TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Elision of Holocaust Violence in James Bradley's *Flags of Our Fathers*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Art in English

By

Vijay Singh Adhikari

Central Department Of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

April 2010

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

T. U., Kirtipur

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Vijay Singh Adhikari has completed his thesis entitled "Elision of Holocaust Violence in James Bradley's *Flags of Our Fathers*" under my supervision. He carried out this research from June 2009 to April 2010. I hereby recommend this thesis to be submitted for viva voce.

Mr. Ghanshyam Bhandari

Supervisor

Date: ……

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Approval Letter

This thesis entitled "Elision of Holocaust Violence in James Bradley's *Flags of Our Fathers"* submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University by Mr. Vijay Singh Adhikari has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

_____ _____

Internal Examiner

_____

_____

External Examiner

_____ _____

Head

Central Department of English

Date: _____

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the proper guidance of my thesis supervisor Mr Ghanshyam Bhandari of Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. I express my heartily gratitude to him.

I would like to extent my deep appreciation to Prof. Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the Head of Central Department of English for his motivation.

Similarly, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Birendra Pandey, Badri Prasad Acharya, Harihar Gnyawali, Puspa Raj Acharya, Saroj Ghimire, Pom Bahadur Ghurung, and all the staffs of English Department who helped me in different ways to complete the present research. I am grateful to American Library, Central Library of Tribhuvan University, Social Science Baha and Library of English Department for the valuable materials of my research.

I am equally thankful to Basanta Kumar Shrestha, Krishna Prasad Bhattari, Pradip Aryal and Ram Bdr Chhetri, who helped me to prepare my dissertation. I am grateful to all the friends who know me and have helped me directly or indirectly while doing my research.

I would be remiss if I do not mention my parents Durga Bahadur Adhikari and Harikala Adhikari, Sisters Krishna Adhikari and Sarada Adhikari, brother Bikash Adhikari, brother-in-law Durga Bahadur Khattri and Bishnu Acharya and relatives for their encouragement. I want to remember my lovely fren Anamika(Sabi) who also helped me to complete the present research.

April 2010 Vijay Singh Adhikari

Abstract

James Bradley's book *The Flags of Our Fathers* examines the Holocaust memoir and the representation of trauma. James Bradley's *Flags of our Fathers* is an autobiographical account of his journey into his father's triumphant deeds in the Second World War in the Pacific Island called Iwo Jima. Rewriting the history of American involvement in the war with the symbolic representation of the flags, he glorifies the war in terms of patriotism thereby valorizing the American nationalism. While transforming his father and five other soldiers from anonymous representative figures into individuals, Bradley valorizes Americans and 'others' the war victims. Bradley's memory of war experiences of his father is guided by the cultural ideologies. His memory thus takes ethical turn and becomes a part of the ideological politics. His narrativization of trauma is tainted by ideology and uses the language of demonization. Bradley's book, thus, is a representation of his cultural ideology and trauma is the tool that he uses to show the cruelty of the opponents while narrating the accounts violence.

Contents

I. James Bradley, Holocaust Violence, and American Nationalism

Flags of our Fathers is an autobiographical account of James Bradley's journey into his father's triumphant deed in the pacific Island called Iwo Jima. Rewriting the history of American involvement in the war with the symbolic representation of flags, he glorifies the war in terms of patriotism thereby valorizing the American nationalism. While transforming his father and other five soldiers from anonymous representative figures into individuals, Bradley valorizes Americans and 'others' the war victims.

Bradley's memory of war experiences of his father is guided by his cultural ideology. To elide the holocaust violence Bradley engages him in constructing community by othering Japanese, Jews, and Chinese. In this book Bradley relies far too much on biographies, memoirs and Americans. This kind of material works fine as a supplement to historical works, but otherwise it needs to be treated skeptically and used sparingly most especially when discussing strategic or operational matters. This difference between biography and history, obviously enough, is one emphasis: biography can not offer panoramic view; major events are interpreted from the perspective of one person's experiences.

The research work contends that Bradley's memory of war experiences of his father is guided by the cultural ideologies. His memory thus takes ethical turn and becomes a part of the ideological politics. His narrativization of trauma is tainted by ideology and uses the language of demonization. The thesis argues that writer's authorities, editing and censor ship practices ultimately lead their literature of trauma that narrativization to traumatic memory.

James Bradley burst onto the national scene as an author in 2000 with his New York Times bestseller book *Flags of our Fathers*. James is the president of the James

Bradley Foundation, which fosters understanding between America and Asia. The foundation sends American to Japan and China to study. James is also a professional motivational speaker who has delighted thousands of listeners all over the world. James was raised in Wisconsin, studied at the university of Notre Dame, Sophia University in Tokyo, Japan and graduated with the degree in East Asian History from University of Wiscomsin. Before becoming an author James produced corporate films. He has travelled the world, living and working in more than 40 countries for nearly a decade. He has run companies in five countries. He has jumped out of airplanes at 15,000 feet, has scuba-dived in deep waters worldwide, and trekked to Mount Everest's base camp and walk among lions in Africa. He is an avid reader of history, enjoys discovering exotic cuisine, cliff diving, golfing and snow skiing.

Along with *Flags of Our Fathers* James Bradley has written two more books: *Flyboys* and *The Imperial Cruise*. In his highly acclaimed *Flags of Our Fathers,* Bradley told the story of the six men who raised American flag at Iwo Jima. A book on the bestseller list, entitled *Flags of Our Fathers*, describes the reluctance of many with combat experience to welcome attention and adulation. This book is about marines in Iwo Jima. The real heroes, say the survivors, are those who did not come back. Twenty-six thousands American fought for possession of this tiny Island. The author, James Bradley son of one of those in the famous photograph of the American flag being raised on Iwo Jima, describes his father hardly ever speaking about Iwo Jima avoiding interviews. His father, John Bradley, a navy corpse man, had joined the navy hoping to make it through the war with a bunk to sleep in everyday and regular meals. Instead he was assigned as a corpsman with the marines- a group highly respected by every marine in combat. James Bradley rejects the idea of heroism as

uncommon valor. He sees the performance of those like his father who served on Iwo Jima as common valor.

Like his earlier book *Flags of Our Fathers*, *Flyboys* provides highly personalized accounts of the savagery of the war in the pacific and how it affected the people who took part in it. His research included an examination of recently declassified military documents regarding the *Flyboys'* imprisonment as well as interviews with surviving family members and with former Japanese soldiers who had been with the Americans after their capture. But *Flyboys* is much more than a series of biographical sketches of nine American airmen who were shot down over a small Island in the Pacific Ocean. Bradley tries to put their story in a much larger context. His second book, *Flyboys,* which debuted in 2003, is the secret story of eight naval aviators who were beheaded on the island next to Iwo Jima. It is the true story of young American airmen who were shut down over Chichi Jima. This an ambitious book that denotes its first hundred pages to tracing the history of Japanese-American relations from the time Commodore Perry first forced Japan to confront the rest of the world in 1853 the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. Bradley provides painful examples of instances when Americans committed terrible atrocities against people they had convinced themselves were somehow less than fully human. In the end *flyboys* is not just a "true story of courage" but a frightening reminder of the savagery human beings are capable of and of the terrible moral choices nations at war must make.

In *Imperial Cruise,* Bradley writes about the World War II moves to an earlier era to write about a series of actions that helped set the stage for that war. In 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt dispatched a team of politicians including his secretary of war, future president William Howard Taft to Asian order to set in motion a series of secret agreements that drastically advanced America's dominance on the world

stage. Bradley explores the idea that American Imperialism began with the voyage, and takes a close look at its implications throughout the 20th century and into the 21st.

In the winter of 1945, on the tiny island of Iwo Jima, a ferocious, epic battle was fought, resulting in the loss of more than 48,000 lives and producing what was to become one of the most recognizable symbols of World War II: a photograph of six soldiers raising an American flag on the peak of Mount Suribachi. One of the six, Navy corpsman John Bradley came away from this historical moment with a deep and mysterious silence about his role in the flag raising. Even his wife heard him speak of it only once in their 47-year marriage. After Bradley's death, his son James began to piece together the facts of his father's heroism, as well as that of the other five men, all of whom became reluctant heroes because of their presence during that fateful instant when the shutter clicked and created a wartime icon. Based on James Bradley's *Flags of Our Fathers* for adults, this abridged version for younger readers retains the somewhat terse drama, intense heartbreak, and bittersweet triumph of the original narrative. Through his research on the event and the soldiers (three of the men were killed in combat within days of the flag raising), Bradley explores the dubious nature of heroism and the devastating effects of war.

But perhaps the most interesting part of the story is what happened after the victory. The men in the photo--three were killed during the battle--were proclaimed heroes and flown home, to become reluctant symbols. For two of them, the adulation was shattering. Only James Bradley's father truly survived, displaying no copy of the famous photograph in his home, telling his son only: "The real heroes of Iwo Jima were the guys who didn't come back." Few books have ever captured the complexity and furor of war and its aftermath as well as *Flags of Our Fathers*. A penetrating, epic look at a generation at war, this is history told with keen insight, enormous honesty,

and the passion of a son paying homage to his father. It is the story of the difference between truth and myth, the meaning of being a hero, and the essence of the human experience of war.

In this unforgettable chronicle of perhaps the most famous moment in American military history, James Bradley has captured the glory, the triumph, the heartbreak, and the legacy of the six men who raised the flag at Iwo Jima. Here is the true story behind the immortal photograph that has come to symbolize the courage and indomitable will of America. Thomas J. Schaeper says:

> This is the touching and emotional story of the most famous photograph to come out of World War II, the flag-raising on Mount Suribachi during the Battle of Iwo Jima is February 1945. Bradley is the son of one of the six man immortalized in that remarkable photo, and his gripping narrative, vivid descriptions , and heartfelt style make this a powerful story of courage, humility, and tragedy. [. . .] Three of the Marines were killed in combat just days later; the other two Marines and Navy Hospital Corpsman John Bradley survived the war only to face unwanted fame as reluctant heroes. (102)

More than just a history of a famous battle, this is a poignant and fitting tribute to a loving father, to all Pacific demic and public libraries. Likewise, Clay Lewis interprets it in the light of History and Myth. In this regard he rightly says:

> The story of men at war, focusing on the six begins in their families from across the country, from Pennsylvania to Texas. The reader follows their enlistments training, combat on Guam (in a few cases), intense training in California and Hawaii, the assault Iwo, and the month long battle with its ferocity, brutality, and glory (for less than a

> second). Only three of six survived with one of those, Doc Bradley badly wounded by shrapnel. Drawing on interviews with families and U.S. Marine survivors, medal citations, unit histories, and the accounts of historians, the story is effective for its focus on individuals. The bloody and devastating experience of marines is conveyed through firsthand accounts. (Cxxv)

Merrill L. Bartlett also reviewed *Flags of Our Fathers* in terms of patriotism and nationalism. Though he made little emphasis upon effects of Pacific War, his major emphasis is upon patriotism and nationalism. According to him;

> This readable and poignant account had its origins in unusual circumstances. When John H. Bradley, the lone navy man in the famous photograph, died, his son sought answers to the questions that his father never answered. A cigar box among the elder Bradley's possessions contained his medals from the war including a Navy Cross, the nation's second highest award for heroism. (554)

Instead of a dry rehashing of events, good historical nonfiction gives the reader a feeling of being directly in harm's way. Extensively researched they are also filled with tension, courage, and resourcefulness, making them as thrilling as top suspense novels. In this regard Rollie Welch comments;

> James Bradley tells the story of the six men--- one of whom is his father--- who were immortalized by the famous World War II photograph of the Marines raising the American flag on Iwo Jima. His journey of discovery is a fascinating and deeply moving account of a photograph and monument that almost everyone can identify 55 years later but about which most actually know little. (144)

Similarly, *Flags of Our Fathers* is reviewed by Boston Globe as "A powerful book whose vivid and horrific images do not easily leave the mind…[*Flags of Our Fathers*] relates the brutalizing story of Iwo Jima with fine eye for both the strategic imperative and the telling incident" (Blurb, *Flags of Our Fathers*).

A central claim of contemporary literary trauma theory asserts that trauma creates a speechless fright that divides or destroys identity. This serves as the basis for a larger argument that suggests identity is formed by the intergenerational transmission of trauma. However, a discursive dependence upon a single psychological theory of trauma produces a homogenous interpretation of the diverse representations in the trauma novel and the interplay that occurs between language, experience, memory, and place. Considering the multiple models of trauma and memory presented in the trauma novel draws attention to the role of place, which functions to portray trauma's effects through metaphoric and material means. Descriptions of the geographic place of traumatic experience and remembrance situate the individual in relation to a larger cultural context that contains social values that influence the recollection of the event and reconfiguration of the self.

Trauma, in my analysis, refers to a person's emotional response to an overwhelming event that disrupts previous ideas of an individual's sense of self and the standards by which one evaluates society. The term "trauma novel" refers to work of fiction that conveys profound loss or intense fear on individual or collective levels. A defining feature of the trauma novel is the transformation of the self signified by an external, often terrifying experience, which illuminates the process of coming to terms with the dynamics of memory that inform the new perceptions of the self and world. The external event that elicits an extreme response from the protagonist is not necessarily bound to a collective human or natural disaster such as war or tsunamis.

The event may include, for example, the intimately personal experience of female sexual violence, such as found in Dorothy Allison's *Bastard out of Carolina* and Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye*, or the unexpected death of a loved one, as found in Edward Abbey's *Black Sun.*

The group of cultural and literary theorists whom I would loosely categorize as practitioners of "trauma theory"-including, most probably, Cathy Caruth, Soshana Felman, Dori Laub, and Dominick LaCapra-share several assumptions. Their ideas all derive to a large extent from Freudian conceptions of memory and trauma, and they all emphasize the temporal aspects of psychic trauma: Caruth for intance, describes the traumatic encounter as "as break in the mind's experience of time" (61). Implicit in this concept of trauma, as well, is the assumption that trauma is an individual and private phenomenon. And they all suggest, moreover, the trauma manifests itself primarily as a loss of language, coupled paradoxically with the compulsion to talk about that loss. The corollary of this point is that the "cure" for traumatic memory disorders is some variant of the talking cure. For some theorists, this is the tasks of formal psychoanalytic therapy: Dori Laub, for instance, argues that therapy is "a process of constructing a narrative, of reconstructing a history and essentially, of *re-externalizing the event"* (Felman and Laub). For LaCapra, "testimonial witnessing" is a more effective mode of constructing narrative around traumatic occurrences: "witnessing based on memory…provides insight into lived experience and its transmission in language and gesture" (*History and Memory 11*).

This thesis examines historical transformations of many soldier's collective memory of the Pacific War of Island called Iwo Jima by utilizing a theoretical framework that combines a model of reiterated problem solving and theory historical trauma. I illustrate the event of the pacific war allowed characters to consolidate

previously fragmented commemorative practices into a master frame to define the interwar American and Japanese identity in terms of commemoration of cultural ideologies of “Iwo Jima.” I also show that nationalization of trauma of “Pacific War” involved a shift from pity to sympathy in structures of feeling about the event. This historical study suggests that a re-iterated problem-solving approach can be effacious in analyzing how construction of politics of memory traumatic event connects with the recurrent reworking of national identity, on the one hand, and how theory of historical trauma can be helpful in exploring a synthesis of psychological and sociological approaches to commemoration of a traumatic event, on the other.

This is a war novel. War is the cause of grief, frustration, devastation, suffering, and untimely death; this even gives continuity to these things. Different literatures have preserved the traumatic experience that wars have imprinted on society. The hideous nature of war took thousands of peoples lives; it carried stream of tears and blood. The trauma of war loomed everywhere, represented everywhere. Many innocent armed forces had to sacrifice their lives, becoming scapegoats in the battle of two great countries. They lost their lives without their any guilt and mistakes, situation turned into horrible pangs in their families. In this book too; characters that are survived in the war have the feeling of wounded, neglected, horrified and terrified, only can feel the sour taste of it.

There is always politics of representation on every piece of writing, the writer who has written about a text, is always guided by the ideological instances that he is accustomed to, eventually making his writing a mere reflection of the representation of his cultural ideology. James Bradley as an American valorized American war veterans by ‘othering’ other countries’ war veterans. War has always represented as something bad and horrible due to its bad impact upon people and society. Most of the

writers have focused on the terrific sight and destruction of war. It can never have any good impact upon society, hence is always discouraged. There are other writers too, for whom war is a vehicle of change. Whatever be the evidences provided in favor or against it, this topic is worth pondering. Every opinion about war is the result of representation of writer's ideology. Truth is always hidden because one has to go beyond biasness in order to reach the arena of truth and must be free of any opinion but it is impossible to avoid our ideological stances.

The author James Bradley in this book has included different veterans who fought in the interwar period for national glory. Men experience historical events, such as wars, as different times in their lives and are thereby influenced in different ways. Using data on a cohort of veterans from interwar period, this study investigates the proposition that entry into the armed forces at a relatively early age maximized discontinuity and facilitated a redirection of the life course through psychological development, a delayed entry into family roles, and greater advancement opportunity. By comparison, later entry into the service favored greater risk of family and career disruption with in pattern of life continuity from adolescence to the middle years. In *Flags of Our Fathers*, the messy idea of James Bradley searching for insight into his father's war trauma serves great purpose. Anyone paying attention to the remainder of the book will easily realize why and to what extent the older Bradley suffered with gruesome memories he didn't want. The Pacific War and the Japanese and America Occupation were traumatic periods in the lives of people now over sixty years old in Japan and America and others. This study traces why individuals interviewed for oral history of the Pacific War and the American Occupation have often been able to tell stories of trauma without being overwhelmed by their reminiscences. It emphasizes that memories of traumatic experiences of the Pacific War and American Occupation

in Japan is mediated and eased by supportive social networks that are part of the interview subject's community. The individual's personal memories of traumatic war experiences are positioned in the context of the collective memory of the group and, thus, are made easier to recall. However, for individuals whose personal memories are at variance with the collective memory of the group they belong to, recalling traumatic experiences is more difficult and alienating as they do not have the support of their community. The act of recalling traumatic memories in the context of the collective memory of a group is particularly relevant both in America and Japan.

"Violence" is often reified, taken as a characteristic or category that is either present or absent within a society or group, making it difficult to examine the role it plays in social relations or to examine it as an alternative people use to deal with human predicaments. Going beyond the mere presence or absence of "violence" challenges us to locate it within a set of practices, discourses, and ideologies, to examine it as a way to deploy power within a differential social and political relation, or as a means that states use to buttress.

Scholars do not agree on exactly what constitutes "violence". Nothing that it permeates daily life in many parts of the modern world, Williams selects violence as a keyword, denoting a concept that in his estimation significantly reflects ideas and values that often characterize general discussions of contemporary society. He identifies seven senses of "violence": aggressive behavior, vehement conduct, infringement of property or dignity, the use of physical force, and threat, or dynamic portrayal of any of the above. Riches argues that what is generally called violence can be practical or symbolic, visible or invisible, physical or emotional, and can stem from a perpetrator's personal capacity or from the forces of society. Anthropologists who have considered violence primarily in its practical, physical, and visible

manifestations have juxtaposed “violent” societies, as though they were mirror images. Biological explanations are far from a dead letter in psychological and genetic studies, especially as they are viewed in popular culture, but rarely cited as a single cause explanation in anthropology. A large literature has emerged on other causes of violence e.g. material, ecological, psychological, and historical.

Along with *Flags of our Fathers* by James Bradley, many books, movies and articles like "The Myth of Iwo Jima: A Rebuttal" by Brian Hanley, "Breaking the Cycle of Iwo Jima Mythology" by Robert S. Burrell, *Iwo Jima: Monuments, Memories, and the American Hero* by Karal Ann Marling and John Wetenhall, "Diary of First Lieutenant Sugihara Kinryu: Iwo Jima, January-February 1945" by Stephen J Lofgren and *The Sands of Iwo Jima* a movie by John Wayne are published and directed in the event of Iwo Jima. In a recently published essay of the time, "Breaking the Cycle of Iwo Jima Mythology" Caption Robert S. Burrell asserts that the taking Iwo Jima in 1945 was unnecessary-something that was known at the time but discounted because of inter-service rivalry. In the article "The Myth of Iwo Jima: A Rebuttal" Brian Hanley is critical of the methodology and conclusions of an essay by Robert Burrell published in the October 2004 *JMH* asserting that the invasion of Iwo Jima in 1945 was unnecessary and in part a function of inter-service rivalry. Burrell is engaging in retrospective criticism, neglects the role of the impending invasion of Japan, and engages in the sort of parochial-mindedness he detects in the Army Air Force and the Navy. But later on Burrell considering its horrific lost, he says Pacific War veterans understandably sought to label Iwo Jima as the “inevitable battle”. He further points out that Iwo Jima should not be associated with simplistic description, the stories of its heroes is both tragic and triumphant, but no marine died in Iwo Jima in vain!

Marling and Wetenhall's *Iwo Jima* is especially rich in detailing the many variations on the original that have been wrought over the years. This book gives the detailed picture of Pacific War. Marling and Wetenhall conclude *Iwo Jima* with a chapter on the 1985 "Return to Iwo Jima," a reunion of the surviving warriors from both the United States and Japan who, forty years later, saw their lives in a fuller perspective and embraced one another in recognition of the final futility of war. John Wayne movie *The Sands of Iwo Jima* forms the subject of a whole chapter in "Iwo Jima. Diary of First Lieutenant Sugihara Kinryu: Iwo Jima, January-February 1945" by Stephen J Lofgren is first hand Japanese accounts of ground combat against United States forces during World War II are comparatively rare, especially accounts that have been translated into English. The following contemporary account, a diary from Iwo Jima, is particularly timely as we mark the fiftieth anniversary of the American-Japanese battle for the island of Iwo Jima. His vivid first-hand description of life on Iwo Jima before and during the battle provides a graphic rendition of the operation from the Japanese perspective. Like most of his comrades, the author of the diary did not survive the fighting on Iwo Jima. In every books articles the vivid description of the Pacific War is well described.

Every art, thus, is a representation of writer's cultural ideology and trauma is the tool that he uses to show the cruelty of opponent, representing the reality according to his ideological preferences. It is impossible to present the reality without being colored by some personal preferences. Writer's biasness is always present in his writing and thus making the writing a mere representation. There is politics of memory while making representation in every text and it is unavoidable fact. Thus *Flags of our Fathers* by James Bradley explains historical trauma theory and the historical trauma response. It includes ways to incorporate the theory in treatment,

research, and evaluation and concludes with implications for all massively traumatized populations and individual.

II. Historical Trauma and Memory

Writing Trauma, Writing History

We live in a world torn and scarred by violence. Globalization has increased the speed and scale of conflicts and catastrophes, but violence has been integral to the human condition from our earliest origins. We should expect, therefore, to find its traces in the design of our brains and bodies no less than in the weave of our communities. Trauma has become a keyword through which clinicians and scholars from many disciplines approach the experience of violence and its aftermath. The metaphor of trauma draws attention to the ways that extremes of violence break bodies and minds, leaving indelible marks even after healing and recovery. But the notion of trauma has been extended to cover a vast array of situations of extremity and equally varied individual and collective responses. Trauma can be seen at once as a sociopolitical event, a psycho physiological process, a physical and emotional experience, and a narrative theme in explanations of individual and social suffering.

The etymology of the word *trauma* goes back to the Greek word for wound. By the mid-1600s, *trauma* appears in medical literature to refer to bodily wounds, and this use of the term continues up to the present in medicine and surgery. Although trauma involves damage to tissue, the body has mechanisms of repair and healing that can restore its integrity and function, albeit often leaving scars. When physical trauma exceeds the body's capacity for repair, there may be lasting damage or death. Severe trauma can lead to a state of cardiovascular collapse, termed *shock*. This idea of shock as an overwhelming of the body's regulatory systems accompanies the notion of trauma throughout its medical history. Just as trauma to the body may result in a loss of physical function, trauma to the head or spinal cord, resulting in a shock to the nervous system, can lead to a loss of behavioral, psychological, or intellectual

functioning. Throughout the medical history of trauma, the key concept is that a violent event can cause injury with structural damage to the body and its physiological systems, while also activating bodily systems dedicated to survival, recovery, and repair.

Moving far beyond its origins in medical terminology, “trauma” has enjoyed a multitude of applications in various disciplines. Where trauma originally denoted a physical wound, within the fields of psychoanalysis and psychology, any inspection or treatment of the traumatic wound shifts the main emphasis from somatic to psychic topologies. With the inclusion of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) into the official diagnostic manual in 1980, public awareness of trauma increased rapidly. Since the mid 1990s trauma has also gained a great deal in currency within fields other than psychology and psychiatry.

Scholars such as Cathy Caruth, Dominick LaCapra, Jenny Edkins, Tim Woods, E. Ann Kalpan, Avishai Margalit, Shoshana Felman and Lawrence Langer have introduced trauma theory as a central concern of their literary interpretations. The term has taken on cultural dimensions due largely to its relevance for issues of collective identity, and has thus become popular in Cultural Studies. The vogue of the concept has also necessarily been contingent on a succession of historical conditions – two World Wars, the Vietnam War, (post)colonialism and global terrorism – as well as on changes in the ideologies, philosophy, and cultural practices of the West: particularly the popularization of psychoanalytic discourse and the proliferation of public staging of personal suffering in the mass media. While the concept of trauma has traditionally been used to address concerns of the victimized and marginalized, it has also come to function well as a paradigm for postmodern anxieties concerning experience and representation.

Trauma analysis emerged in the 1990s as an explicit, cross-disciplinary method of theoretical inquiry. In the study of the Holocaust, especially, bit also in the study of modernity, slavery, race, gender, and what came to feel like all forms of suffering or shock, fundamental or regional, trauma surfaced as a key term for categorizing experience a concept with which the work of Sigmund Freud, Walter Benjamin, and Paul de Man came into contact. Sigmund Freud finds the dynamics of trauma, repression and symptom formation as the matter of hysteria. Freud held that an overpowering event, unacceptable to consciousness, can be forgotten and is revealed in the form of somatic symptoms of compulsive and repetitive behaviors. Studying trauma theory related with Freud, James Berger comments on the relating mater of neurotic symptom with the repressed drives:

> [I]nitial theory of trauma and symptom became problematic for Freud when he concluded that neurotic symptoms were more often the result of repressed drives and desires than of traumatic events. Freud returned to the theory of trauma in 'Beyond the Pleasure Principle', a work which originated in his treatment of World War I Combat Veterans who suffered from repeated nightmares and other symptoms of their wartime experience. (570)

The traumatic event and its aftermath become central to psychoanalysis.

Memorizing Historical Trauma

Historical trauma is cumulative emotional and psychological wounding, over the lifespan and across generations, emanating from massive group trauma experiences. The Historical Trauma Response is a constellation of features in reaction to this trauma. The Historical Trauma Response may include substance abuse as a vehicle for attempting to numb the pain associated with trauma. The Historical

Trauma Response often includes other types of self-destructive behavior, suicidal thoughts and gestures, depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, anger, and difficulty recognizing and expressing emotions. Associated with Historical Trauma Response is historical unresolved grief that accompanies the trauma. Historical trauma is an example of intergenerational trauma, which is the general idea that a trauma an individual experiences in an earlier generation can have effects that reach into the lives of future generations.

It is often assumed that history becomes meaningful when seen through the lens of personal experience. This work is informed by our extended study of forms of commemoration that enable the remembrance of war in a way that traces and supports the potential transformation of the social grammar of violence inherent in such realities. Educators often assume that traumatic historical events can be meaningful through hearing, reading, or viewing accounts that make apparent personal engagements with history. These accounts take the forms of diaries or eye-witness statements, documentary photographs or film, novels, poetry, stories, and fictionalized film or theatre. The primary purpose of all such accounts is to provide testimony to convey through multiple expressive forms the historical substance and significance of prior events and experiences. Memory is usually left to psychologists and biologists and now to the newly developed cognitive science. But memory in the form of history and tradition is central to what we mean by society and to all social interaction

The memory wave in the humanities has contributed to the impressive revival of cultural history. Memory is usually left to psychologists and biologists and now to the newly developed cognitive science. But memory in the form of history and tradition is central to what we mean by society and to all social interaction, which was exactly the point Marx wished to make. Memory provides individuals and collectives

with a cognitive map, helping orient who they are, why they are here and where they are going. Memory in other words is central to individual and collective identity.

Memory is usually conceived as individually based, as residing inside the heads of individuals. Theories of identity formation, socialization, tend to conceptualize memory as part of the development of self and personality. Memory, once viewed as important in anthropology because of its role in the maintenance of oral traditions, has returned to the fore, this time in recognition of memory's centrality to embodiment and the creation of meaning. Memory is embodied. It emanates from bodily experience that enacts the past. Memory is not simply a personal, subjective experience. It is socially constructed, and thus reconfigures experience. People filter memories according to what is meaningful in the present. Through current meanings, memories interpret the past events in people's lives as people try to make connections between past, present, and the anticipated future. But what happens when memories are so traumatic that the effort to create these connections only underscores one's sense of disruption and renders the present unreconciled in light of the past? Embodied memories of terror and violence refract the world through a lens altered by fear and mistrust and by physical and emotional pain. Such memories encompass those aspects of cultural processes that have allowed the world one lives into become an unspeakable, hostile, and death-ridden place.

Memory is replacing old favorites--- nature, culture, language--- as the word most commonly paired with history, and that shift is remaking historical imagination. History, as with other key words, finds its meanings in large part through its counter-concepts and synonyms, and so the emergence of memory promises to rework history's boundaries. Those borders should attract our interest, for much current historiography pits memory against history even though few authors openly claim to

be engaged in building a world is which memory can serve as an alternative to history.

Dominick LaCapra, a leading scholar in the field of trauma theory, has produced some works that address the moral and hermeneutical dimensions of representing traumatic history and the Holocaust in particular. LaCapra as a poststructuralist historiographer gives historiographic touch to trauma theory. In *History and Memory after Auschwitz,* LaCapra deals with the nature of history and memory following the Holocaust. LaCapra sets about examining history and memory in a post-Holocaust age: What does it mean to remember? What is remembered and to what purpose? What is the precise role of forgetting? The book leaves the reader with a probing sense of the difficulties that surround the very act of remembering the Holocaust. Concerned primarily with the generations of individuals who did not experience Nazi horror directly yet who have lived with its memory all their lives, the book launches a thoughtful probe into some of the ensuring problematics.

Writing History, Writing Trauma reiterates LaCapra's long-standing critique of "objectivist" history, that is, any neutral, comprehensive survey of the past that does not recognize its own implication in the act of understanding. At the same time, it rejects the constructivist assertion that truth claims can be made only in relation to discrete events, not in relation to the higher-level interpretive structures within which historiography embeds them. For LaCapra, much about the past is determinable; it is the inditing of the past's reality into:

> A goal of historical understanding is, as I have intimated, to develop not only a professionally validated public record of past events but also critically tested empirically accurate, accessible memory of significant events which becomes part of the public sphere. (95)

That the historian, particularly the historian of trauma, should pursue. Doing this requires more than simply recording the past; it demands a disciplined empathy with the traumatized.

LaCapra, in his another work “Trauma, Absence, Loss”, describes recovery from trauma as a process of separating absence from loss, where loss involves a particular historical event, and absence the perception of something as missing that was never present to being with. Since every history is written from a dominant perspective, it has the tendency of hiding the loss. This loss marks absence. Conflation or confusion of these is a part of traumatic experience, but could also result from inappropriate identification with another’s loss, mistaking felt absence for experienced loss. Failure to properly distinguish between these two has disastrous consequences. As LaCapra writes:

> When absence is converted into loss, one increases the likelihood of misplaced nostalgia or utopian politics in quest of a new totality or fully unified community. When loss is converted into (or encrypted in an indiscriminately generalized rhetoric of) absence, one faces the impasse of endless melancholy, impossible mourning, and interminable aporia in which any process of working through the past and its historical losses is foreclosed or prematurely aborted. (698)

LaCrapra further says that treated as loss, absence pushes witness to fill voids that cannot be filled, through retaliation or through misplaced identification with real victims. Alternately, a witness or victim may choose to preserve the void, and revisit the site of perceived historical loss with compulsive regularity.

Dominick LaCapra in his essay "Trauma, Absence, Loss" talks about historical trauma and structural trauma in relation to the conflation of absence and

loss. In terms of absence, one may recognize that one cannot loss what one never had. The terms can be used with the term, lack too. Structural trauma is related to trans-historical absence (absence of / at the origin) and appears in different ways in all societies and all lives. Everyone is subject to structural trauma and historical trauma is related to particular events that do in deed involve looses, such as, the dropping of the atom bomb on Japanese cities. The Holocaust, slavery ort apartheid-even suffering the effect of the atom bomb in Hiroshima or Nagasaki can become a founding trauma. Historical trauma is specific and not everyone is subject to it. LaCapra in relation to it opines:

> The belated temporality of trauma and the elusive nature of the shattering experience related to it render the distinction between the structural and historical trauma problematic but do not make it irrelevant. The traumatizing events in historical trauma can be determined while structural trauma like absence is not an event but an anxiety producing condition of possibility related to the potential for historical traumatization. (725)

Historical trauma is treated in three ways: one as absence, two as presence and acknowledgement. That acknowledgement itself is structural trauma and it can't register the Real. Loss is vertical thing leads towards modern notion and absence is horizontal leads towards postmodern notion. LaCapra believes that trauma should be dealt in relation to loss and absence as he opines:

> Historical losses or lacks can be dealt with in ways that may significantly improve conditions---indeed effect basic structural transformation---without promising secular salvation or a sociopolitical return to a putatively lost unity or community. Paradise absent is

> different from paradise lost: it may not be seen as annihilated only to be regained in some hoped-for, apocalyptic future or sublimely blank utopia that, through a kind of creation *ex nihilo,* will bring renewal, salvation, or redemption.

The historical trauma is associated with loss but the history does not recognize it as loss rather it marks absence. History has a tendency to see everything as smooth and comfortable which leads to structural trauma. Structural trauma tries to deny the force of trauma.

In the essay, LaCapra alludes to ways in which absence misunderstood as loss can manifest itself in destructive forms of nationalism. He also identifies in such confusion a more subtle violence towards difference, through misplaced empathy that folds the other (the real victim) into the self. According to LaCapra, to violently empathize is to expand the space of the self, constructing social symmetry where there is none.

Jenny Edkins in "Introduction: trauma, violence and the political community" of her book *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* talks about the reckoning that comes in aftermath of a war of catastrophe to clarify the same fact of LaCapra. Jenny Edkins explores how we remember traumatic events such as wars, famines, genocides and terrorism. She argues that remembrance does not have to be nationalistic but can instead challenge the political systems that produced the violence. Using examples from the World Wars, Vietnam, the Holocaust, Kosovo and September 11th, Edkins analyzes the practices of memory rituals through memorials, museums and remembrance ceremonies. This wide-ranging study embraces literature, history, politics and international relations, in an original contribution to the study of memory.

Using historical and field research, Edkins examines sites and practices that commemorate famines, wars genocides, and terrorist attacks.

A traumatic event, as Edkins defines it, usually involves force, although this is not enough; trauma also:

> Has to involve a betrayal of trust… What we call trauma takes place when the very powers that we are convinced will protect us and give us security become our tormentors: when the community of which we considered ourselves members turns against us or when our family is no longer a source of refuge but a site of danger. (4)

As such, traumatic events obliterate our previously held assumptions that the world and our place in it; they often "reveal the contingency of the social order" (5).

Some forms of remembering, however, do not rewrite survivors' experience into an official, nationalist history. While these sites and practices vary widely, they have in common spontaneous, unscripted responses from the public and the refusal to see the past as something static, where our interpretations of events are somehow settled. These sites acknowledge the existence of trauma time; rather than channeling or masking the horror of the event, they make use of traumatic memory to unsettle the foundations of sovereign power.

Trauma and the Memory of Politics is gracefully written; weaving together nuanced theoretical observations with rich historical and ethnographic detail. Rather than awkwardly imposing a single theoretical framework on the cases she studies, Edkins lets the theory emerge almost organically from the cases themselves. Theory happens here in the interstices between events and interpretations. This is significant because her method reflects her intellectual and ethical concerns with bearing witness; "[w]ith a traumatic event," she argues, "we are not able, even in a preliminary way, to

say what happened" (39). To impose a clear theoretical narrative on memory would be to ignore the unique dimensions of trauma time, and the difficulty inherent in describing events that are beyond words. Yet, as Edkins asserts, the impossibility of saying does not absolve us from the responsibility of trying. Thus, her method, like the more "successful" memorial experiences she describes, must " 'encircle again and again the site' of the trauma," rather than fix it in time and space with a definitive account of its truth (Slavoj Zizek quoted in Edkins, 15).

Even historians have been forced to rethink their scholarly identities as a result of the rise of memory studies. While most academics still maintain that in its demand for proof, history stands in sharp opposition to memory, there are good reasons to question such a clear epistemological divide between academic and non-academic representations of the past. Perhaps history should be more appropriately defined as particular type of cultural memory because, as Peter Burke already remarked in 1989:

> Neither memories nor histories seem objective any longer. In both cases we are learning to take account of conscious or unconscious selection, interpretation and distortion. In both cases this selection, interpretation and distortion is socially conditioned. (98)

Memory's relation to history remains one of the interesting theoretical challenges in the field.

After traumatic events, there is struggle over memory according to Edkins "Memory is not straightforward, especially in the case of traumatic memory"(16). Elaborate this concept of traumatic memory she states:

> As far as memory is concerned how we remember a near, for example, and the way in which we acknowledge and describe what we call

> trauma can be very much influenced by dominant views, that is by the state. However, it is not determined by them: their influence and the state structure itself can be contested and challenged. (11)

In the view of Edkins, traumatic experiences can be resulted when there is mismatch between expectation and event. Traumatic experience may also arise in the forms of revelation since trauma can not be comprehended when it first occurs.

Trauma, Ethics and Morality

Memory is one aspect of social practice. Memory can be viewed as a human, cultural practice that is moral rather than a natural process that is technical, instrumental, or intellectual. Memory is never morally or pragmatically neutral. Memories are powerful symbols of the self. They are suffused with individuals' moral authority, their view of how life has been and should be. Accounts of the past are culturally organized to make sense of the world and one's place within that world, and, as such, memories are incomplete, reshaped interpretations to create a world that makes sense.

Traumatic memories may be narrated repeatedly in an effort to bring healing and closure to the pain of remembering. It must be acknowledged, however, that the enormity of the pain and the incomprehensibility of the memories may overwhelm those embodied efforts to heal past and present. Not all discontinuities can be healed. Life consists of retellings, thereby calling attention to the importance of time and process in narrative. For survivors of genocide, the disruption they have experienced may never be reconciled.

Memory, once viewed as important in anthropology because of its role in the maintenance of oral traditions, has returned to the fore, this time in recognition of memory's centrality to embodiment and the creation of meaning. Memory is

embodied. It emanates from bodily experience that enacts the past. Memory is not simply a personal, subjective experience. It is socially constructed and present oriented, and thus reconfigures experience. People filter memories according to what is meaningful in the present. Through current meanings, memories interpret the past events in people's lives as people try to make connections between past, present, and the anticipated future.

Individual memory is never literal reproduction, but an effort to render the continuity in change realistic. Personal memory of events is frequently experienced in imaginal form. Imagination is both a disposition and a powerful self tool; imagination and perception coalesce in embodied experience. Narrating traumatic memories is an effort to make sense not only of the past but of the present as well. In narrating the traumas they have experienced, people are trying to establish a sense of continuity between past and present and come to terms with the ruptures in their lives and their selves. Traumatic body memories result in the fragmentation of the lived body. They disrupt the routinization of bodily experience and sever a sense of connection with an array of personal meanings, leaving a void. The imaginal performance is a self process through which healing may occur.

Despite the stark events it names, trauma is not a natural category but a culturally constructed way to mark out certain classes of experiences and events. The salient examples and cultural prototypes of trauma have changed over time, along with our ways of thinking about illness and suffering, our concepts of mind and personhood, and the moral politics of victimhood, blame, and accountability. Trauma is a metaphor borrowed from the domain of medicine and extended to a wide range of experiences. Like any generative trope, the metaphor of trauma shapes our thinking in ways that are both explicit and hidden. The history of trauma, then, is not simply a

story of the march of scientific, medical, and psychiatric progress toward greater clarity about a concept with fixed meaning, but a matter of changing social constructions of experience, in the context of particular clinical, cultural, and political ideologies.

Plato thought that search for knowledge is tied up with memory, the effort to recall something we collectively knew. Freud took memory even further, positing that repressed memories are the key to shaping up us as individuals and as a society. Avishai Margalit, the author of the book *The Ethics of Memory*, takes up these issues in respect to an idea of communal memory. Acknowledging that historical religions "can make a bid on moral memory of humanity as a whole" (9), he instead poses a question: "Is there an ethics of memory?" (6). Margalit writes:

> The topic of this book is the ethics of memory, with a question mark: Is there an ethics of memory? I consider this topic distinct from the closely related subjects of the psychology and memory, the politics of memory, and even the theology of memory. I believe that it is an important question to ask and not merely a futile administrative exercise in channeling issues to this or to that intellectual department. (60)

Margalit is concerned with the ethics of memory or the duty of remembrance. According to him we have ethical obligations to remember.

In his book, Margalit explores the ethical significance of memory with special reference to the potential value of even obligation to serve as the agent of historical memory for those who suffered and perished in the Holocaust. Margailit believes that we do have obligations to remember people or events from the past. His book opens with a story about a certain colonel in the Israeli army. As Margalit tells it, the colonel

was consumed by public outrage after admitted to forgetting the name of a soldier killed under his command. Margalit says: “I was struck by the moral wrath heaped on this officer simply for not remembering something and it led me to think about the officer’s obligation to remember” (19).

The book takes up the question of duties of memory. Margalit opens his study with the question: “Is there an ethic of memory?” (6), and thereby drives forward his subject of examination by evocating a series of questions like “Are we obligated to remember people and events from the past? If we are, what is the mature of this obligation?” (7). Margalit answers later in the book: “Let us understand the *we* as the collective or communal we” (48). Finally, Margalit concludes, the “ethics of memory is the ethics of collective memory” (48).

As an astonishingly humane thinker, Margalit argues that human beings have an ethical obligation to remember the past persons and events. He maintains that the source of this obligation to remember comes from the effort of radical evil forces to undermine morality by rewriting the past and controlling collective memory. He argues that it is necessary for community to have collective memories in order to achieve a level of repentance and reconciliation. In the book, Margalit explores the evaluative and ethical dimensions of memory both in the private and in the collective spheres. He writes: “My question, Is there an ethics of memory? Is both about micro-ethics (the ethics of individuals) and about macro-ethics (the ethics of collectives)” (6 -7). The main unifying theme of the book, as the title signals, is the treatment of memory, individual and collective, as something responsive to ethical evaluation.

Margalit explores the way we rely on memory to give meaning and substance to the “thick” or “thin” ethical relationships. “Thick” relations, he argues, are those that we have with family, friends or community – and they are all dependent on

shared memories, but we also have "thin" relations with total strangers, people with whom we have nothing in common except our common humanity. Margalit writes:

> Thick relations are grounded in attributes such as parent, friend, lover, fellow- countryman. Thick relations are anchored in a shared past or moored in shared memory. Thin relations, on the other hand, are backed by the attribute of being human. Thin relations rely also on some aspects of being human, such as being a woman or being sick. Thick relations are in general our relations to the near and dear. Thin relations are in general our relations to the stranger and the remote. (7)

The central idea of Margalit is that when radical evil attacks our shared humanity, we ought as human beings to remember the victims. In the case of monstrous crimes against humanity –such as the Nazi mass murder of Jews or Communist liquidation of the Kulaks – he argues that memory should shape a renewed and universally shared understanding of morality. Exceptional moral witness to such crimes can preserve harrowing memories that will galvanize others to act against social and political evil.

Margalit further states that ethics guides our thick relations whereas morality guides our thin relations. He writes: "Morality, in my usage ought to guide our behavior towards those to whom we are related just by virtue of no other attribute. These are our thin relations. Ethics, in contrast, guides our thick relations" (37). According to Margalit, ethics tells us how we should regulate our thick relations and morality tells us how we should regulate our thin relations. He further says:

> [T]he primary concern of both ethics and morality is with certain aspects of human relations. Morality is greatly concerned, for example, with respect and humiliation; these are attitudes that manifest themselves among those who have thin relations. Ethics, on the other

> hand, is greatly concerned with loyalty and betrayal, manifested among those who have thick relations (8)

The major concern of Margalit is that “while there is an ethics of memory there is very little morality of memory” (7). According to him, because it encompasses all humanity, morality is long on geography and short on memory whereas ethics is typically short on geography and long on memory. For him, memory is the cement that holds thick relations together, and communities of memory are the obvious habitat for thick relations and thus for ethics. And by playing such a crucial role in cementing thick relations, memory becomes an obvious concern of ethics “which is the enterprise that tells us how we should conduct our thick relations” (8). The central idea of Margalit is that morality should be concerned with memory as well when the gross crimes against humanity are an attack on the very notion of shared humanity. He writes:

> Though I confine memory predominantly to ethics, there are cases when morality should be concerned with memory as well. These cases consist of gross crimes against humanity, especially when those crimes are an attack on the very notion of shared humanity. Nazi crimes carried out by an ideology that denied our shared humanity are glaring examples of what morality requires us to remember. (9)

Yet, as Margalit sees, humanity is not a community of memory. Someday it may evolve into one, but today, as a matter of fact, it is not according to him. He asks, “So who should carry the ‘moral memory’ on behalf of humanity as a whole?” (9).

Amy Hungerford's essay "Memorizing Memory" examines the Holocaust memoir and the representation of trauma. In the process of becoming a form, the Holocaust memoir and the representation of trauma in general has been described by

two of the most prominent theorists of trauma and literature--Shoshana Felman and Cathy Caruth--as embodying a certain relation between language and experience, a relation that ultimately asks us to understand Fragments as the epitome of the very assumptions that underlie trauma theory's analytic discourse. These assumptions:

> About language and experience are also integral to contemporaneous fictional understandings of the relation between memorization and memory, between what you know and who you are, between epistemology and ontology in an era dominated by the memory and the threat of genocide. (69)

This essay questions the use of memory/fragments in writing history. Hungerfords sees the contradictions in Felman and Caruth understanding of the fragments. Both Felman and Caruth are working on the context when knowledge has been questioned but they fail to understand that truth of the fragment is itself delayed by the politics of memory. For them fragments give us the greater grasp of history.

There are certainly costs for dwelling too much in the past, as Hungerford indicates; however, there are no simple answers as to how to avoid this, particularly when historical traumas like the Holocaust, slavery, or genocide are passed on culturally, economically, and politically. Though it could profit from a more informed engagement with how the past comes to afflict present and future, this is an engaging and well written investigation that asks many provocative questions.

Tim Woods in his essay "Mending the Skin of Memory" sketches the ethical value in trauma and linked it with history. According to him ethics is local and morality is universal. History and past for him can be used for the betterment of the person, society and nation. He quotes:

> History is thus produced ethically in the writing and representation of it. By putting one's foot back into the track of history, one's present position is reoriented by the direction of that track, not to mention shaped by the track. If history is an 'impression' in the mind of generations, then it is a case of hilling out that 'impression' -- expressing it. (343)

The notion of the material history is not bounded or limited by received wisdom.

Memory is a key for the ethical representation of the past, and literature, as a mechanism for collective memory which opens up the past to scrutiny, can act ethically by resisting dogmatic, fixed, closed narratives. History, he believes, stems not from the motives of realism and record, but from ethical need to use the past as a warning to others about future survival. Since:

> In bearing witness to history, people are to able to place themselves with in a communal context defined by their community; their very lives speak to a shared suffering and to a shared cultural ethos. Only then can the skin of history be mended and the 'healing' capacity of literature manifest itself as an ethical practice. (347)

If history is preserved as personal history it should be given shape and meaning through the interpretation of individual lives. And those personal identities should be formed in relation to a larger ethical and cultural context.

Historiography and Construction of Community

There is always politics of representation on every piece of writing, the writer who has written about a text, is always guided by the ideological instances that he is accustomed to, eventually making his writing a mere reflection of the representation of his cultural ideology. War have always represented as something bad and horrible

due to its bad impact upon people and society. Most of the writers have focused on the terrific sight and destruction of war. It can never have any good impact upon society, hence is always discouraged. There are other writers too, for whom war is a vehicle of change. Whatever be the evidences provided in favor or against it, this topic is worth pondering. Every opinion about war is the result of representation of writer's ideology. Truth is always hidden because one has to go beyond biasness in order to reach the arena of truth and must be free of any opinion but it is impossible to avoid our ideological stances, thereby constructing community.

'In 1947 when India achieved independence, it was also partitioned' is one of the numerous sentences that accompany the writings on the ecstasy of freedom and agony of communal riots. It may be remembered that though there was a division of the subcontinent and it affected the entire population, but only Punjab and Bengal were partitioned. So were their societies, cultures and communities. Living in their native villages, small towns and the cities for centuries, the people never thought that they would be uprooted forever. They might not have left their native place had there been no riots. In a way, the year 1947 got imprinted in the minds of those Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs who were made homeless and penniless by the forces of events, which unfolded on the eve of independence. Remembering partition is an exercise not simply going into the past and making objective and value neutral observations, but an effort to tread a path in which many issues regarding history, nationalism and independence are colored by overwhelming violence, which is difficult to quantify.

One of the major problems in remembering partition is related to the choice of the method to do it. Should an exercise into the collection of the oral accounts of the people who witnessed and experienced violence as victims or victimizers? Or the official and personal accounts of various events of the officers, political leaders and

social workers constitute another way of unfolding the pattern of violence of such a horrendous scale. Finally, we also have literature in the form of novels and stories, which could constitute a fragment in the construction of the story of partition violence and all that happened some months before and after August 15, 1947. All or each of them could be the basis of constructing the past. How these sources are used gives us the key to the mind and the method of the historian. Still another important aspect is to examine the sources of various kinds as discourses constructed at different levels. Once the historian converts these into different levels of discourses noticeable methodological and epistemological problems enter into the analysis, as there is a fear of the text being understood as a discourse of one level. In such a situation how the text is read becomes important.

"The Construction Community", the last chapter of *Remembering Partition* by Gyanendra Pandey dwells on the theme of the construction of the community. The author makes it clear that:

> Nations and communities that would be nations, seem to deal with the moment of violence in their past (and present) by relatively simple stratagem of drawing a neat boundary around themselves, distinguishing sharply between 'us' and 'them', and pronouncing the act of violence an act of the other or an act necessitated by a threat to the self. (177).

His illustration of the case of village Gharuan makes an interesting reading on the depiction of the way violence and killings were perceived as something routinised and it did not matter whether one had killed someone or not. The case of one village provides an insight into how the reality was understood by the participants in the violence. However, it is not sufficient to establish the truth of the construction of the

community. The book is a seminal contribution not only to the study of partition, but also to the area of how national and community identities constitute in violent times. Interestingly, the book has provided a tremendous insight into the construction of gender in the making of community and the nation - a contribution for which the work would remain a constant source of inspiration for new ways of understanding gender and violence.

I do not think that Indian understanding of the partition violence and subsequent construction of nationhood and community are complete if they continue to ignore the Muslims of Malerkotla in Punjab. In spite of the construction of religious communities through genocidal violence of the partition, the Muslims of this region were not touched by the communal attacks. Some would allude to the episode of the martyrdom of the younger sons of Guru Gobind Singh - the tenth Guru of the Sikhs. However, the Kukas in the 19th century did not think so about Malerkotla. Some riddles remain to constantly challenge Indian notions of society, community and nation even when they feel that most of the questions have been answered. However, this work has answered many questions and cleared many doubts and it seems that the author has been reasonably successful in bringing partition to its rightful place in history.

Gyanendra Pandey's essay "The Prose of Otherness" in *Subaltern Studies VIII*, a richly deserved tribute to Ranajit Guha, not only attempts to place the spotlight on the consciousness and experience of subordinated classes but also locates partition historiography within the larger framework of colonialist and nationalist historical writings. Pandey is writing as a subaltern historiographer. For him history should be written from the perspective of the 'others'. He sees the problems in Indian partition history and is against the biasness of official history which others other community.

Pandey questions the official history of India. He heavily comes upon the partition history. Official history fails to represent the traumatic experiences of the subalterns. It blames others for violence and it is guided by thick ethics which supports the existing status quo.

Pandey must be commended for noticing, even if somewhat belatedly, the 'paradoxical position' (204) that the question of Partition occupies in Indian historiography. The marginalization of what "may indeed by described as the single most important event in the history of the twentieth century" stems, as Pandey correctly point out, from its location in a historiography dominated either by "the story of the British Empire in India" or "the career of the Indian nation-state (204). Consequently, the history of partition and Pakistan not only "gets extremely short shrift" but "as the Other of genuine nationalism" is painted "in entirely negative colours" (204). Pandey takes to task various branches of colonialist and nationalist historiography for being complicities in this process of marginalization. Could it be that its project too was largely framed around the question of the inability of the 'nation' to come into its own, making it trifle awkward to recognize the subject hood of the 'Muslim Other'?

Pandey nevertheless should be congratulated for underlining the subalternity of the history of partition in Indian nationalist historiography. This history has been "presented separately" or as "a subordinate" in the recounting of the "larger drama of India's struggle for independence" (204-5). What Pandey misses, however, is the extent to which the history of communalism is presented separately from, and yet succumbs to, a teleological view of the history of partition. He is right, of course, in realizing that historians of communalism have written their histories as "pre-histories of Partition" (204).

Pandey no doubt has a point when he shows the striking convergences between colonial and nationalist accounts of popular violence. But there are contradictions in the position he takes on the question of manipulability and agency. For instance, criticizing the Congress's Kanpur Enquiry Committee's attempts to lay the blame for sectarian violence at the door of criminal elements, Pandey complains that "[t]his is to deny the involvement of those who employ and support the "criminal elements" ". At the same time he objects to the assignment of the history of violence "to the distinctly Other" and "not the ordinary residents of the towns and villages, hard-working and God-fearing Hindus and Muslims-in a word, not people like us". Within the space of a few sentences Pandey has assigned the history of sectarian violence both to the employers and supporters of the 'criminal elements' and to 'the ordinary residents of the towns and villages' who sometimes regard 'these elements as protectors and even heroes' (200). This is a powerful critique of colonialist and mainstream nationalist discourses on violence which leaves out of account the social critique that surely existed of violence committed by hired hands on people who were weak and vulnerable.

Pandey's most trenchant attacks are reserved for the historians' history of violence and of partition. He begins by considering a contribution to partition historiography by the 'nationalist' Y. Krishan and the 'colonialist' Ian Talbot. The latter in particular is seen as representing that form of the historians' history which seems irremediably infected by colonial prejudices.

III. Ethical Memory and Trauma in James Bradley's *Flags of Our Fathers*

Since traumatic memory is politically contaminated, the real traumatic experience of traumatized people is never explored in their stark realism**.** When trauma occurs, it is unknown to the traumatized subject and when it is known and revealed, the traumatic experiences are either added or subtracted because of the network of the cultural politics. This happens because of discrimination and biasness which is preoccupied in the mind of the person who presents the victimized once. The prominent factor behind the distortion and exaggeration of testimony is because of nationalist bias which itself is the politics of that intervenes the real traumas to be unveiled. So, the authentic traumas are never accessible. Because of the same nature of trauma, it seems paradoxical and peculiar kind of experience. And trauma survives in paradox. The oppressors do their bets to normalize the catastrophic tragedies of people during the violent years and the traumatic experiences do not get an outlet. Moreover, when chance comes even the oppressed and traumatized group do not reveal the authentic traumatic experiences because of cultural politics. Trauma theory tries to return criticism backwards being an ethical, responsible, purposive discourse, listening to the wounds of others. But if it is truly to do this, this point of convergence also needs to be the start of divergence of an opening out of theory to wider contexts. Trauma is intrinsically multidisciplinary, to make its future wider and bright, it needs to displace older paradigms and attend to dynamic configuration of cultural knowledge.

The 'ethics' of memory necessarily becomes a political question that must address hegemony, or the asymmetry of power relations. This thesis will address the historical stakes of collective memories of violence. In the context of an increasingly global literature of memory, it becomes necessary to ask certain questions. How does

memory itself become a means for repeating violence? How does memory manifest collectively particularly in the context of literature?

In other words, what happens when the Japanese representation of memory comes into conflict with the American mainstream memory? The concern of this thesis is that the "ethics" of memory necessarily becomes a political question that must address hegemony, or the asymmetry of power relations. Ethical memory of Arishai Margalit establishes the difference between an ethics of memory and the violent repetition of a traumatic memory. This violent repetition of traumatic memory of Bradley only contains the trauma of American soldiers and leaves the trauma of Japanese and minority. But a key point of the argument is that psychoanalysis reaches a political limit when confronted with the question of how or where a collective memory repeats. Using the work of Avishai Margalit that collective memories must be viewed in the context of public space and thick relation, James Bradley's novel *The Flags of Our Fathers* deals with the politics of trauma and ethical memory of violence during the five years of World War II between America and Japan. It is in this terrain that collective memory takes place and runs the risk of reproducing past violence. That's why ethics of memory must confront issues of public in order to address the international political situation.

Rewriting the history of American involvement in the war with the symbolic representation of flags he glorifies the war in terms of patriotism thereby valorizing the American nationalism. While transforming his father and other five soldiers from anonymous representative figures into individuals, Bradley valorizes Americans and ‘others’ the war victims.

Bradley’s memory of war experiences of his father is guided by his cultural ideology. To elide the holocaust violence Bradley engages him in constructing

community by othering Japanese, Jews, and Chinese. In this book Bradley relies far too much on biographies, memoirs and Americans. This kind of material works fine as a supplement to historical works, but otherwise it needs to be treated skeptically and used sparingly most especially when discussing strategic or operational matters. This difference between biography and history, obviously enough, is one emphasis: biography can not offer panoramic view; major events are interpreted from the perspective of one person's experiences. My argument is that Bradley's memory of war experiences of his father is guided by the cultural ideologies. His memory thus takes ethical turn and becomes a part of the ideological politics.

The Flags of Our Fathers raises the issue of political and historical conflict between two nations in which common people and solders are, increasingly not only the victims but the weapons of war. Bradley's sensitive and careful telling of a story on behalf of those who can not, have not been allowed to tell it obliges us to examine the limits of representation with constraint for greater than those that have conventionally taxed scholars who have working on the trauma of the war. It has been difficult enough for scholars to struggle with the vexing questions that surround available testimony about the holocaust; in what language at what time with what audience can the unspeakable horror of the traumatic event be adequately alienated. He means to say that the traumatic experiences of common people during the World War II present us with an event greater challenge, when there no validation of the event itself in the layer social register. But the traumatic events are presented from the perspective of ethical memory of mainstream American ideology.

Bradley in this book, while representing violence of World War II and its aftermath demonizes Japanese by using the prose of otherness and by presenting the imbalance. Thus this text turns out to be poor literature of violence. The narrative

technique of *Flags of Our Fathers* supports to the mainstream American Ideology. At the same time he refuses to recognize the experience of others (Japanese and other soldier) trauma and because of his failure he cannot achieve a moral stance. By refusing to participate in the process of trauma creation, communal groups restrict solidarity, leaving others to suffer alone.

In *Flags of Our Fathers,* James Bradley writes that the image of his father and his fellow soldiers raising the flag at Iwo Jima transported many thousands of anxious, grieving, and war-weary Americans into a radiant state of mind: a kind of sacred realm, where faith, patriotism, mythic history, and the simple capacity to hope intermingled. Bradley writes:

> We honor the individuals hare depicted, who by God's mercy still live among us. But they are not represented on this stamp as individuals. In the glorious tradition of the Marine Corps, they submerged their identities, giving themselves wholly to the United States of America.
>
> My Father was now listening to the news that his identity would never again be be his own: that it remain, in some irretrievable way, the property of the nation.
>
> He would not be able to leave the image. The image would not leave him.
>
> He was a figure The Photograph. (448)

In the study of World War II, it's only natural that each participant country focuses on the heroics of their own countrymen.

This book is about the traumatic memory of war veteran during violence of World War II from the perspectives of mainstream American ideology. Bradley while narrating the traumatic experience of the survivors and death of the soldiers he uses

ethics of memory which is dominated by thick relation so he writes this book from the perspective of thick ethic. He narrates the event by using prose of otherness and focuses on collective memory from the perspective of mainstream politics. The biases emerge in writers tone, attitude and exclusion and inclusion of details.

The book portrays the violence inflected by both the American and the Japanese Army, but this portrayal is Bradley's politics of trauma and ethical memory. The novel describes the atrocities committed by American Army as heroism whereas the atrocities committed by Japanese are taken as violence rather than heroism. Bradley is an American so; he portrays American and especially his father positively. If the writer is Japanese s/he might have written this book by emphasizing the heroic present of Japanese crops. Thus this book is less critical of Japanese.

When seen with in the parameters of representation of violence Japanese are maligned other and they are the demon wreaking havoc upon the innocent world and America. Bradley is not away from use of politics of trauma and ethical memory is concerned. He is valorizing the American War between the violence penetrated by the American and the Japanese. He says:

> Against Japan, however, America would stand virtually alone in the Pacific. Japan had violated American soil, and first and last American battles of World War II would be fought there. The Pacific War would be "America's War." (89)

There is subtle politics of exclusion and inclusion in his writing. He only indicates the violations by Japanese Army and leaves out the violation committed by the American. He mentions only the less brutal violations from the American side. Despite the facts that he is concerned about difficulties faced by the people and solders at the American hands, he belittles this concern by elaborated details of the violence penetrated by the

Japanese. Living under the shared values of American, Bradley narrates the event of killing and violence belittling the Japanese. He adds:

> The nation "created by the Gods" initiated "co-prosperity" by raining terror down on Manchuria and China. With official approval and chilly detachment the Japanese army bombed Chinese cities and slaughtered everyone in its way, including unarmed men, women and children. The Japanese army employed ruthless tactics in China. Japanese airplanes bombed defenseless civilians. Rats infected with deadly bacteria were systematically released among the populace, making Japan the only combatant to use biological warfare in World War II. The Japanese army raped and pillaged with full encouragement from its superiors. But China is a vast country, and despite millions of casualties, Japan's war became a debilitating war of attrition. (92)

The memory of the event is presented here in such a way that as if we are witnessing the event. The narrative became more real from the perspective of morality but his narrative is guided through ethical memory. So he is remembering the violence made by Japanese solders.

The event of killing Japanese in chapter 13 called 'Like Hell with the Five Out' is only the few of the events of atrocities committed by the American Army:

> He was treating a wounded Marine in a shell hole, my father told my brother Tom, when he glanced up to see a Japanese soldier charging him with a bayonet. "I shot him with my pistol," John Bradley recalled later. "What did you do then?" Tom asked him. "I finished my job and ran to the next one." "You didn't check to see if he was dead?" "That wasn't my job." (359)

But sometimes even another American solder Ira's veneer cracked. Bill Ranous recalls "One night a Japanese came close to our foxhole and Ira shot him dead. The next morning I could see sorrow on Ira's face as he looked at the dead man. He was moved" (365).

The rest of the atrocities that find mention in the novel are carried out by the Japanese. In this book the first atrocity committed by Japanese soldiers' starts from attack on Pearl Harbor. Bradley writes:

> A sleepy American Sunday afternoon in early December, Yuletide season in the air, roast chicken dinners finished, and the dishes washed, family radios tuned to Sammy Kaye's had begun *Sunday Serenade* on the NBC Red Network, or *Great Plays* presentation of *The Inspector General* on the Blue, or perhaps the pro football game between the Washington Redskins and the Philadelphia Eagles… And then suddenly urgent bulletins crackling through static. The future had begun. (87)

He further writes:

> The shocking interruptions started at 2:25 p.m. John Daly of the NBC Red was on the air first: "*The Japanese have attacked Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, by air!"* Five minutes later an anonymous announcer elaborated over both NBC systems: *From the NBC newsroom in New York! President Roosevelt said in a statement today that the Japanese have attacked the Pearl Harbor… Hawaii from the air! I'll repeat that… President Roosevelt says that the Japanese have attacked Pearl Harbor in Hawaii from air. This bulletin came to you from the NBC newsroom in New York.* (88)

This book is written from the American perspective. Every action done by Japanese soldier is taken negatively. This book tries to show the holocaust made by Japanese. In chapter 20 called 'common virtue' Bradley explains how dreadful/terrible Japanese soldiers are. Doc says:

> We were pinned down in one area. Someone elsewhere fell injured and ran to help out, and when I came back my buddy was gone. I couldn't figure out where he was. I could see all around, he wasn't there. A few days later someone yelled that they'd found him. They called me over because I was a corpsman. The Japanese had pulled him underground and tortured him. His fingernails… his tongue… it was terrible. I've tried so hard to forget all this. (518)

This exemplifies the intense and the problems these men faced after brought back nightmares of what they did and what they witnessed of man's inhumanity to man. The trauma of the Japanese and the violence done by the American is clearly mentioned nowhere in the book. A cave scene of where a handful of Japanese soldiers blow themselves up with grenades is shocking.

Bradley describes the trauma of the mentally disturbed American war veterans who have been wounded psychologically because of war experiences and that have lost their friends and physically because of Japanese. In chapter 1 'Like Hell with the Five Out' the narrator narrates many events of killing, torture and trauma. These are an image wounded soldier who is going near to the death. He writes:

> On March 8, the Marines of Easy Company found Iggy. He had been grabbed, probably from behind, and pulled into a cave full of Japanese soldiers. As the company medic, it was my father's job to deal with whet remained of Iggy's body after three days brutal torture. I feel

> certain that the shock my young father must have experienced added greatly to his near-total silence, for the rest of his life, regarding memories of the war. (362)

Though Bradley seems initially to acknowledge the understanding of traumatic experience, he goes on to transcend the gaps in this record through literature, to absorb the terrible feeling of humanity truncated, tortured and to rehearse the trauma of those who have suffered at the hand of history. To assert that the writer can somehow 'know 'and convey the experience of those who have been traumatic is to misunderstand the partially of the traumatic experience and this assertion obscures the exercise of power through representation. He seems 'neutral' medium that can carry and convey the suffering but he indicates toward Japanese that they are not able to learn the difference between right and wrong. However showing enduring trauma of the people who were victimized the violence of Japanese he supports mainstream American Ideology that is the polities of traumatic memory.

Trauma can only be understood with reference to the specific contexts in which it occurs, including cultural norms, political context, the nature of the event, the organization of the community. While discussing the problematic issue of memory in the narrative of trauma in this novel, that the society was troubled by the overwhelming flood of the dangerous emotions resulting from the traumatic impact of an event on the scale of world war. Representing the nightmare of war as well as the troubling and unresolved effects of the war, this witness perspective has been institutionalized and become politically consequential. As traumatic memories move between the historical and the structural, the narrativization of trauma has eventually given way to its politicization. Bradley's subtle politics of exclusion and inclusion emerges at places when he comments violence directly. Hence, his own centrist

politics, a political stance in text is tilted in favor of the ethical memory of the mainstream American nationalism rather than the memory of Japanese.

James Bradley in this very work tries to picture out the traumatic vision through the depiction of post War chaotic society. He has only presented the trauma of American because he only favors his country. Almost all the historical characters of the book are either haunted by the traumatic ghost or bitterly suffered by disillusioned scenario, devastated and frustrated worldview. In other words, the book's setting, characters activities, their involvement in drinking, their silence, memory, alienation, dreaming, crying lead the book's direction towards traumatic vision. Not only the major characters of the novel are fallen in traumatic circle but also others are not beyond from whirlpool of trauma. James Bradley also sketches the traumatic situation through the portrayal of disintegrated and alienated characters. Bradley is haunted by memories of war and his friends who past away (in special Iggy, whom Bradley was fond of before his death). What Really Happened to Doc's Best Friend, "Ralph "Iggy" Ignatowski"? According to official reports, Ignatowski was captured, dragged into a tunnel by Japanese soldiers during the battle, and was later found with his eyes, ears, fingernails, and tongue removed, his teeth smashed, the back of his head caved in, multiple bayonet wounds to the abdomen, his arms broken, and his severed genitalia stuffed into his mouth. Bradley's recollections of discovering and taking care of Ignatowski's remains haunted him until his death, and he suffered for many years from Post-traumatic stress disorder. The author James Bradley says, "And then my father broke a long silence" (518). Doc Bradley says:

> I have tried so hard to black this out. To forget it. We could choose a buddy to in with. My buddy was a guy from Milwaukee. We were pinned down in one area. Someone elsewhere fell injured and ran to

> help out, and when I came back my buddy was gone. I couldn't figure out where he was. I could see all around, he wasn't there. A few days later someone yelled that they'd found him. They called me over because I was a corpsman. The Japanese had pulled him underground and tortured him. His fingernails… his tongue… it was terrible. I've tried so hard to forget all this. (518)

The most important incident that candidly reveals the writer's view about the Japanese appears towards the end of the novel, when Iggy dies in the attack of Japanese. After the death of Iggy Ira, Doc and other solders become mad like. Ira screams. He can not control the situation around him. Doc and Ira become the witness of their friend's death. Doc himself describes an overwhelming experience of that catastrophic event. The story is about three men who were part of the few non-main line soldiers who are instructed to hoist the flag on the captured Iwo Jima hill. The media built-up, the aspirations, the trauma and fears of these exposures had different effect on each soldier who knew they are not the real heroes of the war. The one to suffer the most was Ira Hayes, a Red Indian serving for US army.

Bradley's book about the iconic photo and its aftermath is a confusing, unsettling, deliberately unsatisfying book. Told using a serpentine flashback structure, the book seems to mimic post-traumatic stress disorder in the way it insistently revisits horrific events as survivors of combat do, and in its seeming compulsion to find order in the welter of human memory. The book is ostensibly about World War II, but its true subjects are the exploitation of the common fighting man by the government and the role of mythmaking in war.

The messy idea of James Bradley searching for insight into his father’s and his colleague war trauma serves great purpose. But the problem is that Bradley's ethics

captures the trauma of only American war veterans and every time he glorifies the American nationalism. Anyone paying attention to the book will easily realize why and to what extent the older Bradley suffered with gruesome memories he didn't want. It was only a replacement flag, but became the flag in the most famous photograph in history. This book begins in 1998, when James Bradley, son of one of the flag-raisers, travels to Iwo Jima to post a memorial to his father, John Bradley.

Some, like three of the men in the famous photograph at the center of this book escape through horrific deaths. Then there are the others, the ones who survive as the three main characters of the book do, who end up doomed to recreate what they've seen and heard through the dreams of years to come. The surviving men in the photograph, Navy Corpsman John Bradley and Marines Ira Hayes and Rene Gagnon, are depicted here as damaged by the celebrity status thrust upon them by a desperate United States government. They struggle with survivor's guilt, false promises and unwanted fame, respectively, as the din of thanks from a grateful nation falls silent.

Though the stories of all three men are compelling, it's Hayes, a Pima Indian thrust into the spotlight against his will, who is the book's tragic figure. A habitual drunk, Ira Hayes was found dead, face down and buried in his own vomit, at the age of 32, less than a decade after the flag raising. While the book only touches on his experiences, it still manages to paint a complex picture of a man who was cruelly refused service in a restaurant on the same night he was cheered before a football stadium full of people. Hayes is perfect, inspiring emotion and compassion for someone who must have been difficult to portray in this book.

As the surviving flag-raisers reluctantly play their public roles as "the heroes of Iwo Jima" during an exhausting (but clearly necessary) wartime bond rally tour, *Flags of Our Fathers* evolves into a pointed study of battlefield valor and misplaced

idolatry, incorporating subtle comment on the bogus nature of celebrity, the trauma of battle, and the true meaning of heroism in wartime. Wisely including direct parallels to contemporary history, Bradley allows us to draw our own conclusions about the Iwo Jima flag-raisers and how their postwar histories (both noble and tragic) simultaneously illustrate the hazards of exploited celebrity and society's genuine need for admirable role models during times of national crisis. This book defies the expectations of those seeking a more straightforward war-action drama, but it's richly satisfying, impeccably crafted book that manages to be genuinely patriotic (in celebrating the camaraderie of soldiers in battle) while dramatizing the ultimate futility of war.

Bradley's ethics captures the American traumatic experience. John Bradley, Ira Hayes and other men of the book fought together in Iwo Jima but cannot spend their time together aftermath of the war because of anxiety and memory. This anxiety recurred in in the book in the form of nightmares, flashbacks, distorted memory and other repetitive phenomena. Because of these repetitive phenomena, traumatic figure cannot maintain the psychological equilibrium which increases irritability, sleep disturbance, failure to trusting people and communication, dreaming, immature relationship with friendship, excessive drinking, aimlessness and destructiveness with oneself. These are the basic symptom of trauma. The novel is filled with these characteristics in this sense it is not far from traumatic vision. Bradley's literary world is world of war, which brings destruction, horror, violence, death, and disorder. Post Traumatic Stress Disorder was a term these American survivors knew. They struggled in silence to deal with horrors they couldn't understand. Gagnon worked at menial jobs, also became alcoholic, and died at 54.

Using 'trauma' he attempts to bridge the memories of the survivors to the scientific tools of the historian and social scientist. Though, giving different example he tries to claim the emotional traumas that lie at the heart of trauma mode, namely emotional dissociation, there is a twist, as he substituted the events in ethical ground. Personal trauma has moved via cultural trauma to structural trauma. Every event in the book is vitally connected to the shared community of American.

John Bradley, the father of this book's author, is haunted by nightmares and flashbacks of scenes of unimaginable horror which is the essence of trauma. These sorts of things also apply in the case of other characters activities. Their life is triggered by the World War II and contemporary instable politics. Throughout the novel the character's suffering do not get any kind of solution rather deteriorated because of the experiences of the Word War II. Traumatic shocks block their attempt to get release from suffering. Bradley says, "To the civilian noncombatant, war was "knowable" and "understandable". War could be clear and logical to those who had not touched its barb" (137). He further says:

> But battle veterans quickly lost a sense of war's certitude. Images of horror they could scarcely comprehend invaded their thoughts, tortured their minds. Bewildered and numbed, they could not unburden themselves to their civilian counterparts, who could never comprehend through mere words. (137)

These lines clearly unfold the activities if traumatic figure. They give value for lighter thing and do not care for grave matter. Not only this but also John Bradley can not sleep properly because of the bitter thought of war as author says: But forgetting had not come easily for John Bradley. It had taken him a while to forget.

> He may have spoken about Iwo for only seven or eight disinterested minutes to Elizabeth Van Grop on their first date. But after they were married, my mother told me, he wept at night, in his sleep. He wept in his sleep for four years. (394)

This sort of problem is undoubtedly the traumatic problem. His wounds, bitter war experiences, emasculated and contemporary situation make him painful. He wants to free from not only traumatic disillusionment but also internal anxiety, but traumatic shocks block his attempt. He always wants to be alone as young Bradley asserts "He was comfortable with himself; he didn't need any embellishment. And his family, friends, and community closed around him to protect him from the inquiring world" (395). Managing Editor Gene Legro, who has worked for the newspaper for almost forty years comments about Bradley. "He wants to be left alone. He wants his privacy and he's entitled to that" (395) Legro says. Doc Bradley is traumatized by the Battle of Iwo Jima and internalizes his experiences.

The novel is a dramatization of miserable and frustrated character. John Bradley, the hero of the Iwo Jima event like other men Ira Heyes, Rene Gagnon, Keith Wheelers, Cliff Langley, Thomas Meyers, Chick Robeson, Melvin Duncan, Homer Angell, Leo Ryan and others who are wondering and losing their heroism in America. The war veterans, so recently returned from battle, had not yet recovered from its ravages. James Bradley states,

> My father was crying in his sleep. Ira was drinking hard. And Rene had developed a tic that never goes away. As for the mothers, they were still in a haze of grieving. From the families of the three, I have often heard it remarked that their grief could never end: The fact of The Photograph obliged them to relieve it over and over again. (438)

The hope of beautiful life of the character is deemed or it is limited only in the imaginative world, in real world it is dying out. Everywhere they find not more than misery, pain, frustration, hopelessness, anxiety and disillusionment and every time they want to forget it but the traumatic memory of the past strike them bitterly and make their effort worthless. Doc (John Bradley), a war wounded hero, haunted by the traumatic experiences. His wound is not only physical but also psychological, which is ore painful than physical and remains long lasting, sometimes at night he can not tolerate the internal pain suddenly comes out. Because of that pain Doc most of the time remains silent. Power seeks to control memory; to keep it in the realm of politics. In trauma and the memory of politics explore instances when memory has functioned to challenge the politics of the state. Memory can be harnessed as a form of resistance. Bradley criticizes Japanese for his father's silence. James Bradley describing the nature about his father and says:

> There were other plausible reasons: Iggy, for example. The pain and anger of remembering what had happened to Iggy, and for pilgrimage Doc had made himself make to Iggy's parents after the war, to give them reassurances. I'm sure that Iggy's memory fueled Dad's silence somewhat. He never spoke disparagingly of "Japs" or "Nips" or "the enemy" or even "the Japanese". (391)

Doc's keep his silence for the same reason most men who had seen combat in World War or any war keeep silent because the totality of war is simply too painful for words. As author says "some veterans cope with pain via alcohol or drugs. I think my dad may have been a little different: He coped by making himself not think about the war, the island, his dead comrades. He coped by getting on with life" (394).

The tortures of the war have made Pima Indian American Ira Heyes mentally disordered. He finds pain, sorrow, frustration, depression everywhere which make him as an anxious and fearful person. In order to avoid this sort of problem he drinks heavily with friends. Ira Hayes is traumatized by the Battle of Iwo Jima and drowns himself in alcohol. James says "Iwo Jima haunted Ira, and he tried to escape his memories in the bottle" (17). Ira spends a lot of time being a silent man and drinks heavily. He does not think much about himself. Sometimes he seems very emotional. This fear of emotion consequence is the result of traumatic reaction

Ira was mostly silent and his mates could guess his thoughts. Kenneth Milsted, who heard Ira's pain in the dead of the night, says:

> Ira was always depressed. Over and over he'd repeat. I have nothing to go back to. There's nothing waiting for me at home when I get back. It was just his nature to be depressed. He didn't talk much to most guys, so they couldn't tell, but when he talked to me it was with this down-in the-dumps attitude. I would just try to change the subject and get into something else. (170)

Abnormality of life is one aspect of traumatic situation. He compares his life with an abnormal activities and he is too critical towards his life as well as behavior. His mood had turned fatalistic: "well I was offered another chance to go to communication school and be promoted fast and get away from this rough life. But I said no. My place is with a rifle. I didn't come in here to lead an easy life" (171). The man now behaved a lot differently from the boy who had been impressed by the sermon on alcohol. George Scott of Easy Company remembered a late night after liberty when he was sitting in the tent talking quietly with some buddies. He remembers:

> Ira lurched into the tent and, without warning, hurled a bayonet in Scott's direction. It struck in the ground. We all looked up in silence at him. Scott recalled. He just stood there scowling. I don't think he intended to hit me. He was just angry. He was generally angry. There was a chip on his shoulder; he was separated somehow. (171)

This sort if behavior is somehow abnormal. What above examples make clear is that trauma strikes the person's attitude towards progress achievement and better life. Ira's life is triggered by traumatic experiences and instable contemporary situation. He has a very doomed perception of life which haunts a lot to make life better and prosperous.

His characters, especially Bradley (Doc) and Ira Heyes repeat the same words time and again and their language are not straightforward. They speak the language out of the domain of war, past, their experiences and other repetitive activities. 'Are the guys who didn't come back', 'eternity spent in hell', 'I don't know', 'silence' are the common phrases, words and sentences which they repeat again and again. Bradley hero in particular and characters in general hate the war. In the very initial stage of the novel character's negative attitude towards war is revealed. They are indifferent towards it and do not like to talk about it. James Bradley makes remark about his home "No copy of the famous photograph hung in our house. When we did manage to extract from him, a remark about the incident, his responses were short and simple and he quickly changed the subject" (5).

Though almost all the characters hate the war, they are, at the same time, closely attached with it because either physically or psychologically they are affected by the World War II. All of them have the distorted memory of the war since most of them directly or in indirectly involved in it. Presentations of war hated characters; its

devastative and destructive nature and its effect in people's psychology tremendously provide the clue to the traumatic experiences. As most of the characters face the war directly, they are not free from the traumatic shock.

Ira Heyes's trauma experience leads him to the state of drunkard. Ira was arrested for more than two times for being drunk and disorderly. As Bradley says:

> Ira arrested in Phoneix for being drunk and disorderly. Someone figured out that it was his fifty-first such arrest, dating back to April 4, 1941--one of two arrests he had experienced before entering the serviced. (500)

Though they try to forget the war torture and try to search the remedy from traumatic experiences and then they indulge in drinking but their traumatic memory does not overcome rather it is strengthened in the form of distorted memory. Like other men Ira take the help of wine to forget the past and want make it as tool for remedy but it can not work properly. While drinking he is haunted by the traumatic shock. Most of the time he spends in drinking but his trauma is not over. After drinking he finds himself more anxious, more painful, more depressed and behaved very widely." Ira drank to escape the images of horror burned into his brain on Iwo Jima. He drank because he walked off that island, leaving so many buddies behind" (490). The drinking goes on. Ira's war would never end. Bradley says:

> To the reporters and tourists who never lefty him alone, he remained tolerant, if distant. Ira took stuffing an American flag in his back pocket while working in the field, to satisfy the inevitable request of the strangers with their cameras. But he'd never talk alone the event. Or the war. Not to the tourists. Not to Nancy and Jobe. (Nancy later recalled that Ira had tried to unburden himself to her once or twice, but

> had ended up sobbing.) Not o anyone, except perhaps to his best friend, according to his cousin Buddy Lewis, was the bottle. (478)

Because of war's violent and disgustful nature, people become doomed, their sympathy and feeling are harassed. The death of the human beings' even the death of his colleagues, own disabled condition and great depression of economy and livelihood created by war made Heroes more tortured, depressed, and traumatic. His characters are also haunted by the bitter war experience, and other disgusted phenomena.

Traumatic figure often reported intrusive thoughts, effort to avoid thinking about their traumas, somatic symptoms such as headache, nausea, sleeplessness, imagery and dreaming. Traumatic shock also increases feeling of personal vulnerability, difficulty to trusting others, emotional numbing and flooding sexual difficulties due to the physical and psychological wounds, irritability alienation, changes in the belief about themselves and others, progressive loss of energy and idealism. Sleeplessness and emotional condition of the war veterans are explored in these lines:

> For the six guests of honor on the platform-- the three flagraising "heroes" and the three bereaved mothers-- this moment must have throbbed with widely competing emotions. The boys, so recently returned from battle, had not yet recovered from its ravages. My father was crying in his sleep. Ira was drinking hard. And Rane had developed a tic that would never go away. Yet here they were, the inspirations, at least in part, for an outpouring of wealth that might save thousands of American lives. As for the mothers, they were still I n a haze of grieving. Form the families of the three; I have often heard

> it remarked that their grief could never end: The fact of the photograph obliged them to relive it over and over again. (437-438)

All the war veterans express the traumatic experiences in the different distorted memory.

John and Ira don't want to live in any glory. They have not any glories life. John's soldering life reflects in his speech and activities. For him, soldering life is bloody life it is a life sacrifice for others not for himself. The nasty war life can not be transacted with medals. In the stage of traumatic severe pain, fake glory becomes the hatred thing. So he is always indifference to it. For him, "it was a dead issue; a boring topic, But not for the rest of us. Me, especially" (5). This expression unfolds the John's disinterestedness towards soldering. In this regards James Bradley further says:

> My father, John Bradley, returned home to small-town Wisconsin after the war. He shoved the mementos of his immortality into a few cardboard boxes and hid these in a closet. He married his third-grade sweet-heart. He opened a funeral home; fathered eight children; joined the PTA, the Lion, the Elks; and shut out any conversation on the topic of raising the flag on Iwo Jima. (4)

Another character Ira Heyes is also not far from traumatic situation and living in homeland without any glory and hope. He is so depressed because of glory given to him. Ira's indifference towards war and alienation of its aftermath is explored in these following lines:

> What's also clear- to me, at least- is that the notion he died young as a result of his fame is just bunk. Today a battle-scarred Ira Hayes would be diagnosed with post-traumatic stress syndrome, and there would be

> understanding and treatment available to him. But in the late forties and early fifties, Ira had to suffer alone. Suffer daily with images of and misplaced guilt over his "good buddies who didn't come back." (503)

As trauma is a working through rather than acting out phenomena traumatic memory continues to resurface from past memory. Traumatic shock unmasks the turmoil of character in the form of nightmares, flashback and dreaming. Chick Robsen feels nightmare every time. He remembers, "As we lay in our foxholes trying to sleep, we could hear them blowing themselves up with grenades hold to their stomachs" (327). Like him Bob Schmidt remembers "Other than to remark what good buddies the Marines were. We were out to enjoy ourselves and neither of us talked about the war" (457). Corpsman George Whalen, a Medal of Honor winner on Iwo, did not grow aware of the trauma he had suffered until the battle had ended.

> I had nightmares in the hospital after Iwo, he told me. "I would scream in my bed. They had to put me in a private room because I would wake up the other guys. I had dream s of my platoon sergeant with his face blown away, his legs gone. (462)

For Danny Thomas:

> no amount of toasting could ever quite put "Buttermilk Chick" to rest."After a while the dreams started, "he said."And the one that kept coming back-you know how the surf comes in on a beach, rolling back and forth? I was that surf coming in on Iwo, and there are the bodies of my friends, just rolling back and forth. And there's nothing I can do for them. (462)

James Buchanan found it hard to concentrate on things. "I felt life was very short, "he said."I didn't value anything other than life and my family. I lacked incentive. I couldn't take anything too seriously" (462). Corpsman Cliff Langley could not stop the nightmares:

> I would be facing death, "he said, "I would come close to being killed, and then it didn't happen. If I would wake up, get right up out of bed, it would finish. But if I laid there, the nightmare would finish. But if I laid there, the nightmare would continue. This went on for years. (462)

Wesley Kuhn, the theatrical "kissing Bandit" from Appleton, found the nights hard, too. "When I traveled on business, "he said, "I would check into a hotel room, and one of the first things I did was lay my k-Bar knife on a chair next to my bed" (463)

John Bradley seemed to have escaped the demons of the wartime dreamscape. In the first months of his return, he wrote constantly to Betty from Milwaukee and the mortuary institute, and there was no Iwo Jima in the letters; the letters were suffused with serenity and happiness, a kind of luminous normality:

> Gee I just can't seem to keep- my mind on this schoolwork and that's bed in a way. The good thing about it is I'm always thinking of you and wishing myself with you Serenity and happiness. And yet even after the two were married, John Bradley continued to weep in his sleep for four years. (463)

A penetrating, epic look at a generation at war, this is history told with keen insight, and the passion of a son paying homage to his father. It is the story of the difference between truth and myth, the meaning of being a hero, and the essence of the human experience of war. Bradley in this book presents the Historical trauma of American war veterans.

Historical trauma is cumulative emotional and psychological wounding, over the lifespan and across generations, emanating from massive group trauma experiences. James Bradley is trying to represent the historical trauma. On the one hand he includes historical unresolved grief and often includes other types of self-destructive behavior, suicidal thoughts and gestures, depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, anger, and difficulty recognizing and expressing emotions and on the other hand he gives information about his historical war at Iwo Jima for posterity. Historical trauma is an example of intergenerational trauma, which is the general idea that a trauma an individual experiences in an earlier generation can have effects that reach into the lives of future generations. So it is quite near to the vicarious trauma.

It is often assumed that history becomes meaningful when seen through the lens of personal experience. This work is informed by our extended study of forms of commemoration that enable the remembrance of war in a way that traces and supports the potential transformation of the social grammar of violence inherent in such realities. Educators often assume that traumatic historical events can be meaningful through hearing, reading, or viewing accounts that make apparent personal engagements with history. These accounts take the forms of diaries or eye-witness statements, documentary photographs or film, novels, poetry, stories, and fictionalized film or theatre. The primary purpose of James Bradley is to provide testimony to convey through multiple expressive forms the historical substance and significance of prior events and experiences. But memory in the form of history and tradition is central to what we mean by society and to all social interaction.

Memory is usually conceived as individually biased, as residing inside the heads of individuals. Theories of identity formation, socialization, tend to conceptualize memory as part of the development of self and personality. Memory is

not simply a personal, subjective experience. It is socially constructed, and thus reconfigures experience. Bradley in his book *The Flags of Our Fathers* while representing violence of World War II and its aftermath demonizes Japanese by using the prose of otherness and by presenting the imbalance. Thus this text turns out to be poor literature of violence. The narrative technique of Flags of Our Fathers supports to the mainstream American Ideology. At the same time he refuses to recognize the experience of others (Japanese and other soldier) trauma and because of his failure he cannot achieve a moral stance. By refusing to participate in the process of trauma creation, communal groups restrict solidarity, leaving others to suffer alone.

James Bradley's book *The Flags of Our Fathers* examines the Holocaust memoir and the representation of trauma. But his representation of Holocaust memoir and trauma is like fragments. Understanding Fragments as the epitome of the very assumptions that underlie trauma theory's analytic discourse is never true. Truth of the fragment is itself delayed by the politics of memory. For James Bradley fragments give us the greater grasp of history. Though he is trying to presents the actual depiction of World War II, it is never possible truth of historical trauma is always delayed.

In the beginning it seems he is giving the actual details of war and its effect from both the American and Japanese sides. He begins his book in this way:

> The fate or the late-twentieth and twenty-first centuries was being forged in blood on that island and others like it. The combatants, on either side, were kids-- kids who had mostly come of the age in cultures that resembled those of nineteenth century. My young father and his five comrades were typical of these kids. Tired, scared, thirsty,

> brave; tiny integers in the vast confusion of war making, trying to their duty, trying to survive. (3)

It begins in the midst of battle. On a dark, denuded landscape, a solitary combatant stares blankly at us, his face transfixed with shock.

> IT BEGAN EERILY, IN THE NIGHT: A dark Pacific sky cut by hellish red comets, rising and descending in clusters of three, each descent followed by a distant explosion. Sleepless young Marines stood watching atop their LST's, thirteen miles offshore. To Easy Company's Robert Leader of Cambridge, Massachusetts, it looked like heat lighting on a summer night. Through his daze, he heard a voice in the darkness utter what sounded like a fragment from a dream: "That's Sulfur Island." "What do you mean?" Leader murmured, not turning his eyes from the sky. The speaker beside him, a Navy crewman, replied:"Don't you know? 'Iwo Jima' Means Sulfur Island." (232)

All wars are obscene and involve incidents that are morally troubling. War is the cause grief, devastation, suffering, and untimely death: this even gives continuity to these things Different literatures have persevered the traumatic experience that wars have imprinted on society. The hideous nature of war took thousands of peoples lives; it carried stream of tears and bloods. The battle in Iwo Jima is staggering and gruesome. No, we never really get to know the true personalities of the boys named as heroes, but having been through a war this reader can mention that backgrounds and character studies somehow dissolve when young men are thrown into the horror of survival. They were all heroes, whether they survived or not. Bradley is asking us to look at the heinous futility of war and the depersonalization war causes - except in the tortured memories of those who come home. Though Bradley's attitude towards war is

not positive he has done great mistake by leaving to depict the Japanese trauma and war's effect on them. Thus he has narrowed his memory to the ethics instead of morality.

Vicarious trauma can also come with in the historical trauma. In his journey the narrator is vicariously engaging himself in the trauma of war veterans. Vicarious trauma happens because you care – because you empathize with people who are hurting. Empathy is the ability to identify with another person, to understand and feel another person's pain and joy. Empathy doesn't mean feeling exactly what someone else is feeling. Everyone is unique. Everyone has his or her own personal history, personality, and life circumstances. You cannot ever feel exactly what someone else is feeling. But to a certain extent (and more effectively in some cases than others), when you care, you can relate to other people's experiences, reactions, and feelings. And when you care about and identify with the pain of people who have endured terrible things, you bring their grief, fear, anger, and despair into your own awareness and experience and feel it along with them in some way. Here James Bradley becomes the second hand witness of different event of violence which speaks of enduring trauma, betraying a wound that has never quite healed the damaged body and psyche of war veterans who became the sites of the worst violence. When traumatic experience takes place the mind and body are found in numbed state the overpowering event is revealed in the form of somatic symptom or compulsive repetitive behavior. But his second hand witness is politically guided. He is able to present the trauma of his fathers and some American soldier but not of Japanese and other war victims.

Flags of Our Fathers is a novel about the relation between trauma and collective identity. The trauma of war renders the mixed-blooded Pima Indian's problem of identity dramatically visible. Thus, the story of Ira becomes story of

refiguring identity within a conformist community of Native community of Native Americans. This de/construction of Ira's social status as an outsider among war veterans, a role he has internalized on from his early childhood, involves an intense and often painful confrontation with both his Pima and White legacies as conflicting fragments of identity that are united within himself. Therefore, Ira has to face oppression from both the Pima community and a White hegemony that seems to be in control of Native American Land, culture and history. Ira is target of racism. James Bradley Says:

> And in Ira's culture being quiet and self-effacing was encouraged. "In our culture, it's not proper for a Pima to seek recognition," tribal leader Urban Giff explained to me. Or as Dana Norris put it, "We Pimas are not prone to tooting our own horns." But Ira wasn't just quiet; he was a silent island unto himself' already separate from his other Pima friends. (58)

This confrontation of involves Ira's active remembering of both personal and collective memories, which seems almost impossible for the traumatized protagonist whose war experiences are inscribed on Ira psychologically as well as physically. Racial segregation of Pima Indian as Bradley remembers:

> At birth Ira was already "apart," separated from other Americans by law and custom. Arizona, a state for only eleven years at the time of Ira's birth, did not recognize Pima Indians as citizens. Pima could not vote; they could not sue anyone in the courts. The home of Ira was born into was a one-room adobe hut built of mesquite posts and arrowhead rock. (57)

Just as Ira is traumatized and unable to do with his past memories, the Pima Indian mythical world is also traumatized since the European had captured their land and it could not act properly. This book shows how racism is prevailed in America. One of the six flag raisers was an American Indian or Native American. They spent a good amount of time throwing all manner of insults his way and the rest of the time telling us how money hungry the American war machine was. I'm sure Ira Hays endured many an insult in his life, and that is regrettable. But his problem was the same one that many men face when they return from the brutality of war. The demons haunt them. Ira turned to liquor just like many another fighting man - whether he was red, white, black or whatever. He has taking a good number of alcoholics who were prescribing their own medicine to forget. Ira is helplessly haunted by the violence of the war scenes that appear repeatedly in his dreams on the one hand and he is sometimes disrupted by the government on the other.

> By the 1870's, and despite lip-service assurances from the U.S. government, the Pimas' agricultural system was disrupted. In the 1890's, agents of the U.S. Geological Survey arrived with plans to rectify the situation. Buy they wouldn't listen to the suggestion of the Pimas who had successfully farmed there for centuries. Instead, the United States tore up the canals and replaced them with an unworkable and destructive system. (60)

The traditional ceremonies restoring these native values can be powerful tools in healing historic trauma.

> His Pima culture had enveloped him on the day before he set forth in America's war. Nancy Heyes invited the tribal elders, church leaders, and choir to dinner in his honor. the guests enjoyed sumptuous feast-

> jackrabbit stew, Jobe's favorite dish, cooked in clay pots over flaming mesquite branches; spicy tortillas, fried potatoes, wild spinach, beans whipped into a pudding.
>
> Then each guest spoke to era about honor, loyalty, his family, and his people. The Pima abhorred war and all its brutality; but in this instance, the elders agreed that it was necessary.
>
> The choir sang hymns, and each guest embraced young Ira Heyes and said a private good-bye. All prayed for his safety. (116)

This sort of ritualistic reaction is also one of the symbols in Pima Indian. According to tradition the Pima tribe had its genesis in the Salt River valley, later extending it's settlements into the valley of the Ila; but a deluge came, leaving a single survivor, a specially favored chief named (tiho, or S611o, the progenitor of the present tribe. One of his descendants, Sivano, who had 20 wives, erected as his own residence the now ruined adobe structure called Casa Grande (called Sivanoki, 'house of Sivano') and built numerous other massive pueblo groups in the valleys of the Gila and Salt. The Sobaipuri, believed to have been a branch of the Papago, attributed these now ruined pueblos, including Casa Grande, to people who had come from the Hopi, or from the north, and recent investigations tend to show that the culture of the former inhabitants, as exemplified by their art remains, was similar in many respects to that of the ancient Pueblos. Sivano's tribe, says tradition, became so populous that emigration was necessary. Under one of the sons of that list a large body of the Pima settled in Salt River valley, where they increased in population and followed the example of their ancestors of the Gila by constructing extensive irrigation canals and reservoirs and by building large defensive villages of adobe, the remains of which may still be seen.

Agriculture by the aid of irrigation has been practiced by the Pima from prehistoric times. Each community owned an irrigation canal, often several miles in length, the waters of the rivers being diverted into them by means of rude dams; but in recent years they have suffered much from lack of water owing to the rapid settlement of the country by white people. Until the introduction of appliances of civilization they planted with a dibble, and later plowed their fields with crooked sticks drawn by oxen. Grain is threshed by the stamping of horses and is winnowed by the women, who skillfully toss it from flat baskets. Wheat is now their staple crop, and during favorable seasons large quantities are sold to the whites. They also cultivate corn, barley, beans, pumpkins, squashes, melons, onions, and a small supply of inferior short cotton. One of the principal food products of their country is the bean of the mesquite, large quantities of which are gathered annually by the women, pounded in mortars or ground on metates, and preserved for winter use. The fruit of the saguaro cactus (*Cereus giganteus*) is also gathered by the women and made into syrup; from this an intoxicating beverage was formerly brewed. As among most Indians, tobacco was looked upon by the Pima rather as a sacred plant than one to be used for pleasure. Formerly they raised large herds of cattle in the grassy valleys of the upper Gila. The women are expert makers of water-tight baskets of various shapes and sizes, decorated in geometric designs. They also manufacture coarse pottery, some of which, however, is well decorated. Since contact with the whites their native arts have deteriorated.

One of the major characters of this book Ira Heyes is certainly an Indian. Old Pima shared their culture with harmony. They all have to fight with illness and death through such tradition their rites and rituals are dominated by the White Christians tradition. The Whites are always attempted to damage their beliefs and values

accorded to landscape. Thus, they are traumatized. Though White attempted to destroy their rituals, they are not totally surrendering their rituals. Bardley says:

> Ira enlisted in the Marines nine months after Pearl Harbor, when he was nineteen. His community sent him off to war with a traditional Pima ceremony. Fifty-six years later, I was embraced by a similar Pima ceremony on my visit to Arizona. It was a dinner at the Ira Heyes American Legion Post, about mile from where Ira's house stood. I listened to young and old Pima speakers relate proud stories of their culture and felt the warm embrace of community we rarely experience in our Anglo gatherings. (63)

Ira is doubly traumatized character both from Anglo-American and World War II. As Su-he says, "We hope in death he has now found his peace and the peace that he couldn't find in this earth" (64).

Hayes died of alcoholism at 32. The conflation of truth, false memories, and disinformation that makes up the "fog" of every war is laid bare here, well wrought in the central parable of this book: the competing versions of the Iwo Jima flag raising itself Questions about heroism, sometimes addressed obliquely but never didactically, include: What motivates combatants to fight with such seeming courage? Who are the greater heroes, those who survive or those who died? Why do some people pretend to be heroes? What are the long term costs of heroism, to the individual and to society?In "Flags" we are repeatedly confronted by the anguish of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). For Hayes this mainly consists of extreme survivor guilt, depression, social dysfunction, and alcohol abuse to temporarily assuage his psychic pain.

What we know was just how much of an impact it had on these young men's lives. Through alcoholism, depression and an uneasy relationship with fame, *Flags of Our Fathers* explores the events that transpired after three men were proclaimed "heroes" for reasons beyond their own doing. This story centres around three young soldiers – John "Doc" Bradley, who recalls the incident as an old, guilt-laden man, still thinking about the men who perished on that fateful day when they raised the flag, Rene Gagnon, who saw a lot less action than his fellow peers, but was still honored as a flag raising hero, and Ira Hayes, a native American who battled severe alcoholism, racism and depression after all three are trusted into fame and fortune, when a famous photo of six soldiers raising the American flag becomes an iconic symbol of hope and patriotism during the second world war. What the story then depicts is how this affected the three remaining combatants themselves. How they struggled to cope with fame, and why they found it so hard to come to terms with being hailed a hero, when the horrors of their wartime experiences haunted them rigorously. It is unfortunate then, that the emotional turmoil, clearly suffered by such haunted souls as Ira Hayes, has not been translated into the kind of dramatic intensity that a book like *Flags of Our Fathers* needs. They don't want to be heroes, because they would rather remember those precious moments of male bonding rather than the massacre of war.

This is about the brutality and the grotesque horrors of combat. We see combatants die violent and excruciatingly agonizing deaths. This is not done for sensationalism, but rather to provide the terrifying eyewitness point of view of the combatants. The book focuses on the private lives of the men who were believed to be in the famous Iwo Jima flag raising photograph. The horrors they witnessed in combat lay the groundwork to profile these men, and how they were psychologically scarred

by the experience. Stories of shell shocked and battle fatigued veterans are well documented, and this book shows proper respect and sympathy for them.

This book doesn't allow the reader to forget either the past or the immediate present. Stories of contemporary and past American and Japanese war are told here in such a personal tone. There are the stories of struggle, of pathos, of triumphs, of gloom and finally, some hope. His utter dislike for Japanese and deep support for the American marks the tone of politics and his nationalistic vision. That is his politics of narrative.

There is always politics of representation on every piece of writing, the writer who has written about a text, is guided by the ideological instances that he is accustomed to, eventually making his writing a mere reflection of the representation of his cultural ideology. War have always represented as something bad and horrible due to its bad impact upon people and society. Most of the writers have focused on the terrific sight and destruction of war. It can never have any good impact upon society, hence is always discouraged. There are other writers too, for whom war is a vehicle of change. Whatever be the evidences provided in favor or against it, this topic is worth pondering. Every opinion about war is the result of representation of writer’s ideology. Truth is always hidden because one has to go beyond biasness in order to reach the arena of truth and must be free of any opinion but it is impossible to avoid our ideological stances, thereby constructing community.

IV. Conclusion

Bradley in *Flags of Our Fathers* tries to give the aura to the war. His eulogization of war has sidelined the devastation of war. It weaves, and often contrasts gallantry and deception, idealism and disillusion, war and propaganda, truth and the protection of national interests. On one level, Mr. Bradley has composed a touching eulogy to his father and American soldiers, one that honors them precisely for those qualities that did not earn him fame and recognition on Iwo Jima. Beyond that he has produced an arresting meditation on the nature of heroism, the public perception of it, and the unbridgeable chasm between the two.

Bradley's representation of violence of World War II and its aftermath demonizes the Japanese by using the prose of otherness and by presenting the imbalance. The narrative technique of *Flags of Our Fathers* supports to the mainstream American Ideology and American nationalism. Because of this there is no objective depiction of the war Bradley has created the binaries like 'one' (American) and 'other' (Japanese). He is othering the 'Japanese' thereby constructing community. At the same time he refuses to recognize the experience of others (Japanese and other soldiers) trauma and because of his failure he cannot achieve a moral stance. By refusing to participate in the process of trauma creation, communal groups restrict solidarity, leaving others to suffer alone. This book is about an examination of heroism in war in all of its subtle and understated glory, but it is also a poignant reminder that heroism has a dark side. It depicts the battle of Iwo Jima as viewed from the American perspective.

The community of memory and the obligations that reside there are seen through the lens of the illusions bound to that community's collective memory. The relationship between memory and ethics takes many forms, some more twisting and

twisted than others. Here Bradley is guided by the thick ethics that supports the mainstream American ideology."Ethics" refers to "thick" human relations and corresponding obligations, etc., the obligations we share with those near to us.

Bradley has, for his own ideological reasons persistently and deliberately misrepresented and manipulated historical evidence. For the same reasons he has portrayed America in an unwarrantedly favorable light, principally in relation to his attitude towards and responsibility for the treatment of the Japanese that he is an active Holocaust denier; that he is anti-Japanese and that he associates with right-wing extremists who promote. Bradley has elided the Holocaust Violence. So he has not presented the real trauma. Thus, *Flags of Our Fathers* is guided with the language of demonization which has been used largely against Japanese.

Works Cited

Abrams, M.H., A *Glossary of Literary Terms*. New Delhi: Harcourt India Private, 2001.

Bartlett, Merrill L. *"Untitled"* Rev. of *Flags of Our Fathers* by James Bradley *The Journal Military History, 2002.*

Bradley, James. *Flags of Our Fathers.* New York: Bantam Dell, 2006.

- - -. *Flyboys.* Little, Brown and Company, 2003.

- - -. *Imperial Cruise.* Little, Brown and Company, 2009.

Burrell Robert S. "Breaking the Cycle of Iwo Jima Mythology." *The Journal of Military History.* vol. 68.4, 2004: 1143-86.

Caruth, Cathy, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History. Baltimore: Johns* Hopkins UP, 1996.

Edkins, Jenny: "Introductioin: Trauma, Violence and Political Community." *Trauma and the memory of Politics.* Cambridge: CUP, 2003: 1-10.

Felman, Shoshana, and Dori Laub. *Testimony: Crises of witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History.* New York: Routledge, 1992.

Flags of Our Fathers. Dir. Clint Eastwood. Prod. Robert Lorenz. A Client Eastwood Film, 2006.

Hanley Brian. ""The Myth of Iwo Jima: A Rebuttal." *The Journal of Military History.* vol. 69.3, July 2005. 801-9.

LaCapra, Dominick. *History and Memory after Auschwitz.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998.

- - -. "Trauma, Absence, Loss." University of Chicago, 1999. 696-727.

- - -. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.

Lewis, Clay. "*The History and Myth at Iwo Jima*" Rev. of *The Flags of Our Fathers,* by James Bradley *The Sewanee Review* 6 June 2009: 125.

Lofgren, Stephen J. "Diary of First Lieutenant Sugihara Kinryu: Iwo Jima, January-February 1945." *The Journal of Military History.* vol. 59.1, 2001.

Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory.* Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Marling, Karal Ann, and John Wetenhall. *Iwo Jima: Monuments, Memories, and the American Hero.* London: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Peter Burke, "History as Social Memory," *History, Culture, and the Mind,* ed. Thomas Butler. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989-98.

Riches D, ed. *The Anthropology of Violence.* New York: Blackwell, 1986: 1-27.

Schaeper, Thomas J. "*Flags of Our Fathers*: An Introduction" *Library Journal* vol.180.38, 2000: 102-3.

Williams R. *Keywords.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976: 256.

Pandy, Gyanendra. "Constructing Community." *Remembering Partition.* Cambridge, CUP, 2001: 175-205.

- - -. "The Prose of Otherness." *Subaltern Studies VIII: Essays in Honour of Ranjit Guha.* Eds. David Arnold & David Hardiman. Delhi OUP, 1994:188-221.

Hungerford, Amy: "Memorizing Memory." *The Yale Journal of Criticism.* vol. 14.1, 2001 : 67-92.

Woods, Tim: "Mending the Skin of Memory: History and Ethics in Contemporary Narratives." *Rethinking History.* vol. 2.3, 1998: 339-48.