).

From age six to 11, the child has a sense of "industry" through the use of deductive reasoning and by playing and learning by rules. This sense of industry is enhanced when the child is encouraged to explore and undertake practical achievements. Inferiority is experienced by the child, when the parent views the child's efforts at making and doing as "mischief."

The stage known as Identity vs. Role Confusion is most applicable to survivors of the Holocaust and their children, as this is the adolescent stage of life, spanning from age 12 through 18, the period when many survivors lost their parents and had their lives traumatically disrupted.

During a normal adolescence, one develops various approaches to perceiving and thinking about the world, from which emerges an ego identity or a sense of self. This is an integration of different images into a whole in which the person realizes who he is, where he has been and where she is going. When a psychological identity cannot be attained because of an unfortunate childhood or difficult social circumstances, Role Confusion results. This is a sense of not knowing what he is, where she belongs or to whom she belongs.
Normal developmental events such as experimentation, rebellion and risk taking also tend to become hindered or distorted in the case of role confusion.

With respect to concentration camp survivors, the opportunity to arrive at a well-integrated identity may have been denied along with most normal life experiences as a consequence of the war. Therefore, it would seem likely that survivors emerged from the war with a sense of disorientation compounded by the loss of parents and family. It would also appear likely that some of their children would experience problems in conceptualizing their identities as a result of being raised by parents whose identities were assaulted and disrupted.

Erikson's next stage called Intimacy vs. Isolation deals with the young adult's ability to share with and care about another person or the opposite extreme, isolation.

During middle age one enters the stage of Generativity vs. Self-Absorption. Here, the person begins to be concerned with other beyond his immediate family, with future generations and the nature of the society and world in which those generations will live. But when one's personal needs and comforts are of predominant concern, self-absorption results.

In the later years, one enters the stage called Integrity vs. Despair. Integrity arises from the individual's ability to reflect on his life with satisfaction, while
despair results when one views her life as ridden with mistakes and missed opportunities and the realization that it is too late to start over.

Yet another milestone of human development is achieving a state of autonomy and independence from one's parents. Called the separation-individuation process, it requires the child's achievement of separate functioning in the presence of, and with the emotional availability of the mother (Mahler, 1975).

Separation involves the child's emergence from a symbiotic fusion with the mother, while individuation refers to those achievements marking the child's individuality. Although these processes first take place in the young child, separation continues even until the individual becomes a young adult and moves out on his own. This is the period most pertinent to this paper.

Kaplan (1978) describes this event in early childhood as beginning in a diffuse state of oneness whereby the child's entire world centers on its mother. But by age three, the child achieves an initial sense of separateness and identity. As Kaplan points out:
The three-year-old has but a small degree of constancy—just enough to allow him to feel safe in the world even though he now recognizes that his self is separate from the self of his mother. He can hold on to a positive image of his mother when he is away at school or visiting friends. He may occasionally long for her presence, but he does not turn separateness from mother into a fantasy that she is a bad, frustrating mother who has ceased to care about him or love him.

In this sense, a balance must be attained between the child's anxiety about the mother's separations, his wishes for continued gratification, and the realization that some future, brief separation will occur.

As the child matures into an adolescent, the problem of separation often becomes a situation in which the child desires separateness but encounters resistance from the parents in the form of mistrust or overprotection. This issue is especially relevant to survivor families. The topic of separation as it relates to survivors and their children will be taken up in more detail in the following chapter. For now, there is one further topic to be briefly discussed, and that is family theory.

First, the family unit is like the individuals making up the family. Similar to the life cycles of individuals, the family also experiences a developmental process over time, passing through phases and sequences usually marked by a critical transition point—marriage, birth of the first
child, last adolescent leaving the home, and retirement (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 1980).

Families, as do individuals, also vary in their degree of psychological fitness and well-being. In healthy families, transactions with one another are ideally loving, open, empathetic and trusting. There is also a basic respect for one's views and those of others, along with a respect for personal autonomy, or a recognition of individuality and separateness between the family members. Each has a sense of "I-ness" and each person is able to adapt to changes brought about by growth and development such as separation and loss (Lewis, Beavers, Gossett & Phillips, 1976).

By contrast, dysfunctional families are characterized by poor communication among the members, an absence of warmth, competition and hidden conflicts and confusion among the members as to their roles in the family (Beavers, 1977).

One result of a dysfunctional family is enmeshment, which occurs when family members are overconcerned and overinvolved with one another. The family dominates all experiences, thus hindering the development of a separate sense of self. At times, the family's lack of differentiation makes one's separation from the family an act of betrayal (Minuchin, 1974).
An opposite situation is seen in disengagement, where family members are isolated from one another to the extent that they are too separate and autonomous and show little family loyalty. As a result, boundaries are overly rigid and members can rarely form relationships outside of the family, because they have not had the experience within the family. (Minuchin, 1974).

These problems are particularly important in the case of survivors, since many survivor marriages occurred following the losses and trauma of the Holocaust. As a consequence, these individuals and the families they would soon raise were vulnerable to the development of such dysfunctions.

This overview should suffice in providing one with a background to more fully understand the dynamics of survivors, their children and these people as family units. In the chapter which follows, a summary of the literature of the field will be presented, culminating with some general conclusions about the literature.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The psychological effects of the Holocaust on its victims has been an expanding field of inquiry for almost three decades. Today, attention is being focused on more specific issues such as the impact of the Holocaust on the children of survivors and the transmission of effects from the survivors onto their children.

In the pages which follow, I will review the research literature dealing with the survivors and their children. An effort will also be made to identify sensitive problems between the generations and relate these to relevant theory in human development pertinent to survivors and their children.

The Survivors

Psychiatrists and other mental health specialists first drew attention to the problems of Holocaust survivors about 15 years after the war ended. In treating survivors, therapists learned of the austere conditions of the concentration camps and began piecing together some general conclusions about the traumatic experiences of survivors and the problems they faced years later.

Berger (1977) classified the persecution experience as consisting of (1) a protracted life-endangering situation;
prolonged helplessness; (3) chronic starvation and illness; (4) physical abuse; (5) in many instances, loss of family; (6) recurrent terrifying episodes; (7) abrogation of causality; (8) and assaults on self-esteem and self-image.

The consequences of these extreme conditions became apparent in a variety of traits later recognized to be characteristic of many survivors. Defined by Niederland as the "Survivor Syndrome," the symptoms were classified into six areas:

1. Pervasive depressive mood which includes a tendency to withdraw, general apathy, feelings of helplessness and insecurity, lack of initiative and interest, and self-deprecatory attitudes and expressions. In extreme cases, some resemble "living corpses."

2. Severe and persevering guilt complex concerning their own survival when others were destroyed.

3. Somatization ranging from headaches and body tremors, to psychosomatic disorders including peptic ulcers, colitis, as well as respiratory and cardiovascular syndromes accompanied by hypochondriacal symptoms.

4. Stages of anxiety and agitation marked by insomnia, nightmares, motor unrest, inner tension, tremulousness, and fear of renewed persecution, often culminating in paranoid reactions.

5. Personality change and radical disruption of the
entire maturational development, especially in those interred in the camps at an early age.

6. Psychotic or psychotic-like disturbances with delusional or simidelusional symptoms, paranoia, morbid brooding, inertia, and agitated behavior.

Hoppe (1971) employed a psychoanalytic framework and expanded on the Survivor Syndrome to include a symptom he defined as "chronic reactive aggression." He noted:

Chronic reactive aggression is on the one hand a repetitive explosion of pent-up rage and a defense against depression, therefore a relief. On the other hand, it represents a constant source of misery and suffering. The aggressive survivor suffers from his uncontrollable outburst of rage, especially if he turns his hate addiction against his own family members or God. The results are self-accusations, guilt feelings, lowered self-esteem and psychosomatic symptoms.

This aggression can result in maladaptive family relationships in which masochistic and paranoid attitudes become ways of dealing with the reactive aggression (Krystal & Niederland, 1968). They pointed out that such individuals are impaired in the ability to nurture their children which, in turn, produces problems in the next generation such as a symbiotic relationship which interferes with the individuation of the child.

This brief overview of the problems of survivors should present an adequate picture of the psychological and physical problems traceable to the Holocaust.
The Children of Survivors

Much of the literature dealing with children of survivors documents a number of maladaptive behaviors that are for the most part, traceable to the problems faced by the survivor parents. Early studies by Trossman (1968) and Sigal & Rakoff (1971) reported incorrigibility, depression, learning problems, and sibling rivalry among children of survivors and symptoms characteristic of the Survivor Syndrome.

Klein (1971) observed a common set of problems in children of survivors he studied in Israel. Among his conclusions were that:

1. They show an unconscious denial of conflict situations with surrounding adults along with an avoidance of overt expressions of anger or aggression toward parents.

2. When confronted with open aggression from other children as well as adults, they react passively, escape, hide, cry, or stick to the group of children and do not respond with active aggression.

3. They tend to stay as much as possible with their parents and dislike any kind of separation. They also wish to protect the parent by taking special care of him and avoid asking any questions which might be hurtful.

The possibility of the survivor syndrome being transmitted from the parents to the children is proposed by Sigal (1971), who hypothesized that the children can identify with
their depressed parents and adapt their behavior patterns.

Sigal further postulated that the parents are so preoccupied with the unending mourning process that they are unable to relate to the needs of the children. Consequently, the children's demands are seen by the parents as depriving them of their already limited affective capacities. The children of course, would not understand this and, as a result, may either act out to gain attention or withdraw into fantasy or an affectless state similar to that of the parents.

Phillips (1978), speculated that the "child-of-the-survivor syndrome," as he called it, evolves in a family environment where the child is overprotected to such an extreme degree that it causes him to be overly fearful of imagined or actual dangers. He notes:

He learns to react to strangers and new ideas with mistrust and suspicion. At the same time, he is regarded as the salvation of the family and is expected to provide meaning for the otherwise empty and joyless lives of the parents. When he tries to respond to this impossible challenge, however, the parents block his natural tendencies toward personal growth, achievement and success. They impose this paradox because of their own fearful and paranoid stance toward the world and yet it is in that precise place their child must interact if he is to meet their needs for their own sense of fulfillment through his accomplishments.

But as later research followed children of survivors into their adolescent and young adult years, new issues crystallized. Among these are feelings of guilt, blocked aggression and conflicts pertaining to autonomy and identity
Fogelman & Savran (1980), who worked with brief therapy groups elaborated further and concluded that children of survivors of adult age experience psychological problems which include:

1. A need to identify with parents' suffering in order to understand them better and feel more intimate with them.
2. Difficulty in communicating with parents about the Holocaust for fear of causing themselves and their parents pain, or of discovering details of their parents' suffering and survival.
3. A conflict between the need to express themselves openly and the attempt to protect their parents from further suffering by suppressing their own pain and anger.
4. A struggle with the fantasy of compensating their parents for the loss of family, friends and entire communities.
5. Difficulty in coping with their own rage, shame, mistrust, guilt, fears or scarred feelings because of what happened to their parents.
6. An inability to mourn people they never knew.
7. A search for a personal way to express their thoughts and feelings about the Holocaust and develop a meaningful continuity with their family's past.

Feelings of intense guilt remains a predominant theme in several works focusing on the late adolescent and young

Kinsler (1981) pointed out that many children of survivors consider guilt a "Jewish disease." She categorized sources of guilt as rebellion, separation, ingratitude, not living up to expectations, shame, and any act which was not in total compliance with parental expectations.

Rustin & Lipsig (1972) postulated that guilt arises when the children perceive themselves to be substitutes for lost relatives and believe they must "fill someone else's shoes." They reported that some children are named after siblings, uncles, aunts, and grandparents who perished. Although it is a Jewish custom to name children after dead relatives, the situation is different for a child of survivors who might feel that she is expected to assume the role of that person rather than her own identity. Therefore, guilt results when the person tries to establish his own identity and cannot fulfill the role believed to be desired by the parent.

Sonnenberg (1974) also found that some survivors tend to identify their children with exterminated siblings, resulting in a resurrection fantasy on the part of the parent. According to Sonnenberg, this causes the child to fit into a mold and hinders maturation.

Still another aspect of the guilt constellation has the children viewing the parents as damaged people who are
too fragile to endure even the slightest degree of emotional pain. As a result, the children are reluctant to disclose to their parents minor problems, fearing they would not react well to such news (Portney, 1982).

In addition to guilt, children of survivors are often high achievers and tend to overburden themselves as a means of satisfying parental demands and expectations and to prove their endurance. Again, the roots lead back to the Holocaust as the following example illustrates:

When I became aware of myself, I began to wonder whether I, in the same circumstances, would have survived. If I was unhappy, I would wonder whether I would have sustained the drive to stay alive through several years of the most abject misery. When I failed at something, whether it was at making friends or at finding a job, I wondered whether I would have had the ingenuity, the skill, the craft, to have kept myself in food and shelter and out of the hands of the Germans, Ukrainians and Poles, (Steinitz and Szonyi, 1979).

Trachtenberg & Davis (1978), reported similar feelings among children of survivors in therapeutic groups. They found that a majority of group members believed that their task was to give renewed meaning to their parents' lives on their parents' terms and that they somehow had to compensate for their parents' suffering.

This could be accomplished by pleasing the parents and providing "nachas" or sources of pride. Some members expressed concern over failing to fulfill such goals during the lifetime of their parents. The researchers maintain
that such pressures can be burdensome and overwhelming to the children.

They also reported that when these children do attempt to meet such expectations, there is little pleasure in accomplishment. This is because the children look ahead to another goal before attaining the one at hand.

Some children of survivors tend to struggle with issues and problems which transcend a variety of life areas. Among these are fears of another Holocaust, feelings of shame and rage about the Holocaust, strong reactions to anti-Semitism, difficulties in establishing a Jewish identification and reluctance in dating or marrying out of the faith. Other issues relate to a sense of "specialness," feeling unique and feelings of isolation from other Americans, both Jewish and non-Jewish (Kinsler, 1981).

Still, others become intensely interested in their family heritage and undertake efforts to seek out and meet the surviving members of their family and reestablish lost connections (Pilcz, 1979).

The fact that many survivors married quickly after the war to escape the loneliness brought on by their losses and to reconstitute lost families (Newman, 1979), raises other questions for their children. Some might wonder how much their hastily-married parents love one another and whether they had other spouses before the war, particularly those survivors who were young adults at the time.
In summary, the psychological and emotional issues concerning adolescent and young adult children of survivors are numerous and interrelated. But the major ones pertain to conflicts with autonomy, guilt feelings, achievement and questions about their heritage and the very dynamics which brought them into the world.

Survivor Families

New literature has surfaced in recent years which addresses the problems and underlying dynamics of survivor families.

A pioneer in this field is Klein (1971), who studied 25 survivor families living in Israeli Kibbutzim and concluded that the survivors felt that the primary purpose of the family was to restore those who were lost in the Holocaust and to compensate for the destruction. This became evident to Klein when he observed that parents named their offspring after those who died in the war. However, naming children after deceased relatives is a Jewish tradition.

His other observations included:

1. A definite pattern of relationships between parents and children in which they tend to spend more time together within their homes than do other kibbutz families;

2. Mothers had fantasies of themselves, their children, or both being damaged;

3. Parents exhibited fears about their children, originating from their fear of the return of persecutions.
These fears manifested themselves in ritual behaviors such as frequent nighttime inspections of the children;

4. Family members dealt with one another in highly emotional manners, as if suppressed effects reemerged and recathedted to new love objects;

5. The families exhibited an open, effectively unrestricted way of dealing with each other.

He also found that parents desired that their children be socially active and capable of mastering adversity, and that the children were seen by parents as a source of security and gratification.

In terms of Klein's work, it is impossible to know to what degree these adaptations differ from those in non-Israeli groups. Still, Klein's results on the whole, are similar to findings reported in studies on other Holocaust families.

A study by Russell (1974) of 34 survivor families revealed weaknesses in the areas of childrearing and family interaction. Among his conclusions were that mothers felt unable to nurture their children and became overprotective, often warning their children of hidden dangers; fathers tended to be weak, withdrawn and passive, while at times exhibiting outbursts; mothers acted as the family spokesperson; parents shared exaggerated expectations regarding their children's scholastic achievement; and that limits for the children were set either too rigidly or were not
set at all. He also found that the survivor families "presented more than the expected double-binds, destructive dyadic and triadic alliances, incongruencies, dysfunctional communication patterns, and maladaptive behavioral sequences."

As with earlier studies, the subjects consisted of a clinical population which was not compared with a control group. However, Russell emphasized this point when he explained that attempts to find a matching control group of healthy survivor families failed.

A similar analysis of the survivor family milieu was carried out by Danieli (1980), who arrived at four family types after studying about 75 survivors and 300 children of survivors. These are, "victim" families, "numb" families, "fighter" families and "those who made it." Each family type represents specific traits, while the dynamics which determined which form the family would take is in part attributed to the Holocaust experience of the parents, according to Danieli.

"Victims" are typically fragile and helpless families, typified by a home atmosphere of pervasive depression, worry, symbiotic clinging, as well as mistrust and fear of the outside world. Children are often trained to be survivors of future holocausts and stress is placed on keeping a low profile and to avoid sticking out in a crowd.

In "numb" families, parents are typically tolerant of
only a minimal amount of stimulation—both pleasurable and painful. In this environment, parents often protect each other and children protect the parents as well. In addition, the children are expected to grow up on their own and to care for themselves. Consequently, the offspring view their parents as old, distant and withdrawn. When parental advice or direction is sought, a usual reply is, "Whatever makes you happy."

Next, "fighter" families are typified by an intense drive to build and achieve along with an obsession for compulsive activity. Such families do not trust outside authority and encourage aggression and defiance against outsiders. Offspring are expected to establish a fighter/hero identity both in order to belong to the family and to separate from it.

Finally, "those who made it," are families composed of survivors who are motivated by a wartime fantasy to "make it big" if they survive the camps. By achieving success and status, the Nazi goal of exterminating the Jews would not only be defeated, but the survivor accomplished success in addition to just survival. Also, the perceived success serves to undo the shame associated with being tagged at least in one's mind as a Jew who is a non-fighter. The survivor with this preoccupation assumes a dominant role in the family while other members take subordinate roles. As a result, the goals of this individual become the goals
of the family.

In likeness to other studies focusing on survivors and their children, Danieli's paper appears to focus on the negative and dysfunctional qualities of the survivor families studied. Since there were four categories delineating dysfunctional survivor families, it would have been appropriate to list four other categories that would be representative of healthy survivor families. However, the investigator did make a brief point about the health of these families by stating: "Many of these people were well adjusted by most external criteria. Thus, they reflected a wider range of adjustment than is traditionally reported in the clinical literature on the sequels of the holocaust in the families of its survivors."

In contrast to these findings and conclusions are those of Leon (1980) who compared families of concentration camp survivors with those of immigrants who escaped Nazi persecution and found no significant differences between the two groups.

Although survivor families in particular expressed a great deal of worry and concern about their children, both survivors and comparison groups reported feeling close to their children.

Among her general conclusions were:

1. Survivors and children of survivors as a group are not psychologically disturbed. The survivors studied
demonstrated a remarkable adjustment to the severe stresses they had encountered during the war.

2. Marriage and having children appeared important and psychologically helpful in overcoming the sense of anomie or helplessness and homelessness experienced by the survivors after they were liberated.

3. The concern for education and achievement in one's children along with the worry and concern of the parents for their children are not signs of psychological disturbances.

While the preponderance of studies cited point to pathological traits and processes in survivor families, Leon's work is rare in that it utilized a comparable control group to demonstrate the relative health of survivor families, given the trauma endured in the parental generation.

However, these findings are open to interpretation depending on one's point of view. For example, one can find comparable amounts of disturbances in both of these groups. At the same time, there are comparable degrees of resilience. However, in view of the enormous stigmatization of survivors and their children in research, Leon's findings of no significant differences between the two groups are more in line with expected adaptations to adverse experiences such as the Holocaust.
Adolescence of Survivors and their Children

To what extent has the inability of the survivors to experience a normal adolescence affected their development and that of their children? Although there do not appear to be studies geared specifically at this question, a few however, have addressed this as a secondary issue.

Hoppe (1971) reported on the experiences of 49 survivors who were adolescents at the time they were either in the camps or in hiding. Those for example, who lived in ghettos or were illegally hidden during their youth, felt uprooted, anxiety-ridden, unable to adapt, and often antisocial.

Frankle (1970) best sums up the results of severe persecution on the developing individual based on her own wartime experience:

Development evolves through many phases, and the child's perception of the world is shaped by how he completes his tasks of growing up and how he resolves his conflicts with significant people around him. For most of us this evolution stopped suddenly. Almost from the very beginning of the war, much premature reversal of roles took place. Parents, because of their Semitic looks, or because they sounded Jewish, could not venture out into the hostile world. Children, for one reason or another, were safer and, of course, more daring. Life for our parents changed instantly, and we witnessed their inability to cope. This in itself was a shock.

Newman (1979) makes a similar point:

It is understandable that their children's adolescence would be more than usually troubling for Holocaust survivors because the parents had
a highly abnormal adolescence in Europe, which may have combined physical separation with loss of their family. As adolescent victims, they were often obliged to inhibit their natural instincts to play and interact and were instead forced to take initiatives or responsibilities far beyond their years.

Kinsler (1978) agrees when she theorizes that since normal emotions could not develop during that period and that "the result of the repression of all healthy experimentation, autonomy, meaningful study and work seem never to be repairable."

Also stressing this theme are Trachtenberg & Davis (1978) who pointed out that adolescence is a particularly difficult period for the survivor family in that the child's adolescence usually corresponds to the time when the parents' trauma took place.

They found a parallel in which children of survivors during their adolescence, strive for independence and libidinal freedoms which were denied to their parents who, as adolescents in Nazi Europe, had to inhibit emotion and institional impulses for the sake of survival. They concluded that this often sets the stage for conflicts between the parents and the children.

Frankle (1970) elaborated on this issue when she emphasized that survivors have a void in their lives by "not having parents to struggle with for our own independence, not having a model of how this can be done, and not experiencing first-hand the frustrations of that struggle....."

A more dramatic example of the significance of the
parents' adolescent trauma upon their children was demonstrated in a study by Axelrod, Schnipper, & Rau (1980), who worked with hospitalized children of survivors and concluded that patients' ages coincided with the age at which one or both parents were interned in the camps.

They noted that in 52 percent of the patients, the age at first psychiatric hospitalization was exactly that at which a parent was incarcerated by the Nazis or exiled to hiding. An additional 32 percent were first hospitalized at an age that correlated with some other major parental Holocaust-related experience. In addition, many of the patients believed that they were in a concentration camp while in the hospital.

Some years earlier, DeGraaf (1975) noted that some of his outpatients developed symptoms at the age their parents were when they separated from their own parents.

Separation in Children of Survivors

In general terms, separation and individuation is a gradual process by which the child recognizes that she and the mother are no longer "one" and that in fact, she is a separate being (Kaplan, 1978). Again, separation does not end at this point, but continues as the individual matures into an adolescent. At this point, separation involves the individual asserting his own autonomy and leaving the home.

With children of survivors, the desire to break away creates special problems for some. For example, many feel
obligated to preserve the family unit and to "honor thy parents." (Barocas & Barocas, 1980).

In other cases, a lack of understanding of the separation process on the part of the parents acts to hinder the children's quest for autonomy. As Frankle (1970) pointed out:

We constantly want to do for them what we think now we would have wished then to be done for us when we were their age. In addition, we have not a memory of how it was for us to be a young adult attempting to separate from his or her parents.

The issue of separation, therefore, is especially difficult, not only because to many of us our children are everything we have, but also because our separation was abrupt and never truly resolved.

Russell (1980) emphasized that the pressure to separate from one's parents is culturally enforced and presents itself as a social expectation when he wrote: "to break away, to grow up and lead one's own individual life independently represents the U.S. cultural norm and role expectation."

This creates a double-bind situation in which the decision in young adulthood to leave home creates great stress as does the choice to stay at home. The dilemma is best summarized by a quote from Steinitz & Szonyi (1979):

There's a real tension between the American quest for self-realization and the ties that we are compelled to feel for our families. Reconciling the tension between being independent and finding fulfillment and meeting parents' expectations is something I haven't been able to do.
obligated to preserve the family unit and to "honor thy parents." (Barocas & Barocas, 1980).

In other cases, a lack of understanding of the separation process on the part of the parents acts to hinder the children's quest for autonomy. As Frankle (1970) pointed out:

We constantly want to do for them what we think now we would have wished then to be done for us when we were their age. In addition, we have not a memory of how it was for us to be a young adult attempting to separate from his or her parents.

The issue of separation, therefore, is especially difficult, not only because to many of us our children are everything we have, but also because our separation was abrupt and never truly resolved.

Russell (1980) emphasized that the pressure to separate from one's parents is culturally enforced and presents itself as a social expectation when he wrote: "to break away, to grow up and lead one's own individual life independently represents the U.S. cultural norm and role expectation."

This creates a double-bind situation in which the decision in young adulthood to leave home creates great stress as does the choice to stay at home. The dilemma is best summarized by a quote from Steinitz & Szonyi (1979):

There's a real tension between the American quest for self-realization and the ties that we are compelled to feel for our families. Reconciling the tension between being independent and finding fulfillment and meeting parents' expectations is something I haven't been able to do.
Trying to make certain breaks while maintaining ties to home has been an impossible thing to achieve. The reverse is also impossible. I still can't reconcile being children of survivors, and yet adults and professionals in America.

A more in-depth analysis of the separation-individuation issue is presented by Freyberg (1980), who cites several possible factors inhibiting autonomy. One is simply that the child is ambivalent about being separate and independent as a result of the way she was raised. Another and more complex explanation is that the child's independence and separateness are threatening to the survivor parents. Freyberg noted: "Part of the Holocaust offspring's mission is to prevent any further stigma or loss to the parents. To the extent that the child is regarded as a highly valued possession, his individuation is a loss he cannot inflict upon his parents."

In short, the independence of the child represents yet another loss to the parent. This, in turn, is communicated to the child who experiences guilt and therefore is reluctant to separate.

Faulty identification is yet another dimension of the separation-individuation issue. Barocas & Barocas (1973) pointed out that destructive identification is associated with the parent's expectation that the child will become an extension of the parent rather than a separate person and that the parent may use the child to gratify his own
conscious or unconscious needs and thereby inhibit autonomous growth.

Barocas & Barocas (1980) observed that survivor parents unconsciously place obstacles in the children's path as they move toward independence and identity formation, by constantly reminding them to "be careful" and to "watch out." As the parents respond to their own symbiotic needs, by their intrusiveness and anxiety, they defeat the children's progress towards independence.

They further emphasize that it is the parents who strive for closeness with their children, and that this serves as a fulfillment for the lack of closeness they feel due to lost relationships. This desire for closeness also compensates for the lost closeness of their youth.
Summary

The literature on survivors describes a traumatized population of those who are scarred physically and psychologically as a result of their war experiences.

The emerging studies on children of survivors appears to portray an equally dismal characterization of these offspring, by proposing that there exists an intergenerational transmission of maladaptive behavior from the parents to the children.

Although there are studies and papers focusing on the functional and positive aspects of this group, these are few in number.

Solkoff (1981) critiqued a majority of the literature on children of survivors and concluded that many of the clinical and experimental studies are plagued with methodological inadequacies.

Among his criticisms were that many studies such as Trossman's early work on adolescent children of survivors were based on bias samples since the subjects used were being treated for school-related and interpersonal problems, therefore resulting in an unrepresentative sample.

Axelrod's study on hospitalized children of survivors poses a similar problem, when it delineates a variety of symptoms in the population, including psychotic behavior and traces these back to the parents' experiences. However, the study did not emphasize that the noted symptoms
are not typical of the general population of children of survivors.

Another bias of many of these studies is that they search for the intergenerational psychopathological effects of parental persecution upon the children without providing an explanation for the survivor parents and their children who suffered few, if any, permanent psychological scars.

Yet another drawback is that some of the studies rely too heavily on a psychoanalytic framework which tends to lean toward psychopathology. As Solkoff pointed out, "It is patently clear that these clinicians assumed, from their psychoanalytic perspectives, that psychological damage must have been perpetrated upon the children, and then proceeded to search for the evidence to confirm their impressions."

Solkoff cited four major recommendations to improve future studies on children of survivors. These were:

1. Samples should be more carefully selected to represent the population about which generalizations are to be made.

2. Control groups and experimental groups should be carefully constituted and carefully matched on those variables that could produce differences in types and degrees of psychopathology, independent of the effects of parental traumatization.
3. Careful descriptions of intrafamilial interactions must be provided and both healthy and psychologically impaired offspring within a given family must be studied.

4. Samples must be more fully described to facilitate replication. Included should be the ages of the parents when incarcerated, time and duration of incarceration, type of camp, social and psychological background of the parents prior to the trauma, the immediate post-trauma experiences of the parents.

Wendel (1982), a psychologist and a child of survivors, demonstrated one major drawback of the clinically-oriented literature when he stated, "I feel different because we are made to feel different." He also criticized the bulk of Holocaust studies as focusing too heavily on individuals in therapeutic settings; overlooking characteristics attributable to Jews in general and potential differences in Jews of diverse backgrounds; the effect of being an immigrant and neglecting the consideration that cultural differences are neither right nor wrong.

Moskovitz (1982) also encouraged future research efforts to take into consideration Jewish family lifestyles, the strengths of survivors and their children and to investigate the dynamics of healthy family environments of survivors.

Finally, Solkoff made one other point which is worthy of remembering as one prepares to delve into the heart of
this investigation and future studies dealing with Holocaust survivors and especially their children:

The conclusions should, however, be tempered with the awareness that being a child of a survivor is not necessarily a significant, predisposing condition for the development of psychopathology. Indeed, it might be argued that many of these children have become less psychologically vulnerable, more competent, and more creative as a result of their intra-familial experiences.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The goal of this research was to study a non-clinical population of Holocaust survivors and their children to accomplish the following: First, to ascertain whether the interruption of the parents' own youth has by American standards unduly hindered the process of separation and individuation of their young adult children. Second, to identify any issues, dynamics and problems which arise when these children seek autonomy from their parents.

The Subjects

The subjects were 10 survivor families. For the purpose of this study, one child was interviewed and one or both parents were interviewed, each separately. The parents consisted of 13 men and women between the ages of 50 and 70. In seven families, only one parent volunteered to participate. In one case, one parent took part because the other parent was not a survivor of the Holocaust.

Their offspring were five men and five women between the ages of 19 and 32. The subjects were recruited from a newspaper advertisement and by word of mouth. The advertisement, directed at the offspring, was a short announcement placed in the Los Angeles Jewish Community Bulletin during the week of September 8, 1980. It stated:
CHILDREN OF SURVIVORS

For a master's thesis, I am collecting data and doing a study on children of survivors of the Holocaust. If you are willing to be interviewed, please call Henri Mondschein, 997-3403, days or 702-9090, evenings. Complete anonymity and confidentiality assured.

At least six people responded to the advertisement. In initial telephone conversations, it was determined that some of the respondents were unsuitable for the study because their parents lived out of town and would not be able to be interviewed or neither parent was interested in participating. Three indicated that they had at least one parent who was interested in participating; thus they were incorporated in the study.

The remaining subjects volunteered to take part after being made aware of the study by word of mouth. Three were involved in non-therapeutic groups concerned with children of survivors and were told about the project. One family was visiting from New York and was willing to take part. The other participants were from the Los Angeles area.

Procedures and Instrumentation

An appointment was first arranged with the offspring. While talking over the telephone, some expressed a curiosity in learning more about the project and inquired about specifics. I informed them that it deals with the relationships of the parents and the children and emphasized that
I could not elaborate, as this could bias their responses. However, I pointed out that I would be happy to share my findings with them when my project would be complete. At this point, some asked whether they could obtain a copy of the thesis and I assured them that some arrangement could be worked out in the future.

Upon meeting, each second generation participant was given a short questionnaire to fill out (see Appendix A). This provided general background information about the subject and his or her family. Based on this data, it was determined that neither the child nor the parents were involved in a similar venture or receiving counseling or psychotherapy at the time of the interviewing. In one family, the child and the parents had counseling a year earlier when the parents divorced. It was believed that this would have no bearing on their present participation.

The children were interviewed first, while meetings with parents usually followed on a different day. In cases where parents and children lived together, both were interviewed privately at separate times on the same day.

Whenever possible, the meetings were held in a quiet and comfortable setting in the person's home. When the offspring and parents were interviewed the same day, the meetings were carried out in a room or part of the house where privacy was assured. The sessions were tape recorded. None of the subjects expressed any concern over the taping.
In each case, I assured the participant that the recordings would be confidential and erased after the project was completed.

The questions, which were prepared in advance, utilized the "Funnel technique" as defined by Kerlinger (1973) in that they first touched on broad topics and narrowed down progressively to the specific issues of concern (see Appendices B & C).

For the offspring, the sessions which averaged about one hour in length, began with general questions about their parents and the family environment. Next, they were asked about their feelings about the Holocaust and their parents' experiences. Finally, they were queried about issues concerning Guilt, Autonomy and Coping as they relate to the children's relationships with their parents and the issue of separation. At the start of the interview, the subjects were told to feel free about their responses and were told they could deviate from the questions if they felt a need to discuss a particular issue or thought in greater depth.

My procedure with the parents was as follows: first, they were queried about their backgrounds and included subjects such as their hometowns, their family situations prior to the outbreak of the war and their relationships with their parents and siblings at the time.

Then I eased into the more sensitive topics pertaining
to the circumstances of their separation from their parents. In most cases, this was when families were rounded up by Nazis and sent in cattle cars to the concentration camps.

Again, during the hour-long interview, the subjects were instructed to feel free in their disclosures and generally were not interrupted when they spoke in depth about their experiences. Out of concern for them, when two of the participants found it especially painful or difficult to elaborate on some details, I assured them that they did not have to delve any further into the subject and proceeded to the other portions of the interview.

Subsequent questions guided their attention to their situations after the war with an emphasis on what they perceived were their most important losses, whether they have tried to make up for these (either in themselves or their children) and their experiences in starting new lives just after the war.

Ultimately, the focus shifted to the parents' relationships with their children, incorporating such issues as closeness, their degree of concern or worry about their children and finally, their experiences and feelings on the subject of separation as it related to their children's autonomy.

For the most part, all of the subjects were cooperative, open and did not raise concerns about the depth of the questions either before or during the interviews. None
of the subjects were recalcitrant. This may in part have been due to the fact that in initiating the interviews, I have found it most useful to first introduce myself as a child of survivors who was interested in learning about the backgrounds of other children of survivors and survivor families. By doing so, I established a fraternal atmosphere, thereby gaining their trust and dissolving the image of myself as an outsider who might be scrutinizing them as laboratory subjects. Upon introducing myself, many parents especially asked me about my background and were curious about where my parents came from.

After the interviews were completed, each was summarized separately. The most pertinent topics were extracted verbatim from the tape recordings, transcribed and analyzed.

In order to assess the impact of the parents' interrupted youth, its influence on their own children's youth and how these related to problem areas such as autonomy, guilt and coping, predominating themes were listed and charted for the child and parent interviews.

In both cases, three major issues were listed as areas covered in the interviews. These were: Autonomy, Guilt Feelings and Coping. In the child interviews, the underlying issues or themes charted under Autonomy were "residing with parents," "working for parents," "closeness (comfortable)," "closeness (uncomfortable)," "overcontrol by
parents," "being a custodian to parents" and "fear of abandonment of parents at separation." Under the Guilt Feelings category, the major themes charted were "burden of compensation for parents" and "feeling burdened by responsibility."

Coping was divided into "breaking with parents to a degree," "alienation from peers and society," "high achievement," "mission in life" and "concern with serious issues and values."

For the parent interviews, Autonomy was broken down into themes labeled as follows: "child seen as replacement," intense concern with child," "concern about child marrying non-Jews," and "feelings of abandonment upon separation."

The Guilt Feelings category consisted of "unresolved mourning" and "survivor guilt." The Coping category listed these themes: "seeks more closeness with child," "lives vicariously through child," "desires that child have freedom," "believes child cannot compensate for past," and "parent now pursues missed opportunities."
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Part I

The Interviews

Presented in the pages which follow are the interviews of the children and parents succeeded by a separate section analyzing the interviews.

Although the names of the individuals have been changed to insure confidentiality, all of the other disclosures are factual. In most cases, the names of concentration camps have been omitted also in an effort to maintain confidentiality.

The interviews are presented as narrations, the intent being that the reader feel as if he or she is actually observing the interactions between myself and these people, thereby appreciating the various problems and themes as they were related to me during the interview sessions.

In reading each interview, the reader is directed to charts A and B which outline the broader issues and underlying themes pertinent to the children and the parents respectively. The charts are designed to permit the reader to assess those problems significant to the individual participants as well as in relation to the groups themselves.
When Jack thinks about the Holocaust, he becomes angry, not only because of the immense destruction of lives it represents, but also because of how it affected his parents, and now him. To this 26-year-old professional, the Holocaust has something to do with the bridge between himself and his parents.

His Czechoslovakian-born mother was a concentration camp inmate as a teenager; his father managed to avoid incarceration. However, Jack finds that both of his parents are very much alike and strongly believes that much of the worry and overconcern in his mother was also instilled in his father by his mother.

Jack comes from a family of four children and is the middle child. He has two brothers, ages 30 and 28, and one sister, age 23. He learned of the Holocaust mainly from his parents, who occasionally discussed the subject with him. Overall, he feels he is very much affected by it and stands among those Jews who believe that another Holocaust could still happen again.

As he speaks about a number of personal feelings and experiences related to growing up, Jack is all but relaxed; his tense and rapid dialogue is sprinkled with harsh words and anger. At times he speaks of his mother, while at other times, he discusses both parents. Throughout the
interview, Jack's discontent over the relationship with his parents seemed to revolve around themes relating to his parents' emphasis on discipline and worry which he perceived as their overcontrolling his life.

"It has made me worry more," he said. "She is always suspicious of people who are not Jewish," he pointed out.

Even after he moved out of the house, his mother expressed concern over whether he would be able to tend to duties like properly washing his clothes and staying fed. Although he resides only about five miles from his parents, Jack visits them infrequently, complaining that his mother "asks too many questions" when he does drop by.

Here, the issue of overcontrol comes into play. Even though he is an adult, Jack complained of feeling as if he was a child in the eyes of his parents.

"In a way you are still a child to them," he said. "It's like they can't disclose to you things that are taboo." He paused to reflect for a moment and then added, "Why do they have this stupid attitude that only parents can speak their minds? They think kids are kids and they don't have anything valuable to contribute," he said of the gap he experienced while growing up.

Beneath Jack's irate feelings, there exists an equal amount of empathy and understanding as to some possible
reasons for his mother's worrying and her overcontrol of his life. The war, he contends, has resulted in her missing a childhood of her own and she cannot relate to what it is like growing up as an American kid, Jack theorizes.

"She couldn't understand what it's like to want to wear pants (fashions) like other people do, or what it is like to go to school and be left out. Those things she never even considered, maybe because she thought they were so petty," Jack explained.

In his mother's terms, the things which were important were having a formal education, food to eat and clothes to wear. That is, the basic necessities of life were most important, while leisure interests were frivolous and unimportant, according to Jack's interpretation of his mother's reaction to his adolescent whims.

Despite his strong rebellious feelings towards his mother, Jack rarely made these known to her and keeps them private even today. The reason he holds back is because of guilt.

You want to tell her what you feel, but then you always remember what she went through and why she's like that," he admitted, with a lessening of hostility in his voice. "If you don't think why, then you could lash back, but I feel guilty because I know there are reasons."

"She's always laying 'guilt trips' on me," he continues.
"I can't enjoy my life, because of my guilt feelings."

Today, as Jack lives on his own, he has time to reflect on his autonomy and present life situation. Unlike some children of survivors, he did not find moving out especially threatening to him or his parents. Rather, it was a chance to live his own life and make his own decisions, while for his parents, it served as an opportunity for them to take pride in their son's existence on his own. As Jack put it, "They want me to be autonomous so they can go bullshit about how well their son is doing on his own."

Jack has a strong drive to achieve; even his restlessness while talking hints at a constant need for activity. His challenges and standards for success are his own, he emphasizes, while asserting that he resists any influence from his parents. But his drive to achieve is a result of his upbringing more than anything else.

"I am persistent in things as a result of the way I was brought up. I also have a greater zest for life and for survival," he said. "And I have a greater respect for life."
Mrs. D.

For Jack's 55-year-old mother, the Holocaust is an ordeal which continues to haunt her, causing pain, grief and continued mourning despite the complacent life she leads today. During the interview, she disclosed some very personal feelings that were kept clandestine for years and informed me that I was the first person with whom she shared these. Indeed, the venting of these feelings to another individual was painful for her and years overdue.

She was 16 when she boarded a cattle car and was shipped off to concentration camp, leaving her family behind and not realizing the horror that was to be. That moment was the last time she saw her parents, and the fact that she did not say goodbye to them is just one of many emotional burdens she has carried with her ever since.

She was one of seven children and the oldest of six girls. Only she and her brother were alive when the war ended.

Thinking back to her 17th birthday, she recalls shoveling coal when she stopped for a moment to reflect. A guard soon approached and demanded why she stopped and she explained that it should have been a special day for her. In fact, it turned out to be special considering the circumstances, when the guard gave her part of his sandwich.
"That was my 17th birthday present. It was white bread which I haven't seen for so long," she said, somewhat sarcastically.

White bread was an insignificant part of life Mrs. D. missed out on during those years. She had already lost her parents and most of her family. She had also lost the opportunity to grow up and experience what normal adolescents do. Even before the war broke out, she had a "mature childhood," in that being the older sister, she took on the role of a second mother to them.

"My sisters were like my children to me," she remarked. When the war ended and she discovered her sisters as well as her parents were gone, her conscience was burdened by a need to replace them. To a lesser extent, she also tried to recapture some of the youthful experiences she was denied, like dating and having fun, but her driving motivation was to replace her lost family.

As a result, Mrs. D. soon married and over the years, she had four children, three sons and one daughter. Through these children, she is convinced that God somehow replaced those lost family members.

"The best way I can explain this is that I have only four, and we were seven children. Out of the seven, two of us are here, myself and my brother. I have four and he has two, that's six. It is almost like they were replenished," she reasons. "It's as if God had a plan in which
no family was totally wiped out. Somehow there was always someone left from the family to perpetuate the family line."

As she started a family of her own, Mrs. D. experienced an emotionally difficult period. When she was pregnant with her first child, she regarded the unborn baby as a replacement for one of her lost sisters and experienced tremendous guilt. She realized the child would be a replacement and not the actual person.

"I sat in the nursery and I was not really rejoicing about having the baby. I was feeling sorry for the ones that could not enjoy this," she concedes, as she begins to cry. "It wasn't that I wasn't happy to have the baby. I was always thinking of my other babies, my sisters. But she soon realized that this was to be her child -- a completely different human being.

She was primarily concerned over how she would handle the baby in light of the extreme guilt she felt. But she had an easier time accepting her children as truly hers by the time the second and third child came along. "It was just too close to the Holocaust," she reasons of the difficulty she had with her first child.

Today, she seeks a special type of closeness from her children, which she feels she does not have. She does not expect a very close relationship from her sons, pointing out that they should naturally relate more with their
father. But she is discontent in the relationship she had with her only daughter whom she labels as distant.

"I can't say that I am satisfied. I was always imagining having a daughter that relates to me, tells me about her plans, her dreams and wishes, but she does not do that. I don't expect it from my sons," she said.

Each child is different, she notes, in that the middle son will disclose more to her than the older or younger one. Of her four children, two live in the same city and two live in another part of the state. As far as these distances are concerned, Mrs. D. contends that miles are unimportant as long as she and her children are in contact. She points out that the most independent of the children were those who lived home the longest. Overall, she maintains that she has been liberal in raising them and that if she were not a Holocaust survivor, the children would not have grown up as free as they have. She reasons that she permitted them to enjoy the freedoms which she was denied during her adolescence, although she did not specify what these were.
A persistent need to somehow make up for some of the things her parents missed best describes the burden 30-year-old Donna feels when she talks about the Holocaust. And her way of coping with her burden has always been by helping her parents in every way she could, especially with the family business.

"I worked for them in their business and did so ever since high school. I worked very hard and gave up a lot of normal kid things like a social life. In retrospect, it's maybe my way of making up to them for what they had suffered," she reflected.

Donna, who was born on the east coast, is the younger of two sisters. Both of her parents originated from Czechoslovakia and both were concentration camp survivors. Her father, who was 20 years old when taken away, spent the war years in a variety of camps. Her mother, who was 16 years old, survived one of the notorious death camps. When the war ended, her father was 22 years old and her mother was 18. Donna's father was reluctant to discuss the Holocaust or anything related to it, but her mother showed no reservations to volunteer.

In fact, Donna maintains that her mother tends to "overexpose herself," in the sense of continually reliving
the past. "She almost searches out opportunities to discuss it, whereas he would rather leave it alone," she commented of the paradoxical behaviors of her mother and father when it comes to the subject of the Holocaust.

But overall, the subject was much discussed in the household while Donna grew up. Consequently, she believes that there is not enough awareness about the subject today and believes very much that another Holocaust is possible.

In talking about her parents and her childhood and adolescent years, Donna's overall tone and sentiment was one of empathy. In a way, she felt sorry for her parents and sensed that she has a responsibility to help them in whatever way she can. Her parents, she maintains, were robbed of a normal youth.

"There are a lot of things my parents have a hard time relating to because they never went through the experience. Their parents were gone, so they didn't go through normal growing up things," she explained.

Donna, who attended college for several years, is a successful businesswoman. She is a vice president for her parent's business based in Los Angeles. She enjoys her job and speculates that her deep involvement with her parent's business is her way of helping them and compensate for their suffering. But at the same time, her role in the business has interfered with her own life, as she
pointed out that as a youth she lacked a social life and gave up a lot of "normal kid things."

In all other ways, Donna was like most other teenagers. "They didn't allow me to do a whole lot of things, but I didn't listen," she points out. "But I was the only kid who had a curfew."

Despite her parents' attempts at overprotection, Donna does not feel that she had missed out on a lot because of her parents. Although she did not permit her parents to restrict her activities, she imposed her own restrictions by involving herself with her parents' business.

As a child, she found her separations from her parents to be traumatic at times. She described what happened once, when as a child she was left somewhere without her parents.

"We still lived on the east coast and I was sent to visit my aunt and uncle in California. I went bananas," she says. "I had to talk to them every night; I was scared to be alone; closet doors had to be closed in my room. I was really afraid that there was someone waiting there to grab me. I always got nervous around uniforms and I must have thought a Nazi was waiting for me."

Her complete separation from home occurred during her early twenties, when she was married. While there were no
problems with her moving out, her parents did object to the marriage which ended in divorce several years later. Although they did not approve of the marriage, her parents did stand behind her decision as they do with other decisions Donna sets out to do. She comments on her own philosophy when it comes to parental demands: "I try not to hurt or disappoint them. But I cannot live my life according to their rules. It's my life."

But even as an adult, she still feels a very close attachment to her parents. "The umbilical cord is still there. It always will be," she says.

The experience of being a child of survivors has impacted on Donna in other ways as well. One of these is her self-image. She has always felt that she was different from other adolescents because her parents were Holocaust survivors.

"I feel special because my parents went through that and survived. And my sister and I are the proof that they survived. It's like the rest of the world is here, and we are up here somewhere," she says gestering with her hands. "Not that we are better, but we are different. It's as if we have lived through something vicariously. I feel the experience must have become transferred somehow."

Donna continues on the same frame of thought, this time recalling the differences between her teenage concerns and those of other girls.
"Maybe we are capable of deeper thought, deeper feeling because we had to grow up with our parents' past," she speculated. "Our friends' biggest concerns were whose party they were going to on Saturday night. To me, life was more than just chewing bubblegum and riding your bike to the beach."
Mrs. G.

As the deportations began for European Jews, many did not realize the full extent of the situation, believing they would shortly be reunited with their family members who were sent away. Sadly enough, for many that was the last time they saw their family members and relatives.

That was the case with 55-year-old Mrs. G. And the experience of suddenly losing parents and kin has intensified her feelings as a parent to the extent that she prefers having her children within reach "should a need arise."

At the start of the war, Mrs. G. and her family lived in a ghetto. When the Germans moved in around 1944, her family was rounded up, packed into cattle cars and shipped off to concentration camp. The moment the train screeched to a halt and the fleeting moments afterwards still remain as clear and vivid to her as if it happened yesterday.

"The Germans yelled 'out, out, out!'; I will never forget it. I fell into my mother's arms. I hugged her and cried, 'Mother, am I ever going to see you again?' Her last words to me were, 'Yes, you will,'" she recalls.

The constant hope of possibly seeing her mother again served as a motivation to help her survive the camp ordeal, despite the fact that it faded into a cruel disappointment. But when it was all over, she did find a sister, an aunt, some friends and her boyfriend, the man who soon became
husband two weeks later.

Today, as she sits comfortably in her daughter's home on a quiet Saturday morning, she reflects on the things that went through her mind decades earlier. Initially, she felt a frenzy of emotions and a surge of excitement over her emancipation and reunion with whoever was left of her family and friends.

"I was bewildered," she says. "We danced every night and it was like we weren't normal. Here we came home to find that our parents and family members were gone and knowing how they died, we behaved like that. I guess we were just happy to be alive," she rationalizes her guilt for rejoicing. But it did not take long for the initial excitement over freedom to fade and depression and grief to set in.

"I regretted that I did not spend more time at home with my parents," she admits. "Had I known what was coming, I would have. But as a child, I was interested in having a good time."

Like many survivors, she has never completed her mourning.

"I still feel cheated because my family is gone and we could not all celebrate the end of the war."

Presently, Mrs. G. is for the most part, a content parent. She considers her family close and appreciates it being so. Although she and her husband live in Los Angeles,
their daughters live on their own, both in the San Fernando Valley, about 20 minutes away via the freeway. In her view, the ideal distance for parents and children to live apart is "distant enough, yet close enough for them to be there when the need arises."

Although she does not worry much about them now, she tended to do so when they were teenagers and out late. But when the daughters were somewhat older and went off to college, she found herself confronted with conflicting feelings about their moving out.

"When they moved away to college and my husband and I were alone, the question was put to me, 'How do you feel to be without the children?' I felt guilty when I said that it felt wonderful, but the truth was that it felt good to be alone with my husband,' she explains. Apparently her inner conflict was one of being guilty for having what people would consider a normal feeling for a middle-aged parent whose children were set on their own.
Family Three

Alan T.

Young adults live with their parents usually because it is convenient, it saves money or because they are not yet established in a job or profession. Yet when people in their thirties live at home, the reasons become less clear. But for one 32-year-old man, the reason seems to be to aid and care for his again parents.

This man is Alan. He is single, a professional and successful. He has one brother, age 33, who also lives at home.

Alan was born on the east coast. Both of his parents, now in their seventies, were in concentration camps during the war. Unlike most survivors, Alan's parents were middle-aged when the war broke out and suffered setbacks in the prime of their lives rather than during their adolescence. His father, who originates from Poland, was 38 years old when he was sent to concentration camp, and his German-born mother was 34 when she was sent away. When the war ended, they were ages 40 and 36.

The magnitude of the losses was the same: parents, relatives and friends, but for middle-aged people there was also the added trauma of possibly losing a spouse. This was the case with Alan's mother who remarried after the war to the man who became his father.
Alan maintains that he lives home because he wants to and finds the arrangement comfortable. He dismisses any aged parents explanation. "They could manage by themselves. I wouldn't worry about their safety," he said assuringly.

Alan further asserts his independence by making his own decisions and not allowing his parents to influence him. He said, "If I decide that I want something, they don't stand in my way. If I buy a suit and they don't like it, I won't take it back because they don't like it."

Although they live under the same roof, Alan, his brother and parents do not interact much. The sons have dinner on their own and the parents dine at a time they see fit. Religious holidays are the only exception when the entire family sits together at the dining room table.

While Alan notes that he is free from his parents, he nevertheless does have responsibilities to them that most people his age do not. Since neither parent drives, it is his task to take them shopping, to meetings and to friends.

"I don't mind doing it, especially since they are getting older," said Alan.

However, Alan also finds himself in the position of being a parent to the parents by watching over them from time to time.

"Sometimes with my father, I feel like I have to guide him along and take care of him so he doesn't make mistakes"
or hurt himself," he noted. "If he wants to go somewhere and take the bus and I feel it's a bad neighborhood, I'll give him a ride there. He really makes his own decisions, but I help out."

Yet, Alan points out that should he move out, it would not be stressful for either him or his parents.

"They wouldn't mind. They want me to do what I think is best. There's no pressure to stay or leave," he said. After thinking for a moment, he joked, "They would have to find another chauffeur."

As an adolescent, he was a typical teenager except for the fact that he did not start driving a car until he was about 19 years old. "We just didn't have a car," he explained, as if trying to dispell other possible explanations. But being a teenager without a car did not hinder him in any way, as he went out with friends who did drive.

The major problems he could recall having with his parents during that time was their tendency to overprotect him. He claimed that they worried when he was out and kept close tabs on everything he did.

"My parents were too close to me. They monitored everything I did. They made sure I was not running around with the wrong type of crowd. This took place until I was about 19 or 20," he said.

But Alan speculates that his parents would be overly
concerned with him today as well, should he decide to move out.

"If I were to move out, they think my place would be a mess, that I would never clean it up and that I wouldn't have anything to eat," he noted.

About the only thing that he himself and his parents would want would be for him to settle down and raise a family. In fact, his view of success in life is based more on happiness than anything else.

"I used to measure success by a monetary standard. But now it's more of an inner satisfaction with the job you're doing," he explained. "And having a nice wife, a couple of kids and making your parents grandparents," he added, raising his voice with emphasis.

"That's what parents want, and I hope I have it in me, as they feel that if you're married to a Jewish girl, have two or three kids, then you have a future. What use is a job if you don't have a family?," he mimicked what his parents would likely say. But he added assertively, "I would do it for me, not them."
Mrs. T.

To Mrs. T., age 70, the losses she endured as a result of the war and the task of virtually starting a new life, are analogous to a severed tree trunk slowly sprouting new branches:

"It's like a tree grows; then you cut it in the middle. What grows again is not the same as it was."

From 1934, she and her family lived in a ghetto. She had a mother, father, brother, sister, a husband and a young child. She lost them all.

For a short time she was together with her mother and sister in a concentration camp, but were soon separated, never to see any of them again. From then on, Mrs. T. was shuttled to and from a number of camps.

When she finally gained her freedom, she was a middle-aged woman who had lost everything and was left alone.

"I was lonesome, crying and always dreaming. My plan was to go to Australia, but I came to New York instead. Today, I am proud to be in America," she said.

Soon she remarried, had two sons and began living again. Today she, her retired husband and two grown sons live in an older apartment in Los Angeles, like any other typical family, except that all are much older than parents and children of most families.

She speaks admirably of her sons, emphasizing that she is pleased with the way they turned out. Her oldest son,
age 33, holds a position with a major firm, and her younger son, Alan, is a professional.

"I just told them to do what they like, and I never interfered," she commented of the way she raised them. "I just wish they would get married," she added with a wry smile.

While they were growing up, she admits to doing a fair amount of worrying. She feared that they might get lost when away from home or for their safety, but felt more relaxed knowing that they were with other children.

Today, she does not worry much about them, pointing out that "they are grown men," but admits that they often call home if they are due back late.

Whether or not her sons would move out, would be left to their own volition, Mrs. T. emphasized.

"I can't tell them what to do and I don't mind how long they stay. Even if they decided to move to another country, I would not stop them," she affirmed. Then she added jokingly, but with a touch of seriousness, "But then I would have a place to go. I would visit them a lot, until they would throw me out. They are my whole life."
Family Four

Karen B.

"Don't bite the hand that feeds you," is the proverb 20-year-old Karen utilized to sum up the cautious way in which she relates to her parents. And those very words are conveyed to her by her parents when they expect her to comply with certain expectations and wishes.

In order to avoid "biting the hand that feeds her," Karen went as far as dumping a boyfriend because her mother did not believe he was Jewish. In short, she is a portrait of a child of survivors who would rather comply with parental demands, even if they appear unreasonable, in an effort to satisfy them rather than to hurt them.

Karen, born on the east coast, is single and a full-time college student. She is the middle child in the family, having a 14-year-old brother and a 27-year-old sister.

Her father, who was 17 when the war broke out, hid in the Warsaw ghetto throughout the ordeal, while her mother, age 16 at the time, was sent away. Today, her father is self-employed and her mother is a housewife.

Karen comes across as personable, energetic and bubbly. Her rapid-fire way of speaking often causes her to jumble words together and even her sentence pauses are filled by nervous giggles.

She was raised in a conservative household, where religion and values were stressed. She learned of the
Holocaust mainly from her mother, although both of her parents discussed the subject quite often as she grew up.

Overall, she believes the Holocaust has affected her life to some degree but not a lot, and she is only slightly interested in learning more about the subject. But she will not dismiss the possibility of another Holocaust occurring again.

For her, the subject is hard to perceive, and she emphasized that she can not vicariously experience what her parents lived through.

"I don't know if I can identify with something that never happened to me. If something hasn't happened to you, you can't really understand it or relate to it," she reasoned.

However, she does understand her parents and has formed a clearer picture of each of them in her mind. Her mother is the dominant of the two. She is stronger, more overbearing and handles family matters. Yet, she is also quite nervous and to some degree, dependent upon others, as she does not drive.

She described her father in more subdued terms. He is less energetic, not big on family decision-making and not aggressive. If her parents could change, Karen would like to see her mother calmer, less aggressive and more understanding. She would like to see her father have a more active role in the family. "He should be kind of a
Robert Young type in 'Father Knows Best,'" she quipped.

She concludes that their personalities were shaped by their past and had they not experienced what they did, they would probably be the opposite of the way they are now.

"They would not be as nervous, tense or anxious. They have no reason to be domineering or forceful, because they don't need to use that against anything. They learned to fight during the war and they carry that through life," she observed.

Mistrust and suspicion are other traits Karen believes her parents have inherited from the war.

"They don't trust many people. They're afraid there's going to be another world war. They're afraid of anti-Semitism too. It's the way they talk," she said. "They think everyone who isn't Jewish hates Jews. My mother doesn't trust people because everyone is out to get you."

The consequences of their shattered adolescences is yet another result of the war by which she finds her own life touched. Her parents, she contends, did not go through the normal growing up experiences as did she, her sister and younger brother. As a result, Karen found it difficult to relate to her parents the importance of teenage concerns.

"I don't think they can understand as much as they'd like to or want to. They don't have the same concerns," she said. "Their way is always right."

In an effort to avoid hurting them, Karen has complied
with many of her parents' wishes. She once dated a boy who she claimed was Jewish, but because his name did not sound Jewish, her mother believed he was of another background and asked her to stop seeing him. She did.

Nevertheless, Karen feels little remorse towards her mother on the account of her domineering style and control. She explained:

"I learned to understand more. If they yell at me, I understand why. It is because they went through the war and that's the way they are."

Guilt is yet another entity she has encountered, and claims her parents utilized it to manipulate her. She explained how the strategy works:

"Because we brought you up, you mustn't hurt us. So if we're giving you all of this, how can you do this to us," she said, imitating what her parents would say if she were to do something they dissapproved of.

Her rule of thumb in maintaining a relationship with minimum friction is based on an old proverb. "It's basically, 'don't bite the hand that feeds you,'" she quoted.

In order to please her parents and avoid conflict, Karen must abide by a few rules which she claims were "drummed into me," over the years. She described them in an animated tone, how she feels her parents want her to "play it safe."

"Marry rich and Jewish, don't spend money foolishly, do well in school, pick a good profession and stay in the
company of only Jewish people," she said with a hint of humor in her voice.

When the subject of moving out surfaced as an issue in her household, Karen's father appeared more reluctant to having her leave than was her mother, something which surprised her. The issue arose when she decided to attend college away from home.

"My father didn't want me to move out. He offered to buy me a car," she recalled.

But she left anyway and attends a large university. The distance from her dormitory to her parents' home is about a six-hour drive.

Karen likes the autonomy and the freedom of being on one's own. But still, her close ties with her parents remain and are a part of her conscience. She explains how her parents wield influence over her by citing their philosophy:

"You're okay if you're on your own and do everything by their rules. But once they find out you're not doing everything by their rules, it's not too hot."

In other words, although she lives away from home, she feels that she is not completely autonomous. But on the other hand, Karen claims she does not give in to every parental whim, either, thereby maintaining some individuality.

She does this by not allowing the issue of the Holocaust to become an overpowering entity of her relationship
with her parents.

"I don't look at them as survivors and I don't treat them differently because they went through that. If I did that, I would feel guilty about everything I do."
Mrs. B.

It is difficult to conclude that from the worst of tragedies something positive can be found. But in the case of Mrs. B., age 56, traumatic separation from her parents during the war has, in an ironic sense, eased the separation process between her and her children. That is, she recalls her separation from her parents by the Germans as among the most traumatic, while her daughter's moving away to college as mild by comparison.

Mrs. B. remembers her parents as being typical for that time in Poland--they were strict and did not openly discuss everything with their children. But at the same time, they were close with their two children.

When the war broke out, she was 15 years old. She was at home with her parents and only sister when the Nazis came and divided the family by taking Mrs. B. and her sister away.

Even before that moment, she was already traumatized by a German soldier who tried to kidnap and rape her. She explained:

"One German came to our house and said he was taking some girls to work. He took me out and I had a feeling that something bad was going to happen. He started driving in the opposite direction and I was afraid that he was going to rape me. I escaped and started to run and someone rescued me."
Soon afterwards, she and her sister were taken away, where they spent the next three and a half years. Her parents were taken away two years later, in 1943. Although her father hid for a short while, he was captured and was killed in a transport.

Her mother was sent to a different camp. Mrs. B. recalled the time the Nazis took her away:

"When the Germans came to take me, I wanted to leave my mother a ring, but she did not want to take it. She did not believe that I was not going to come back. Nobody knew what was going to happen. I did not even kiss her."

At age 21, she was liberated along with her sister. In the years which followed, life was difficult, she pointed out. She was newly wed and her husband began his career as a builder, while she worked as a waitress.

Today, she is the mother to three children: a 27-year-old stepdaughter, a 20-year-old daughter and a 14-year-old son. She did not describe her relationship with them as ideal, but she emphasized that she does not experience much anxiety or worry either.

"I don't know. I think there are worse children. So far, I do not have so many problems," she said.

"As long as you have them at home, you are much closer with them," she continued.

When Karen moved away from home to start college, Mrs. B. did not find the separation to be difficult for either her or her daughter. At first, Mrs. B. contended
that she simply realized that it was time for her daughter to become autonomous. Later, however, she disclosed that her attitude about her children's autonomy had deeper implications.

"When Karen first talked about moving out, my husband wanted her to stay home, but I didn't stay in the way. In one way, when they move out, they have to be on their own and be independent. I understand that today it is a different world and they have to go on their own. You can't keep a child with you all of the time," she said.

But by comparing her own separation from her family during the war with her daughter's moving away to college, Mrs. B. was able to cope with the separation, as it did not compare in severity with the experience she remembers. In fact, she pointed out her daughter left "the nest" under normal circumstances.

"We started to be independent when the Germans took us away," she said. "They are starting their independence in a normal way."

In a way, Mrs. B. is an example of how one's own traumatic separation can actually prepare one to better deal with the autonomy of one's own children.

In similar terms, Mrs. B. maintains that she did not give her children much attention when they were younger, rationalizing that giving them things that she missed in her youth would not compensate for those losses.
"I am not the type of mother who would want them to have everything because I did not have those things. I don't overdo. I would not shower them with things because I did not have them. I don't think you can make up for the past."

Mrs. B. also emphasized how she does not want to exert control over her children's lives, except in the area of marriage.

"I just want to see that they are happy in whatever they do. But I want to make sure that they don't marry with a gentile," she said.

However, Mrs. B. expressed a sense of helplessness in that she could not stop her stepdaughter from wanting to marry a gentile.

"It hurts me. I couldn't do it (marry a gentile). But I can't stop her," she said.

Her strong emotions regarding marriage to gentiles presented itself as a type of mistrust of non-Jews, which she developed possibly as a result of the Holocaust. She explained:

"After what happened with us, I am afraid that one day sooner or later, they (gentiles) would say, 'you dirty Jew.'"
Mr. B.

A generation gap, or more appropriately, a communication gap, is how Mr. B. characterizes his relationship with his three children. At the core of the problem, he sees a lack of closeness and understanding on the part of his children resulting in unfulfilled needs on his part.

Mr. B., age 61, was born in Warsaw. During the war, he hid in the Warsaw Ghetto, but fled before the famous uprising. He lost his older sister and mother to the Nazis. His father died of typhoid in the Ghetto.

Before the war, Mr. B.'s family was close. His father, an importer, earned a middle-class living and was considered well-to-do at that time in Poland. It was particularly unique for Jews to be well off, in light of repression and anti-semitism directed at them from the Poles.

"We felt the effects of anti-semitism in the press and were accustomed to anti-semitic behavior from the gentiles," he explained.

After his father died, his mother tried to avoid deportation by the Nazis by opening a business, thinking that the gainfully employed would be spared.

"We had some money, so we got a shop somehow. Eventually, the Nazis came and began sorting out people from the shops and factories anyway," he recalled. "That's when my mother and sister were taken. I never heard from them."
As his mother and sister were sent to Treblinka, Mr. B. escaped from the Ghetto with his uncle. They hid from the Poles who cooperated with the Nazis and killed Jews as well. They both made it to freedom in 1944, when the Russians crossed over and allowed them to flee to the east.

Looking back at his ordeal, Mr. B. recalls that the most ominous emotion he felt during that period was fright and a relentless feeling of being hunted.

"I was always scared," he related. "I am still afraid that another Holocaust could happen."

He was 21 years old at the end of the war and eager to establish a new life and attended a technical school in Belgium, where he settled shortly after the end of the war. From there he moved to Australia and then to the United States.

Mr. B. was married twice; his first marriage ending in divorce. His oldest daughter is from the first marriage, while the two younger children are from his present wife.

His relationship with his children is inadequate, he contends. He sees a gap between his way of viewing life and the way his children perceive things.

"A person who went through my experience looks at things a little differently than do my children who were born here," he said. He feels that his children do not take
life as seriously as they should, emphasizing that they are not as concerned about careers and the future as he would like them to be.

"Life is not only fun and pleasure," he said.

He maintains that children should be close to their parents and he feels that this closeness is lacking in his family.

"They don't show the feelings that children should show to their parents, like closeness. There is a generation gap. I don't think we communicate like we should," he said.

"I think they are plain spoiled and very selfish. I have a different approach to life and find it hard to communicate with them."

Again, he stressed the concept of closeness when he pointed out: "A family should be close-knit. That is of number one importance."

He objected when his daughter Karen decided to move away to college. However, his wife did not raise any objections to the daughter's plans.

"I think the family should stay together. I don't think children should leave home too early, especially girls. I believe that when parents get older, the children should stay with them somehow.

Preferably, children should live at home until marriage, according to Mr. B. In a sense, he views marriage
as possibly the only reason for grown children to seek autonomy and perhaps as the most important reason for parents to accept their child's moving away. Lesser events, such as moving away to college do not justify one's moving away, in his view. He pointed out:

"When they have their own lives, I can't dictate what they should do. I don't believe you can stand over them all of the time."
Family Five

Mike N.

Mike has a special goal in life. Someday he hopes to hold a key governmental post that will enable him to direct some input into policies affecting the rest of society. But unlike most young people with such aspirations, Mike does not pursue this for monetary reward or prestige. Rather, he hopes to fulfill a mission in life: to prevent even the slightest possibility for another Holocaust to occur.

Mike is a talkative and energetic 21-year-old who has already graduated from college with a degree in political science and has his goals set for graduate school at an age when most students begin their sophomore year in college.

His Polish-born parents were both concentration camp prisoners during most of the war years. He has one sibling: a 28-year old brother who lives on his own.

Mike believes that another holocaust is very likely to occur again if the world does not protect its precious freedom. But rather than just worrying about it, Mike hopes his future career in public administration might help safeguard the future.

"What happened to my parents illustrates what could happen when sinister forces take over government," he said, relaxing in his room at his parents' home. "I see my role as preventing that from happening here and that influenced
my decision to pursue a public service field. Maybe I won't be able to change the world, but if I have my hand in public policy, I could have some influence."

For Mike, the Holocaust has burdened him with a nagging sense of responsibility whereby he views his purpose in life is to achieve some type of success that would compensate for some of the things the victims of the Holocaust were deprived of.

"When you talk about those six million people who are not around to carry on our faith, I feel a sense of responsibility. Sometimes it would be nice to quit everything and go to the beach 365 days a year and live the fun life, but I really can't, because I feel responsible to those people. If my background were different, maybe I wouldn't have those responsibilities and I would feel a little more free."

Mike gets along well with both of his parents and he attributes unique qualities to each. He described his father, a craftsman, as a very gentle man, while his mother, a housewife, as more outspoken. In his family, his father is traditionally the breadwinner, but his mother is the dominant of the two.

To Mike, they are strong people, because of the fact that they "faced what they did and came out of it alright, and were able to make lives for themselves." Had they not been in the war, he speculates that they could have been
more successful, perhaps owning a large business.

As he reflects on what he knows about their past, he is grateful for the type of life he has today. Said Mike, "Their family backgrounds were torn apart. They could not have had an average adolescence. They were adults at a very young age." (His father was 13 years old when the war broke out and his mother was only nine. When it ended, his father was 17 and his mother 14.)

The effects the war had on his parents are not hard for him to recognize. He found that it is difficult for his parents to be trusting of others, even relatives. They can also get emotional and irritable at times, as well, Mike said. He pointed out: "I can remember them getting very irritable at times about things that did not seem very rational."

But as he reflects on his own adolescence, he does not feel that he grew up differently from his peers. He recalls times when he did feel overprotected, but for the most part, Mike's adolescence heralded an increasing amount of independence. In his words, "If I wanted to do something, it would be up to me."

Friction between Mike and his parents arose when he decided to move out and live in a dormitory. He smiles as he recalls his mother's argument that the time he would spend going to class would be almost the same whether he lived at home or the dormitory.
"They were initially resistant to it, but after I showed how important it would be to me, they understood and let me leave the nest for a while."

Mike's autonomy was never a total separation, he claims. Since he lived only a few minutes from his parents, he visited them and dined with them several times a week.

Today, he is back at home in order to save money for graduate school. If he goes away to the east coast, as he plans to do, that would be a complete break from his parents and an event for which he is ready.

"I think I've been developing toward that," he said. "I think I'm ready for it and I think they are too."

His career goal in public administration seems to be in part motivated by the Holocaust in the sense that he hopes to take a leadership role in society that might prevent a future holocaust, and also fulfill his parents.

"It would be a letdown to them if I did not use my potentials to achieve," he said. "My parents expect a lot of me, but they never pressured me. They led the way and allowed the opportunity. They pulled instead of pushed."

Mike finds motivation in himself as well. He does this by setting goals and striving to meet them. But at the same time, he does not live by self-induced pressures. Mike pointed out: "I have goals and I challenge myself to meet them. But I do not live by day to day pressures."
Mrs. N.

Before the war, Mrs. N., age 51, had hopes of becoming a doctor. Years afterwards, she worked in the medical field, but only as a nurse. Today, she contends that she probably would have become a doctor had her life not been so severely disrupted.

Perhaps it is coincidental, but her 28-year old son became a physician. Although she insists that she had "nothing to do with it," Mrs. N. is nevertheless glad that her son became something that she could not. As she reflects on it, she theorizes:

"There's a purpose in everything, so maybe there is a purpose in surviving and that somewhere along the line, the second generation makes up for what we could not do."

Back in 1945, when she was a mere 14 years of age and just freed into a cold desolate world scarred by war, she never imagined that someday she would be a mother to two children and that her life would be normal. Instead, she was depressed and unhappy about being a survivor.

"I felt I should have been where my mother was. She died in Auschwitz. I didn't see any reason for living," she said of her survivor guilt. "I just could not pick up the pieces."

Years later, "the pieces" of her life finally started coming together, as she married and began living a normal life. Still, she and her husband, also a survivor, found
that life was to remain difficult for survivors many years after the war ended.

"We thought that the countries of the world would open their doors and say, 'you've suffered enough' and would take us in. But that wasn't the case. Nobody wanted us. We rode in trains meant for animals, crossed borders illegally and lived like criminals."

Now, as she thinks back on the difficult years she experienced, Mrs. N. considers herself very fortunate. She has a happy family and is proud of the way her two sons turned out.

The family is close and closeness is a trait she considers very important. Both sons are in touch with their parents on a regular basis. Her youngest son, Mike, still lives at home, at least until he attends graduate school, possibly on the east coast. Even then, they expect to be in touch by telephone from time to time and neither Mike nor Mrs. N. would find the separation especially stressful. Although her older son is married and on his own, she hears from him often and is content with that arrangement.

Her motto is "When a family suffers together, it strengthens itself." This belief evolved from the difficult times Mrs. N. and her husband experienced after the war as they tried to start a life for themselves in the United States.
"We had extremely hard times coming into the country. We did not know the language and we had no relatives. We had to be close to overcome."

When her children were born, she developed her own philosophy for raising them as well. She pointed out: "When children are little, they need strictness and love, but when they grow up, they'll make better decisions on their own than their parents can do for them."

She recognizes the importance of independence and individuality for growing children and contends that she would not influence them in any way except for one area--marriage.

"I would like to see them happy and choose whatever careers they feel are good for them. I will guide them but never influence them. But I would strongly fight it if my son would bring in a non-Jewish girl."

The reasoning behind that strong sentiment apparently relates to the Holocaust. She noted: "It's important because we have suffered so much from the people who are non-Jewish. I would not want the reason behind why all of those millions of people died, to just diminish."
Family Six

Gail R.

Why did my parents survive and the others perish? Were they spared to perpetuate the Jewish race? Was I born for a similar reason? Must I accomplish something special in my life?

These questions often trouble children of survivors as they reflect philosophically on their parents' survival and their own existence.

In interviewing 32-year-old Gail, these issues arose as we talked about the Holocaust and the significance of it in her life.

Gail is the oldest of three adult children. She has a brother, age 29 and a sister, age 26.

She has been married for eight years, works and is a mother to two small children.

Both of her parents were in the war. Her 62-year-old father was in a labor camp and her 58-year-old mother survived a number of concentration camps, including Auschwitz. Her parents are now divorced after 37 years of marriage.

As Gail puts the Holocaust into a present perspective, she finds that being a child of survivors seems to alienate her from the rest of society and tends to make her feel "special."

"I think the fact that I have parents who went through that makes me feel very different from others and special."
"I always felt as if I were superior to other Americans. I took it as an asset rather than as a detriment," she explained.

"I had something like the 'chosen people' kind of thing. Americans didn't know from nothing and here, look at what my parents suffered and the fact that they are coping well in life. I am a lucky person to have them as parents," she said.

As she probed deeper into her feelings about her parents' past, she began questioning the essence of their survival.

"I took that issue as, 'well, because they did survive, there must be a purpose for it. It must have been, to have us;' and then I thought, 'Oh my God, what a burden; I'm supposed to do something great for the world.' Then I thought, 'maybe it was my brother or sister who were supposed to do something great. Or maybe it is my children or their children.'"

To Gail, getting married and starting a family was very important. But she emphasized that she did not see this as an effort to make up for those people lost in the war or as a task to satisfy her parents. Rather, it was mainly to satisfy her own needs.

Focusing on her parents and how the war affected them, she viewed the war experience as permanently changing the course of their lives in terms of lost family members and
life opportunities.

Just before the war, her father, age 20 at the time, was part of a wealthy family who enabled him to study medicine. But when the war broke out, his family and their wealth were taken by the Nazis. Even after the war, he was unable to continue his studies.

"When he came to this country, they wouldn't let him in the medical schools because of the Jewish quota. He was 26 and I was born and he had to support a family. So he became a waiter," she said.

"He eventually went back to school and became a teacher. Had the war never existed, he would have been a doctor," she speculated.

Gail's mother was 16 at the start of the war. She views her mother's losses more in terms of adolescent life experiences.

"She was only a school girl. She missed out on her education, her parents, opportunities to date, experiencing things and choice," she said.

Her parents were "sweethearts" before the war who found each other years later and married, Gail noted.

As Gail looked back at her own adolescence, she described these years as normal in relation to other teenagers. Although as a teenager, she felt her parents "ruled by an iron thumb," she now concludes that she had considerable freedom and did not miss out on anything that most
adolescents experienced.

At 18, she spent four months in Australia, staying with cousins and considered the possibility of remaining there.

"They never tried to keep me under their wing. They were real worried, but they didn't let me know it until I got back. When I told my mother I might stay there, she said, 'whatever makes you happy.' She left the decision up to me," she noted.

However, Gail added that she was frequently anxious about pleasing her parents and avoided purposely hurting them. When she saw her younger siblings misbehave, she took offense.

"I couldn't understand how my brother and sister would do something to purposely hurt them. I hurt them too, but I could never do it purposely. I would feel guilty if I did," she pointed out.

She also considers herself to be an overachiever in the sense of pleasing her parents. As a child, she was obsessed with "pulling good grades" and now, as an adult, she continually strives to achieve in her work and marriage. She explained:

"My parents suffered so much and I don't want them to suffer from me. I always wanted them to be proud of me. I want to give them a little 'nachas,' because they could use it."

She reflected on the subject some more:
"I want to be a parent pleaser and a people pleaser. Perhaps I tried to make everybody love me because I was looking for the grandparents I didn't have. That developed into my becoming a people pleaser."

Gail's separation from her parents was not a major problem either, she contended. She moved in and out of the house a number of times before marrying. Before she got married, she did not experience any resistance from her parents; likewise, her autonomy was not threatening to them. She said that her parents desired for her to become independent and to eventually settle down and have children and a profession.

"That's what I did," she emphasized.

Today, Gail still relates well to both parents, but is closer to her mother. She lives about three miles from her mother and one and one-half blocks from her father. She emphasized that her father moved close to her, although she would prefer if he lived further away. She said he takes advantage of the fact that they live close together, but did not specify how.

She talks of the spatial distance as if it were synonymous with social distance when she remarked, "He put himself smack-dab between my mother and me," as if implying that her father was interfering with the relationship between her and her mother.

Still, she visits with her semi-retired father once
every two weeks and sees her mother about once or twice each week. As she observes her parents interacting with her children, Gail experiences another void in her life. She pointed out:

"When I see my mother and daughter together, I think about what I lost. I realize the fact that I never had the experience of having a grandmother."
Mrs. R.

Freedom was merely a fleeting but comforting thought to concentration camp inmates as they sought solitude from the misery of their predicaments. Mrs. R. recalls how tempting was even the mere thought of freedom. That is why she has raised her children with few restrictions.

She believes that she has experienced enough repression and setbacks in her life. Consequently, she does not want to hold back her children from experiencing almost anything they want to.

"About the only way in which the war has influenced me is that I am a fierce defender of freedom. I want my children to have freedom, even freedom from me," she said.

Mrs. R., age 58, was 15 years old when the war broke out. She and her sister survived, but her parents did not. At the start of the war, the family was sent to a ghetto. From there, her father was sent to a labor camp, from which he escaped and headed towards Russia. However, he turned his back on freedom to return to his family, realizing that he would probably be killed. Eventually, both of her parents were sent to concentration camps and both died. Mrs. R. recalled the day her mother was sent away:

"My mother was sent to Bergen-Belsen. We were told people were taken to work someplace. I did not want to part from her, so I ran to her side, and a huge German guard grabbed me by the scar around my neck and threw me
across the street. Some people picked me up and I was taken to work. That was the last time I saw my mother."

The last time she saw her father was equally if not more traumatic. In the labor camp where he worked, a prisoner escaped and, as a result, the rest of the inmates were taken out and shot. Mrs. R. was there and recognized her father among the bodies of those who were killed.

Mrs. R. was an inmate of a number of different camps, including Bergen-Belsen and Auschwitz. She took part in one of the infamous camp evacuations, where inmates were marched from one camp to another, during which countless died on the way. She was marched from Auschwitz to three other camps including Ravensbruck and Mauthausen. She explained why it was coined "the march of the dead:"

"Out of 10,000 women, only 20 survived. I am one of them."

After the war, she found the man she was in love with before and married him. She had three children, two girls and a boy. Although she more or less lived a normal life in the United States, the past still haunted her. She described one recurring nightmare she had for a while:

"I dreamt we were all being chased by the Nazis and I had my three children with me. In the dream, I had to make a choice and take one with me and leave the other two behind to fend for themselves."

Over the years, the nightmares dissipated and the war
was no longer an overwhelming influence on her life. It goes without saying that the war permanently changed her life. Besides human life, a major loss in Mrs. R.'s life was her education. Her goal was to become a physician, as did her husband. She never had the chance to start and her husband went as far as two years in his studies before the war interrupted his work.

If she had the opportunities now that her children have, Mrs. R. would return to college and pursue her original goal. Still, she manages to shrug off this missed opportunity rather matter-of-factly.

"Dreams are very important in life, but I don't think we should fall apart if they don't happen. We have to be flexible," she surmoned.

With similar ease, she dealt with the issues of autonomy and separation as they affected her children. She did not hold them back from experiencing things as they grew up, because she did not have many of those privileges herself.

"I think parents have to learn that the children have their own lives and the parents have no way of protecting them from the blows of life. No matter how much we want to spare them pain, we can't. Parents have no right to make babies out of their children forever. The parents should let the children go."

"I feel that we cannot grow without learning and
without experiencing. You cannot experience anything if someone is protecting you from that experience," she said.

She does not find an ideal distance for parents and children to live apart. Rather, families can be close and life far away if there is a good relationship between them, she pointed out. Nevertheless, Mrs. R. only lives a mile away from her oldest daughter Gail, and sees all three children at least once a week.

Part of Mrs. R.'s concept of freedom also means allowing her children to choose the type of lives they want to lead. She explained.

"It is proverbial for the Jewish mother to say, 'my son the doctor,' or 'my son the lawyer.' However, I don't think this is the crux of life. There are people who are bricklayer, streetcleaners who are happy in their endeavors. If whatever you do gives you contentment, it makes no difference what it is."
Mr. R.

For many survivors, the time when the children first move out is regarded as a major break in ties, even though the children and parents visit and communicate with one another. But when family problems such as divorce arise, and one parent loses contact with his children, separation anxiety on the part of that parent is height­ened.

This is the case of 62-year-old Mr. R. who has recently been divorced from his wife after 32 years of marriage. The divorce, he claims, has caused his three children to side with their mother, thus leaving him abandoned.

Mr. R., now semi-retired, was born in Czechoslovakia. His family was well-to-do, his father owning a business. After completing high school, Mr. R. studied medicine, but found his future disrupted by the outbreak of war.

When he went back home to rejoin his parents and three sisters, he found that he had arrived too late. They had either fled or had been taken by the Nazis. He described his abrupt separation from his family:

"When I arrives a day later, I noticed that the house was secured. I looked through the window and saw their unfinished breakfast still on the table."

Later, he received a letter from his father, warning him, "Whatever you do, don't come here." He soon discov­ered that his father was in Auschwitz, his two sisters
were in concentration camps and that his mother and third sister attempted to flee to Hungary. They were also captured after his mother broke a leg while crossing the border and decided to turn back.

By a twist of fate, Mr. R. was spared from the concentration camps and, instead, wound up in a civilian labor camp three years after the start of the war. There, he worked with other Jews and gypsies under the guard of the Slavic army.

After the war, he found his high school sweetheart and both went to Poland to get married. For a short time, Mr. R. still had hopes of finding one of his sisters who, he claims, wrote him a letter saying she survived. However, he was unable to find her and believes that she died after the letter was written.

Over the years, Mr. R. raised three children, one boy and two girls, all of whom are now grown. Although he was strict, requiring them to return home at specified hours, Mr. R. regards himself as having been a reasonable parent. The kids were raised to live their own lives and were free to choose what they wanted to do, he said.

However, he admitted to not having very much patience with them as they were growing up and attributed this to his war experiences. Mr. R. has always desired a close relationship with his children. He maintains that parents and children should live close enough to see each other
from time to time; but on the same note, he feels that parents should not try to hold their children back, even if it means moving far away.

"I hear parents complain that their children live in the East and that they don't get to see them that often. I think children should live in the same state, at least," he explained.

"Gail almost married a man in Australia. But she decided that she would miss the family and came back. I'm very happy she didn't marry him, because how often can you go to Australia?" he asked, with a hearty laugh.

His children moved out of the house around the time they started college. Mr. R. maintains that by doing so, his children missed out on opportunities to talk with him and learn more about his Holocaust experiences.

"This was a time when they were grown up and when you can have discussions with them. They were not around and when they were in school, they were busy," he pointed out.

When his oldest daughter first moved out of the house when she started college, Mr. R. objected, but did not insist that she stay, after she explained her reasons for wanting independence.

"I wasn't too happy about it, but she explained why she wanted to be on her own and I did not stop her. When my son moved away to Chico, we didn't see him for about a year," he said.
He reflected for a moment and added, "All parents are used to having the kids around. When there's one person missing at the dinner table, you feel the difference."

Since he and his wife divorced, Mr. R. has found his relationship with his children to be at an all-time low. Although all three children live in close proximity, Gail only two blocks away, and the others in nearby communities, he sees her regularly but is in poor contact with the other two.

"My younger daughter thinks I call her because I'm lonely, but that is not the case. I can go out every evening with a different person, but I just want to be with the kids sometimes," he said.

In fact, just as he talked of his social life, a phone call interrupted the interview. The call turned out to be from a woman friend he was going to meet for dinner.

As a result of the divorce, Mr. R. said he feels abandoned by his children who he believes have sided with their mother. He has tried to maintain contact with them, but has been unsuccessful since the break up.

"I've invited them for dinner and they say they are busy. They say they will call back, but never do. I'm too proud to call them if they don't want to be bothered," he affirmed.

To Mr. R., the apparent siding of his children with their mother is like another type of separation experience.
But unlike the time when his children moved away to school and still remained in contact, the sense of being abandoned is harsher and threatening. He summed up his feelings best when he said: "It bothers me that the kids got so far involved in the divorce. They should love both parents as they did before."
Family Seven
Howard P.

Nineteen-year-old Howard is only a junior in college, yet he can gaze down an imaginary road to his future and visualize himself at various stages of financial success many years from now.

After finishing college, he expects to be a certified public accountant (CPA) and would like to hold a real estate broker's license as well. Then, he would shoot for a stockbroker's license and by the time he reaches middle age, he expects to run his own CPA firm or investment company and, perhaps, start his own bank.

"Pop started with nothing. Because of the war, he came over here with a dollar in his pocket and built his life up to where he has a nice home, owns some property and lives comfortably. I'm starting with so much. Therefore, I have to do so much more to just equal his accomplishments," he explained.

Howard studies accounting and real estate finance in college. He lives with his parents and his 18-year-old sister. Both of his parents are camp survivors. His 57-year-old father was in a concentration camp, while his 56-year-old mother was in a labor camp. Both were adolescents during their incarceration.

The family is close and gets along very well, according to Howard. His father is the dominant parent and
more outspoken. As he jokingly noted, "When he gets mad, he foams at the mouth."

Although slightly critical of his mother for her secondary role, Howard still finds strengths in her.

"If she wants to, she could be just as good a puncher as Pop is right now. She is not as aggressive as he is."

Howard maintains that the Holocaust has had a considerable effect on his upbringing and view of the world.

"I'm a little more cynical about what people say. I'm not as trusting of people in general. They are usually up to something or scheming," he said. "You have to be conscious of politically-oriented groups and some ethnic groups. You have to wonder what their real intentions are," he said, almost echoing the concerns of the McCarthy era.

In confronting the Holocaust, his philosophy is that the event is a tragedy one must accept. But the present generation must somehow prevent something like it from happening again. In his family, only his mother discusses the subject at any great length. His father has always been reticent. As Howard pointed out, "He doesn't talk about what was, just what will be."

Many of Howard's suspicions about people are handed down from his parents, who have adapted those traits as a consequence of their persecution, he rationalized. But, although they are cynical to an extent, he finds strengths from his parents' suffering, when he said, "They can feel
more for people who are being persecuted today."

As Howard reflects on his early adolescence, he spoke of carefree and complacent years.

"I've done everything I wanted to. I've played sports at school, and basically had a lot of freedom. When I went out, I did not have to call home unless I was outside of the city limits or something like that," he said.

He seldom felt overcontrolled by his parents. On the contrary, there were times when he felt undercontrolled and sought direction from his parents.

"When they put their foot down, whatever they say goes. They've been around a lot longer than I have, so they probably know what is best," he said. "I think we need their guidance."

In fact, his parents serve as models for him to emulate. He already considers himself a mirror image of his father, sharing mannerisms and the impetus to succeed.

Because his father has demonstrated to him that one can build a life virtually from scratch, Howard feels he must surpass that achievement and do more. That is where his long-range goals of being a CPA, and dealing with financial ventures and even becoming a bank president come into play. In his view, simply attaining a comfortable living would not be sufficient, considering the opportunities he has before him. And since his father has achieved what he has without the benefit of a college
education or a family for support and motivation, Howard not only feels fortunate, but compelled to utilize his opportunities to achieve as much as possible. He emphasized:

"My goal is to make as much money as I possibly can. Money is my tool to get whatever I like. Then I can relax and enjoy myself in my spare time."

Although his parents help him shape his future goals, they do not have overriding influence on his decisions. As he noted, "We always come to a compromise on what I want and what they feel I should have."

In similar terms, he does not feel any pressure to satisfy them in any way. On this issue, he said, "As long as I do best whatever I want to do, they are satisfied."

However, Howard finds himself in the midst of a family rift when the issue of moving out arises. His mother basically wants him to move out when he reaches the age of 25. But his father does not set any chronological standard, instead allowing him to decide when he feels he is capable of managing on his own. His own concept of the right time approximates that of his father; he will leave when he is ready.

"Mom does not want me to leave because I'm her little boy. But I have to leave sometime and she realizes that
she wants me to stay as long as I possibly can," he said.

Still, Howard has a lifelong obligation to his parents and would never completely sever the close bond between them. If he were to move to another state and his parents would grow old and need to depend on him, he would move back. He explained why:

"It's our responsibility to later take care of them. After all, they took care of us."
Mrs. P.

Mrs. P. admits that most of the things her children have, they take for granted. These include food, shelter, clothing and a family. But although these were denied to her as a result of the war, Mrs. P. would not think of imposing guilt upon her children because they enjoy life and she did not at their age.

"What fault is it of theirs that I did not have food and they do? Should I make them finish everything on their plates because of that?" she asked.

She is an example of one survivor who feels it is unjust to create a burden in the form of guilt on her children or to impose on them some type of obligation simply because they happened to be born to survivors. As she reminisced about her youth, she too had taken for granted her most valued possessions.

"You didn't realize what your parents meant to you," she commented, while her eyes turned downward towards the table in front of her. That thought came to mind, she said, at the time when she no longer had parents.

Now age 56, Mrs. P. was 14 when the war broke out. She came from a small family, having one brother who also survived the war. Their father died about six years before the war, but their mother lost her life at the hands of the Nazis.

"I was with my mother in Richenbach until the very
"We were spared a few years together before the war."

Yet, she clearly delineated her role as a parent in her children's futures.

"If they want to become something, we could help them as much as possible. And if they are successful, it is because they have the abilities. But if they don't become anybody great, it would not be the end of the world," she said. With a hint of sarcasm, she added, "But I would not like them to become stupid nothings."

All things considered, Mrs. P. does not try to intervene much in her children's lives. Even when they do something she is not pleased about, she does not try to impose heavy parental influence.

"One of my kids is in a relationship that I wish would end," she began with an example. "Howard is dating a girl who is not Jewish and who he is getting serious about. I feel he is too young to be involved in a serious relationship. But there is nothing I can do about it."

The issue of Jewishness is of significant concern to Mrs. P. She is anxious for her children to find Jewish spouses someday, fearing they may face troubled marriages with non-Jewish mates.

"There is not very much of a bond or understanding between the gentiles and the Jews. If you disagree (with another Jew), at least you leave religion out of it,"
she rationalized.

Her own personal reasons for wanting future Jewish in-laws eventually surfaced when she said, "We were looked down on because we were Jewish."

Mrs. P. is concerned to a lesser degree about her children moving out. She hopes that they decide to live at home until they become settled in careers or marriage. But should that not occur, she is ready to face that, too.

The most essential losses in her life were people. She did not have elaborate educational or vocational plans at that time. Her future would have been a menial clerk job even if there was no war. She best described the meaning of her losses when she commented:

"What we lost is the feeling of what it means to belong to a family. That is why it is important to have a family now. Sometimes we substitute good friends for family."

Although her own family fills a void created by the Holocaust, her own children cannot actually substitute for lost relatives or less significant losses such as opportunities.

"They are born in a different time and at a different location. They have the possibilities that I did not. They happen to live in a fortunate place and I did not," she emphasized.

Later in the interview, Mrs. P. again stressed that
her children cannot compensate for her losses. She brought up the issue when she posed the question to me whether some survivors make their children feel as if they take for granted those things which their parents did not have. She emphasized the absurdity of parents compelling children to finish their meals because they did not have such food in the concentration camps.

She asked in an argumentative tone, "Can I expect my children to become something which I could not? I would not expect things like that from them."

One thing Mrs. P. is certain about is that she cannot expect her children to live at home for too much longer. And she prepares herself for the time when they will leave.

"Right now, I would not want them to move out. I enjoy them a lot and it would make the home incomplete," she said. "But I realize that sooner or later they will go on their own."

When they do, distance will not be an issue for her. Living close does not necessarily make people close, just as living far apart does not mean people cannot stay in touch, according to her logic.

"If they live far away, it just might be more expensive to talk to them or to visit them," she explained.

Despite her apparent confidence in coping with her children's future autonomy, Mrs. P. admits to being highly protective, especially to her daughter. She explained why:
"I did not have the chance to be protected by my mother or to have her care about me. I always had a need to hover over her. I wasn't as protective of my son, because traditionally, you need not be as protective of boys as you are of girls."

In comparing herself to her children, Mrs. P. listed several qualities she saw in them which she considered to be strengths. Ironically, these strengths, which included independence, education and openness were traits she felt she lacked.

But like herself, she felt that her children had strengths and weaknesses which included having a strong sense of family, a compassion for others and warmth on one hand and "a tendency to be explosive and sometimes rotten," on the other hand.

She paused for a moment before adding one final criticism: "I wish my daughter to clean her room."
Mr. P.

The missed adolescence of Mr. P.'s life can never be redeemed. But of the many things he did not experience, he has observed in his children. In a way, Mr. P. has experienced his lost years vicariously.

"I see in them those things that I missed and that makes me proud and happy," he said. "Whatever they do is what I would have done at their age."

Mr. P., age 57, was born in Poland. When the war broke out, he was among 250,000 Jews who were relocated in a ghetto until 1944. In August of that year, Mr. P., his parents and sister-in-law were sent to Auschwitz. There, his mother and relatives were sent to their deaths, while he and his father remained together for at least four months. Soon, both were sent to a labor camp where his father died a short time later.

At the time, Mr. P. was almost 14 years old. By the time the war ended, he was 19 and liberated from a third concentration camp in Czechoslovakia. From there, he returned to Lodz to look for possible surviving family members, but he found none. Then he moved on to Germany, where he met his wife.

"We decided to move to the United States, but we had no language, no profession and no family. I had one Canadian dollar which I exchanged for U.S. currency. It only came to 98 cents," he recalled with a sarcastic
chuckle.

Having an aptitude for mechanics, he landed a job which he termed a "grease monkey." Today, he is an established entrepreneur. He is also the father to two grown children, a daughter age 18 and a son age 19. He sees in his children some of the strongpoints which he values about himself.

"Howard has always been a self-made man. He has worked since he was twelve. He loves to make a buck and loves to spend a buck," he said.

Mr. P. conveys an impression of a soft-spoken and gentle individual. Yet, another facet of his identity is that of a "rugged outdoorsman." A cabinet in his living room is adorned with at least a half-dozen guns and rifles of various types.

"They are marksmen first class," he said of his children. "They have been shooting at the ranges since age seven. Howard has driven a jeep down narrow mountain roads when he was twelve," he boasted.

On one hand, Mr. P. takes pride in the fact that his children have taken interest in the same leisure activities he enjoys, namely camping, hunting, and target shooting. Yet on the other hand, he also envies his children, for he sees in them the things that he could not experience when he was young.

"I actually live through my kids. All of my missed
years I see in them," he explained.

Still, he tries not to influence their lives or make decisions for them. He views the role of parents as limited to offering guidance and advice, but not to coerce the children to satisfy the parents' desires. But at the same time, if he were to place himself in their shoes, he would probably be doing what they are doing now.

"I wouldn't do anything different. They have all of the opportunities and chances to take advantage of. If I were young now, I would be better educated and grow up in a different environment," he speculated.

Although he avoids interfering with his children's lives, should one of them decide to do something that may prove harmful in some way, he would try to interject. But even in mistakes, Mr. P. feels there is a lesson to be learned and maintains that allowing a child to struggle sometimes is a positive thing because, as he put it, "It would be a learning experience."

He also sees his children's weak points as not being weak points at all. He commented:

"Like all teenagers, they are a little lazy. But why shouldn't they be? They don't have families to support. So let them enjoy life. When they will go out on their own, they will find out what life is really like when they have to depend on themselves."

This brought up the issue of moving out. Mr. P. will
not set a deadline for his children to go out on their own but, instead, he will let them determine for themselves when the time is right. He emphasized that he will also not allow his attachment to them impede their individuation and autonomy.

"This could create resentment on their part," he reasoned.

When they do leave, Mr. P. is not even concerned about where they will settle down. He argues that there are no real distances, since the jet age and modern communications allow people to remain close even though they are physically distant.

Mr. P.'s easy-going philosophy in confronting issues and problems apparently stems from the manner in which he has coped as a survivor of the Holocaust--by accepting life as it is and by learning and strengthening oneself from life's experiences. He noted:

"Every traumatic experience leaves a scar. But actually I look at it from a different point of view. I look at it (the Holocaust) as a life experience from which I gained knowledge, even though it cost me a part of my life."
Survivors have endured enough pain and toil during the war. Therefore, the last thing they need today is trouble from their children.

That is how 32-year-old Lori explains the philosophy which underlies her relationship with her parents. Lori, who has been married for 12 years, is a mother to two young children. She has one sibling, a brother age 28.

Her 62-year old father was 24 when he was sent away to a satellite of the larger and more infamous Auschwitz. Lori's mother, now 64, spent a year as a forced laborer in an unspecified facility. Her mother was married before and lost her first spouse and a child in the war.

Lori characterizes her parents as "survivors," in the sense that both are strong and independent. The family is a close one, as Lori visits her parents two or three times a week, often bringing her husband and children along for dinner. On many occasions she spends the night there with her children, especially if her husband is out of town on business.

She identifies more with her father than her mother, pointing out that she learned most about the Holocaust from him. And it is the Holocaust, she contends, that justifies her parents more respect and protection than perhaps American-born parents who suffered no trauma of the
magnitude of the Holocaust. Lori pointed out:

"The Holocaust is kind of like a shadow. No matter how happy we are or what situation we are in that might make us feel really good, there is always that dark spot in their history and there is nothing we can do to change it."

But Lori's way of mitigating her parents' past suffering is by sparing them of any pain in their present lives. When faced with a problem, she tries to resolve it by herself rather than telling her parents about it, "so they won't worry too." Whenever possible, Lori tries to avoid arguments and whenever possible, she thinks through the consequences of her everyday decisions, weighing the potential impact on her parents.

"My actions reflect in some way how my parents are going to look at it. But although I have them in mind, I also have my family in mind."

Still, Lori maintains that she cannot stop her parents from worrying about her. Her serious tone dissipates as she breaks into a smile. She begins describing what sometimes occurs when she comes home a bit late and her parents called earlier.

"If I stop somewhere to have dinner and they don't know about it, a neighbor would greet me at my front door and say, 'you better call your mother. I just talked to her and she is worried about you.' Even though I'm 32 years
old, married and have two kids, and have not lived at home for 12 years, they still worry."

Despite her parents' perturbable nature, Lori did not encounter any hurdles when it came time for her to move out on her own. The reason it was so easy, she contends, is that she got married.

"If I had wanted to move out without getting married, I don't think they would have gone for it." she reflected. "They were very attracted to me. But I did the respectable thing. I got married to a Jewish guy."

As she talked about the way she moved directly from home into marriage, she realized that she was never completely "free" or by herself. She pondered what it would be like to live alone and come and go as one pleases and without being responsible to anyone else but herself. "I missed that whole experience in my early twenties," she shrugged.

But as she compared her life with that of her younger brother, she considered herself to be more independent at his age than he appears to her.

He's in a comfortable niche," she said of her brother who still lives at home at age 28. "They clean his room, serve him dinner and treat him well. So he's real comfortable. But he is not independent. People say you can be between two hard places. He is between two hard places with two soft pillows (his parents)."
She speculates that the attention she and her brother receive from their parents is related to the fact that their parents are survivors who deeply value their only precious possessions -- their children. And because this milestone in modern history has directly affected her life, Lori has become involved in an organization for children of Holocaust survivors. She emphasized:

"That is one of the ways I can release some of my frustration about the Holocaust. Another way I deal with it is by learning as much as possible about the Holocaust. I cannot change history, but maybe I can do something about the future."
Mr. H.

When Mr. H. has a dream about the Holocaust, he rarely tells his daughter about it. She would become upset, he pointed out. In the same manner, when his daughter has a problem, she would prefer to keep it to herself for the same reason—not to upset her father.

Their system of mutual protection is their way of maintaining a type of equilibrium in which neither hurts the other, even unintentionally.

Mr. H., age 62, was born in Poland. During the war, he spent a year in captivity. He was 24 at the time. His recollection of the start of the Holocaust mirrors what most survivors report:

"We didn't expect that this was going to happen. We felt that something was going on, but we didn't expect anything like this. They took us by surprise."

His family lived in a ghetto until the Nazis moved in. After the roundup, he never saw his parents again. Out of seven siblings, his four brothers survived, but his three sisters died.

Mr. H. was asked about the losses he endured during the Holocaust. His reply was nonchalant:

"You didn't think of all the losses," he said. "You thought that maybe someone was going to survive."

When the war ended, he met a woman and married her a few months later. This was a new beginning for Mr. H.,
but not for his new wife, who was married before and lost a husband and a young child in the Holocaust. In 1949, they moved to the United States.

Over the years, the couple raised two children and today, the most important part of Mr. H.'s life are his children: a 32-year-old married daughter and a 28-year-old son who still lives with them. He is very close to his children which becomes evident when he said, "They are all we have." This closeness was a family characteristic that continued even after Lori was married. He explains:

"When she got married, she was more here than at home. Her husband was at work and she was here. She came for breakfast, she came for lunch and I didn't even need to invite her. This is her second home, even today."

Mr. H. also finds his living arrangements with his son quite satisfactory, emphasizing that although he lives at home, his son still has the freedom to do as he pleases.

"He takes care of himself. He's dressed, he's working and makes a living." he said, emphasizing that his son rules his own life. But at the same time, Mr. H. is careful to avoid any friction that could jeopardize the arrangement. He pointed out: "If he makes the phone bill a little higher, I look away. He doesn't bother me and I don't bother him."

When the subject of his son's eventual departure from home arose, Mr. H. expressed mixed feelings. On one hand,
he would be happy to see him completely on his own, but on the other hand, he would miss him.

"It would only be me and my wife -- nobody else. Nobody likes to be left alone," he said.

Even when both children will be on their own, he hopes that neither would decide to move too far. His conception of an ideal distance for parents and children to live apart is based on accessibility.

"I don't mind their living 20 miles away (about the distance he now lives from them). I can always take the car and go there. I wouldn't like them to live in another state," he noted.

Part of maintaining a close and equitable relationship with his children means sparing them of his problems, particularly those brought on by his war experience.

"We don't tell them everything," he stressed. "Sometimes when one of us has a bad dream about the war, we don't tell the kids about it. If I tell them, they will feel bad too. Lori sometimes starts to cry when I tell her about those things. So I don't want to upset her. It's not enough that I feel bad?" he asked.

In terms of Lori, the protection is mutual. Mr. H. explained:

"If she doesn't tell me about her problems, she does not want to upset me. She protects me and I protect her," he commented.
For that reason, he is reluctant to bring up the subject of the Holocaust to any great extent. Both of his children react differently to the subject. While his daughter wants to know more about it, his son would rather lay it to rest.

"He says I would be better off if I would try to forget about it," Mr. H. noted.
Pleasing one's parents on the one hand while pursuing one's own interests becomes a delicate balancing act, especially when a compromise is hard to attain.

This is the dilemma in which 32-year-old Stuart finds himself. Although the health care worker is pursuing the field he enjoys and remains unmarried by choice, he senses a shadow of guilt hanging over him because he did not take over his father's business as his parents had anticipated and because he is still single.

"It burdens me because I am not fulfilling them. I feel like I have to do something for them," he related.

Stuart has one sibling, a sister 11 years younger. His Polish-born parents are both concentration camp survivors. His father, now 60, was incarcerated from age 17 to 21. His mother, 55, survived concentration camp at roughly the same age.

Stuart has lived on his own since his early twenties when he joined the military. Since then, he has lived in Central California and now has resettled in Los Angeles. He is close to his parents, both emotionally and in physical proximity. He lives only two or three miles from them and rents an apartment in a building owned by his father.

The major issues in Stuart's relationship with his
parents seem to revolve around a disparity between his viewpoints and those of his elders, in terms of his life goals and their hopes.

"Sometimes I feel as if I fall short of their expectations," he admitted.

Among these expectations is to raise a family. The fact that he is beginning his thirties and remains single is a source of discontent for his parents, Stuart concedes.

"They feel like, how can I be a whole person and be responsible when I live a life without commitment," he pointed out. "Because I'm single, they feel like I'm not part of society. It makes me feel guilty because they are looking to me for a certain gratification and I'm not providing it."

Starting a family and taking over the family business are the two major desires Stuart perceives his parents have for him. Turning down his father's invitation to take over the business was a painful experience for Stuart, but a milestone event in which he asserted his individuality.

"I know it was something he really wanted of me. But I was uninterested and it was something I would have to live with on a day by day basis," he pointed out.

Growing up, he found his parents to be relatively strict but not overbearing or overprotective.

"I remember my mother not allowing me to miss a day of school unless I was deathly ill," he related. "But their
expectations were realistic."

His biggest skirmish with his parents took place when he started college and had an impulse to move out. His mother, in particular, considered his proposed action an insult, he maintained.

"Her position was, 'Why do you need your own place? Can't you go to school and study here? Can't you have girlfriends over here? What are we doing that limits your lifestyle?' I told her there was nothing really wrong. I was just jazzed up about having my own place." he explained.

Stuart read his parents' reaction as signaling a sense of abandonment on their part. Eventually he left upon joining the service.

"In their upbringing, you didn't just move out for no apparent reason. You moved out because you got married," he said. Stuart paused for a moment and added, "Could you imagine me still living at home at age 32?"

He assesses the communication gap between him and his parents as stemming from the radically different life experiences of his parents as contrasted with those of young adults today. His parents, he believes, were attracted to each other because of their similar backgrounds and experiences which bonded them together.

He concludes that his parents view his world from their perspectives and expect from him actions which would
seem reasonable to them. He elaborated on his point by pointing out that one reason he is still single is that it is more difficult to meet a potential mate today because of the vast diversity in people's backgrounds and interests.

"They have a real basis for staying together. But when I meet women, there is no special background to cement a relationship as quickly and easily as in their day," he said.

Still, he hopes that someday he could provide his parents with what he termed "nachas." He elaborated:

"I feel like I want to do whatever would make them happy. My guilt is definitely linked up to how I make my parents feel. But I can't allow guilt to dictate my actions. I have to reach a compromise where I can do what I want and at the same time gain their support."

An especially burdensome situation arises when his parents compare him to his cousin, who is roughly the same age but married, a father and a successful professional.

"They see him as being really productive by making leaps and bounds for his age," he said. "But he married the first girl he ever went out with. Although I would like to enjoy the success he has, I wouldn't want to follow his footsteps."

Although Stuart, his sister and parents are a close family, he is bothered by what he detects as a lack of physical closeness and responsiveness especially from his
father who becomes uncomfortable by physical displays of affection.

"When my sister puts her arms around him and kisses him, he gets very embarrassed. I guess he was just brought up that way," he explained. "My mother is more accepting of expressions of warmth, but now I'm beginning to be like my father and I feel that bothers her," he added.
Mrs. L.

Retrospecting of the times her children were young, Mrs. L.'s thoughts are satiated with memories. But the one conspicuous recollection from all the rest is the amount of attention she gave her two children. And the reason for the attention becomes apparent when Mrs. L. commented:

"I was a little overprotective because we were trying to give our children everything that we couldn't have."

Mrs. L., age 59, originates from Poland and was one of five children. From those five, she, a brother and a sister survived the Holocaust. In 1939, at age 14, Mrs. L. was sent to a concentration camp where she and her surviving sister were laborers. The siblings who did not survive were probably sent to Auschwitz as were her parents, she speculates.

Once she was sent to camp, she never heard from her parents again, nor the other siblings. Yet she attributes her survival and ability to cope in the extreme conditions of the concentration camps to having her sister with her. She noted:

"I survived because I was with my sister. We lived for each other."

For Mrs. L., reminders of the Holocaust still linger even today. She can never rid her memory of the dreadful pungency of the black smoke billowing from the chimneys of one of the death camps where she remained until liberated.
"I still can't stand it when I smell something burning. It makes me sick and reminds me of everything," she admitted.

Right after the war, she settled in Sweden. Three years later, she was married. Shortly after Stuart was born, the family moved to the United States. Over the years, as Mrs. L. had her second child and she found herself showering her two children with attention, she later realized that this attention was meant to provide for her children many of the things she missed because of the war.

"I was watching them a lot and we did everything with them. We have always tried to give the kids the opportunities that we didn't have. When the kids wanted to have even little things, we would let them have them, because we couldn't have them, she explained.

Among the opportunities she forfeited as a youth was education. When Stuart was young and had problems keeping up with mathematics, his mother quickly provided him with a tutor so he could keep up. He was also required to have weekly piano lessons.

These were the things that I missed," said Mrs. L., who today takes courses on occasion and reads as much as she can in an effort to broaden her knowledge.

While Stuart did not follow his father's footsteps into the family business, Mrs. L. seemed supportive of his
alternative endeavors.

"I think it is really wonderful that he chose what he is doing," she said of his health care position. "He explained it to me once and said it is good for his ego to be able to help people."

Mrs. L. seemed more accepting of Stuart's decisions than he perceived his mother to be, especially when Stuart disclosed how he believed his parents viewed him as unproductive when he was compared to his cousin. Mrs. L. conveyed a contrary opinion:

"I never compare the two. Not everybody has the same abilities. But Stuart is doing very well and I am proud of him," she said.

One fact which neither will dispute is Mrs. L.'s worrisome nature.

"I am a worrier," she conceded. "I had many sleepless nights when he was growing up and I still do when my daughter goes out. I just don't relax when she is not here."

However, she worries less about Stuart today mainly because of his age and the fact that he no longer lives at home. She admitted somewhat sarcastically:

"He doesn't live home, so I don't know when he's out and when he's home. Besides, he is 32 years old."

Mrs. L. would not be highly concerned if either of her children were to move out of town, only admitting that she
would miss seeing them as often, but would not want to interfere with their happiness, even if it means living far away.

But she would be less accepting of the possibility of one of them marrying a gentile.

"We were brought up in orthodox homes, so something from that background remains. I am very Jewish in my heart. I would like to see my generation continue through the next generations," she pointed out.

"In the Holocaust, we paid a very high price for being Jewish, and for that reason, it would be hard for me to accept a gentile in the family.

Still, she allows room for flexibility:

"I don't expect them to promise me that (they would not marry a gentile). Love is very strong and they can get involved with a gentile. Although it would hurt me, I would not interfere because it is their lives and their happiness."
Family Ten

Debbie J.

A yearning to become independent on the one hand, and a deep attachment to one's parents on the other creates a sensitive dilemma over priorities: whose needs are most important, one's own needs or one's parents?

These are the two sides to the tug-o-war taking place within 24-year-old Debbie. As a young woman investing much time and energy starting her career with a large company, she has come to the point in her life where she feels the need to live on her own. Yet, she fears that her moving out will be an abandonment of her parents.

"When I think of leaving home, I feel a terrible pang in my stomach, a guilt feeling as if I was deserting them," said Debbie, an only child. Her 59-year-old father originates from Czechoslovakia and was a prisoner of the camps. Her mother, age 52, was born in Poland and was in Europe during the war, but avoided the concentration camps. Her father was in his late teens and early twenties during the Holocaust years, while her mother was a teenager.

Indeed, Debbie regards herself to be considerably affected by the Holocaust, particularly in her outlook on life and the way she was raised.

"Because of my background, I have become a different person than I would have been under different circumstances," she said. "I appreciate life more and I value
people. I don't take things for granted as much as most people would."

Waste was something to be deplored. Debbie recalled how her mother in particular stressed the importance of finishing meals. Even today, her upbringing dictates much of her behavior.

"If I go out to eat, I always finish what I have on my plate. I never leave anything behind because I remember how I was told, 'I was hungry once,'" she said.

Frequent reminders of wartime deprivation on the part of her mother have resulted in her feeling guilty for buying new clothes, until she started working and paying for her own necessities.

"I've been told, 'You really have everything. When I was your age, I only had one dress.' After it's repeated to you, you get to the point where you feel guilty for doing that because you think, 'well, I could live without it,'" she explained.

On the whole, Debbie concludes that her parents have been hurt by the Holocaust and blames her mother's provincial concerns to growing up during wartime. Her father is more affected, as he suffers from medical problems traced back to his incarceration. Her father, she said, was secretly married in Auschwitz and had a child with his secret wife. He happened to be an artist and created drawings depicting the conditions of the concentration
camp. At one point, he was interrupted by the Nazis about the drawings. When they were unsatisfied by his responses, they brought his wife and child in with him and killed them in front of him.

Knowing what her father experienced in the war allows Debbie to better understand him. Her mother, she said, appears as the dominant parent, being outspoken and in command of the family.

But Debbie finds that she is closer to her father and has always related better to him than to her mother.

"We're extremely alike in personality," she said. We both tend to keep our emotions and feelings to ourselves and have difficulty in expressing ourselves."

This symmetrical relationship with her father was at the root of some turbulence between her and her mother during most of her adolescent years, she said. Not only did her mother feel left out when she spent more time with her father, but because she has no siblings to side with during family arguments, she often found herself taking sides with her father, to the dismay of her mother.

Today, Debbie's relationship with her mother has improved and she still remains close with her father. Still, she longs for physical closeness from both parents and admits that this need is something she does not receive from either.

"I feel really close to my mother when I walk with
her and can put my arm on her shoulder. The same goes for my father. I could use a hug from him sometimes. But they are not that expressive," she explained.

On the whole, she perceives her relationship with her parents to be close-knit, perhaps too close in her words. Although she desires to move out, she feels a responsibility to her parents and suppresses periodic urges to tear away.

"It's really difficult," she related. "Other people I know get to a point where they want to leave home and they do. But I would feel guilty for leaving them, because it will appear as if I am deserting them or that I don't care about them. I will be unable to help out at home and I keep thinking about what would happen if they get sick. Who's going to take care of them?" she asked.

Even when she does make the break, Debbie foresees herself visiting frequently and calling on a daily basis. As she examined her difficulties with separation, she theorized that had she gone away to college rather than attend a local university, separation would have been easier. Had she been away at college, she reasoned, she would have had an excuse for not being home and could blame classes and homework for not calling daily.

Recently, her striving to attain independence was quelled by the possibility of her father's losing his job
because of poor business conditions. The burden on Debbie's shoulders became apparent and her guilt feelings intensified when her mother hinted that her parents may need to depend on her paycheck should her father find himself out of work.

"To me, that means I can't move out. My mother will probably say I am throwing away money in rent that could go to help my father out," she remarked.

Nevertheless, she is still determined to take the first step someday to prove to herself that she can survive alone.

"They'll have to learn to accept it. I have to do it for myself." she asserted. "I have to know that I can be on my own. If something happens to my parents, I don't have anyone else. I don't have brothers or sisters and no family that I am really close to. It's scary to think about."
Mr. J.

Some things turn out better in the long run when they take a little longer to happen and occur under their own volition. That is how Mr. J. feels about his daughter's eventual departure from home: it is best to allow her the freedom to decide when the best time is to make the move.

Mr. J., age 59, is confident that his approach will work. His own feelings of overprotection eventually dissipated over time to the point where he no longer worries about his daughter and anticipates the time she will move out.

But his past feelings of overprotection developed for a good reason, he pointed out. During the war, he had a wife and child who were killed before his eyes. That horrible experience conveyed to him the fragility of life and how precious and irreplaceable are one's family.

"Because I lost a child under terrible circumstances, I came to a point where I couldn't bear the thought that something could go wrong with my present child. As a result, I became overprotective," he explained.

Mr. J. also lost his parents under equally grim circumstances, as did most survivors. His father, a physician, gave shelter to Jewish refugees from Germany. When the Nazis found out, they considered him a threat and he was taken away. That was the last time Mr. J. saw his father.
At age 16, I became the man of the family," he said. "Soon afterwards, I went to camp along with my mother, grandmother and some relatives," said Mr. J., who had no siblings.

The ghetto, he said, was a concentration camp of a better class, as it had no gas chambers. But he observed that people were constantly being huddled onto transports and shipped to the East. Although his grandmother died of natural causes, his mother died in Auschwitz.

"We had no idea that Auschwitz existed," he noted. "We just had a bad feeling."

Mr. J., who was an artist at the time, was among 36 artists in the ghetto. Of that group, only two survived, he being one. In fact, he was fortunate enough to cheat death more than once during the war. When he was in Auschwitz, he secretly made drawings which depicted the camp conditions. Apparently another inmate found out about the drawings and turned him in.

"Another Jew found my drawings and thought he could save his life by denouncing me," he recalled. "He isn't alive, but I am," he added, almost boastfully.

But on the account of the drawings, his wife, whom he secretly married during the war, was killed along with his young child. Years later, when he was remarried and again started a family, Mr. J. found himself to be very protective of them, especially his daughter. Today,
however, he realizes that his concern for her was excessive

"You become unrealistic," he admitted. "You want everything to be perfect and you have to put yourself together."

He compared his reaction to the time Debbie first went out driving at night by herself with his matter-of-fact response of today when he said:

"I worried all night the first time she went out. Then I got used to it. Now I don't know when she comes and I don't worry anymore. If she comes home at three or four o'clock, I hope she had a good time."

Mr. J. rationalizes that he could not worry about her anyway if she would live away from home, since he would not know when she was home and when she was out. Therefore, he claims, he should not worry now.

Although he would like to see her living on her own, Mr. J. does not push the issue, contending that it is best to allow her to decide for herself when to move out.

"I think certain things must take their course," he pointed out. "If she finds a young man to marry, the question of moving out will be solved in five seconds," he added with a laugh.

Yet, Mr. J. is aware of the guilt Debbie feels over abandoning her parents by moving out. He described her concern as "ridiculous" and emphasized how he once
encouraged her to rent an apartment, but failed in his effort.

"I found an apartment she could afford and tried to take her to see it. She didn't even go, so I went for her," he said. "If she feels guilty (about moving out), I can't help it," he added.

The relationship Mr. J. has with his daughter is symmetrical in nature, as they are very close and share similar interests such as sports, especially swimming.

He takes pride in the fact that he helped her secure the position she now holds at a major corporation. Mr. J. described how his daughter first applied for a job as a typist after graduating from college, only to be rejected.

"She missed the speed requirement by two words. Not only was she upset because of that, but also because she was a college graduate applying for a typing job," he recounted. "Her mother said she would just have to learn to type faster. But I said, 'no, she should not put herself in a class where she does not belong.' Then I brought her into the society I belong to and helped her get the position she now has," he explained, while emphasizing that his wife doubted that she would have the abilities for the position. But Mr. J. stressed why he never questioned her capabilities: "I know her, because she is exactly like me."
Part II
Analysis of the Interviews

A non-clinical population of survivors and their children was interviewed to learn whether disrupted youth in the survivors influenced their own children's youth with respect to the specific problems of autonomy, guilt and coping.

In terms of the offspring, the key focus was on their experiences with separation from their parents, specifically the concerns and issues related to separation and styles of coping with these issues. With the parents, attention was directed at issues in their lives which affect their child's autonomy as well as issues pertaining to parental guilt feelings and their strategies for coping with these problems.

Upon pursuing this, various themes emerged and these have been categorized and charted separately for both the children and parents. Chart A summarizes all of the individual children's interviews while Chart B deals with the parents similarly. In these charts, no attempt has been made to tabulate the frequency of themes within each interview, regardless of the number of times it was mentioned.
The Child Interviews

Beginning with Chart A, the results show that three respondents resided with their parents and two different respondents were involved in a working arrangement or potential working arrangement with their parents (one woman helped manage her father's business and one man was offered an opportunity to take over his father's business, but declined the offer).

Four of the 10 described their relationships with their parents as being "comfortably close" or relatively free from major frictions or problems. However, the remaining six expressed discomfort with the closeness of their parental relationships. Falling under this category were those who indicated during the interviews that they felt their parents were overprotective.

Related to this and also a part of the broader Autonomy issue was the theme "overcontrol" which appears to be the predominant theme under the Autonomy category. Seven of the 10 interviewees conveyed feelings of being overcontrolled by one or both parents.

Three disclosed that they felt responsible for carrying out custodial roles for their parents. One disclosed how he took his elderly parents places since neither drove; while another spoke of being available to her parents to help with household duties. A third individual pointed out that he felt committed to help his parents once they grow
old.

Three offspring also expressed some type of concern over abandoning their parents, two fearing they would do so by going on their own while one felt he had abandoned them by moving out despite a persuasive effort by his mother to stay.

Under Guilt, the major issues which emerged centered on a burden to compensate for parental losses and strong feelings of responsibility which hinder the enjoyment of life or suppress frivolity in some. Four of the 10 interviewees related that they felt burdened to compensate for lost family members or the missed youth and opportunities of their parents. Six indicated that they were unable to be carefree because of their relation to the Holocaust.

Turning to the Coping category, four indicated that they coped with parental pressures by breaking off with their parents to some degree, either by moving out on their own and still remaining in touch with parents or by remaining at home and assuming complete control of their own lives and schedules. Only one of the interviewees broke off completely from his parents.

Three felt alienated from peers and society, believing they have experienced more in life than most people because of their Holocaust backgrounds. Yet, those three who see their lives as having special meaning may reveal a positive compensatory way of coping with these feelings. A total
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of seven persons, including the three above, related that they are "high achievers" or devote significant time and effort toward school, work or a future aspiration.

Four persons went as far as to state that they believed they had a special mission in life. One explained that he believed his special mission is to work toward preventing a future Holocaust, while another theorized that perhaps her children or their children are destined to contribute something special to the world. This, she emphasized, could explain why her parents survived the war and why she was born.

Finally, of these 10 individuals, six indicated that they feel they have developed a deeper respect for life or special inner strengths as a result of being children of survivors. This theme has been classified under Coping as it can be regarded as an attempt to derive a worthwhile lesson from the Holocaust consistent with Jewish values.

In essence, the results of the offspring interviews indicate that the 10 children of survivors do share a high degree of concern in specific areas related to Autonomy, Guilt and Coping. These appear to be uncomfortable closeness (column D) and a perception of being overcontrolled by parents (column E) under Autonomy; feeling burdened by responsibility (column I) under Guilt Feelings and high achievement and concerns with serious issues and values under Coping.
The Parent Interviews

Parental interviews were analyzed in terms of how the issues of Autonomy, Guilt and Coping relate to the parents and how they affect the parents' relationships with their children.

A theme appearing in some interviews was the perception by a few survivors that their child is a replacement for those who perished in the war (see Parent One), while three other parents indicated that the second generation was possibly born to carry on the family line or experience the missed opportunities and lost years of their lives (see Parents Three, Five and Nine). These are regarded as themes which may interfere with autonomy since the child may not be seen as an average individual, but as someone special who must accomplish certain deeds.

Of the 13 parents interviewed, seven indicated having an intense concern with their children. Although in some cases this was not directly stated by the parent, it was inferred from the interview. In Family Three, for instance, the mother predicted that she would not attempt to stop her sons from moving far away had they chosen to do so, but disclosed her intense concern with them when she said:

"But then, I would have a place to go. I would visit them a lot, until they would throw me out. They are my whole life."

Six parents, however, did indicate directly that they
were concerned about their children marrying non-Jews. (However, whether one views this as intense concern or overconcern would be culturally determined.)

The final Autonomy theme expressed by some survivors was a fear of being abandoned by their children as a result of the offsprings' separation from home. One man said he was abandoned by two of his three children following his divorce. He claimed that his children took the side of their mother in the divorce situation and broke off with him (see Parent Eight). The other parent, also a father, expressed concern over being left alone with only his wife once all of the children move out (see Parent Eleven).

Guilt Feelings was the most prevalent theme among the survivors interviewed. Six disclosed signs of unresolved mourning and two experienced survivor guilt. Some still expressed pain in missing the opportunity to say goodbye to parents and relatives who disappeared and were killed in death camps, or when they were taken away from their parents. Many comments were similar to those made by the mother in Family Six:

"My mother was sent to Bergen-Belsen. We were told people were taken to work someplace. I did not want to part from her, so I ran to her side and a huge German guard grabbed me by the scarf around my neck and threw me across the street. Some people picked me up and I was taken to
work. That was the last time I saw my mother."

Another survivor (Parent Four) gave his account:

"When the Germans came to take me, I wanted to leave my mother a ring, but she did not want to take it. She did not believe that I was not going to come back. Nobody knew what was going to happen. I did not even kiss her."

One survivor who expressed having a sense of no closure with her lost relatives also described how she once pondered why she was left alive (see Parent Six).

Under Coping, six categories emerged in the interviews. Among these categories or themes was a desire by some parents to attain more closeness with their children. This varied from parent to parent, as some spoke of emotional closeness while others implied physical proximity in terms of where they resided. This theme relates to coping, in that some survivors deal with their past losses by clinging to their children who in some instances are seen as replacements for the lost relatives.

Yet, other forms of coping with past losses were utilized by two parents who indicated that they live vicariously through their children, thereby enjoying the milestones and accomplishments of their children and thereby experiencing indirectly the developmental events they were denied in their youth (see Parents Ten and Twelve).

Six parents expressed a desire for their children to have the freedoms which they were denied in the war. In
a sense, these parents coped with their missed years by assuring that their children would experience as much in life as permissible. As one survivor (Parent Seven) pointed out:

"About the only way in which the war has influenced me is that I am a fierce defender of freedom. I want my children to have freedom, even freedom from me."

Three parents also indicated that their children cannot compensate for the past. Typical of such comments were those of Parent Nine: "Can I expect my children to become something which I could not? I would not expect things like that from them."

Finally, two survivors coped with their losses by pursuing some of their missed opportunities. One woman (Parent Eleven) disclosed that she enjoyed reading as much as she could in an effort to educate herself, while one man (Parent Eight) boasted how he earned a college degree late in life.

Too few interviews were conducted in this study to permit seeing more than trends in relating some of the child-parent themes. Still, for example, it was observed that the three children still residing with their parents reported feeling uncomfortably close with their parents, as did one who worked for her parents.

Also, some of the children who reported feeling over-controlled, had parents who wanted their children to have
### Chart B: Parent Interviews

#### Issues and Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Issues Affecting Child's Autonomy</th>
<th>Parental Guilt Feelings</th>
<th>Coping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Child seen as intense concern about replacement by child</td>
<td>b Feelings of abandonment upon marrying non-Jews</td>
<td>c Unresolved Survivor Guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Guilt</td>
<td>g Seeks lives vicariously</td>
<td>h Desires believes child now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j Close-ness through have compensated</td>
<td>k Compensate for opportunities past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the things in life which they missed.

In summary, it may be seen that the parents also share some common concerns both as survivors and as parents to adult children. Under the Autonomy section, the problems having the most significance to this group center on an intense concern with their children and a concern about their children marrying non-Jews (columns b and c). Under the Guilt Feelings category, the majority of parents interviewed experienced emotional pain from unresolved mourning (column e). In terms of the Coping category, most of the survivors seek more closeness with their children and desire that their children enjoy the freedoms of which they were deprived (columns g and i).
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The themes emanating from these interviews lead to a number of important conclusions one can draw about the relationships of this particular group of survivors and their children.

On the whole, the traumatic disruption of the survivors' youth does appear to play a significant role in the relationships of a non-clinical group of survivors and their children. This has been evident especially in the ways in which some of the survivors cope with their losses.

For example, in the cases where parents reported wanting their children to have and experience those things in life which they did not, the children in turn maintained that they felt overcontrolled by the parents.

In addition, while only two of the survivors spoke of living vicariously through their children, the obligation to excel in school, work or other life areas seems real to the children. Consequently, it is likely that some of the high achievement motivation observed in the children was sparked when they realized that their parents were monitoring their life pursuits as if these were their own.

Also, the desire by some children to bestow "nachas" or pride onto their parents can be interpreted as their need to make their parents happier than they are.
In addition, the children also assume the role of rescuers by improving their parents' lives.

High achievement in some of these individuals can also be seen as a method for coping with feelings of anger and frustration. That is, redirecting these feelings into a more constructive outlet such as school or work can be regarded as cathartic. Similarly, high achievement can be viewed as an effort to compensate for their parents' missed opportunities. In other words, by achieving a specific goal in life, the child not only accomplishes what the parents could not, but attaches a special importance to the parents' survival which may be beneficial in undoing feelings of shame and guilt in some survivors.

But this high achievement could be seen as undesirable if it tends to dominate the individual's time and interferes with other life areas or becomes an obsession.

A major area of focus throughout this study has been the issue of autonomy, specifically the separation issue.

From the interviews and resulting themes, one can see that the separation issue is truly a complex one. With nearly half of this group of children between the ages of 19 and 32 either living with or working for their parents, it is no wonder that most of these young adults find themselves uncomfortably close with their parents.

Of those who remain at home during their early adult years, the reasons vary. As outlined earlier, some
individuals take on a custodial role, particularly when the parents are elderly as in Family Three. In this case, the individual finds it even more difficult to exit from the responsibility. Closely linked to this is the concern by the child of abandoning the parents by moving out, as in the case of Family Ten. Although the parents are not older than usual, the child feels obligated to care for them. Also, the child may sense the parents' vulnerability or need to use the opportunity to reverse the control and demonstrate that "I am in charge now."

Both situations can cause a stressful dilemma which threatens on the one hand the child's attempt at individuation and, on the other, the parents' sense of security. Hence, these could account for why some children of survivors have difficulty establishing their own separate lives.

Nevertheless, other children of survivors do not experience difficulty in separating. Some do manage to away without excessive difficulty and, in some cases, break away dramatically in an effort to maintain their individuality. This was seen in Family One.

But at the same time, there are those who separate from home when both the children and parents find the time is right and not on the account of friction or pressures. About half of this group moved out under such circumstances, some going away to college as in Family Four.
In respect to the separation issue from the viewpoint of the parents, one must weigh the influence of culture as a powerful variable. In the United States, for instance, autonomy is generally expected as a forerunner to marriage, while in European nations and in European Jewish culture, children traditionally remain with the parents until marriage. Since survivors originate from this latter culture, their expectations are likely to clash with those of their children, who for the most part, have been acculturated in Western traditions.

The normal pain of separation from their children becomes aggravated for survivors when they have few if any surviving family members left. As a result, their children are idolized and considered the most valued aspects of their lives. Essentially, these survivors have built their lives around their children and find it most difficult to accept their children's moving away.

It is important in this regard, not to overlook how one survivor's own traumatic separation from her parents in wartime allowed her to accept the normal circumstances of her daughter leaving home to attend college. Parent Four was able to realize that her daughter was not being torn away from her as was she from her parents and this made separation a tolerable event.

Leaving home can be less stressful for both the children and the parents when it is recognized by the parents
that their children's autonomy would serve a worthwhile purpose. Although marriage is a classic example of an event which justifies one's moving out, attending college also becomes an important reason to leave home, as it directly affects one's future. To this end, pursuing a college career legitimizes the autonomy and makes it easier for the parent to accept. The child can also let go, feeling less guilty.

Having a drive toward high achievement also relates to this as does the theme of having a mission in life. In these ways, the child may find a more permissible route to autonomy by achieving success which rewards the parents as well as the child, thus ameliorating possible guilt feelings for leaving home.

It must be emphasized at this point that this particular study investigated families where both the children and parents were available to be interviewed and implies that they lived within access of each other. Other volunteers were not used in the study mainly because their parents lived in other cities or states and were unable to participate. But the fact that they did reside relatively far apart suggests that perhaps other survivor families have completely different experiences with separation than did those who were interviewed here. The long distances suggest, perhaps, that there were some reasons which allowed them to move far apart, but we do not know with
what degree of comfort.

With respect to the separation and closeness issues, one must be careful about classifying these and other problems as "pathologies." First, it is difficult to determine to what extent these problems reflect an Eastern European upbringing or find their roots in Jewish traditions and what percentage is a result of the Holocaust experience.

Secondly, it has been suggested that some survivors who were examined by psychiatrists were diagnosed as suffering from symptoms associated with the Survivor Syndrome, when in reality they were well-functioning. In these instances, survivors complained of the symptoms even though they did not have them, while some psychiatrists diagnosed survivors as having problems, as efforts to obtain restitution from the German government. In essence, the only way to receive restitution has been through the documentation of illness (Moskovitz, 1982).

But at the same time, one must bear in mind that although the Survivor Syndrome is not universal, it has been legitimately and accurately diagnosed in a large number of survivors after the war.

Thirdly, one must question whether these problems and the Survivor Syndrome are actually pathological if one considers the fact that the Holocaust was an event unique to human history. That is, there are very few events
which one can compare to an event such as the Holocaust or a genocide. Therefore one does not know what a "normal" or "abnormal" reaction would be to an event of such an enormous magnitude and trauma. That is, it is entirely possible that the nightmares, suspiciousness and unreasonable fears reported by many survivors even years after the war are a normal human reaction to an unnormal event.

The results of this study in part reflect many earlier findings on survivors and their children, especially in the areas of guilt feelings in both survivors and their children; overprotection and overcontrol on the part of the parents; the issue of compensating for the past as it relates to both the parents and the children and of course, the problems of closeness and separation.

But at the same time, many characteristics described in studies on clinical populations of survivors and their children were not seen to a significant extent in the population studied here. For example, I did not observe survivors to be excessively preoccupied with the Holocaust or trauma, overly anxious and mistrusting of the world, feeling hopeless and helpless or pervasively depressed.

Likewise, none of the children interviewed seemed obsessed with the Holocaust or overwhelmed by problems involving their relationships with their parents. Of course, one can argue that all of these individuals were visited for only a brief time and that comprehensive
interviews and the use of psychological inventories might prove otherwise. But in terms of my observations, these people appeared to be well-adjusted and well-functioning individuals outwardly not very different from most American families.

It must also be stressed that a considerable amount of data originated from these interviews and that only a small portion of this has been incorporated in this study. The variety of topics can be discerned from the preliminary questionnaire (Appendix A) and from the interview questions, particularly the warm-up questions at the start of the interviews (Appendices B & C).

On the whole, it is clear that this study of persons who have not presented themselves for therapy, confirms both the existence of prevailing themes of autonomy, guilt and coping in survivor families while at the same time, reveals a wide range of individually different adaptations in these people.

Such information could be valuable in understanding other groups of people with comparable backgrounds. Included are Armenians whose heritage is darkened by an attempted genocide against them as well as the Indochinese and Vietnamese refugees who have faced persecution and trauma in their homelands. These refugees are now starting new lives in the United States as did the Holocaust survivors decades earlier.
It would seem plausible that some of the problems and stresses they experience may share common ground with those of the Holocaust survivors despite the different cultural background. Perhaps their children grapple with similar problems as do the children of Holocaust survivors. This could serve as a fertile area for future investigation with the potential of further illuminating the role of cultural value factors inherent in these issues.

In terms of any traumatized population, it is important to understand the key issues which arise within their families so one can obtain a clearer picture of how the parents and children relate to one another which is useful in the development of intervention programs to help them. If the interviews in this study reflect the problems and concerns of many other survivor families, then it would be beneficial to provide therapy and discussion groups for both generations to share feelings and concerns together in an environment which encourages optimism and hope for the present and future while at the same time help them make peace with the past. The planning and implementation of programs for the third generation must also begin, as some of these offspring are already adolescents.

The field of education should be included in these efforts as well. Teachers, counselors and school personnel must be aware of some of the problems and issues confronting offspring whose parents experienced a trauma of the
magnitude of a war and should be prepared to deal with these children in an empathetic way.

Finally, future studies could explore the issues and problems examined in this study on a larger scale. Such studies could incorporate a larger sample and could focus on sibling relationships and family system interactions to learn what issues arise between the children themselves as well as the parents and children as a system. Future studies of a larger scope, could also utilize broader parameters and investigate families where the children and the parents live in separate cities or states in order to understand the circumstances and issues of such distant separations.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire will be used in conjunction with the interview in which you have volunteered to participate as part of the Holocaust study. Please answer these questions as completely as you can. All of the information you provide will remain strictly confidential.

FEMALE_________________ MALE_________________AGE_____

Please check the appropriate response:

1. Marital status
   a. ___Married, first time.       b. ___Remarried
   c. ___Separated
   d. ___Divorced
   e. ___Single

2. Marital status of parents
   a. ___Married, first time       b. ___Remarried
   c. ___Separated
   d. ___Divorced
   e. ___Father deceased
   f. ___Mother deceased
   g. ___Both deceased

3. Number of siblings
   a. ___Brothers                b. ___Sisters

4. Ages of siblings
   a. ______Brothers             b. ______Sisters
5. Place of birth
   a. ___________ Self  
   b. ________ Father 
   c. ___________ Mother 

6. Your education
   a. ___ High School  
   b. ___ College __ Two years __ Four years 
   c. ___ Graduate degree  
   d. ___ Trade/technical school 

7. Parents' education
   Father
   a. ___ Elementary school  
   b. ___ High school 
   c. ___ College __ Two years __ Four years 
   d. ___ Graduate degree  
   e. ___ Trade/technical school 
   
   Mother
   a. ___ Elementary school  
   b. ___ High School 
   c. ___ College __ Two years __ Four years 
   d. ___ Graduate degree  
   e. ___ Trade/technical school 

8. What is your occupation? If you are attending school, indicate "student."

9. What is/was your father's occupation? 

10. What was his occupation before the war? 

11. What is/was your mother's occupation? 

12. What was her pre-war occupation? 

13. In which camps were your parents incarcerated? 
   Father ___________  
   Mother ___________
14. How old were your parents while incarcerated?
   Father ___________   Mother ___________

15. How old were they when the war ended?
   Father ___________   Mother ___________

16. What are their present ages?
   Father ___________   Mother ___________

17. How would you describe your religious upbringing?
   a. ___ Orthodox   b. ___ Conservative   c. ___ Reform
       d. ___ Secular     e. ___ Other

18. From what sources did you learn about the Holocaust?
   a. ___ Father     b. ___ Mother     c. ___ Relatives
       d. ___ School     e. ___ Reading     f. ___ Films

19. To what extent do you feel the Holocaust has affected you?
   a. ___ Very Much     b. ___ Considerably     c. ___ Somewhat
       d. ___ Very Little     e. ___ Not At All

20. Do you feel a solidarity with other Jews as a result of the Holocaust being a part of your family background?
   a. ___ Very Much     b. ___ Considerably     c. ___ Somewhat
       d. ___ Very Little     e. ___ Not At All

21. Did your parents discuss the Holocaust with you as you were growing up?
   a. ___ Very Much     b. ___ Considerably     c. ___ Somewhat
       d. ___ Very Little     e. ___ Not At All
22. How interested are you in learning more about the Holocaust?
   a. ___ Very Interested   b. ___ Considerably Interested
   c. ___ Somewhat Interested   d. ___ Slightly Interested
   e. ___ Not Interested

23. Do you believe that another Holocaust could happen?
   a. ___ Very Much   b. ___ Considerably   c. ___ Somewhat
   d. ___ Very Little   e. ___ Not At All

24. Do you feel there is enough awareness about the Holocaust in today's world? ___Yes ___No

25. Have you ever taken part in a rap group or therapy group for children of survivors? ___Yes ___No

26. If you have, would you participate again? If you have not, would you participate in one if the opportunity arose? ___Yes ___No

27. Have you had counseling or psychotherapy? ___Yes ___No

28. If yes, when? ____________________________

29. Have either of your parents had counseling or psychotherapy?

30. If yes, when? Father _______ Mother _______
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - CHILDREN

1. What do you hope to gain from this participation?
2. What do you feel are the strengths in your family?
3. Which of your parents do/did you identify with more? Why do you feel so?
4. Who do you consider the dominant parent? Why?
5. What do you feel are their strengths?
6. What do you feel are their weaknesses?
7. If your parents could be different, in what ways would you like them to be different?
8. Can you tell me a little about your siblings?
9. How are they like you, and in what ways are they different?
10. How do you feel about what your parents have gone through?
11. In what ways do you feel it has affected you?
12. What are the most important things you feel your parents have missed because of the war?
13. How do you feel your parents would be different if it were not for the war?
14. In what ways do you feel your parents are fragile as a result of their experiences?
15. Did you feel guilty about hurting your parents?
16. What happens when you feel angry at them?
17. Do you recognize them more as parents or as survivors or do you perceive them as a little of both?
18. Do you ever feel as if you reverse roles with your parents?

19. Growing up, was it difficult for you to be separated from your parents?

20. As a child, did you go away to summer camp? How did you feel about it? How did your parents feel about having you away?

21. How would you describe the attention you received from your parents as you were maturing?

22. How did your parents respond to your growing up problems?

23. Did you feel overprotected or overcontrolled?

24. As an adolescent, what types of problems did you encounter with your parents when you went out with friends or on dates?

25. Did you have to call home? Under what circumstances? How often?

26. What were some things that your friends did that you did not do? Was it somehow connected with your parents?

27. How does/did the issue of moving out affect your parents? How does/did it affect you?

28. Do you feel your autonomy would be threatening to your parents?

29. Do you feel obligated to satisfy your parents?

30. How far away do you live from them?

31. How frequently do you visit or dine together?

32. What support have your parents given you for things you wanted to do, but that they disagreed with?

33. What are some of your future goals? How do your parents enter the picture as far as influence goes?

34. Do you sometimes feel pressured by them?
35. What do you devote a lot of time to? How much time?
36. Do you challenge yourself in your daily life?
37. Is there anything else you would like to talk about?
38. What did you think of this interview and about sharing with me?
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - PARENTS

1. Can you tell me where you were born and raised?
2. What were your parents like?
3. Was it a close family? If so, in what ways?
4. Where did you live before the war?
5. How old were you at the start of the war?
6. Can you tell me about the circumstances of your separation from your parents? How old were you then?
7. Was there any contact after you were separated? Can you tell me about it?
8. What were the losses you endured in the war as far as people and opportunities are concerned?
9. How did you feel about your life right after the war?
10. What would you say helped you survive the war?
11. How would your life be different today if it were not for the war?
12. What do you feel are the strengths in your family today?
13. How would you like the family to be different?
14. What do you feel are the strengths in your child? What are his or her weakpoints?
15. If you were given the chances your child has had, what do you think you would have done?
16. Do you see your child as making up for some of the losses you endured during the war?
17. Were there things which you allowed your child to do even though you did not support or approve?
18. Has the Holocaust influenced the way you have raised your child?

19. When your child was young, did he/she go to summer camps or travel during vacations? How did your child respond?

20. When your child was a teenager, did you worry when he/she was late coming home?

21. Did you expect your child to call you? How often?

22. Are you satisfied with the kind of relationship you have with your child in terms of closeness?

23. How would you like to improve communication with your child?

24. How far apart does your child live from you?

25. What do you feel is the ideal distance for adult children to live from their parents?

26. How frequently do you see him/her or dine together?

27. Is there anything else you would like to talk about?

28. What did you think of this interview and about sharing with me?