

## CHARLOTTE SALOMON

Judith Herzberg, Frans Weisz

container-text for lecture presentations

© PROF.DR. ETTY MULDER , RADBOUD UNIVERSITY, COMPARATIVE ARTS [2003/2009/2013/2015]  
Stichting Kunstenaarsverzet 1942-1945

Before presenting some of my topics on Charlotte Salomon

I want to give a short impression of my first acquaintance with the material, about 1990. It may be sufficient to sum up very shortly as *pars pro toto* what happened to me being confronted with the work *Leben oder Theater* and the film *Charlotte* by Judith Herzberg and Frans Weisz 1981.

As a musicologist and a theoretician of arts I became fascinated by the aspect of *synesthesia*, the phenomenon of synchronicity of different artistic levels of communication, working within one art-work, in this case the artwork ***Leben oder Theater*** of Charlotte Salomon. I was deeply impressed by the idiosyncrasy of fate and form of the work, the synchronicity of text, images, colors and music, as well as the internal relationship of different arts representing the story of Charlotte by herself.

I studied these materials reading and trying to understand the terminology of her subtitle *Singenspiel* and *Gesamtkunstwerk* as it was ment by her, according to my professional knowledge that both terms don' t fit in the theoretical usual sense of art history.

Those terms belong, to begin with, to very different areas of musical presentations, the *Singenspiel* for example is strictly connected to the 18th century, for example Mozarts *Zauberflöte*. The *Gesamtkunstwerk* is mostly connected to Wagnerian atmospheres. The terms refer to different aspects and forms of theatre closely interconnected by the same artist, for instance in a work as *Der Ring des Nibelungen*. Charlotte may very well have known that she was creating a totally new form using this weighty titles in a anachronistic and maybe even cynical or parodying way.

I never before experienced a synesthetic art in which the visual aspect predominated music and text as is the case in Charlotte Salomons play.

Following the rather confusing, even odd advice of the Jewish Historical Museum in their catalogue I tried to trace the reception-history of Charlottes Life or Theater, considering her above all things 'as an artist, a very gifted one, and not so much as a victim'.

I felt extraordinary puzzled by the connections, and obvious disconnections between Charlottes biography, her play, and Auschwitz, were she was killed on 10 october 1943. As we all know the Shoah, however, is no issue in Charlottes play, how near to death and annihilation the author's fate may have been.

But we have to take into account the strong connections between these fate and family-tragedy and the massacre of the European Jews, as a political plan, how complicated this connection may be. We also do have to refer very strong to the anti-semitical atmosphere, as well as the political situation in pre-war Berlin that Charlotte

had to face at her school and on her academy, her father and stepmother being fired from their high positions, her father sent to Sachsenhausen and brought back because of particular circumstances. The Salomons belonged to the absolute upper tier in those pre-war Berlin-situations.

The image we get of Charlotte is of a not fully grown, extreme solitary, even desolate person who is described by others as retired and silent.

As she is suggesting in her play, she is totally depending on parents, grandparents and substitute parents (as Wolfsohn and Lindberg were to her). There are no letters or diaries underlying the play.

One could suggest that Charlotte is not grown up, as long as the family history was kept close to her. After the coming out of the terrible secrets, when the sadistic and incestuous grandfather reveals everything to her, she is able to show her independency, by explosions of creativity in Life or Theater..

**In the reception-theoretical sense of the arts** we have to consider an obligatory double interpretation of Life or Theater for each who faces it.

Two levels of interpretation of reality are directly manifesting themselves. Firstly on the personal level: her artwork transforms reality as any form of art does, and also ours, transforming her play to our play by the processes of unconscious projection and identification that are working according to our personalities confronted with her material.

In the second place: much has been changed considering the interpretation of art as a vehicle of autobiography during those last two decades 1881-200 after the creation of the film. As to this we have to take into consideration some complexities of the film Charlotte made by Frans Weisz and Judith Herzberg in 1981, following very ingeniously Charlottes play - as a script- . I have to mention this film and discuss it very seriously, because this film has become a major source on Charlotte. It even has been received, in a certain sense as a film about Charlotte Salomon, **in stead of only one possible interpretation** of her play.

Seeing the film today one asks oneself what could be the reason why these artists in the eighties mentioned the death of Charlotte, only by some written sentences on screen in the concluding scenes of the film without taking up in the script the dates of Charlottes marriage with Alexander Nagerl, her pregnancy and the deportation of both of them to Drancy and Auschwitz.

The answer of course, is, that they, indeed **followed Charlottes play as their own script, and the end, of course is not in the play..**

By giving this interpretation of the play-by-film, they – so to say- “missed” , had to drop out, the last unrepresented period of her life. Of course there was no way to complete the story according to acceptable standards by switching from the end of the artistic level of the play to documents referring to the reality of the marriage, pregnancy, deportation to Auschwitz. One simply could not do this, facing severe problems of artistic and moral integrity. Frans Weisz and Judith Herzberg made their interpretation of the Singspiel, as a film, in silence, not pretending a film about the life of Charlotte Salomon, **only trying to execute her play**. They did a great job emphasizing the overwhelming and unforgettable melancholy of the material.

---

But : Can this be ever totally true?

As to an interpretation like this one of 1981 one has to consider that in the meantime however the field of art-reception has been overruled by **post-modernistic views on representation, narrativity and focalisation**. This could accentuate an unusual modern but not consciously planned aspect of the film considering the right of the artist to be totally free in creation. For instance: to have biographical pretensions regarding to the materials that has been used or not used in the film.

This freedom of artistic creation is used by Charlotte in taking and presenting her life on the level of art, escaping madness and suicide, as it has been taken over by Frans Weisz and Judith Herzberg.

They feel free to give an extremely strong accent on a complete love affair between Charlotte and Alexander Wolfsohn alias Amadeus Daberlohn, who was the sang teacher of Charlottes stepmother Paula Lindberg alias Paulinka Bimbam.

As to my view Charlotte is giving us an impressive mixture of both relationships with Alex Wolfsohns, both of Paula Lindbergs and her own, she undoubtedly was in love with him, as he was with her stepmother, but, in fact, also she, Charlotte, adored Paula herself. .

Wolfsohn felt fascinated by Paula Lindberg in a sublime and highly fictionalized way according to a theory by himself built upon the Orpheus-myth that onely by diving into the very darkness of death one should be able to live, a theory that in fact highly influenced Charlotte in the creation of her Life or Theatre. It is without doubt that Charlotte was under the spell of this prophetic man who had been highly traumatized by his experiences in the first World War. I am convinced that Charlotte was enabled to create her play only by means of the very strong impulses of her love and admiration towards these two persons who were to her, sources of extreme vitality, force, and originality.

But It was only in 1961, a year before dying, that Alex Wolfsohn who survived the second world war, by the play of Charlotte got informed about the role he played for her in those years that he taught Paula.

-----  
My first reception of the artistic material of Charlotte as a person was highly influenced by interpretations that came to me by the film. Thinking and rethinking about my feeling uncomfortable with it I finally find out that it was not the lack of a valid theory of art and representation that bothered me. There is a principal fact that the scrutinous and beautiful film Charlotte by Weisz and Herzberg doesn't refer to, **because it is not in the play**: the central fact is that we have to be aware that our position, our views, and interpretations connecting to Charlotte Salomon only exist according to this one big condition namely: that she and her unborn child ended in Auschwitz.

Maybe it has no use to mention this, it doesn't change anything, and makes things incredible complicated, but we do have to know that this fact is dominating the whole story: **the narrative itself**, that regards the possibility to understand the film of Frans Weisz every first viewing of it.

We know, by her play, that Charlotte was suffering almost constantly from fear of loss, because everyone she depended on was leaving her. Her solitude did make of her an observant outsider. Of course this situation in which she grew up, also was rooted in the destructive powers of the Berlin pre-war-society. But it would become very difficult indeed to argue that Charlotte was reflecting on the political situation, on the fate of the Jewish people. In a way she all the time she gives us in her play she is surviving the fate of her family.

-----

So: confused by the extreme complexities of all this I stopped interpreting and even thinking on Charlotte for a long time. Her work however seemed to me above all things witnessing fate and tragedy in lesser dimensions or maybe, even on the contrary, bigger ones than were proposed at the time by her interpreters, --I did n' t understand at that moment.

It should take many years before I could refind my fascination and retake my research, feeling the strong backing of gender-theoretical and psychoanalytical texts that had been written in the meantime by **Mary Lowenthal Felstiner** 1994, and **Janine Chasseguet Smirgel** 1990.

The first as a high-rank feminist biographer of Charlotte, the second as a prominent psychoanalyst working on the themes of anti-Semitism and racism, implicating the exclusive weight on the destruction of procreation, according to the Nazi-theory of so called Blut und Boden in connection with the cumulation of suicides in the matrilinear history of Charlotte Salomon.

Those texts, in connection with my renewed view and interpretation on the influence of Alex Wolfsohn alias Amadeus Daberlohn on Charlotte, brought about a continuation of my interest, however without pretending to deliver more than a rather small contribution in the deciphering of the extremely complex and extensive material.

-----

I 'll summarize now the biography of Charlotte Salomon according to the pre-existing materials about her in combining the general and common biographical dates from several authors about Charlotte.

Charlotte was born in Berlin on April 16th, 1917, the only daughter of the prominent surgeon Albert Salomon and his wife, Franziska Grunwald. In 1913 Franziska's younger sister Charlotte had drowned herself. In the papers and among family and friends the death was not spoken as suicide. In her grief Franziska turned to a nursing career (and intriguingly the word for nurse in German: *Schwester* is

the same as that for sister). So she met Salomon. When the couple had their first and only child , Franze named this daughter again **Charlotte**.

As far as I know nowhere has been so far mentioned upon this first heavy burden that was laid upon the shoulders of Charlotte , being a substitute for her mothers sister. This naming of hers almost directly is pointing at the tragical and unmighty position of Franziska' s motherhood.

In the winter of 1925-26 Franziska threw herself out of the window of the Salomon fourth-floor apartment. Again, no mention of suicide appeared in the obituary and Charlotte was told that her mother had died of influenza.

It took thirteen years before anyone – her grandfather- would tell her the truth. This lye about her mothers dead can be seen as a second almost unbearable burden in the mind of Charlotte, that she is going to work through later on with the tremendous potential of her creativity.

After her mothers dead, and this will be the following terrific deception for Charlotte, she yearned for the letter her mother had promised her many times, to tell her personally, as an angel about heaven and afterlife.

In fact we can conceive that Franziska Salomon, by telling these fairy-tales to her daughter must have induced into Charlotte very early her personal death-wishes as well as her obsession with dead and dying. Of course we have to connect this obsession of hers, with the very stron death-wishes her own mother was suffering from for many many years.

Dr. Salomon met and married a well-known opera-singer Paula Lindberg in 1930 and by all reports, including Charlottes own, Paula soon won over the step-daughter. Paula Lindberg survived all of Charlottes protagonist, she died in 2000, on the age of one hundred and two years.

I'll continue now by taking the general biographical facts in particular presented by Catherine Bernard, author of *Modern Thought and Literature*, and discussing the texts of Mary Lowenthal Felstiner that I will refer to more directly in my paper.

When Hitler had became chancellor in January 1933 the effect was devastating felt by the Salomons. Charlottes identity as a full Jew (all four grandparents as defined by nazi race science were Jewish) increased her vulnerability to anti-Semitic hostility in her school. But the Salomons, like so many other German Jews, adjusted. Albert continued as a surgeon for the Jewish hospital; Paula began to sing with the Jüdische Kulturbund, a cultural organisation founded by her colleague Kurt Singer , who had recently been dismissed from his position as the director of the Berlin City Oper.

The Jewish Cultural Association were Paula Lindberg joined in was run by and for Jews who were permitted to do so by the German government.. This organisation was established to provide a safe place for Jewsih artists to perform for an exclusively Jewish public in community centers, in synagogues and sometimes in private homes.

Here Alfred Wolfsohn arrived on the scene this time as a fan of Paula and a voice teacher. Alfred Wolfsohn had been deeply traumatized as a German soldier in the first world war. In the screams of dying soldiers he noticed the vast potential of the human voice and developed on this a method for releasing and training the voice, in which the voice and the personality are deeply connected.

In fact this therapeutic approach, known as scream therapy is worked out and applied on modern music by the Roy Heart Company till now, as it was developed even after the death of this very special person Alfred Wolfsohn in 1962.

With Charlotte he also referred to his theory about life and death, saying that only by diving into death - as Orpheus did- one could be free of fear and destruction. Influencing her deeply by doing so.

This man developed a complex relationship with the Salomon family, having strong sentiments for Paula Salomon Lindberg. He survived the Shoah by fleeing to England. In Charlottes paintings he is referred to as Amadeus Daberlohn, prophet of song.

Charlotte met Alfred in 1937 when he was sent tot the Salomons to become Paula' s singing instructor. Charlotte was deeply infatuated with Alfred because she admired his determination, his idealism and his philosophy about life and living. They shared a brief romantic encounter that ment much more to Charlotte than it did tot Albert.

In the winter of 1935/36 Charlotte Salomon was admitted to the State Art Academy in Berlin, as the only student of 100 % Jewish blood. At the academy Charlotte learned the Nazi-approved modern techniques, but was probably, to judge from her work, much more inspired by the modern art books miraculously still available in the Academy' s library and by the infamous 1938 ' Degenerated Art' show put on by the government and featuring some of the most provocative works of German expressionism, cubism, and the other artistic " isms" which flourished so luxuriously in the first part of the twentieth century.

But by November 8 , 1938, Kristallnacht, she had left the Academy; a prize for which she had been nominated had been diverted to another student, for fear of calling attention to Charlottes Jewishness.

In January 1939 after Kristallnacht , after Albert Salomon had been temporality interned in Sachsenhausen (and released only through the untiring efforts of Paula, who called up all her dramatic presence and considerable charm to please his case) Charlotte Salomon was abruptly packed off on the coast of southern France tot stay with her mothers parents, the Grunwalds. Her father and stepmother fled to Holland and survived, escaping from Westerbork.

In September 1939, Charlottes grandmother stole into the bathroom and put her neck in an noose. Charlotte found her there near dead.

As Grossmama Grunwald lay recuperating in the next room , Charlottes grandfather told the truth about her ghostly legacy. This was the moment when Charlotte Salomon began to paint her life.

Mary Lowenthal Felstiner writes in 1988, introducing Charlotte :

Charlotte was 23 and a refugee when she learned that the women in her family, her mother's sister, her mother's aunt, her mother's cousin, tried to take her life, till 1939, when her mother's mother tried to take hers too, the family kept its suicides secret for fear of perpetuating them. Chances were that whatever struck her relatives, would take Charlotte too; and unaware.

So the recovery of a silenced past became her project, her protection.

In 1994 Felstiner's description, gleaned from years of study of the pages to this incident in Charlotte's work, is far more expressive of Charlotte's pain and horror.

Soon after Grossmama's suicide-attempt, Grosspapa spilled the secret for thirteen years, not caring about how it hurt, bringing along a real climax of crudelity and sadism within the life of Charlotte..

In this family, every single person commits suicide.

Charlotte comments: 'I knew nothing of all that' Now she knew.

The traumatic revelation comes out, at last.

After the suicide of her grandmother – she throws herself out of the window, as her daughter, Charlotte's mother, did thirteen years earlier, Charlotte collapses and is suffering for weeks from a severe nervous breakdown.

Finally, as she puts it in her play, she finds herself alone with her painting, ready to make the choice between committing suicide herself too, or as she puts it, doing something really excentric.

This excentric thing will be her play: **Leben oder Theater**, in which she retakes her life on the level of artistic creation.

By this process of creating, that can be interpreted as **a sublime act of defence in the psychoanalytical sense**, one can say that she becomes the producer of her own fate.

As she declares on the last pages of her work, suicide is the only way out left to her, but remembering what her mother told her after the suicide of her younger sister Charlotte Grunwald, the aunt of Charlotte Salomon, 1913, - namely that she planned to do something excentric and crazy, in reaction to the events, and became a nurse ( Krankenschwester) . Charlotte Salomon on her turn decides to do the same: not to commit suicide but turning to write her play **Leben oder Theater**, that she finishes in September 1942.

The American owner of the French house she lives in Otilie Moore buys some of her work, to sell them in the USA.

Charlotte herself gives her work Life or Theater to a friend of this family asking to take care of it "it's all my life".

Another friend of Otilie, the Austrian refugee Alexander Nagler, also becomes very interested in the work and in Charlotte herself. They marry on 17 th June 1943. Because of an bureaucratic incident with the identification-documents, Alexander,

who has a false passport, is forbidden to marry Charlotte and unfortunately for both of them then declares openly himself also being a Jew, - because of all this Charlotte and Alexander are arrested on 24<sup>th</sup> of September 1943, when she is pregnant four months.

They are deported to Drancy, the last station to Auschwitz, where she probably is murdered immediately after arriving the 10<sup>th</sup> of October. Alexander dies from exhaustion on the first of January 1944.

-----  
I'll now more explicitly sum up some general characteristics of Charlottes play before make my concluding remarks on the psychoanalytical question regarding gender, involving also the very close identification of Charlotte with the male protagonist: Alfred Wolfson alias Daberlohn . After that I shall finish by showing you some materials from CD-ROM and film **Leben oder Theater**.

The play has been composed from 769 pieces, in which texts and images are brought together, often within allusions to pieces of music that, as Charlotte declares herself appear to her mind in the ongoing process of creation the text and the painting.

The play is presented in three parts, Vorspiel, Hauptteil and Epilogue, each of which has its own chapters and subdivisions as well as a numbering.

The central person in the play is called Charlotte Kann. The story begins with the suicide of Charlottes aunt, called Charlotte Knarre. We see the marriage of her parents, Albert Kann and Franziska Knarre 1915 and the birth of their only child Charlotte, 1917.

After some years Charlottes mother in the play dies from influenza, 1926. Her father re-marries the singer called Paulinka Bimbam , 1930, who is adored by Charlotte . Charlotte names the closest friends of Paulinka by professor Singsang and professor Klinklang.

When Germany turns nazi, her father, a medical professor, is fired and Paulinka has to stop her stage-career.

Charlotte very openly refers to the relationship between her stepmother and herself, as she does also in the central part (Hauptteil) with the relationship between Amadeus Daberlohn (the name is alluding to Mozart as well as to the fact that he has a structural lack of money – daber Lohn) and Paulinka, respectively Daberlohn and Charlotte.

Albert Kann , the father of Charlotte , is arrested by the Nazis and liberated after the very strong intervention of Paulinka Bimbam. Charlotte goes in exile to the south of France where her grandparents Knarre, alias Grunwald have lived since 1933.

In the final part of Leben oder Theater the war has begun. Grandmother Knarre tries to commit suicide.

After this, grandfather tells her about the suicides in the maternal line of the family, Not only referring to Charlottes aunt, also her mothers aunt and her mothers cousin , especially her mother herself threw herself out of the window, a fact completely new to Charlotte. Grandfather Knarre is trying to abuse Charlotte in making continuous incestuous advances to her.



Charlotte desperately tries to convince her grandmother that life is beautiful, using the theory of Amadeus Daberlohn by quotations: " You must go into yourself –into your childhood—to be able to get out of yourself".

Grandmother Knarre throws herself out of the window , following, by doing so, both of her daughters.

Grandfathers asks very cynically and sadistically Charlotte literally if she also is going to commit suicide, so that this whole story finally shall be stopped.

In fact Charlotte, at the moment of the suicide of her grandmother is the only survivor in the matrilinear line of the family Knarre/Kann.

-----  
Summarizing the play we are confronted with a very complex and highly extensive interartistic autobiographical material, a **Mixtum Compositum of texts , painting and music.**

It is a work of art in which autobiography is the mediating force.

The play of Charlotte actualizes major issues on the identity and function in art in European civilisation, art as the sublime, art as a way out, art as redemption.

The play also puts into question its own functionality, which is the most important characteristic of the work of Charlotte Salomon, connecting herself by doing so to modernism as the major stylistic movement in early twentieth-century art history.

The modernistic art work, generally spoken, puts itself into question. This definition , conceiving the work of Charlotte has a very heavy special connotation, namely that her play thematizes, above all things the the mental powers of the maker, the possibility or impossibility to keep alive, not to commit suicide.

The question of functionality also brings about the question of interpretation :

It can be filmed . We can read it as a book, it can be staged, or played,- we can read it as a strip

or film-script, focussing on the main characteristics, zooming in and out.

All of this has taken shape within the influential atmospheres of big other expressionistic artists as Charles Munch, Marc Chagall and Vincent van Gogh, within an incredible tearing and deeply melancholic background of vocal musical musical compositions –music with text- carefully chosen by Charlotte from the works of Bach, Mendelssohn, Mendelssohn, Mozart, Gluck, von Weber, Beethoven, Mahler.

I now will keep close to the ideas of Mary Lowenthal Felstiner

underlying her biography of 1994. However many reviews and articles about

Charlotte have been written almost none of them make significant reference to

Charlotte's gender and certainly none uses the word "feminist" to describe her work.

Had Felstiner not seen her work one day and found herself enraptured by its strength and scope, Charlotte Salomon might have remained merely an coda tot Anne Frank

, another example of the sensitivity and delicacy of a – somewhat older- young girl.

Felstiner's analysis of Charlotte Salomon and her work is a profoundly feminist one.

At all times she stresses the autonomy of her subject; that Salomon strove to be the author, quite literally, of her own fate, despite the Nazis. Despite the atmosphere of despair among the exile community, despite the seduction of suicide.

Charlotte was able to take the suicides of the women in her family and analyze them, not as evidence of women's hysteria or innate weakness, as the authorities of the day were wont to, but as evidence of a deep need for affinity, for recognition of the difficulty of being a woman in that world. Charlottes family had erased these suicides—so many of them - from their collective memory, had refused to acknowledge them as such. It would have been easy for Charlotte to do the same, easy and almost fitting for her to kill herself.

Mary Felstiner believes that *Life of Theater* is deeply the work of a woman, and accordingly describes her articles and book of Charlotte as a feminist scientist. What Felstiner brings to the larger discussion of the Holocaust is a compelling argument that gender is not merely a sidebar issue in the counting of the dead. Sex was not merely one of the many, and often described as wholly illogical and arbitrary, criteria for selection, it was the criterion..

On the ramp the primary secret purpose of deportation was finally acted out: to deprive Jewry of its biological reserves; to obliterate the biological basis of Jewry, as Himmler said Hoess; And as it was put in the Wannsee Protocol: to eliminate the germ cell of a new Jewish revival ( *Keimzelle eines neuen jüdischen Aufbaues*).

To be father of a child had no impact on selection. To be a mother in fact or in future – that was the final sentence.

Genocide is the act of putting women and children first. Of all deceptions a death camp settled on, this one went down the deepest. This was the hard core of the Holocaust.

I felt impressed by the argumentation put by Mary Felstiner to write about Charlotte out of **rage**: She says: What was personal about it for me is just my rage that she died. I cannot reconcile myself to it. And in some ways, feminism was my response – response may be too rational a word—my reaction of rage, because at least I could say one rational thing: That she was more likely to have perished because she was a woman, and not only that, but misunderstood her fate, because she was a woman.

Advancing certain hypotheses concerning racist ideology as a psychoanalyst Janine Chasseguet-Smirgel describes an intriguing unconscious wish, a powerful fantasy which she believes is universal, connected with visions of the world that occur in Chapter 2 of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*.

Chasseguet:

1) Only in the brain of a monster – not that of a man- could the plan of an organisation assume form and meaning whose activity must ultimately result in the collapse of human civilisation and the consequent devastation of the world.

2) this planet will, as did it millions of years ago, move through the ether devoid of men.

These two visions of a world turned arid occur at the end of chapter 2 of *Mein Kampf*. This is what the author predicts will happen if there is a Jewish victory over the other peoples of the world.

Janine Chasseguet now points at the very famous extremely important poem of T.S. Eliot, written in almost the same time as *Mein Kampf*, entitled *The Waste Land*.

Attempting some hypotheses concerning thought disorders which made Nazi **biocracy** and genocide possible she investigates the unconscious fantasies and dreams of borderline patients concerning the existence of a primary wish, immediate and inborn to remove all obstacles that make access to the mother's body.

Ridding oneself from all obstacles, to return to the mother's body, from the wish of returning to a world without organization, to pre-aeval chaos, to a universe marked by homogeneity on the continuum present before birth.

It is principally through these dreams of such patients that a kind of Wasteland is evoked, in regard to dreams in which Mother Earth becomes empty, frozen and arid.

Chasseguet here refers to dreams that reveal three successive stages: the destruction of Mother Earth, the preservation of a group of people, the final union of this group with the mother, leading to a state of bliss.

This is the schema of the Apocalypse in the Revelation of Saint John the Divine. It is extremely important how Chasseguet puts psychoanalysis here, as it has been called, **from couch to culture** [Peter Gay] in identifying the phenomenon of the Apocalypse, the Waste Land, as well as the image of an Utopia in the deepest wishes of the personal subconscious.

Here the land, the homeland is identified with the body of the mother (the German's homeland, the whole earth) once all obstacles preventing this union have been swept away.

Continuing her psychoanalytical explanation of the biocracy and genocide

Chasseguet refers to Hess, arguing that National Socialism is nothing but applied biology. The Nazi state, the *Volkische Staat* as Hitler called it is a biocracy.

To understand its essence, it is vital to stress the Nazi hypothesis that blood (the race) and earth are co-substantial: *Blut und Boden*.

The soil with which the German people are united by ties of blood is clearly recognized as being of a maternal nature. There is a link with the Mother that is total and immediate, like that of the foetus in the uterus.

The body of the nation must be purified. The German people (Aryans) must become a single body in order to be able to unite with Mother Earth (*Blut und Boden*).

The systematic concentration of pure blood, together with the expulsion of all that is foreign or undesirable, is the only way to succeed in eliminating impurities in the body of the nation.

In the camps, non-Aryan pregnant women were aborted by the SS doctors, that is if they were not sent directly to the gas-chambers. The sterilization of women and castration of men were also extensively practised.

In fact Charlotte's father Albert, as a surgeon could be saved from deportation because the (then refugee-) camp Westerbork in the Netherlands needed him for sterilization of women. To be able to do this Albert and Paula were consented to

leave the camp, to take the surgery instruments from an Amsterdam hospital, and did'nt return to Westerbork.

Prior to this period, however, euthanasia began to be practised on the deseased, handicapped, or mentally sick members of the German population. And long before the adoption of the Final Solution, euthanasia was carried out on all Jews in hospitals without needing to be justified on medical grounds.

Conceiving **this psychoanalytical view** on the roots of the German Blut und Boden-theory I am convinced that all this view could be extremely important in considering the mental atmosphere in which Charlotte Salomon was born and grew up.

The suicides in her family commonly are declared by a familiar or structural disorder in the maternal line.\* **NB toevoeging 2015 zie onder :“ erzwungene Freitod**

However of course this still can be true one has to take into consideration above all things, the cultural surroundings and mental or social conditions leading to total and systematic destruction of Jewish procreation.

It is indeed Janine Chasseguet, who I am connecting here to Charlotte Salomon, who points at the terrific symptoms of mental disorder underlying the structural hatred against non- German, non Aryan women in relation to their crucial role in procreation of the race that has to be destroyed.

The extremely creative personality of Charlotte Salomon – in a way- escaped and saved her life by art, that she was killed four months pregnant can be interpreted totally according to all this.

- **NB** in 2012 is een artikel verschenen van Darcy Buerkely

over Erzwungene Freitod in relatie tot incestueuze problemen in Joodse families in het vooroorlogse Berlijn,

zie onderstaand, **voetnoten : een aparte tekst refereert aan de familie Salomon.**

<http://www.hsozkult.de/publicationreview/id/rezbuecher-10093>