

INTERNATIONAL BULLETIN

Red: Gonda Scheffel-Baars, Nieuwsteeg 12, 4196 AM Tricht
The Netherlands Tel: (+) 345 573190
e-mail: scheffelbaars@planet.nl
gonda.scheffel-baars@werkgroepherkenning.nl
Sponsor: Stichting Werkgroep Herkenning
www.werkgroepherkenning.nl

Issue 40, Spring 2015

INTRODUCTION

In November 1995, the first issue of the International bulletin appeared. This is the 40th issue and I present it to you with much pleasure!

In October 2014, Henny Granum and Arne Oeland participated in a meeting in Berlin and Henny sent me a report of the proceedings.

This year, The Austrian Encounter will celebrate its 20th anniversary. I received an invitation to their symposium in Vienna. Readers interested in this event are invited to contact one of the organizers.

One of the readers drew my attention to an interesting article - written by Kaethe Weingarten – which she found on the internet. I summarized the text and I would like to share it with you.

In a magazine I read a moving poem, I present it to you, translated in English.

I came across the story of the Dutch Patricia who wrote her story at the request of two of her nieces.

Ebba Drolshagen wrote for the paper *Franfurter Allgemeine Tageszeitung* an essay on a picture made by the famous war photographer Robert Capa. Interesting to notice that we see this picture nowadays with other intentions than the people in 1945!

In 1982, professor Israel W. Charny wrote a book titled 'How can we commit the unthinkable?' Seventy years after the war the issues he addressed in this book are still important and of current interest. In the last part of his book he described why there can still be hope, that we can learn to stop the disastrous destructiveness of aggression. I summarized one of the chapters discussing this issue.

I hope that you will read the articles with interest. Comments, articles and announcements are welcome!

Please inform me of any change in your email/post address.

Best regards,
Gonda Scheffel-Baars

BORN OF WAR i.n. - FORUM der KRIEGSKINDER- HISTORIKERTREFFEN Berlin, October 2014

Two delegates of the DKBF, the Danish Organisation of War Children, Arne Öland and Henny Granum participated in the above mentioned meetings at the WAST (Deutsche Dienststelle) and the Regional Archives in Berlin's Reinickendorf.

Henny sent me a report of these meetings and I would like to translate some of the information it contains.

The meeting in the building of the WAST was meant as the celebration of the 75th anniversary of this Office, which was founded in 1939. Its task was to collect information about German soldiers who had died, or had been wounded or caught as a prisoner of war.

In the Convention of the Geneva Conference of 1929 the nations formulated measures on behalf of prisoners of war. (POW)

In WWII, information concerning German soldiers who had died or had been injured or had become POW's was handed over by the Red Cross to the WAST. Unfortunately, the Convention had not been signed by the Soviet Union and it was in this nation that many German soldiers perished or became POW's. After Germany's capitulation, the WAST had an enormous task in gathering information about German soldiers whose fate was unknown: where did they die, where were their graves, in which POW camp they had been interned? The information that the WAST delivered led to certificates determining who was to receive financial support as a widow or an orphan or as a veteran.

In the 60s, children of war started to carry out research on their fathers who had been in the Wehrmacht (Army). In the beginning these people did not receive the requested information, because the law protected the privacy of the parents and their relatives. Fortunately, the laws have been revised, stating that children have the right to know about their origins. This change has given them the opportunity to trace their fathers. At present the main task of the WAST, in cooperation with Volksbund.de Soldiersgraves and Cemeteries, is to gather information in those countries where documentation and archives are open to research now that the Wall has fallen.

After the meeting celebrating the 75th anniversary of the WAST, the war children and a couple of authorities – Ministers, members of the Parliament, representatives of the Volksbund and the Searchservice of the Church – participated in a festive reception in the town Hall of Reinickendorf. Afterwards, all participants went to the building of the WAST, where a statue was unveiled, representing a decorated Berlin bear. The decoration consists up with letters, sentences, documents, pictures and so on. On one the bear's arms it says: "War children are in search of their fathers". At the foot of the statue is the document commemorating the founding of the War Children Forum in 2007. The participants were invited to visit the picture exhibition as well.

At the meeting of the BOWin (Born Of War i.n.) in 2013 the plan was launched to collect pictures portraying war children and to organize an exhibition. Since former spokeswoman of the BOWin, Gerlinda Swillen regularly stays in Berlin to do research, she was best placed to be charged with this task. The exhibition's title would be: Missing pictures, War Children 1940-1945.

The title refers to the fact that there are very few portraits showing parents and children belonging to this special group of war children, children fathered by foreign soldiers. Information about the situation of these children in the various European countries was noted down by Mrs Swillen and this information gave the visitors a brief impression of their

fate.

The members of the Danish organization had invested a lot of time and energy in gathering 10 relevant portraits of war children and their parents and documents. Each object was accompanied by an information card.

They had high expectations of what the exhibition would offer the visitors and they were very disappointed to see, that most of the pictures on display presented war children from Belgium, Swillen's home country. The portraits from the other countries were small in number and the information that the national organizations had sent was summarized on a couple of A4-sheets. People had to look all over the place before they could be found.

At the BOWin meeting of October 24, 2014, the representatives of the national organizations criticized the behaviour of Mrs Swillen, because she had not fulfilled her task in the way decided upon the year before. The BOWin spokesman was charged with the task to write her a letter informing her of the criticisms of the participants. Her reaction was leaving the BOWin.

There were more problems to deal with. There were discussions about the decisions in former meetings with regard to the need for unanimity in the accepting or rejecting of issues. The decision that only the chairmen of the organizations would have a vote, was in practice disappointing to people who had done a lot of work for particularly the German children with an American, French or English father. Arne and Henny proposed a change of rules, so that unanimity was no longer necessary and so that other active members could ask for admission to the leaders' network.

It was some years ago that Gisela Heidenreich intended to publish a book of life stories of war children fathered by a foreign soldier. It proved rather difficult, however, to collect enough stories from the countries active in the network.

The participants were willing to support the plan of the War Children Organisation Coeurs sans Frontières/Herzen ohne Grenzen to confront the French government with the fact that French war children still meet with many difficulties when they want to carry out research in Archives.

Arne Oeland will be the spokesman of the BOWin for the period November 2014 until Oktober 2015.

The next day was dedicated to the Forum, a co-activity of BOWin and Fantom – Network for Art and History. The Forum is linked with the Historikertreffen (Meeting of Historians) in the WAST. Organizing these activities is very time consuming and requires a lot of energy and it is not easy to find people who are able and/or willing to assume responsibility for one of the tasks. One of the representatives of the WAST, Mr Söchtig, has given well appreciated help to the Norwegian war children and a group of 25 members, visiting Berlin in the framework of WAST's jubilee, thanked him in particular by giving him a beautiful present.

For the first time representatives of three War Children Organizations dedicated to children of Japanese fathers and Dutch or Indonesian mothers, JIN, Sakura and SOO participated in the Forum. With their contribution, the BOWin is no longer just an European issue, but is now a global one. Henny Granum ends her report with these sentences:

'We hope that they will share their experiences and know-how with us. As Danish members of the network of BOWin, we know how important it is to have international contacts with other war children, historians or institutes active in the field of documentation. These contacts are vital.'

THE AUSTRIAN ENCOUNTER

Dear friends, former participants, participants, future participants, friends and those interested in The Austrian Encounter, *including* family members!!

In 2015, we will celebrate the 20th anniversary of TAE meetings by organizing a symposium in Vienna. Founded in 1995, the Austrian Encounter has since held 17 meetings. Until 2009 they took place in different places in Vienna, then one time (in 2000) in Boston (USA); and, every year from 2010 to 2014 in Altausee, Salzkammergut-Upper Austria.

Given your interest and/or participation, we want to invite you to Vienna for a fruitful gathering remembering the past and reflecting the aims of our work toward the future.

If you are interested in this proposed meeting we are keen for you to respond as early as possible, please to Eleonore! Also, please do not hesitate to pose any questions that may arise.

We propose one of the following dates for the meeting:

- October, 22nd – 26th, 2015, **OR**
- December, 4th – 8th, 2015

The decision of the final date will be made after having received the answers, reflecting the majority choice.

Our proposed preliminary Program:

- First day (Thursday evening): opening session (presentations from Samson and others about 20 years TAE, Dan Bar-On, such dialogue work, etc)
- Second day: introduction, lectures, how the encounter groups operate, (films + discussions)
- Third day: free time for sightseeing with or without our support...
- Fourth day: experiences by walking/talking in several encounter groups and a common closing meeting!

We are looking forward to receive your answer and would be happy to welcome you in Vienna!

Best regards,

Elenore Fischer
+43 1 4033005

with support from Ute Georgeacopol, Markus Priller and Samson Munn

WITNESSING THE EFFECTS OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE IN FAMILIES: mechanisms of intergenerational transmission and clinical interventions

This is the title of an article written by Kaethe Weingarten of Harvard Medical School in the Journal of Marital and Family therapy, vol 30, No.1, 45-59.

I would like to quote some paragraphs of this article and summarize its contents.

Weingarten presents a framework for understanding how the trauma of political violence experienced in one generation can “pass” to another that did not directly experience it, and proposes a model to guide clinical intervention.

She states that the global has become personal. What happens in one part of the world reaches the bodies and minds of people in other parts of the world. At continued peril to all, we obscure the fact that traces of distant past political conflicts surface in current situations at home.

Most therapists accept that they themselves are vulnerable to unwanted effects when they hear about the suffering of those who have experienced trauma, they have been more reluctant to accept that family members, whose exposure is constant, also feel the impact. This minimization of familial transmission of trauma is apparent.

Weingarten states that we typically imagine that transmission is vertical in a downward direction, from parent to child, vertical transmission can also proceed in an upward fashion, when e.g. politicized youth in township (South Africa) created traumatized witnesses of their parents. Transmission in families can also be horizontal, for example, from one spouse to another.

Children are at risk if they are exposed to political violence themselves and even doubly at risk when they are directly exposed to political violence and witness the effects of the same political violence on their parents. Children of a parent with chronic PTSD due to political violence might be affected by their parents' experiences.

It is often ignored or neglected that children are exposed to the effects on their family members of political violence that the children did not experience themselves.

The antecedents of troubled times in families may reach back to political events that no one links to today's problems. Or contemporary political struggles in other parts of the globe may stimulate memories of past conflict experienced by adults that disrupt their present functioning. Current political violence, such as the war in Iraq, may directly or indirectly affect families, linking to pain associated with past events of issues of loss.

Weingarten defines political violence as “those acts of an inter-group nature that are seen by those on both sides, or on one sides, to constitute violent behavior carried out in order to influence power relations between the two sets of participants.”(1)

The concept of witness

Violence is often portrayed as a two-person encounter between a victim and a perpetrator. In fact, a considerable amount of violence has witnesses, whether at the moment of the violent act or later. Herman stated that, “Witnesses as well as victims are subject to the dialectic of trauma” (2). But witnessing violence is no subject in an electronic database, whereas victimization is present with 6000 references. One problem is the fact that there are multiple definitions of what constitutes witnessing, among which are categories such as seeing, hearing, or being used in a direct event of violence; viewing it in the media; and subsequent knowledge of another's victimization. There is still no consensus definition of witnessing, but there are excellent reviews of empirical data on children's witnessing community and domestic violence. There is a growing literature on child witnesses to

political violence, including armed conflict and war. Historically, research into the effects of political violence on children began in the 1960s when social scientists began to study the psychological effects of the Holocaust after the 'conspiracy of silence' of the 1950s (3). Initial studies reported psychological problems in both survivors and their children. In the 1970s, many scientists became concerned about the validity of the findings, on methodological and philosophical grounds. Solkoff (4) suggested two new avenues of study: what is the meaning and impact of any parental trauma on a child, and do parents confer strengths to children because of their histories of traumatization?

James Hatley (5) wrote: "By witness is meant a mode of responding to the other's plight that.... becomes an ethical involvement.[...].We find that our witness of the other who suffers, is itself suffered. But this suffering is not one of empathy, which is to say a suffering that would find in its own discomfort a comparison to what the victim has suffered....We suffer, so to speak, the impossibility of suffering the other's suffering." What does it mean for a child to be "summoned to attentiveness" to register the parents "wounding" as a subjective blow? How does a child deal with the "impossibility of suffering the other's suffering?"

Witness Positions

Weingarten introduces a witnessing schema that is of particular relevance to this article. Using a two by two grid, four witness positions are created by the intersection of awareness and empowerment. It makes a difference to the witness - and to the family, community and wider society - whether one is aware or unaware of the meaning and significance of what one is witnessing and also a difference depending on whether one feels empowered or not in relation to what one witnesses. Crucially, witness positions can change.

Witness position 1 is the most desirable, for people are aware – cognizant and mindful of the implications – and have an idea about how to take effective action in relation to that which they observe. For example, a woman whose grandfather survived the Armenian genocide stands with the Women in Black in their weekly silent vigils to act constructively on her abhorrence of ethnic hatred.

Witness Position 2 represents the most toxic condition for others, because people are unaware of the meaning and significance to the victim of what they are witnessing, but are empowered in relation to the situation. A person in this position is most likely to do harm, "do" refers to omissions as well as commissions. For example, a child watches a parent chide the family's Latina domestic worker for requesting a day off to attend problems with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, ultimately inducing sufficient guilt for the woman to withdraw her request. The child, taking cues from the parent, ignores the woman's requests for the rest of the day.

Witness Position 3 depicts a person who is unaware of the meaning and significance of what she is witnessing and therefore does not – cannot – act in relation to that to which she is exposed. Many daughters of WWII veterans describe not having known what their fathers did during the war until after their deaths. It is only in retrospect that they are able to account for their father's moods and behaviors and its effects on their own lives. But how is one affected by that which one does not consciously perceive? What are the consequences of becoming aware after the fact of that which one was unaware at the time?

Witness Position 4 represents the position that people experience with the most evident distress. People are aware of the meaning of what they are witnessing but feel helpless or ineffective in relation to it. Children who know their parents have suffered trauma but feel powerless to comfort them are in one of life's most painful predicaments.

Mechanisms of trauma transmission: the making of a witness

Weingarten restricts in this article trauma to that of political violence. Parents may be traumatized by political violence in a number of ways – political conflicts, war, genocide, internments, politically motivated tyranny, repressive regimes, colonial rule and slavery; having served in the military, peacekeeping forces or humanitarian organizations; having immigrated from regions that erupted with political violence and so on.

The author has selected four categories of mechanisms of transmission of trauma: biological, psychological, familial and societal. No mechanism alone is *the* answer to how trauma “passes” from one generation to the next; none is incontrovertible; and none can be neatly separated from the others.

What is passed is not the trauma itself, but its impact. If one lives with a parent who has suffered from political trauma, one may acquire vulnerabilities one might not otherwise have, but one also has opportunities to develop resilient coping skills that one might not have had.(6)

Bessel van der Kolk has written extensively about the biological and neurophysiologic aspects of trauma, referring memorably to the fact that “the body keeps the score” (7) Yehuda and her colleagues focused in their studies on the vicissitudes of cortisol in sample of Vietnam veterans and survivors of the Holocaust, among other groups. Children may develop vulnerability to PTSD if they grow up in a home in which they are subject to emotional abuse, as those children who grew up with parents who had PTSD related to the Holocaust often did. The vulnerability can be ascertained by the biological marker of low cortisol levels (which may contribute to subsequent biological abnormalities in responding to traumatic events) and may be related to distorted cognitions about the world and the self that develop in the home and predispose children to develop PTSD if exposed to a traumatic event. One question is whether there may be some survival value for the species for parents to pass on to their children sensitivity to danger such that they may better prepared to face subsequent challenges. Openness to this perspective can check us from prematurely assuming that the transmission of a biological vulnerability to PTSD is necessarily “bad”.

Psychological Mechanisms

The distinction between psychological and familial mechanisms of transmission is difficult to make and may appear arbitrary. The criterion the author used is whether the mechanism results in the persuasive diffusion of meaning (emotional tone, belief, theme) throughout the family or remains local to an individual or dyad.

Although researchers may focus on different aspects of 'attachment' (e.g feminists challenge the theory's sensitivity to social context as a crucial influence on the attachment system), no one debates the importance of “attachments”, that is loving relationships that provide protection, comfort, and security. Recent work investigates how “outside systems and conditions” such as community violence can affect attachment in families.

Researchers hypothesize that the attachment system suffers when the caretaker is a “frightened or frightening caregiver whose current mental state is characterized by lack of resolution of loss or trauma”, resulting in inconsistent behavior with his or her children. Experiences of political violence might create extreme fear in caretakers, leading to frightened or frightening behavior.

Projective identification is one psychological process that has been hypothesized as a means of coping with the lasting effects of political violence. Projecting unacceptable feelings on to another is part of ordinary social interaction. It becomes pathological when the projection is rigidly maintained and when the person who is projected upon is unable to

resist or to challenge the contents of what is projected. Parents who have suffered from political violence may use projective identification for purposes of self-healing, “unconsciously using their children as a means of psychic recovery”.(8)

Men, who are routinely socialized to deny fear, are particularly vulnerable to projecting fear during and in the aftermath of political violence, a context in which fear is endemic. One WWII veteran consistently belittled his young son about his athletic prowess, shaming him on the athletic fields in front of his friends. Later in life, he confided in his son how terrified he had been of being humiliated by his superior officer during his military service.

In *The Other Hand* novelist Metzger (9) depicts a father's use of projective identification in an encounter with his son, who cries out in apparent fear at his father's sudden appearance and the freezing blast of cold air that assails him as his father's enter. The son's frightened demeanor enrages the father, who cannot bear to see in his son the emotion that he denies. He tells him that he will help his son to learn to be “friends” with the cold. He sends him outdoors and hours later the child is still outdoors, kissing the snow, oblivious to the fact that the skin of his lips is sticking to the ice. Trapped by his father's disavowal of fear, the boy cannot register the danger he is in, not being able to respond to sensations of cold nor pain.

Familial Mechanisms

Silence is a key mechanism by which trauma in one generation is communicated to the next. Silence can communicate a wealth of meanings: don't go there; don't say that; don't touch; too much; too little; this hurts; this doesn't. But why the territory is as it is cannot be read from the map of silence.

Sometimes silence is total, sometimes it is pocked with speech. Children in families in which speechlessness dominates and few facts have been disclosed may fantasize details to imagine the parental trauma. Silence may follow disclosure, like waves overtaking castles in the sand.

Parents who have suffered from experiences related to political violence know that the world can be a dangerous place. Depending on the experiences they have had, they may also believe that humans are capable of sadistic or indifferent cruelty. Personal assumptions about the world and the self are shattered, e.g. that the world is benevolent and meaningful and the self is worthy.

A parental imperative is to keep one's children from harm. Warning children about danger is a primary means of safeguarding them. However, when the warnings themselves terrify and have the potential to harm, parents are in a terrible bind.

Parents often unconsciously strike a compromise, using one “channel” to tell and one to conceal. They may symbolically communicate the message or respond only when stimuli remind them of their experiences. A mother, arrived in England in the framework of the Kindertransporte, never directly told her daughter a sequential narrative of her memories of her years with her adoptive family. Instead, she would telegraph information to the daughter in situations that she could only imagine were evocative. E.g. her mother would withdraw into icy coldness when her daughter would disagree with her, telling her she had no idea how lucky she was to have a mother at all. Or, she would be dismissive about cards the daughter produced in school for Mother's Day, speaking sarcastically about how little “Americans” understood about hardship.

This kind of communication is of the sort that family therapists are adept at deconstructing with families.

Societal Mechanisms

Silence operates at the individual, family, and national level, often in an interlinked fashion such that the silence at one level takes on additional meanings by its association with other levels. As has been discussed, silence is multifaceted and co-occurs with numbers of

other phenomena. Shame, a painful affect in which one feels exposed as "undamentally deficient in some vital ways as a human being"(10) is one of them. As with silence, shame exists at the individual, family and national level. If silence incubates fear, shame incubates violence, often retaliatory violence (Gilligan). Shame, thus, also plays a role in the transmission of trauma from one generation to the next.

Regional and national experiences of shame, perhaps more aptly called humiliation, are seen as central to the ways that trauma passes collectively from members of one generation to the next. Persons or groups who are humiliated are meant to feel put down or taken down, In those societies in which preserving the dignity of all persons is felt to be essential, humiliation can take on traumatic dimensions, not just at the level of individual persons but of the group as a whole.

When whole groups are humiliated and must swallow their resentment, the desire for revenge builds. Children who see, know or intuit that their parents or grandparents have been humiliated are particularly vulnerable to developing retaliatory fantasies. When one generation fails to restore social and political equality, this failure forms the next generation's legacy.

"Within virtually every large group there exists a shared mental representation of a traumatic past event during which the large group suffered loss and/or experienced helplessness, shame and humiliation in a conflict with another large group. The transgenerational transmission of such a shared traumatic event is linked to the past generation's inability to mourn losses of people, land or prestige, and indicates the large group's failure to reverse...humiliation inflicted by another large group, usually a neighbor, but in some cases, between ethnic or religious groups within the same country (11)

As to the situation of African Americans, the legacy of slavery is passed unconsciously from one generation to the next but intersects with the conscious knowledge of current discrimination and racism. African-American children are confronted by powerlessness in their current circumstances, unconsciously burdened by the expectations and hope that they can redeem the history of brutal violence. They perceive the need to reverse the humiliation, but are blocked from doing so. Societal mechanisms of intergenerational transmission of trauma contribute to a "transfer of destructive aggression from one generation to the next."(12)

Clinical implications

Weingarten states that the purpose of gaining familiarity with intergenerational mechanisms of transmission is to ground therapists solidly in the knowledge that this transmission occurs, so that they can incorporate this domain into the dialogue with their clients, children or parents. It is crucial to understand the role of the child as witness to the effects of political violence, since it provides avenues for understanding and change.

Weingarten presents four cases, one is that of Mara. She is the child of a father and a mother who fled from China in 1948, because they were anti-Mao. Her father had found a job appropriate to his Chinese education and training, her mother not. Her parents never spoke about how they met and her mother could not answer right away if she loved her husband. Mara developed bulimia and suffered from depressive feelings. In therapy, Mara realized that her bulimia was an embodied symbolic expression of her fantasy of her mother's story, which she believed was one of loss and compromise. The bulimia kept her thin, closer to her mother's expectation of how a Chinese woman should look like. It led her to date men and then reject them for fear they would discover her eating disorder. It sapped her energy both physically and psychologically, leading to an inconsistent academic performance – a complex expression of loyalty, honoring her parents' wish for

her to succeed, but always on the brink of “losing everything”. In this way she allied herself with the professional limits that forced immigration had caused her mother. As she made connections between the bulimia and what she had witnessed and imagined, she gained more options. Bulimia no longer served as the solution to her family legacies.

Parents wish to protect their children from the horrors that exist in the world. When those horrors are ones that people inflict on each other, the urge to shield children from knowing about this is even greater. However, the wisdom of the ages, whether literary or clinical, encourages us to resist the temptation to conceal and instead find safe ways to reveal. For a clinician, the task is to create a safe context for whomever he or she is working with to begin to describe and later to integrate the political dimensions into the narrative of the person or family's life. This narrative always has at least three aspects; the story of the political violence itself; the story of the effects on the parent or parents; and the impact on the child, regardless of age. It is important for the clinician to have in mind that the impact usually confers both vulnerabilities and strengths to the child.

Awareness alone, however, does not bring relief. Referring back to the witness positions, we can see that awareness must be coupled with empowerment. Although the “doing” may be symbolic or literal, it is especially helpful when the doing permits a “physical experience of efficacy and purpose” (13), when it is in solidarity with others who are actually or imaginatively present.

Sometimes remembering and grief are the most challenging and courageous responses to legacies of political violence. Mourning the pain and losses suffered by the previous generations is a major contribution to acknowledging the past and securing the future by repairing the present.

Notes.

1. Cairns, E. (1996). *Children and political violence*. Cambridge, M.A: Blackwell
2. Herman, J.L. (1992). *Trauma and recovery*. New York: Basic Books. p.2
3. Danieli, Y. (1984) Psychotherapists' participation in the conspiracy of silence about the Holocaust. *Psychoanalytic Psychology* 1 (1), 23-42.
4. Solkoff, N. (1992). Children of survivors of the Nazi Holocaust: A critical review of the literature. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 62, 342-358
5. Hatley, J. (2000). *Suffering witness: The quandary of responsibility after the irreparable*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
6. Novac, A., & Hubert-Schneider, S. (1998). Acquired vulnerability: Comorbidity in patient population of adult offspring of Holocaust survivor. *American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 19, 45-58.
7. van der Kolk, B.A. (1996). The body keeps score: Approaches to the psychobiology of posttraumatic stress disorder. In B.A. van der Kolk, & A.C. McFarlane (Eds), *Traumatic stress: The effects of overwhelming experience on mind, body, and society* (pp.214-241). New York: Guilford Press.
8. Rowland-Klein, D. & Dunlop, R. (1998). The transmission of trauma across generations: identification with parental trauma in children of Holocaust survivors. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 32, 358-369
9. Metzger, D. (2000). *The other hand*. Los Angeles, CA: Red Hen Press.
10. Kaufman, G. (1992). *Shame: The power of caring*. Rochester, VT: Schenkman Books.
11. Volkan, V.d. (2001) Transgenerational transmissions and chosen traumas: An aspect of large-group identity. *Group Analysis*, 34, 79-97.
12. Apprey, M. (1999). Reinventing the self in the face of received transgenerational hatred in the African American community. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 1, 131-143.
13. van der Kolk, B.A. (2002). Posttraumatic therapy in the age of neuroscience. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 12, 381-392.

I did not mention all the notes Weingarten gave in her article. The list of references would be too long for the IB. People interested in the original text can find it on the internet.

INJURED

I would like to banish the war from my thoughts
and watch the reed waving its stalks,
the ditch and its rippling waters -
but I cannot forget, I cannot.....
I give way to the intense enjoyment
of the first sunny day of the year,
of the tender buds in the hazel-nut tree,
of the blue sky and its promise of rain,
of the cover of rime on the fodder beets' leaves, -
will there ever be healing from the war?
Milk white haze takes off from the soil,
its cool breath kisses my mouth;
o heart, that didn't find peace,
be happy, one day, to-day -
will there ever be healing from the war?

Henk Fedder (abridged poem)
translation GSB

PATRICIA'S STORY

Patricia wrote her story at the request of two of her nieces. She starts with drawing their attention to the differences between societal situations just before, during and after the war and the first years of the 21st century.

In the 40s children lived in a world that was restricted to home, school, village/town and youth club. Television and radio did not interfere with their lives. If their parents read a paper, they did not inform their children about the news, local or national. The opinions of adults and teachers could not be questioned and especially grandfather's opinion stood above any doubt. Children were to obey their parents and teachers, to keep silent and to do their best. The rules were simple: don't yell, don't cry, be healthy, don't run and don't make any noise. Children were to control their emotions, at any price.

That was Patricia's world when World War Two began. She had learned about the invasion of Poland in August 1939, but to her war was something like the story of Old Shatterhand. But when in the early morning of May 10, 1940, German soldiers blew up the bridge across the river IJssel, Patricia and her family woke up in panic, since their house stood at just some hundreds of metres from that bridge. Grandfather ran to the radio and grandmother burst out in tears, crying: 'O God, war has begun.' Her crying grandmother, always so controlled, shocked Patricia; this coloured her memory of the first days of war. People did not know how to react to the news. They buried wine and beer in their gardens to prevent German soldiers from becoming drunk and committing atrocities under the influence of alcohol. People hoarded food and bread, in the hope that the war would not last long, because, of course, England would send soldiers to chase the Germans back home.

The next day people watched the German soldiers entering the town and especially the children were thrilled, because they had never seen a soldier before. Their camouflage, their weapons, their tanks, everything was of a strange, fascinating beauty to them. Only 5 days later, the Dutch army capitulated, war was over, occupation began.

Very soon they learned what it meant to be occupied under German rule. Houses were to be darkened, sirens were installed, the population received instructions on how to react in case of alarm. The street lamps were out, people had to use pocket torches, and later on there was a curfew after 8 o'clock. The distribution of food and clothes was problematical and each family received a restricted number of coupons without which they could not buy anything. Very soon, especially the products which were imported from abroad became scarce. But people were inventive and set up a system of exchange in second/third/fourth-hand goods. In the last year of the Occupation fuel was running out and people collected wood at any place where this was possible.

In June 1940, the Germans claimed Patricia's school building and turned it into their local headquarters. Children were sent to other schools, but the classrooms were too small to give them all a place. So the teachers organized a shift schedule: one part of the pupils went to school in the morning, from 8 till half past 12 and the other part from 1 till 5 o'clock. In 1941 the Germans forbade youth organizations like Scouting and Patricia did not understand why.

The presence of the Germans divided the nation. Some people opposed the occupiers, others supported them and most of the people simply tried to go on with their lives by obeying the enemy when there was no other option, zigzagging between their rules and their own conscience. There were several different motives for supporting the Germans: people embraced the Nazi ideology (Patricia's grandparents), or they hoped to end their jobless existence and find a job and new wealth, and others simply were opportunists who would have supported all other victors.

To Patricia and her brothers and sisters school became an unpleasant place. Their schoolmates refused to play with them and shouted: 'Your father is a Nazi' (which was not true, he did not join the Dutch NSB Party). Grandfather proposed to them that they should join the German School that had been founded for the children of German families and of high ranking members of the NSB. Patricia and her brothers did not yet speak German and in the beginning the German children belittled and ridiculed them. The Dutch children learned German songs and when the weather was nice they marched through the streets singing those songs. They had to learn the old Gothic letters Germans still used for their printing and writing.

In the autumn of 1941, all the pupils of this German School were sent by train to Erlangen, near Nuremberg, for a 6-week-stay in the framework of the Kinderlandverschickung. Patricia and two of her brothers (Mark 10, Sas 7) were among these children, but they did not like their stay there at all.

Grandfather had accepted a job at the Department of Art and Culture in The Hague and his grandson Jelle lived with him and visited the German secondary grammar school there. Meanwhile grandmother wanted Mark and Patricia to be sent to the German Schools for National-Socialist Political Education in Valkenburg and in Heythuysen, both in the south of the Netherlands. Access to these schools was not easily acquired, the pupils had to go through physical and intelligence tests. Children of all regions of the Netherlands who had come through the first tests, were to present themselves at the national test week, where only the best were accepted. Patricia as well as her brother Mark came through, but they did not feel happy at all. It meant that they had to leave home and to live by themselves, only 11 and 12 years old.

Life in the German boarding school was regulated from early in the morning till bedtime. There were 3 age groups and each group had a living room to spend their free time together. However, the pupils did not have much free time. All the days were full of

activities besides the lessons. On Sunday they took walks and picked flowers, or prepared theatre presentations or dances. In fact, the pupils were expected to develop all their talents and to score at all levels sufficient or good. Sport was important, like political education and even the young children were trained in leadership when they had their shift of supervising younger children. They were held responsible for the behaviour of these children and how much authority could one expect from a 12-year-old girl over children aged 10 or 11?

Three times a year they were allowed to spend their holidays at home: 2 weeks at Easter, two weeks at Christmas and 4 weeks in summer.

An important event was the visit of Heinrich Himmler, initiator of the German boarding school system. In his presence the pupils took the oath. In retrospect it is clear that most of the children had a very restricted understanding of what they had to learn about the Nazi ideology, they did not question the ideas raised by their teachers. Of course, these people emphasized the successes of the regime and kept silent about the persecution of opponents and Jews. The pupils lived in an isolated world, they did not know what happened outside the walls of the building. In May 1944, an English plane crashed near the school and the pupils and teachers in the shelter were locked in because the walls had collapsed. Only the next day were they freed by soldiers and afterwards they were sent home.

In the summer of 1944, all the children of the family were at home and the next time they met was many years later. The boys returned to their school, which was moved from Valkenburg to a town in Germany. Patricia could not go back to school, because the building was still in ruins.

Patricia's grandfather was given the post of vice-provincial governor in Assen (in the north of the country) and all the members of the family moved to this town. They could not take much luggage with them and had to abandon their house and belongings which were gone after the war. Patricia's grandparents still believed in the final victory and Patricia, now 14 years old, thought it her duty to serve her country and the German government. She volunteered as a nurse, but she was not accepted because of her age. Although she was of school age, she did not attend school because all the buildings were closed since fuel had run out. She accepted a job at the office of a sport leader of the Hitler Jugend she had met before and who was responsible for the Dutch men and boys employed by the Germans. She had the supervision of hostages, very often children, replacing their father who had days off e.g. for attending a funeral. And she worked as a courier.

Then suddenly, one of her former teachers visited her. She traveled throughout the country to assemble her pupils and to take them with her to a new school in Germany, near lake Constance. Patricia had to join the group in Groningen and the only way to travel to this town was in a truck with German soldiers: a 14-year-old girl among experienced front soldiers, who nevertheless respected her. From Groningen the teacher and her 15 pupils traveled through a devastated Germany to Berlin. They escaped shootings and bombings, ran through burning streets, zigzagged between injured men and corpses and finally, after 3 weeks, they arrived at Reichenau near lake Constance. They joined another group of 3 teachers and 30 girls who had found lodgings in a former psychiatric clinic. There were only 3 rooms: a classroom, a kitchen and a bedroom. Most of the day they were in search of wood for the stove and stealing, if possible, carrots and potatoes from the fields, to chase away their hunger. The front was nearing and the boys in the adjacent building were ordered to join the army. The teachers organized a goodbye ceremony and these young boys, 14 years or older, received a rifle and were sent to the front. They went directly to the dangerous area. One boy was left behind because of a broken leg. He played the

piano, a piece of Beethoven. That was the moment that Patricia was caught by fear.

The next day, the German headmistress had disappeared. Their Dutch teacher assembled the Dutch girls and they set off to Constance where they hoped to cross the border to Switzerland. The town was full of refugees of all nationalities and all hoped to be allowed the entrance to the safe country at the other side of the border. When the German troops entered the town, Patricia's group was the last one to leave Germany. The teacher told the authorities that they had escaped from one of the camps, but very soon the truth came out that they were the children of collaborators with the Germans. Meanwhile they had heard some news about the concentration camps and the genocide of the Jews, the death of Hitler, and they got hopelessly lost: the truth was so completely different from what had been told to them until that day. The Swiss authorities sent them to France where they found shelter in a Displaced Persons Camp. A week later they were taken to a train which would bring them to the Netherlands. Fortunately, most of the passengers in this train were people who had been forced to work in Germany and went home. At all railway stations French men and women provided the passengers with food and beverages. The train stopped in Namur, Belgium, and the small group of girls and their teacher spent one night in a barracks.

Their teacher had instructed them to keep silent as much as possible, but when they arrived in the Netherlands and found shelter in a monastery in Oudenbosch, one of the girls pronounced the name of the village where their former school had been situated, Heythuysen. One of the monks overheard it and knew immediately that these girls had been pupils of the German school. The teacher was arrested and sent to the internment camp in Vught, the girls were taken to a house where they would receive re-education until they reached the age of 21. Fortunately, a physician who knew Patricia's family well was willing to ask the mayor of the town of Assen to give Patricia permission to go back home. In a truck Patricia traveled to Assen where she found her grandmother and some of her brothers. Grandfather was in an internment camp and Jelle, the eldest son, forced to be a soldier for the last 2 weeks of the war, was still in Germany, where he stayed for some months in an English POW camp.

In July 1945, Patricia was back home. She was 15 years old, still of school age. Collaborators' children could be denied entrance to a school, but finally she found a school willing to accept her. During the holiday weeks she studied French, economics and Dutch on her own, trying to make good all the lost lessons of the last three years. She knew that the only subject in which she excelled was the German language. And with this poor equipment she started in the third form of secondary school.

Nobody ever asked Patricia what they had lived through in the last years of the war. The members of the family all had their own stories and nobody was prepared to speak up or to listen to the stories of the others. Moreover, Patricia was seen in her family as a girl that was strong and knew how to cope with her experiences. And, indeed, she managed to shape her life and live it in a rather sound way – but at what price? That is the question with which she ended her story: at what price?

GSB.

THE SHAVED WOMAN – viewing a picture



'Today everyone in the village is excited, very excited, because people have shaved the heads of the women and girls who fraternized with the enemy. This is what one calls 'hair style 1944'. Of course it is awful, because this was a public spectacle'. Gertrude Stein wrote these lines in her diary at the end of August 1944. Some days later the village of Culoz, at the foot of the French Alps, was liberated by the Americans.

One has the impression that after the liberation of innumerable villages in France the inhabitants had nothing more urgent to do than to chase the 'Hun whores'. In all those places people followed a similar procedure, executed in a serious, ritual mood. The women were traced and then gathered at the market place, where a hairdresser with a pair of scissors and a shaver cut their hair and shaved their skulls. From that moment on people called them 'les tondues' (the shaved ones).

On August 16, 1944, in the village of Nogent-le-Rotrou, to the southwest of Paris, about 3000 people gathered to watch the punishment of the women. That same day, the 20th US-Corps liberated the town of Chartres and eleven women had their heads shaved. Robert Capa, the photographer accompanying the American army, made pictures of this 'people's court'. One of these pictures is exceptional, because the woman to whom the spectator's attention is drawn, has a baby in her arms and her skull shows two circles burned in the flesh by means of red-hot irons.

This picture is one of the iconic pictures of the 20th century that influenced our perception and understanding of life and the world. This picture of the shaved woman became the symbol of the liberation and the chastisement of those who fraternized and thereby betrayed their country.

The woman in Capa's picture is Simone Tousseau; within 3 days she would have her 23th birthday. She lived in Chartres, completed her secondary school with excellent marks. In 1944 she got a job as an interpreter and assistant in the library. There she met Erich Göz who was 12 years her senior. They fell in love, but German soldiers did not have the right to marry as long as the war continued. They became engaged and hoped to marry soon. At the end of 1942, Göz was sent to the eastern front, where he was severely injured during the summer of 1943. Simone volunteered for a job in Germany that would give her the opportunity to visit Erich at the hospital. In December 1943 she traveled back home,

because she was pregnant. Her father forbade her to leave the house and it was only on May 23, 1944 that she left home to report at the hospital and to give birth to her child. Six weeks later the child's father died. Only in 1947, did Simone receive the message of his death.

So far, Simone's story has been similar to many other stories of women in love with German soldiers. But Simone's story is different, because she, unlike the majority of those women, was interested in politics. She joined the Parti Populaire Français, the French collaborators' party, after Erich was sent to the eastern front.

There is another point that makes her story different. She and her mother were under suspicion of denouncing their neighbours who had listened to the BBC, which was forbidden. In similar cases people were sent to a house of correction, but here four of the five arrested persons were sent to Mauthausen. Only two of them survived. Simone's father was not a suspect because he was seen as a decent patriot. [In the picture he is walking in front of the crowd, a pillow-case with belongings in his hand. Right after him, half hidden, his wife, who was also shaved; not because of 'horizontal collaboration' but because of her suspected betrayal.

On August 26, 1944, a law was formulated allowing the judges to sentence people who had not transgressed any law, but who had behaved in an indecent way, and had brought disgrace to the nation. In 1946, Simone was taken before the court and she was acquitted of the betrayal charge, because of lack of proof. But her national indecency was substantiated and she lost her civil rights for a period of ten years.

She had betrayed her country by following her own insights and interests and she had neglected her duty to obey her father(land). Women like Simone had disgraced their home and country, now, in their turn, people disgraced them by cutting their hair, the pride of women. Cutting women's hair was seen from time immemorial as the feminine form of castration. Fraternizing was unacceptable because it meant betrayal, prostitutes were never accused of collaboration, since prostitution was seen as a profession.

Capa's picture became famous and Simone the prototype of the 'Hun whores'. Her situation, however, differs from that of others, because of her political choice and her presumed denouncement. The majority of those women and girls did not have any political interest, they loved a German boy and that was all. They might, however, have had vague feelings that their behaviour was not appreciated by their neighbours and the inhabitants of their villages or towns. We need to avoid the view that their behaviour was an act of rebellion or feminine emancipation.

Capa's picture seems the outstanding illustration of how people punished women that had dishonoured their country. But not in all the villages and towns women that had had relationships with a German soldiers had to experience humiliation. Although in France, in many towns and villages, the revenge on these women was more or less officially organized, in far more places the crowd acted spontaneously, on the basis of hatred. These events were initiated by young men and were very often more cruel: they beat the women, they undressed them, they painted swastikas on their heads and chased them through the streets. Many pictures have been made. They give evidence of these events. The maltreated women, the hatred load crowd full of hatred taking revenge on people who could not defend themselves, is hard to see. The Capa picture differs from them, is almost esthetic compared to them, as it focuses on that particular woman, the people who maltreated her left out of view.

In Capa's picture the German soldier is absent, in his role of the child's father, the child who would suffer for years to come as the rejected 'Hun child'. The soldier is also absent in his role as soldier, German, enemy, occupier, Nazi. Capa could have included Germans in his picture, because even after the liberation of Chartres there were skirmishes between French and German soldiers. And after the surrender there were still a lot of German soldiers around before they could travel back to their homeland.

The 'wild' purges occurred in the vacuum between war and peace. They were the last opportunity for people to station themselves at the good side, by distancing themselves from the collaborators and those who made economic war profits. In this vacuum past behaviour was judged, the nation decided who would belong to the 'right' and who to the 'wrong'. The German soldier did not play any role in this purge, that was seen as a national affair.

The shaved woman became the symbol of these 'wild' purges before the official purification was established. But we have to take into account that this purification had every one in view who was suspected to be a collaborator, not only women, but also men. In France, 100 000 people died in these purges, it is more correct to say, they were massacred. Most of them were men, despite the suggestion of Capa's picture that a collaborator was first of all a woman.

Two historians, Gérard Leray and Philippe Frétygné did research on Simone. She died in 1966 as a victim of her alcoholism. The historians also found Simone's child, but they did not give any details about him or her. They corrected the date which Capa gave to his series of pictures 'Chartres, 18 August 1944'. Chartres' liberation was two days earlier.

When we watch this picture today, we see first of all the misery of this young woman with her shaved head, we can sympathize with her and we feel distance to the crowd chasing her. The interpretation of this picture has totally changed since it was made: it is not the story of the betrayer and the decent patriots, but the avengers and the defenceless victim. When we watch this picture, we have to take into account that we know so much more about the war. We know about Hitler, the Gestapo, the German soldiers and SS men, the war period with occupation, bystanders, war profiteers, concentration camps and torture, bombs, pain, horror, but also about capitulation, the victory of the allies, the happy gift of peace.

The picture does not show all that, but just this one young woman, with her baby. A bald woman, gazed at by the crowd. We know so little about her.

Ebba Drolshagen, July 20, 2014
in: Frankfurter Allgemeine Tageszeitung.
Translation GSB.

HOW CAN WE COMMIT THE UNTHINKABLE?

In 1982 Professor Israel W. Charny wrote a book with the above mentioned title. He tried to answer a question that seventy years after the end of WWII, still is important: how is it possible that the human being, in certain circumstances and in certain periods, is ready to use so much violence that millions of people die or become injured, physically and mentally? His point of departure, and conclusion, is that nearly all “normal” men can become genociders, accomplices or bystanders.

The next question is, and even important: can the human being learn to behave in such a way that the massive murdering of wars and genocides will stop?

In the third part of his book, *Why can there still be hope?*, Israel Charny describes how we can learn to escape from the vicious circle of violence.

I would like to present to you a summary of the first chapter of this third part, *Nonviolent aggression as an antidote to destructive violence*, by quoting sentences and paragraphs. [The next two chapters describe strategies for nonviolent aggression in designing the social environment and proposals for the designing of a genocide early warning system.]

'The average book on the psychology of the normal human personality doesn't say much about healthy aggression or energy. If anything, one is apt to find negative statements about aggression. More often than not, the concept of aggression is used interchangeably with the notion of anger or destructiveness, and what is emphasized is that the healthy human personality should not be too angry. The normal, mature human being is seen largely in positive terms – as loving, caring, relating, able to enter into warm and cooperative relationships with other human beings, and so on. Little, if anything, is said about strength of aggression or spirit or energy for toughness in the face of life's problems.

Nearly all therapists speak of the desirability of some kind of strength of purpose, will, self-expression, ability to fight for oneself, and other aspects of aggression energy. Those who do not mobilize sufficient aggression tend to be browbeaten and exploited. In their marriages, they are belittled, harassed, and betrayed. In their everyday work, they are the fine reliable people who carry too much responsibility too seriously, or they are so self-effacing that they do not rise to positions of significance and authority. On the other hand, people can be too driving, attacking, and aggressive. They are characteristically filled with hate, rage, or an enormous concern with power.

Actually, the extremes of too much and too little aggression have a great deal in common. The truth is that both people who begrudge themselves enough spiritedness in life and people who seemingly are cocksure in their power lack a real belief in their basic right to exist. These extremes also alternate in one and the same person. For example, sometimes a person who is unduly passive in his marriage bullies his children; or a person who overpowers his marriage partner is unduly solicitous and indulgent of the children. A mature human being shows in his behaviour: “I believe in my power and in my right to be strong without abusing the rights of others to be strong too.”

Fears of aggression

Why is there so little about healthy aggression in the standard psychological texts and books about normal living? The obvious answer is that people are frightened of their aggression and power because they have seen so many terrible detonations of destructiveness and violence. In their hope for a more peaceful world, people have sought to emphasize the positive qualities of love, goodness, tolerance, responsibility, mutuality – qualities that appear to be as far away as possible from any destructive aggression. However, no matter how sincerely people may try to love and relate creatively to life,

denials of aggression do not stem the relentless tide of power and violence in human affairs.

It has been observed by many psychotherapists that those gentle dear people who seek to avoid anger in their lives or to deny their children aggressive games often work themselves into boxes of dammed-up aggression to the point where they cause themselves and their families considerable damage.

Paradoxically, it may also be that so little is taught about the management of aggression because we are afraid to extinguish the “fires” within us that we know make possible our enormous creativity. We have always known instinctively that building the world calls for brave frontiersmen, not pacifists who would be impotent under fire. The good pacifist may know how to fell trees, but unless he also knows how to shoot attacking “Indians” (of all sort), he cannot stand up to the realities of life.

Many of this century's finest thinkers in the mental health sciences (Leon Saul, Thomas Gordon, Trigant Burrow) have sought to solve the problems of human destructiveness by emphasizing the importance of disciplining, reducing, and finding alternatives to aggression and expressions of hostility. Saul recommends that people must stop feeling intense hostility. Gordon places great emphasis on a method of no-lose negotiations between parents and children, in which differences and angers are to be resolved by their mutual searching for acceptable decisions and goals. Burrow formulated a method for teaching groups to detach themselves from the immediacy of tension and ambition to achieve a warm organismic feeling.

A semantic problem that complicates this and most discussions of aggression is that many people use the words *aggression*, *hostility*, *rage*, and so on interchangeably. Most of us agree that it is desirable to reduce and remove a great deal of our hostility and rage. The more difficult question is what we think about the overall well of man's aggression once we define aggression as a basic life force that may or may not be turned to destructiveness – with aggression being both the source of our necessary power and the source from which anger, hostility, and destructiveness spring and are fueled.

A sizable number of mental health thinkers emphasize the importance of experiencing and expressing aggression as the wellspring for all self-expression, aliveness, and being. However, within this framework of an appreciation of aggression, there are two alternative opinions. Some mental health thinkers like the idea of teaching people aggression in the sense of encouraging self-expression, exploration and so on, but they propose avoiding all negative aspects of aggression such as anger, hate, violence, and rage. Others advocate the expression of these negative emotions, but they emphasize that the expression of these negative emotions must be differentiated from any and all *acts* of destruction and that negative feelings need to be balanced by emotions of caring, respect, and fellowship. Finally, there is an emerging viewpoint that healthy aggression is, in fact, both loving and anger, friendship and hate, the ability to assert oneself and the ability to criticize and fight against unfairness, all balanced together and flowing inseparably with one another.

Healthy aggression as a balanced thrust of positive and negative feelings

The critical point in a modern psychological approach to integrating positive and negative feelings is to put together opposite processes in a single flowing dynamic. When we put together our opposite experiences, we enjoy thrusts of greater strength, satisfaction, release and achievement. But when we split our loving and hating, or goodness and badness, there develop the serious distortions of life that we know of as emotional illness, cruelty, and destructiveness.

But many people hope that in their family life in particular, one can be wholly committed and loving toward one's dear ones. Yet the bulk of the evidence shows that families require both deep commitments to one another and an honest processing of conflict. A Protestant minister wrote: "Most families today need more honest conflict and less suppression of feeling.. Intimacy and conflict are inseparable in human life."(1)

The problem for well-meaning people, of course, is that it can never be exactly clear when or how much aggression should be released. At any given time, we most likely either undershoot or overshoot in expressing our aggression.

It is not surprising that decent people are so often drawn to the fantasy of living without any aggression and well-intentioned philosophies are constructed to accomplish the ideal of shaping people and societies to be entirely wholesome. This dream, however, is impossible to realize. Anthony Storr said: "Man's aggression is more than a response to frustration – it is an attempt to assert himself as an individual, to separate himself from the herd, to find his own identity."(2)

Spokesmen for the "goodness camp" produce evidence of instances in which aggression is destructive of human relationships and should be changed to positive feelings and love. Likewise, spokesmen for natural or creative aggression produce evidence to show that an improved refining of aggression frees many emotionally sick people.

We are to stand up for ourselves, insist that we will not be exploited, be proud of our identities, and press to win love. We are instructed to gain relief from the various demons of psychosomatic illness by "getting feelings off our chests", "taking a load off our backs", "standing up to problems", "letting go", and so on.

In winning friendship and love, for example, loving coupled with an ability to be angry usually brings more rewarding, exciting, and enduring interpersonal relationships.

The process of separating from any close emotional bond seems to necessitate healthy doses of anger. Teenagers busy with the developmental task of separating from parents show bursts of such anger. So, too, do young professionals who are getting ready to move on from a beloved teacher and mentor and husbands and wives when they need to define more of their own "space" or independence.

There is also evidence of the naturalness of parental anger and even hatred of one's otherwise beloved children, and there has long been evidence of how otherwise loving children experience deeply hateful feelings toward their parents. Melanie Klein pioneered brilliant probes into the basic cycling of experiences of anger in the child toward the parents. She takes as her point of departure the inevitable dissatisfaction of the child with certain aspects of the mothering experience.

The child's greatest anxiety is the fear that its own destructive and greedy impulses will destroy the goodness of the mother, and then its larger object world. All of us need to become aware of our angry feelings and learn how to regulate the destructiveness these feelings can unleash. The major challenge for each human being is to master and control this hate and to integrate it with loving feelings lest the hate destroy the loving connection to others. According to this analysis, it would be impossible for a human being ever to work out a relationship to others by emphasizing only loving feelings. Hatred inevitably exists, and the challenge is to deal responsibly with feelings of hate rather than to try to avoid them.

Like the child, the patient in psychotherapy needs to learn to be able to stand up to anger and hatred, because these emotions are natural in all relationships, including relationships that are basically caring and supportive. The alternatives are no relationship or an

unsatisfying relationship.

John Bowlby has argued for some time that aggression is important in maintaining affectional bonds. One function of aggression, he notes, is to attack and frighten away intruders. Another is to punish an errant partner, be it wife, husband, or child.

How to integrate positive and negative emotions to generate healthy aggression

If the natural human energy drive or aggression is built of an interplay of coexisting loving and hating feelings, it is the interplay itself, more than either component, that is the primary source of natural human energy. One effective way to put love and hate together is to concentrate the power of our consciousness on activating both sides of feeling in close proximity to one another – better yet, simultaneously whenever possible.

Even better is to be able to parenthetically experience the reverse emotion along with whatever is the major emotion at the time. Loving times are then what they are, but they include a wary awareness that one also is angry, has been angry, or will be angry again at the other person. Among other things, this awareness protects us against too devastating “falls from high places”, so we are less vulnerable to later disappointments and the rages that bitter disappointments can set off. Loving that is linked to an awareness of present, past, and future hate is no longer so innocent and vulnerable but is linked to a strength that enables one to stand up and fight future hurts.

It is good to know in advance that our children will hurt us. It also strengthens children to accept that parents hurt them. At the least, children who have survived the “vaccinations” of parental hurting will be more prepared for the realities of life, for the fact that other people will surely hurt them and not just love mamma's boy or girl.

Similarly, times of anger are accompanied by an awareness that one also wishes to love another – in fact, does love, has loved, will again love. Hating that is simultaneously linked to one's loving is no longer a brute force that is aimed at the destruction of the other but is linked to loving wishes to protect, care, and build.

Hating that is linked with one's wishes to love means one does not surrender to passions of destroying – either of oneself in the suicidal despair of a person spurned in love or of the would-be beloved. It is no longer brazen, total, and escapist wipeout.

Positive and negative in the foreign policies of people and nations

There is a considerable similarity between the choices individuals make in handling anger and hate and the choices groups of people make that lead to intergroup and international policies. Canadian peace researcher Alan Newcombe has developed a beautiful analysis of the choices that are open to nations in their foreign policies.⁽³⁾ His descriptions of the various strategies are cast in a charming play on words drawn from the game of chess, as well as from the history of monarchy prior to the 19th and 20th century nationalism.

The *Bishop's Strategy* is to meet hostility by turning the other cheek; to return love for hate and friendship for hostility. A hostile power, however, may not return friendship with friendship and may take advantage of the expressed goodwill. In fact, the Bishop's Strategy may actually induce aggression on the part of the other power.

The *Knight's Strategy* in international affairs is a hawk's strategy that argues that people should respond to hostility by arming and preparing to defend themselves against attack. This strategy is appealing when it is entirely clear that one faces a leader and a people who are bent on war, but it leaves much to be desired in many situations in which a very hostile response will actually confirm the other people's fears and will lead to mutual escalation. This strategy can, in fact, induce aggression and provoke war when no violent confrontation was in the offing.

The *King's Strategy* is one of nonviolence. This strategy does not develop an important definition of how to respond to hostility, but the nonviolent strategy is not without serious

risks in the face of a warlord or warring people; hence, it cannot be a basis for shaping an overall approach to international relations.

The difficulty in finding a foreign policy that will turn hostility into friendship is to find a policy which is self-adjusting to the situation. Such a situation has now been found, Newcombe announces excitedly, in the *Queen's Strategy*, which is to meet hostility with strength but to move on to seek and develop initiatives for peace. This strategy suggests that when the other nation is perceived as sending a hostile signal, then one should respond with an equally hostile signal; and if one finds that one is locked into an exchange of hostile signals one should, at some frequency, determined in advance by oneself.... make a friendly initiative, If, after several attempts the other side has not reciprocated, then one could conclude that you were faced with an Adolf Hitler and should proceed at once to arm in order to defend oneself. If, on the other hand, the...initiative was reciprocated, one should continue with such initiatives until a friendly state was reached.(4)

The Queen's Strategy is not only a tit-for-tat strategy but also a strategy for initiating peace seeking. It is a tit-for-tat- strategy for responding to the other party's behaviour and initiatives that is combined with a policy for initiating one's own peace moves.

Newcombe's queen is an outstanding exponent of the process we have been studying of integrating positive and negative approaches as the best way to generate and maintain healthy power for oneself.

According to Newcombe, the point of making peace is to arrive not at friendship and love, but at a state in which the parties can live together in peace, even while they experience considerable hostility to one another.

It is time for social scientists, philosophers, students of ethics and people of goodwill everywhere to adopt a new model of human behaviour that honours aggression as life seeking and life loving.

To be only selfless and peace seeking is to deny the realities of the toughness and attacking tendencies that are in all of nature.

Aggression is life seeking and life loving, as well as a source of strength for attacking and counterattacking when we need to fight for life. Aggression that builds from an integration of loving and attacking offers the greatest flexibility for moving back and forth in response to the unfolding realities of life.

Notes:

1. Gibson Winter, *Love and conflict: New Patterns in Family Life* (New York: Doubleday, 1961), pp.104,105

2. Anthony Storr, "Possible Substitutes for War," in J.D.Carthy and F.J.Ebling, eds. *The Natural History of Aggression*, Proceedings of a Symposium held at the British Museum, London, 1963 (London: Academic Press, 1964), pp.139-140

3. Alan G.Newcombe, "'Lovemate': A Personal and International Foreign Policy for Peace, in: Israel W.Charny, ed. *Strategies Against Violence* (Boulder, Colo.:Westview 1978), pp.3-18

4. *ibid.*, pp 8-9

-Charny, Israel W. (1982) *How Can We Commit the Unthinkable?: Genocide, the Human Cancer*. In cooperation with Chanan Rapaport. Foreword by Elie Wiesel. Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press.

-Paperback edition (1983) with title change: *Genocide, The Human Cancer: How Can We Commit the Unthinkable?* New York, Hearst Professionals Books [William Morrow]

-Translation into Portuguese, with New Introduction to this edition by the author and updated bibliography: *Anatomia do Genocídio: Uma Psicologia da Agressão Humana*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Rosa dos Tempos, 1998. [Translated by Ruy Jungmann]

Israel Charny is a psychologist and genocide researcher who directs the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem. He edited the *Encyclopedia of Genocide* and more recently wrote *Fascism and Democracy in the Human Mind*, both of which were awarded “Outstanding Academic Book of the Year” by the American Library Association.

WEBSITES

Organisation of Children of Dutch Collaborators:

www.werkgroepherkenning.nl

Organisation of Children of War of different Backgrounds:

www.stichting-kombi.nl

Organisation of Danish Children of War, Danske Krigsboern Foerening:

www.krigsboern.dk

Norwegian Children of War Association, Norges Krigsbarnforbund:

www.nkbfn.no

Organization of Norwegian NS Children:

www.nazichildren.com

Krigsbarnforbundet Lebensborn, Norway:

<http://home.no.net/lebenorg>

Organisation of NS-children Vennetreff:

<http://www.nsbarn.no>

Risikoforbundet Finska Krigsbarn: (in swedish)

www.finskakrigsbarn.se

Tapani Ross on Finnish War Children (blog)

www.krigsbarn.com

Organisation of Finnish Children of War, Seundun Sotalapset:

www.sotalapset.fi

Organisation of children of victims and children of the perpetrators:

www.one-by-one.org

Austrian Encounter, organisation for encounters between children of the victims and children of the perpetrators in Austria:

www.nach.ws

Dachau Institut Psychologie und Pädagogik:

www.Dachau-institut.de

Kriegskind Deutschland:

www.kriegskind.de

Website for the postwar-generation:

www.Forumkriegsenkel.com

Evacuees Reunion Association

www.evacuees.org.uk

Researchproject ‘War and Children Identity Project’, Bergen, Norway

www.warandchildren.org

Researchproject University München ‘Kriegskindheit’

www.warchildhood.net

Coeurs Sans Frontières – Herzen Ohne Grenzen

www.coeurssansfrontieres.biz

Organisation d'enfants de guerre

www.nesdelaliberation.fr

Organisation of Us-descendants in Belgium

www.usad-ww2.be

Childsurvivors of the Holocaust in Australia

www.paulvalent.com

International organisation for educational and professional development focused on themes like racism, prejudices and antisemitism

www.facinghistory.org

Aktion Sühnezeigen Friedensdienste

www.asf-ev.de

Organisation of German Lebensbornkinder
www.lebensspuren-deutschland.eu

International Network for Interdisciplinary Research on Children born of War (INIRC)
www.childrenbornofwar.org

Organisation Genocide Prevention Now
www.genocidepreventionnow.org

Basque Children of '37 Association UK
www.basquechildren.org

International Study of the Organized Persecution of Children
www.holocaustchildren.org

Partners in Confronting Collective Atrocities
www.p-cca.org

War Love Child – Oorlogsliefdekind
www.oorlogsliefdekind.nl/en

Children of Soviet Army soldiers
www.russenkinder.de

Stichting Oorlogsgetroffenen in de Oost
www.s-o-o.nl

Philippine Nikkei-Jin Legal Support Center
www.pnlsc.com

Austrian children of Afroamerican soldier-fathers
www.afroaustria.at

Organisation tracing American GI fathers
www.gitrace.org

Next issue: Autumn 2015

Reactions and articles: 1st of October 2015