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Introduction

Trauma cannot be transmitted to others. 3Gs are not experiencing Nazi racism or genocide. What is transmitted to 3Gs are values, worldview, family interaction and love – not trauma. It is time for this hackneyed phrase to be retired. 3Gs are not suffering from ‘silent scars.’

(Eva Fogelman)

So many of us just have this ... emptiness, and this feeling that things aren’t quite right in the way that we grew up, and this underlying pain or anxiety, despite the fact that we’re basically functional people ... I think it’s an unspoken identity ... through my life, I have met people who ... are third generation and just got them instantly. (Josh, aged 30, HSG interviewee)

What is third-generation Holocaust identity? And do its various manifestations and tropes, often contradictory, coalesce as a tangible category? Sociologically speaking, the ‘third-generation’ grandchildren of Holocaust survivors (HSG) are by no means a distinctive group. They are demographically dispersed, maintain diverse religious and professional identities, and subscribe to a host of different value systems. Not only do their grandparents’ survival stories encompass a broad spectrum (from those in hiding to others in death camps, and many other kinds of experiences), but the tone of the narration within individual families varies from empowering to debilitating. In Israel and the United States, HSG grew up sharing their claim to the Holocaust with a surrounding culture that commemorated, taught and commercialized narratives of survival in the
mainstream;³ ‘3G’ organizations are increasingly visible, offering opportunities for educational outreach, community and philanthropy. This kind of collective HSG voice is a recent and still-evolving presence; it was only in 2005 that 3GNY, one of the largest and most active HSG organizations, with a membership of over 1,500, convened its first interest meeting.

Generational distance and normalization of their histories within American and Israeli life have led many to conclude that HSG are not affected by their grandparents’ traumas and that they represent a graduation from survivors’ crippling shame and tikkun atsmi (self-repair) to pride and tikkun olam (world repair, or social justice). Therapist Eva Fogelman writes, for example, of ‘a transformation from shame to pride in the third generation’.⁴ Though they do benefit from cultural resources and generational distance and achieve impressive professional feats in fields as diverse as law and popular entertainment, many HSG privately undertake quests to affirm their positioning and make sense of the weight of internalized responsibility, guilt or anxiety toward traumatic family narratives that defy comprehension. They seek to fulfil grandparents’ unmet dreams, chart and preserve family history, and produce art that offers greater psychological coherence to conflicted positions and inassimilable feelings.

Based on interviews which explored interactions between contemporary American male positioning and family Holocaust legacies,⁵ this study examines personal self-narrations of survivors’ adult American grandsons. More specifically, it asks how family trauma and its afterlife interact with the particular expectations and pressures involved in positioning oneself as a twenty-first-century Jewish American man. It demonstrates how such pressures and expectations negotiate with post-traumatic positioning. Depending on how one understands and internalizes family heritage, post-Holocaust positioning might complicate or reinforce one’s masculine self-image or one’s sense of being American. Conversely, the relationship one has to American or male identity might influence how one understands or internalizes a family Holocaust heritage. Sometimes these negotiations operate on emotional, even embodied levels and sometimes on dispassionate, intellectual levels.

These interviews challenge the conventional wisdom about the experiences of HSG on several levels. For instance, in his recent article for The Jewish Daily Forward, Josh Nathan-Kazis highlights several contemporary studies on HSG and concludes that grandchildren of survivors are doing just fine.⁶ Studies suggesting otherwise are often criticized for highlighting clinical cases that do not reflect the population as a whole. Offering reassurances about the larger group of HSG, articles
like Nathan-Kazis’, however, miss the individual negotiations and conflicts, often highly important to – but below the surface of – functional American grandchildren. Contemplating a transmission of overt post-traumatic symptoms, these approaches overlook the subtle inner representations and personal-emotional mentalities of a traumatic afterlife in the production of subjectivities. As the following interviews illustrate, the experience of internalizing post-Holocaust identifications is not typically one of clinical debilitation, but of meaningful internal tensions and negotiation.

Some of the most nuanced social scientific studies addressing elements of subjectivity in HSO (Holocaust Survivors’ Offspring) and HSG come from the Israeli context. Julia Chaitin’s 2002 study of 20 Israeli families suggests that what passes from survivor to HSO to HSG is not trauma per se, but a double-edged value of intense family cohesion and conflict – a need for tight emotional unity accompanied by feelings of claustrophobia, darkness or fragility. Her concept of ‘paradoxical relevance’ suggests that some HSG internalize elements of post-traumatic family relations, which clash with their own secure, contemporary lives. Their experiences of Holocaust legacies are not direct traumas but disarming effects of enduring post-traumatic family chemistry – residues of the seriousness, ambivalence, emotional volatility, numbness, protective worry, boundary-violation and interdependency that have coloured their parents’ childhoods and influenced their own upbringings.

A 2011 study by Miri Scharf and Ofra Mayeless of 142 Israeli HSG and their families argues that HSG, like their parents, are functional individuals with subclinical sensitivities. These sensitivities correspond to the experience of having overprotective parents who focused on survival issues, coerced their children to satisfy their overwhelming needs, and lacked emotional resources. Post-traumatic parenting may violate children’s needs for autonomy, competence and emotional relatedness to parents, producing feelings of helplessness, fear, loneliness or desertion, and anger. Parental manifestations of these trends, in both survivors and HSO, included overprotectiveness, mentalities bent on saving resources and abstaining from pleasure, obsessive preoccupations with eating and high scholastic achievement, and mutual parent–child separation anxiety. Though less intense for HSG than HSO in this study, these trends were most psychologically disorganizing when they were chronic, related to potent issues in children’s development, characterized by pre- or non-verbal communication, and when children felt helpless to counter or contest them.

In order to address these multidimensional, subsurface and nuanced ways in which HSG self-conceptions integrate or even spotlight their survivor grandparents’ legacies, this study employs the theoretical
framework of gender (in this case, masculinity) to conceptualize post-Holocaust legacies along the complex individual lines of subjectivity and embodiment.

Theoretical Framework
Cathy Caruth calls trauma an ‘unclaimed experience’, a glimpse of one’s own death that is by definition illegible and overwhelming to the human brain, inducing a kind of psychological disjunction and paralysis. It is antireason, a fissure, an internalized threat, a dislodging of emotion beyond social norms. Conversations about who may claim experiences of trauma are sensitive, controversial and not always productive. I operate on the assumption that ‘reality’ is a context-specific social construct that may be disrupted and that all Holocaust survivors have experienced some degree of this disruption, or trauma, via proximity to threats of death and life-altering losses.

This study does not deal with trauma per se, but with post-traumatic legacy, positioning and subjectivity. Traumatic legacies are not equal in substance, weight or duration across post-Holocaust families. Yet common tropes reflect the experience of growing up in families marked and often defined by internalized threats of death, immense personal losses (i.e. of family and home), and by a serious disruption in psychological reality. Individual identification with these tropes interacts with contemporary realities and available social positioning, based both on environmental context and on salient physical markers, such as race or sex. Complacent American masculinity, for example, the male majority position of compliance with the norms of hegemonic masculinity for the male complacent with those ideals, invites and requires men to operate as rational, independent and emotionally restrained people, thus clashing with the emotional, family-embedded and sometimes anti-rational qualities of a traumatized parent. This same American male positioning, however, corresponds seamlessly with a survivor’s heroic tales of endurance and individual resourcefulness.

To explore what influences and is implied by a post-Holocaust positioning, my study avoids clinical language and generalizations about the experience of entire generations. Instead, I focus on individual lines of subjectivity, the dynamic experience of self-in-negotiation. Rather than discuss ‘identity’ in its traditional constraints, I use ‘positioning’ to account for the contemporary individual’s negotiation of multiple affiliations, personal drives, values, narratives and environmental influences. Similarly, I use ‘subjectivity’ to refer to the self-in-negotiation, its fluid interaction with these internal and external factors.
The study of subjectivity is especially important as contemporary individuals in the western world increasingly resist fixed identity categories, opting instead for multiple (even contradictory) identifications along lines of race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, peoplehood, sexual orientation, age, occupation, political affiliation, geographic region, and other spheres of imagined community. A mix of liberated potential and paralysing anxiety accompanies the larger contemporary erosion of traditional identity categories. Identity is increasingly fluid and a matter of individual negotiation, declaration and performance, as Judith Butler, Raewyn Connell and others stress in terms of gender, and as Herbert Gans stresses in terms of ethnicity, which he describes as increasingly superficial and flexible for the American post-war generations. As the concept of identity within the western world continues to become predominantly individualistic rather than collective, symbolic rather than directly experienced in the life of a group, the influence of family heritage, especially of narratives that do not merge easily with the larger social ethos, becomes a matter of inner negotiation on the individual level.

Taking parent–child closeness as a precondition, Marianne Hirsch’s theory of ‘postmemory’ provides a model of a subjectivity pervaded by post-traumatic family effects. The post-memorial child experiences his or her forming self as dispossessed by the dictates of the parent’s larger-than-life traumatic past, which the child comes to crave and despise simultaneously. This past often frames the terms of the parent’s love for the child as reparation for the parent’s loss, and it gives the parent licence to violate boundaries, whether by invading the child’s subjectivity or by overly withdrawing. Hirsch colours HSO experience in terms of psychological impregnation, dispossess and passivity, illustrating a post-traumatic dynamic in which the child is emotionally bound to the parent and barred from the instrumentality and independence that comprise traditional masculinity, at least in the context of this dynamic within the nuclear family. The survivor parents’ weighty, haunting memories are transmitted to [their children] so deeply and affectively as to seem to constitute memories in their own right ... To grow up with such overwhelming inherited memories, to be dominated by narratives that preceded one’s birth or one’s consciousness, is to risk having one’s own stories and experiences displaced, even evacuated, by those of a previous generation ... to be shaped by traumatic events that still defy narrative reconstruction and exceed comprehension.

Hirsch and others additionally stress the survivor parents’ overprotection of their children. This ambivalent relationship, which leaves the child as
both a negated, insignificant receptacle and a privileged, cherished prize of a threatened legacy, persists in its emotional influence, even as the child achieves greatness in the outside world. This kind of subjectivity is weighted by the seriousness of its genesis, as well as shrouded in a profound inner anxiety about its own right to exist, express, enjoy and protest, even as it draws strength from the proud history on which it stands. In some post-traumatic families, this is the stuff of transmitted ‘values, worldview, family interaction and love’, which Fogelman takes pains to contrast with the Holocaust trauma itself. While it is an essential distinction that she makes between trauma and post-traumatic subjectivity, it is also important not to gloss over what are for some HSG significant legacies of the latter.

Gender is a useful lens for studying post-traumatic subjectivity, because it directly addresses the process, even if unconscious, of weighing personal and familial vulnerabilities against socialized identity and its utility in the here-and-now. Like postmemory, it is an inner component of experience with profound influences on self-understanding. Hegemonic masculinity holds the individual male-bodied person responsible for rejecting ‘feminine’ vulnerability and emotional connectedness. Concentrating on the maternalisation of masculinity’ suggests that, for most men, the culturally enforced male repudiation of the feminine requires a drastic separation of boys’ emotional identification away from their mothers; this binds the boy’s entrance into masculinity with anxiety about losing connection to the warmth, sensitivity and support with which all human infants initially identify and depend on through their mothers.

American boys and girls usually incorporate mothers or other nurturing women into their initial sense of self, because mothers and female adults predominate as caretakers of American infants. Before the age of 4, children understand gender as mutable, not fixed, and boys more often report wanting to grow up to be like their nurturing parent than like their breadwinning parent. When unbridled, the initial fluidity of non-verbal identification preceding socialization fosters the boy’s connection to the maternal into his conscious sense of self. Julia Kristeva’s theory of reaching an ability to live with threatening ‘others’ through consciousness of the unconscious, the repressed ‘other’ within one’s psyche directly relates to the need for masculinities in a masculinist culture to access repressed and repudiated identifications with basic nurture and vulnerability (the feminine maternal), as experienced through boys’ identification with mothers. Hegemonic masculinity upholds strength, control, independence and emotional repression, and it equates compassion, emotional sensitivity, interpersonal need and vulnerability with a man’s failure. While the majority of men do not meet the ideals posed by such a model, Connell argues, the majority avoid the threat of subordination via complicity with
the social benefits that hegemonic masculinity provides for the male complacent with those ideals.19

Jewish American maleness has its own genealogy separate from – but also influenced by – the ideals of disembodied, Protestant, western masculinities. In Unheroic Conduct, Daniel Boyarin assembles a history of embodied Jewish masculinity rooted in ideals of domesticated gentleness, intellect, spirituality and expressiveness. Lawrence Fuchs credits this Jewish male difference to Torah study, the involvement and pressure of rabbis, and internalized religious responsibility. According to Fuchs, Jewish masculinity has impacted American family norms by promoting fatherly involvement in childrearing.20 Yet I add that Jewish masculinities were not influential until Jews became American insiders, a process which in itself required its own forms of male refashioning into clean-shaven, rational breadwinners of the secular American public. To varying degrees, Jewish American men of European origins have successfully achieved white male statuses, adjusting to the dominant fiction of their accompanying gender expectations, even if sometimes working to widen those boundaries.21 To become the doctors, lawyers and businessmen that can finance their children’s education and support their development, Jewish American fathers have also needed to devote much energy to work and American socialization, decreasing their involvement in the emotional life of the home.

Holocaust heritage, however, places one further away from comfortable American privilege and closer to Jewish-based fragility, intensity-infused family relationships, foreign otherness, and the emotional disorientation of severe losses. To actively identify with a grandparent’s Holocaust history is often to negotiate a conflict between the vulnerability of this recent family experience and the self-sufficient, invulnerable traits offered and expected by the privilege of normative American masculinities. As Connell articulates, gender interacts with ‘position in the world order’, leading individuals to base conceptions of ‘masculine’, in part, on their own position in history and larger society.22 Positioning oneself in direct relation to Jewish and family victimization interacts with one’s identification with vulnerability and a sense of unrest within widespread masculine complicity. Within contemporary hegemonies that work to enforce a disembodied male subject ideal, Jewish male identifications with personal or embodied Holocaust heritage cause individual negotiations between identifying with vulnerable roots and orienting as complicit men benefiting in social systems that oppress and exploit the vulnerable.

Hegemonic masculinity, which by definition impacts most other masculinities, defines itself against the child’s emotional attachment to his or her parents, as well as against outward emotional vulnerability and expressiveness in general. It privileges instrumentality and social power
above individual sensitivities and empathy. Mid-twentieth-century stereotypes of the overbearing Jewish mother and accompanying anxiety and hostility towards this figure in the American cultural imagination speak directly to the Jewish American man’s struggle to overcome Jewish tropes of emotional family embeddedness to resituate himself within normative American masculinities. Emotional family embeddedness does not, however, clash with American norms for women. Thus, while more Jewish women than men have been able to maintain roles of managing and responding to family emotions, they are also potentially in a more vulnerable position than men with regard to traumatic family legacies; this is because social norms keep them closer to the emotional weight that sets survivor and immigrant families apart from their comfortably Jewish American counterparts. Vogel argues that female development’s emphasis on emotional involvement and identification with parents, contrasting the starker differentiation from parents required of male development, accounts for why studies show HSO females to be more vulnerable than HSO males to distressing effects of parents’ trauma (as well as for why control studies show females to be more anxious and emotionally distressed than males in the general population).

Though it has been little examined, there is something strikingly gendered in Hirsch’s postmemory about the submission to parents’ emotional worlds at the expense of one’s own inner drives and concrete needs. This kind of submission complicates the ability to experience oneself as independent, cohesive and instrumental (and thus, as ‘masculine’). Even Art Spiegelman, in his graphic novel Maus (completed 1991), depicts himself as literally shrinking beneath his father Vladek’s monumental Auschwitz survival, his manhood and success so quickly usurped by Vladek’s protective and controlling impulses, as well as by the imprint they leave on Spiegelman even after his father’s passing. Mastery over his post-traumatic subjectivity is not easily achieved – even within the pages of Spiegelman’s own self-making do we find his parents’ binding legacy in Art’s self-depictions in prison, crying, in therapy, shrinking to child-size, and ultimately mistaken for his deceased brother on the last page. The neatly organized boxes and panels of his comic form cannot contain the sense of indebtedness, anger, guilt, intense love, and sadness with which he regards his parents.

Connell notes that, at least in the western world, gender identity functions on the level of the individual in interaction with larger social structures, meaning that a subject is masculine inasmuch as he or she fashions his or her self along the lines of his or her society’s form of hegemonic masculinity. Personal narratives are one vehicle of such attempts at gendered self-fashioning. Whereas a personal story of heroism or endurance positions one as masculine by virtue of instrumentality and a
successful denial of personal sensitivities (as does silence in place of a story), an emotionally exposing story without empowering conclusions is a threat to masculinity, which is by definition a secure and controlled positioning.

Methodology and Participants
Through in-depth, loosely structured interviews with twenty-four HSG, I sought to delve deeper into the nuances of personal experiences of negotiation in self-identified grandsons of Holocaust survivors. I found my interviewees by posting public announcements in ‘third generation’ Facebook groups, sending individual electronic messages to their members, using word of mouth, and posting a message on the Bronfman Youth Fellowships listserv. While some responded to my public postings, I obtained the majority of participants by individual message replies. As an interviewer, I sought to create a safe space for subjects to openly explore aspects of what it means to them to be HSG, American and male. I did this by providing extensive written information about my project before speaking, and shared my own position as an HSG graduate student researching gender and post-Holocaust positioning. With the exception of one interview conducted in person and six conducted in typed real-time Internet correspondence, I conducted all interviews through Skype. Real names are used only where permission was explicitly granted. What follows is a discussion of several interviews that illuminate tensions and negotiations of particular interest.

Findings and Discussion
Most subjects reported generally secure, happy and healthy positions. Those who did exhibit or report psychological distress in their upbringings and current personalities usually indicated anxiety, nervousness, aggressive impulses, frustration, grief or early developmental struggles. The distinctions I found were not along the lines of ‘normal’ versus ‘pathological’, but rather along the lines of different narratives about how a lived experience of post-Holocaust legacy enhanced or troubled personal positioning in the here-and-now as a Jewish American man. Responses ranged from feeling that the Holocaust had no effect on identity to experiencing it as the central most important factor for positioning oneself. Jonathan, for example, calls his Holocaust heritage ‘probably the most important part of my life’ and insists that ‘it wasn’t something engrained in me; it’s something that I wanted, that I brought out of myself, and that I sought after’. The majority considered Holocaust heritage a significant part of who they feel themselves to be. Most interviewees related to the
Holocaust on an embodied, emotional level, while five described an exclusively intellectual relationship with their heritage. Often the former correlated with lifelong conscious identification with the Holocaust, the latter with interest beginning in adulthood, coinciding with mature values and interests, and quests for meaning in the world. Regardless of these differences, most grandsons were firm about the pride, strength and benefits derived from their Holocaust heritage. Several attributed feelings of personal gratitude and values of persistence, ambition, family closeness, Jewish communal responsibility, and cautiousness to their heritage. A number of them, however, articulated ambivalence or mixed feelings about their heritage as both important and distressing. And a minority experienced their Holocaust heritage as primarily an obstacle or a debilitating force in their lives.

Important factors related to differences across HSG experience included: the manner in which the Holocaust was conveyed to the grandson, the psychological security and emotional sensitivity of the grandson, the grandson’s sense of sociocultural belonging, and the grandson’s comfort level with his own definition of masculinity. Those who related to their heritage more dispassionately or intellectually often recall a calmly articulated Holocaust education with less emotional salience or sensitivity. Conversely, most of those grandsons who related to the Holocaust more emotionally remembered feeling sensitive to childhood internalization of the Holocaust and articulated a relationship to their heritage that spotlighted anxiety, defensive aggression, or sometimes a sustained emotional salience or personal resonance, creativity or expressiveness.

A minority who struggled with masculinity and/or felt rootless or marginal in their sociocultural context identified with the uprootedness, alienation and psychological crisis of their grandparents’ traumas. Necessitating a process of working-through, these feelings ranged from those of overwhelming grief to feelings of personal endangerment. Danny Ghitis, a 29-year-old freelance photographer and HSG who grew up with immigrant parents who frequently relocated, recalls that he grew up feeling like ‘an endangered species’ and almost as if he were himself a survivor:

I’ve always felt like I’ve had an identity crisis, not feeling like I belong in one place or another, sort of, you know, floating along, which is kind of what has led to my career with constant exploration of culture and my own identity through other people’s identities, always ... moving around, curious, asking questions, unsatisfied, and that definitely comes from moving around a lot while I was developing ... I was moving every few years ... this constant transition ... I got used
to that momentum. And when I was finally in one place, I never really felt completely grounded in that spot ... having immigrant parents, speaking a different language at home, and also having half my family in Israel.

Identity crises or not, many interviewees perceived their third-generation position as a kind of rank or marking, and they responded to that marking with mixed reactions. Some clung to the privilege, difference or exceptional quality of this identity. Jonathan admits feeling part of ‘an elite group, a special group, as opposed to the other [Jewish] kids who didn’t have grandparents who were survivors’. Joseph uses the terms of badge markings to express how he feels especially unique as a gay HSG:

if you’re gay, you had a pink triangle. And if you were a – a gay Jew, you had ... two pink triangles making a Star of David. And I remember that – seeing that as the ultimate ... for a Nazi, I feel like they got points, in regards to killing Jews and things like this ... getting a gay Jew was, like, a high point ... So I feel like I’m a – sort of like a rare breed ... that adds to the ‘one in a million’ – the special feeling that I feel.

A considerable number of HSG differentiated themselves from American Jewish mentalities. Gary admits having a more ‘cynical’ and ambitious outlook than most of his friends due to family stories of losing everything. These distinctions between HSG and non-HSG American Jews appeared often around clashes with romantic partners. Gary relays that his non-HSG fiancée’s ideas about their future children’s discipline and education are too lax for his taste which is ‘much more serious’ than hers. Similarly, Evan Kleinman, whose minority status as an HSG makes him not ‘feel white’, explains:

... even my fiancée, who’s ... Jewish, but not of Holocaust survivors ... I – I notice a difference in her family and I notice a difference, culturally, in manner. Like it’s a different mentality ... I’ve observed this in my father, my uncle, my aunt ... You’re careful ... you don’t ever want to complain about something, because what right do you have to complain ... to not be wasteful ... and you have to watch your back.

Historically, traits of self-consciousness, guilt, anxiety and seriousness are certainly not exclusive to families of Holocaust survivors. In the popular imagination of late twentieth-century America, these traits, personified by Woody Allen and other famous Jewish icons, may have seemed
quintessentially Jewish-American. Considering that most twenty-first-century Jewish representations, however, are normalized and even fashionable by American standards, I would suggest that these anxious and destabilizing traits do not characterize Jewishness per se, but proximity to experiences of discrimination and displacement. While Gary and Evan feel those experiences from living grandparents and the marks left on their own parents, their Jewish fiancées stand presumably far from persecution and immigration, let alone the Holocaust.

Because of this kind of historical distance within the larger Jewish American atmosphere, as well as the distance of two generations from the Holocaust, Eva Fogelman and others have claimed that American HSG grow up without internalizing antisemitism in the ways their parents did as HSO. Yet several of my interviewees do feel sensitive to threats against them as Jews. Evan Kleinman describes an incident of being called a ‘dirty Jew’ by a middle-school bully. Josh shares a similar position: ‘I have perceived people to have little bits of antisemitism. You know, the way they talked about Israel, the way that they question me about things, and it was a hot topic for me.’ Isaac, a modern Orthodox HSG, takes cues from his European HSO father:

he’s the kind of guy that every single movie he goes out and sees is antisemitic. He’ll find a way to make it antisemitic ... and it’s rubbed off on me, big-time ... I can see most things as antisemitic. And then I - I, uh, I see anything that is antisemitic and I freak out. I - I mean, I’m ready to run away into a woods and hide, you know. Because that’s what I - I learned growing up.

One theme in some HSO testimonies has been a feeling of being cheated of healthy parental guidance, of lacking a strong basis for cultivating their own identities. In Helen Epstein’s pioneer study, HSO interviewee Al thinks only in terms of ‘my mother’, not ‘my parents’, as his traumatized father was for him a passive and absent source of shame. Al says: ‘He was completely out of it and I felt myself becoming the same way. I didn’t know how to act as a man. It was almost impossible for me to make friends with boys and, later on, with men. I had no concept of how men behaved together.’ For some HSG, post-traumatic legacy continues to revolve around what parents were unable to provide in early development, such as an enduring sense of emotional security or tools for mediating sensations of threat, anxiety and emotional intensity. Josh, a 30-year-old graduate student whose maternal grandparents spent the Second World War in camps and hiding, shares the following experience of feeling lost under his HSO mother’s parenting, which emphasized monolithic ideals of Jewish identity
and academic achievement but did not fully address more nuanced emotional skills:

I was just so confused growing up about my emotional experience, and what I needed to do and what I didn’t need to do. I knew that I needed to be smart, but that was about it, you know. I needed to be smart and Jewish, but how does that fulfill you in any way, you know. It doesn’t mean anything, unless there’s more to it ... being smart doesn’t tell me anything about your values, your politics, your sexuality, or ... temperament, your personality ... something like ‘You are smart and a Jew because of the Holocaust’ doesn’t give you any sort of deeper understanding of who you are.

Josh describes his mother as physically and emotionally abusive and starkly intolerant of his energies and life decisions: ‘[She] could be incredibly loving, and protective, and really there, but at the drop of a dime, she would just yell, and slap, and just – something would trigger her ... growing up was ... it was ... it was ... yeah. It was very, very hard with my mother.’ Josh’s identification with the Holocaust legacy, as filtered through his troubling relationship with his mother, produced ambivalence and guilt, and culminated in a major personal contribution to the legacy – for Josh, a psychology dissertation on relationships and attachment in HSG. However, for Josh, the Holocaust legacy remains stifling to his identity, associated with his mother’s ‘superficial’ takeaway messages, which, as discussed above, he perceived as obstacles, rather than reinforcement, for self-actualization: ‘You will be a Jew because your grandparents survived the Holocaust. You will not marry a goy. You will ... go to Hebrew school and have your Bar Mitzvah and do all the Jewish stuff because your grandmother ... was in the Holocaust.’ Josh confesses, ‘I don’t think I derive any pride from being a Holocaust survivor anymore, or from a family of Holocaust survivors. I see it as more of a burden than anything else.’

This degree of emotional bereavement by the parent seems less common in HSG testimonies, however, than in preceding HSO accounts. But what does appear more often in my interviews, is the struggle to negotiate family pain and its associated rigidity, mystification and stereotypes with positions of mature, nuanced and ‘masculine’ (instrumental, decisive, confident, resilient) positioning. HSG Kevin effectively articulates how masculine performance conflicts with the sensitive proclivities of his HSO mother, who raised him to walk on eggshells:

my mom always told us to be really nice and, like, overly apologetic at times. And I think, like, over time, I learned that I have to toughen
up a little bit and just make a decision ... she always wanted me to please her, and I think more recently, I’ve been like, ‘I’ve just got to do what’s best, you know, in my own life. I’ve got to do what’s best for me’. Sometimes I’ve got to make my mom unhappy, but you know. That’s what being a man is.

If successful masculine performance, even for non-HSG, involves emotional differentiation from caregivers and suppression of the vulnerable traits that elicit or require such care, an emotional investment in the Holocaust legacy or in the unfinished processing of family trauma may, like any family burden, pose a frustrating obstacle for the stark emotional separation demanded in masculine development. When imparting a traumatic heritage has the effect of threatening the masculine claim to emotional reservation, autonomy and power (which becomes especially salient in early adolescence), reactions of frustration, anger and even violence may ensue. Many HSG learn most extensively about the horrors of the Holocaust around the ages of 11 to 13, a time accompanied by boys’ initiation into early manhood. Danny Ghitis, who had a ‘heavy Holocaust education’, recalls his Hebrew school teacher’s approach: ‘she told us ... the horrors of the Holocaust without any sugarcoating ... making us feel like ... we are responsible ... for carrying on the memory of the Holocaust and almost carrying on the burden of surviving’. Isaac, who learned his grandfather’s traumas as frightening bedtime stories, recounts his own process of violent deflection beginning at the age of 11:

When I started physically growing, that’s when I started getting angry ... originally it was anger at the Holocaust ... probably a six- or eight-month period I remember I was just angry that the Holocaust happened, and I would lash out at most people about it ... but I would disguise it in ‘No, I don’t like this food, Mom! I hate you!’ and all this stuff ... it was always in the back of my mind – how could they let them do this? How could they let the Nazis come in and kill their wives and children? How could this happen?

Isaac remembers that his male cousin who did not have Holocaust ties ‘never really understood my violence ... I would snap, and I would start beating a kid up, and he wouldn’t get it. He would not understand. Not many kids did, looking back on it ... none of my friends really understood what that was.’ Gary, who learned his grandparents’ stories as a younger boy, internalized them as accounts of fantastic might:
My grandfather fought with the partisans. And my grandmother, even though she was a woman back in those days she still played a part in fighting the Nazis. Just hearing stories about how she would create train bombs to blow up the tracks so the Nazis couldn’t transport Jews, you know my grandfather had white dots on his body from where he was shot, running away … sounds kind of like heroes to me. So when all these stories were handed down to me as a young boy I immediately grabbed interest, because I was like ‘oh my God, this is like a superhero story’.

Gary’s process of integrating these treasured ‘superhero’ stories into his own life as a Jewish American man and corporate lawyer involved demystifying those stories but maintaining their impact on his performance of strength and endurance:

today it’s a lot more realistic than something like superheroes … As I got older I appreciated more exactly what was involved with being a Holocaust survivor and what my grandparents had to endure. This is going to sound crazy, but sometimes when I’m having really trying times in my life, or when I’m really stressed out, I always think back like ‘this is nothing; this is nothing compared to what my grandparents went through,’ and that just calms me down. It gives me strength.

Jonathan links his desire to serve in the Israel Defense Forces with his grandfather’s story of losing seven younger siblings and both parents to the Nazis:

The problem was that there was no state of Israel, no country with a strong Jewish identity … with an army … If you could have told him at that time that ‘in sixty, seventy years from now, your grandson is going to be on the front lines as an infantryman in the modern Jewish army,’ you know, I think that’s an unbelievable thing. And I definitely want to take a part in it.

His identification with his grandfather’s narrative over that of his grandmother, to whose stories he had closer access, perhaps reflects the kind of masculine identification Jonathan seeks from his family history.

As these accounts demonstrate, a framework of masculinity norms and ideals may both ground HSG in feelings of pride and empowerment, as well as generate defensiveness or aggression. It also may obscure or limit those personally meaningful narratives that do not contribute to ideals of masculine empowerment. A great-nephew of the famed Bielski partisan brothers shares with me that he distances himself from his family’s heroic narrative
specifically because of the macho revenge fantasies it invites and because of the way it overshadows the experience of his grandmother, the Bielski partisans’ sister, who spent the war hiding in various locations. He explains that, while the Bielski partisans’ story is ‘a beautiful, powerful, and incredibly inspiring story’,

[it] isn’t actually my grandma’s story, and I’ve always had a little bit of a grudge that my grandma’s story was obscured (by no one’s fault ... by no means the fault of the brothers) ... it was downplayed ... everyone wanted to talk about the heroism ... [My grandmother] went off on her own. She was 16 years old and found a way, hiding in various places ... she lived out the war essentially on her own, not with the partisans ... As I was maturing and becoming more self-aware, young adult, I became much closer with [her] ... We would do Sunday brunches, and she would do borsch and cook all these Eastern European foods, and she lived very close to us, so I saw [her] all the time ... She died [in] my senior year of high school.

Testifying to the power of family mythology, he says that his relatives repeatedly tell the stories of his great-uncle Zus Bielski’s violence against Nazis, and ‘it gets more elaborate at each retelling’. For this great-nephew, ‘the heroism becomes too much of a lurid fascination, that people want to know [about] Jews killing Nazis, you know, Inglorious Basterds, that type of mentality. But I don’t think that’s the proper reaction to the Bielski story.’ Rather, what he values is the moral strength modelled by Tuvia Bielski, whose character, played by Daniel Craig in the feature film Defiance (2008), says ‘I’d rather save one old Jewish woman than kill ten German soldiers.’

When Holocaust legacy is experienced as a call to masculine positioning and resilience, it may also increase inner tensions for those males already struggling with masculinity pressures on a personal level. Unlike Isaac, whose initial feeling of powerlessness led him to aggression, Simon, a gentle HSG who grew up averse to sports and valuing emotional openness, felt that his grandparents’ survival was an added pressure on him to embody those unwanted parts of masculine positioning. He states that although the legacy sometimes ‘helps me to feel proud of my identity and to see that I have – or that I should have – the capacity to be resilient’, it is sometimes ‘a burdensome weight that goes against my inner voice, so that can make it difficult to live as my individual self and identify as myself’. Simon reflects on the stereotypically masculine behaviour required to survive, even after the war. His maternal grandparents ‘had more of a need to be ‘masculine’ ... to hunt out [a] living’. He shares that his
grandparents’ and HSO mother’s ‘emotion-hiding’ and ‘stiff mouth’ to ward off tears sent him a message about taming emotion with strength. He describes the dissonance of being a gentle, creative person under a tough survivor grandfather:

When I think of my Papa ... I think of his demeanor and persona being pretty integral to his survival ... a tough village boy who can be secretive and fend for himself very independently and fight his way through ... I don’t feel like him ... It’s a problem in a certain way. I don’t want it to be a problem. It’s a problem on an internal level, because since he valued that toughness (‘When I was a kid, you needed to know how to *fight*’) ... Part of me wants to say, ‘Yeah, but Papa, I don’t need to know how to fight.’ And I want to believe that, but there’s part of me that doesn’t, because I respect him, and I respect what that attitude and that toughness did for him. [He] had to fight his way over to America. And he had to fight his way when living in Israel, because he was in the army. And he had to struggle for making a living for his family in America when they came here. And my - my father did not grow up with a - such a privileged life either ... So, for me to grow up with this kind of stability and, like ... the kind of love that I was given - at least the amount of love ... It gives me ... Like, I don’t have that sense of need to be that classic male, I guess ... There’s - there’s the pressure for it, but, like, it’s almost more like in theory. Like in theory, you’re a young man ... These are the examples in your family that you have to go from, but they are coming from a very different place. ... I have, sort of ongoing resentment ... having to do with what my grandfather and father did. Which is to ... work hard and build a family ... Yeah, I’m trying to figure that out ... I think it’s because ... like, despite the pride that they ... seem ... to ... carry around ... their - their masculinity ... that there is - that they’re, like, missing something. That they’re, like, missing the sensitivity and ... have blinders on to, like, a way of living and thinking that I see as, like, inherent to myself.

The model Simon feels pressured to inherit feels anachronistic to him - a masculine resolution at odds with his own values yet intertwined with his understanding of who he is and where he comes from.

Among other interviewees who experience their Holocaust heritage as more emotional than intellectual, Simon feels it on a bodily level: ‘I think it translates into fear for me in some ways that I can’t explain ... That ... you know, just, like, kind of a bodily level sometimes.’ He perceives related anxieties, especially in the area of his mouth and jaw:
There are times when I see that come out in my mother and I will see her mouth tighten up in similar ways [to my grandmother]. Sometimes I wonder if my mother knows that that’s happening. Just, you know, even little instances ... I’ve experienced a lot of anxiety in the past few years. And I’ll find that I’m – I – I’ll have – I’ll, like, lose control of my jaw in a sense and start shaking. And I think of my mother and Nana when I have that feeling. You know, I associate it with ... with some, like – there’s a feeling of insecurity that I think I didn’t know about my grandmother having.

Physical embodiment of post-Holocaust anxieties appeared also in issues related to food and fitness. Gary and Evan both credit their grandparents’ stories of physical suffering and endurance as motivating factors for their own bodily fitness and athletic persistence. The pressure to eat much and waste little was also associated with inherited mentalities. Brian’s grandmother ‘always got angry when there was food left on the plate’. Simon tells of his grandparents, who wanted to avoid heavy psychological burdens: ‘they just want to give me cookies and have things be nice for me ... I was given a lot of ... cookies. [Laughs] And really, like, a lot of desserts and food. Like, being given lots of food.’ He lists the pressure to eat enough as one of the effects of his Holocaust heritage. According to Gary’s grandparents,

if you don’t have something in your mouth there’s something wrong with you ... everything was based around food in my family ... so if you weren’t like ten pounds overweight, there was something wrong with you. Like the way my dad used food and eating ... at a young age, I realized, this is so silly. I’m not hungry. Why am I eating just because Grandma’s telling me to eat? Like I can only eat so much.

Chaim, aged 27, recounts a similar dynamic in his family:

my father, growing up in a family of – of survivors, they were forced – almost forced to eat. My – my grandfather was a butcher, and his wife just cooked and cooked and she was a Hungarian cook. And everyone had to eat incredible amounts, just because maybe tomorrow, there wouldn’t be food. Obviously, that was absurd, but that’s how they grew up. And subsequently, that’s kind of how I grew up ... needless to say, all of my aunts and uncles and my father were all ... overweight ... Maybe my uncle is even obese, I don’t know. But ... this is clearly connected. Like, there’s no, you know, coincidence ... The third generation – some of them are overweight. Not all of them.
Isaac also tells me that his HSO father ‘eats very, very quickly. And whenever you ask him, “yo, Abba, why do you eat so fast?”’, he says, he looks you right in the eye, and says, “I wanna finish before the pogroms come.” And yeah, he’s probably kidding, but not all the way kidding, you know what I mean?’

The trope of physical embodiment merges with an earlier-discussed trope of being marked, and reaches new extremes in a provocative, recent phenomenon in Israel. An article by Jodi Rudoren in *The New York Times* presents HSO and HSG who obtain tattoos of the number worn on the arms of their survivor (grand)parents from the camps. Reactions of the survivors within these families are mixed, but the point seems to be an expression of embodied memory, which intimately ties the HSO or HSG to the survivor. Ayal Gelles, who wears his grandfather’s number, explains that the tattoo is a constant reminder to call his grandfather. Oded Rebak, an HSO, who obtained his mother’s tattoo for himself and his adult son, tells how his mother cried with him when she saw the tattoo, and he told her, ‘you’re always with me’.30 For these HSG, personal closeness with and investment in their grandparents necessitates keeping the Holocaust’s felt legacy of endangerment, loss and pain salient and remembered.

American HSG ward off feelings of vulnerability by identifying more with American liberators than with Jewish victims, by focusing on family strength or heroism, or by what Dominick LaCapra calls ‘working-through’,31 the process of integrating contradictory past and present meanings through therapeutic narration or artistic creation. HSG working-through continues to employ creative investments in the traumas and losses, but, as Gerd Bayer argues, it departs from the original generation of postmemory in its future-oriented attempt to integrate the horrors of the past into a comprehensive approach to contemporary reality as nuanced, subjective and in perpetual motion.32 In other words, HSG working-through incorporates new levels of individualism and wariness toward definitive or knowable truths.

Narrative, documentary or artistic outlets may channel inner conflicts and anxieties into feelings of instrumentality, authorial confidence, and cohesion. Chaim takes on the role of family historian, doing archival research to assemble a family website with photographs and histories. Evan Kleinman’s documentary *We Are Still Here* (2011, wearestillheremovie.com) returns to the sites of his grandparents’ losses to reaffirm his place within his family and fill the instrumental role of laying a gravestone for his great uncle. The takeaway message of Kleinman’s film, as he narrates it, maintains the grief and rupture of his family past while proposing a drive for future-oriented creativity in its memory:
I have learned that it’s okay to cry about what they went through, but tears are not enough. We have to take power from these stories. If the phrase ‘never again’ holds any bearing, then it’s up to us here today to take all the pain and all the suffering and use it as motivation to do something great. How else do you let the world know that you are still here?

In his interview with me, Kleinman offers that ‘living happy’ is ‘the best revenge’.

Danny Ghitis tackles a somewhat related inner conflict in his photography project Land of Os, comprising thirty images of contemporary life in Oświęcim, the Polish town in which the remains of Auschwitz stand. Ghitis approached this project, in part, to demystify the horrors of Auschwitz hanging over him. Learning about the atrocities in an emotionally charged childhood context, he had developed assumptions about Germany, about Poland, about Eastern Europe, about the places where my ancestors came from, and what people are like now ... I remember my mother saying, you know, some things are just black and white. You just can’t – those people just don’t deserve our respect. And ... at the time, I was like, yeah ... Who are these people to, you know, to live in – in such a place, and continue living normally. It should be ... preserved only as a memorial. And after having gone, I realized that she was very much wrong.

With titles like ‘Parking Lot at Birkenau’, ‘Watching Friends Play’, ‘Fence between Museum and Apartments’ and ‘Punk Rocker at Auschwitz’, he offers a vision in which post-traumatic identification with the site of loss can coexist and negotiate with alternative perspectives, evolutions and shades of grey. Ghitis describes his point of entry as follows in his artist’s statement: ‘Most travelers are unaware Auschwitz is in an old Polish town called Oświęcim. Those who do notice – a nearby shopping mall, high school sweethearts holding hands, nicely-dressed families headed to church – are faced with an impossible question: how can life exist in the aftermath of such overwhelming evil?’ Highly saturated clothing, fire, balloons and flowers negotiate with the greys and browns of camp remains and barren landscape in Ghitis’s photos. Visual symbols of danger and antisemitism evaporate as quickly as they suggest themselves. In ‘Controlled Burn near Birkenau’, the first photograph of the series, a line of blazing orange flames parallels the winter horizon of wooden barracks and bare trees. A man stands in the centre of the frame, his head bent, face in hand; he seems in despair, his agonized gesture fitting expectations of what it means to visit
a concentration camp. Yet one quickly notices a figure bent in shadow on the periphery of the frame, purposefully patting a rake against the controlled flames. The central figure is no longer a pained witness but a neutral agricultural labourer, perhaps shielding his eyes from the smoke or wiping sweat from a tired brow. The vibrant flames now refuse to connote the destruction we seek in images of the concentration camp; they are flames of productivity, of present vitality. Like an optical illusion, the image hums, wavering between the traumatic reality we expect to find in an Auschwitz photograph and the living, sometimes unremarkable, human reality that the camera finds there.

**Conclusion**

Though HSG may, as a group, be ‘more American’ than their parents and grandparents, have more resources and more confidently pursue causes of social justice, attention to subjectivity reveals that many of these grandchildren continue to harbour strong identifications with their grandparents’ Holocaust survival and feel personally defined, to varying extents, by those identifications. Those interviewees who described this subtle inner force did so with adjectives such as ‘cynical’, ‘different’, ‘intense’, ‘serious’, ‘special’ and ‘nervous’, differentiating themselves from non-HSG peers, even while simultaneously describing their external optimism, popularity, success and confidence. The ‘values, worldview, family interaction and love’ received by HSG from their parents and grandparents are not without the arresting complexities of post-traumatic family dynamics, as implied by the rosy pictures that Fogelman and others paint of the third generation. To be sure, post-traumatic dynamics in a twice-removed generation depend on personal disposition and environmental factors. Yet it remains evident that embodied post-traumatic trends and fierce identifications with family traumas persist as defining personal characteristics in some survivors’ descendants.

Interviewees expressed greater security in their HSG identities when they were able to accomplish a sense of perceived coherence, to imagine and articulate themselves as cohesive subjects in a tangible and empowering history, rather than a paradoxical, disarming legacy. Sometimes this was accomplished by an artistic project – Danny Ghitis made the present less rigid and threatening for himself; Evan Kleinman made room for his own active place in relation to his grandparents and their traumas. Others found coherence in fashioning themselves as strong protectors, family men, fighters, Jewish community activists and Zionists. Sociocultural marginality, which sustains greater feelings of difference or endangerment, as well as personal sensitivity leave some HSG vulnerable to internalizing
the larger-than-life story defining their family legacy in ways comparable to Hirsch’s postmemory. Most, however, experience their legacy as a source of pride with accompanying pressures or contradictions to be worked through below the surface, variably beneficial and challenging to contemporary life.

This fall, I happened to meet with an undergraduate who, tears welling in his eyes, recounted the centrality of his grandfather’s survival to his own sense of self. His grandfather had fought with the Bielski partisans and had been forced to stop learning Torah at the age of 13, the very age at which this student began studying for his Bar Mitzvah. He expressed a fear shared by many: that the Holocaust will become like the disembodied massacres of which we read in history textbooks, no longer personally or emotionally meaningful to contemporaries. As HSG, the last generation to know survivors at first-hand, come of age, this fear remains pressing and valid. But the devotion that these young adults feel toward their family Holocaust legacies, as well as the creativity and energy with which HSG respond to them, are generating meaningful and undeniable legacies of their own.

NOTES


2. I take this acronym, which emphasizes the individual rather than his or her collective generation, from M. Scharf, ‘Long-Term Effects of Trauma: Psychosocial Functioning of the Second Generation of Holocaust Survivors’, Development and Psychopathology, 19 (2007), pp. 603–22. I also use her acronym HSO (Holocaust survivors’ offspring) for children of survivors.

3. One of my interviewees in this chapter, a great-nephew of the Bielski brother partisans, even saw his family history become a Hollywood production starring Daniel Craig in 2008 (Defiance).


9. Ibid.


26. The Bronfman Youth Fellowships (BYFI), founded in 1987, is a network offering fellowships for leadership development and advanced Jewish education for about 1,000 Jewish Israeli and American high-school juniors, who become part of a lifelong alumni community emphasizing Jewish text study, pluralistic discourse, and social responsibility. http://www.bronfman.org

27. These reports cannot be generalized or attributed to post-Holocaust experience, but are worth noting. Brian, aged 18, was diagnosed in elementary school with generalized anxiety disorder and Tourette's after suffering from enduring fears of robbers and outside danger. Josh, aged 30, struggled with anxiety and an abusive HSO mother. Greg, aged 34, who grew up with a single HSO mother, could not speak until he reached the age of 5, with the help of therapy. Danny Ghitis, aged 29, suffered nightmares and anxiety. Evan Kleinman, aged 29, felt an enduring 'black cloud' of grief and powerlessness after what he describes as a traumatizing exposure to graphic Holocaust history. Simon, aged 27, lists anxiety and difficulty with his family's emotional repression. Seth, aged 26, and Isaac, aged 21, describe violent outbursts in relation to their Jewish identities in the face of perceived antisemitism.


29. A 2009 feature film by Quentin Tarantino in which a group of Jewish American soldiers, under the command of a lieutenant played by Brad Pitt, commit brutality against Nazis during the Second World War in occupied France in order to spread fear among the Third Reich.


34. Ibid.