

JEWISH IDENTITY IN WESTERN POP CULTURE



The Holocaust and Trauma
Through Modernity

JON STRATTON



Jewish Identity in Western Pop Culture

Jewish Identity in Western Pop Culture

The Holocaust and Trauma Through Modernity

Jon Stratton

palgrave
macmillan



JEWISH IDENTITY IN WESTERN POP CULTURE

Copyright © Jon Stratton, 2008.

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 2008 978-0-230-60474-2

All rights reserved.

First published in 2008 by

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN™

175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 and

Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England RG21 6XS

Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN 978-1-349-37261-4

ISBN 978-0-230-61274-7 (eBook)

DOI 10.1057/9780230612747

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Stratton, Jon.

Jewish identity in Western pop culture : the Holocaust and trauma through modernity / Jon Stratton.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

1. Jews—Identity—Europe, Western. 2. Holocaust, Jewish (1939–1945)—Influence. 3. Jews—Cultural assimilation—Europe, Western. 4. Jews in popular culture—Europe, Western. 5. Popular culture—Europe, Western—History. I. Title.

DS143.S767 2008

305.892'401821—dc22

2007044317

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Design by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd., Chennai, India.

First edition: June 2008

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

C O N T E N T S

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
Introduction	1
One Producing the “Jewish Problem”: Othering the Jews and Homogenizing Europe	9
Two Life on the Edge: Liminality and the (European) Jews	31
Three It Almost Needn’t Have Been the Germans: The State, Colonial Violence, and the Holocaust	53
Four The Wall at the End of the World: Zionism, Colonialism, Messianism	77
Five The Banality of Representation: Generation, Holocaust, Signification, and <i>Empire of the Senseless</i>	97
Six Trauma and Memory in the Post-Holocaust West	117
Seven Before Holocaust Memory: Making Sense of Trauma between Postmemory and Cultural Memory	141
Eight Why Were the Sixties So Jewish?	165
Nine Punk, Jews, and the Holocaust: The English Story	193
Ten <i>Buffy the Vampire Slayer</i> : What Being Jewish Has to Do with It	221
<i>Notes</i>	241
<i>Works Cited</i>	269
<i>Index</i>	281

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Jewish Identity in Western Pop Culture has been a book in process for a number of years now—longer than I would have liked. I am very grateful to Palgrave Macmillan for picking the book up and making the final publication so painless.

I would like to thank Curtin University of Technology for aiding my writing by providing me with study leave and with funds to help with the editing. Many people, at various times, have provided much appreciated support and critical engagement including, and especially, Ron Blaber, David Buchbinder, Liz Byrski, Ann McGuire, and Amanda Third. Helen Mumme, as always, keyed in and formatted the chapters for me. Yes, it is true, many of my first drafts are still written in longhand! Aileen Hoath did a wonderful job putting the entire manuscript into Palgrave Macmillan's house style. A big thank you, too, to Mar Bucknell for his expert proofing of this book.

Sections of "Buffy the Vampire Slayer: What Being Jewish Has to Do with It" were presented at the Cultural Studies Association of Australia conference, Hobart, in 2001. During 2002 sections of the chapter published here as "It Almost Needn't Have Been the Germans" were presented during a seminar at the Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre, the University of Cape Town, where I would like to thank Professor Milton Shain for his hospitality, and the Istituto Universitario Orientale, Naples, where thanks go to Professor Iain Chambers and Professor Lidia Curti, and at the University of Essex, where thanks go to my old colleague Professor Peter Hulme. Sections of "Before Holocaust Memory: Making Sense of Trauma between Postmemory and Cultural Memory" were presented at the Cultural Studies Association of Australia conference, Melbourne, in 2002.

I would like to thank the following: Lawrence and Wishart for permission to reprint "The Banality of Representation: Generation, Holocaust, Signification and *Empire of the Senseless*" that first appeared in *New Formations*, no. 51, 2003–2004, pp. 80–98; Sage for permission to reprint "It Almost Needn't Have Been the Germans: The State, Colonial Violence, and the Holocaust" that first appeared in *The European Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol 6, no 4, 2003, pp. 507–527 and for permission to reprint "Buffy the Vampire Slayer: What Being Jewish Has to Do with It"

that first appeared in *Television & New Media*, vol 6, no 2, 2005, pp. 176–199; the Australian Critical Race and Whiteness Studies Association for permission to reprint “Before Holocaust Memory: Making Sense of Trauma between Postmemory and Cultural Memory” that first appeared in the *Journal of the Australian Critical Race & Whiteness Studies Association*, no 1, 2005, pp. 53–71.

JON STRATTON
Professor of Cultural Studies
Curtin University of Technology
Australia

INTRODUCTION

The Holocaust, this book argues, can be understood in the terms of modern colonialism—where the practice of colonialism is understood as, itself, distinctively modern and grounded in a binary division between Same and Other, if you like, between Europe, indeed the West, and the Rest. However, this is not a book about the Holocaust *per se*. Rather, it is about how the West's relationship with the Jews, the construction of the Jews as the West's internal Other, fixes the production of modernity.

The expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492, to take the largest expulsion as the exemplum, in a time when Jews were being expelled from all the lands that were coming to be known as "Europe," book-ends with the destruction of European Jewry that goes by many names, each with their own various connotations but which is now predominantly called the Holocaust. The Jews were expelled from these lands and then invited back. However, when they returned, the context in which they lived was becoming quite different from what it had been before the expulsions.

It is worth thinking briefly about that moment, which varied both in when it happened and in length, between the expulsion and the return. What, epistemically, was going on? In literal, historical terms often not a lot had changed. Sometimes the expulsion and the return happened in the same generation. The changes took place gradually along with the philosophical and political changes that have come to be understood as typifying what we call modernity: the Enlightenment, and with it the primacy of reason, science, secularism, and politically the development of states with central administrations, legal systems, and, for most, citizens with rights, but not for the Jews until the early nineteenth century onward. I discuss this in more detail in chapter 1.

What underlay the distinction between Same and Other, though, what organized that space of subordination which we understand as representation, was violence—violence understood as extreme, violence that is beyond representability because it is the process by which the Other is formed as Other to the formation of the Same; the Other as it is constructed as different yet representable, yet only represented in the terms of the Same, of Europe. Although it may appear strange to some to think about violence as being unrepresentable, this argument is more commonly

thought about in the terms of the debate over the limits of representation. What I am suggesting here is that representation has been a founding discourse in the epistemic formation of the modern world. This is not, then, an argument about uniqueness but about limitations. Dominick LaCapra argues that with the Holocaust:

an outer limit was reached and that, once this limit is reached, something radically transgressive or incommensurable has occurred. This limit may be reached more than once in history and still remains distinctive or even unique in a specific, very important sense.¹

The limit as I am thinking about it has to do with the limits of the modern European epistemic system, not with any limits to violence itself.

What I am describing is how violence that moderns thought of as extreme was the empirical force that incorporated peoples outside of this order of representation into this system structured in the form of Same and Other. This violence marks the entire period of modernity. The conditions for it are already present in the expulsions, which were themselves violent and murderous and which always already informed the terms on which the Jews were allowed to return to Europe. This is the violence which then exists beyond the limit of the Same, of Europe, of what Europeans in modernity called civilization. This is the violence that destroyed the indigenous peoples of that continent appropriated as America, the violence meted out to the indigenous people of what we call Australia, to the Africans of King Leopold II's Congo, to the Herero and, to a greater or lesser extent, to all those peoples designated as non-European/non-"white" who underwent the colonizing process of being Othered and incorporated into the Eurocentered global order. It is within this historical development, as we shall see, that the Nazi decimation of the Jews can be placed. In this context the existence of the Jews in Europe between being expelled as ambiguously Other and being violently subordinated, decimated, as the final act of the Othering process was, we can see retrospectively, always fraught, a toleration that was built on the representational violence of total extermination. This, by the way, is what is in the uncanny space between the actual Jews and "the jews," the ideological abstraction that can be understood as the excess to the European nation-states, in Jean-Francois Lyotard's discussion, *Heidegger and "the jews."*² I discuss this violence through the prism of a discussion of Kathy Acker's novel, *Empire of the Senseless*, in chapter 5.³

Jews existed on the limen between Us and Them both metaphorically and literally. Within Europe, Jews often became the most important traders between the new insular modern states. After being expelled from the Iberian Peninsula, Sephardi Jews became the main traders across the Mediterranean, across, that is, the border that was opening up between Europe and the Rest. In a certain irony, the state of Israel was created as a Jewish state, a state for Jews, after the Holocaust which unsettled the

certainties on which the modern Western order was founded. Dominated by Jews from Europe, and from the Polish borderlands, Israel became a Western state outside of Europe, beyond that now unsettled limen. This liminality is the theme of chapter 2.

We have here then, also a way of thinking about how the Holocaust is both unique and not unique. The issue of uniqueness is simultaneously a red herring—all events can be understood as both unique and having similarities to other events—and of huge political importance. One aspect of this, as it concerns the Germans, has been put very clearly by Charles Maier in his Introduction to his account of what has come to be called the historians' conflict, *Historikerstreit*, in the Federal Republic of Germany in the late 1980s:

If Auschwitz is admittedly dreadful, but dreadful as only one specimen of genocide—as the so-called revisionists have argued—then Germany can still aspire to reclaim a national acceptance that no one denies to perpetrators of other massacres such as Soviet Russia. But, if the Final Solution remains non-comparable—as the opposing historians have insisted—the past may never be “worked through,” the future never normalised, and German nationhood may remain forever tainted, like some well forever poisoned.⁴

To what extent, then, was the German, or Nazi, attitude to the Jews unique? In conceptual terms, the Jews were understood in the same way across the length and breadth of “Europe.” We need only look at the extent of the collaboration with Nazi policy among the occupied countries, such as the Netherlands and France, to appreciate this. However, in practice, there were certain specifics which, brought together, led to the German nightmare venture. These include: the German understanding that Poland was not a part of Europe and therefore could be colonized, a specific history from Germany's defeat in World War I, a totalitarian government with a leader who identified the Jews as the root cause of Germany's problems, and so forth. Indeed, as chapter 3 is entitled, “It Almost Needn't Have Been the Germans.”

There is, though, something else about the Holocaust which gives it a uniqueness. The Holocaust marks the end of modernity. Jürgen Habermas' unfinished project of modernity became impossible to complete after the Holocaust.⁵ In destroying a people thought of in Europe as both Same and Other, or perhaps, not-Other and Other, the Nazis brought to Europe the practice of extreme violence only used in the modern world on those who were being Othered. The consequence was the fundamental unsettling of the modern European order. In practical terms this meant the foundational unsettling of those crucial Enlightenment tenets, the importance of reason, progress, science and so forth, and, with them, the certainty in Europe that, in general, Europeans had the moral and ethical high ground in any contact with non-European peoples—including the legitimacy of those

peoples' utter despoliation and destruction. As we shall see in chapter 6, this argument about the undermining of modern certainties is similar to that made by Lyotard and, even more, that of Andreas Huyssen.

We can, though, take the argument another step. LaCapra notes that, "the study of the Holocaust has now passed beyond the confines of Jewish studies or a section of German studies and has become a problem of general concern."⁶ This is because the Holocaust itself is of general concern. Thinking about the Holocaust in relation to trauma, LaCapra writes that: "In limit cases the perpetrator may be traumatised"⁷ and argues for a "tragic grid...that locks together perpetrator, collaborator, victim, bystander, and resister, and also threatens to encompass the secondary witness and historian."⁸ Using the idea of cultural trauma developed by Jeffrey Alexander and others in *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*,⁹ we might say that, since the Holocaust, one of the defining characteristics of Europe, and the West generally, has been the traumatic consequences of the Nazis' actions. The irony of these is that the Jews are no longer (just) the ambiguously Othered of the West. They are now the site of the cultural trauma that defines the West. This also is discussed in chapter 6.

Israel's history is dominated by the event that undermined the certainties of the European modernity that legitimates the Israeli state. Idith Zertal argues that all Israeli wars have been conceptualized in the shadow of the Holocaust:

This move, which initially more than half a century ago, was goal-restricted and relatively purposeful...became in due course...a rather devalued cliché, Auschwitz—as the embodiment of the total, ultimate evil—was, and still is, summoned up for military and security issues and political dilemmas which Israeli society has refused to confront, resolve, and pay the price for, thus transmuting Israel into an ahistorical and apolitical twilight zone, where Auschwitz is not a past event but a threatening present and a constant option.¹⁰

Israel has not worked through this founding trauma and, indeed, has situated the Holocaust as a general referent for the existence of Israeli society. As we shall see in chapter 4, the reference to the Holocaust is one component in the overdetermination of the Wall, the wall that is being built by Israel in the West Bank.

More generally, though, there is a sense that the Holocaust is "everywhere" in the West now, that it has become a pervasive marker and referent. To take an early example, Terry Nation, working on the celebrated British children's science-fiction television series, *Doctor Who*, which started in 1963, invented the malevolent and all-destroying aliens he called Daleks. The Daleks were central to the cult status the series achieved. Nation, himself, has acknowledged that the Nazis were a key inspiration for the Daleks. In mechanized, guttural voices they would intone: "Exterminate, exterminate" as they killed their human enemies.

If the Daleks could be read as Nazis, then the Jews were replaced with the entire human race. We have here an early example of the generalizing experience of the Holocaust which would become more common as the Holocaust and the traumas associated with it became more acknowledged.

Angi Buettner has argued that:

In today's culture the Jewish Holocaust is not only everywhere—in film, literature, theatre and museums—as many critics from various disciplines have pointed out, but is also utilized outside its historical boundary of the Nazi genocide in a vertiginous variety of different contexts of personal suffering.¹¹

Buettner discusses the pervasiveness of the Holocaust in respect of the issues regarding the treatment of animals. She tells us that: “The news media...draw extensively on Holocaust rhetoric for animal issues. Since the late 1990s, speaking of ‘animal holocausts’ has been particularly prevalent in the context of their commercial exploitation.”¹² To take one example, Buettner explains that: “The coverage of the foot-and-mouth outbreak in Great Britain in 2000 has drawn on Holocaust imagery in both visual and textual representations.”¹³

Another of Buettner's examples is drawn from an advertising campaign by the activist animal rights group, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). In 2002, PETA developed a campaign titled “Holocaust on Your Plate.” As Buettner writes, this “campaign...draws parallels between the treatment of animals in factory farming and the treatment of Jews and other victims of the Holocaust.”¹⁴ At the core of the campaign's exhibition was a series of slides placing Holocaust photographs side-by-side with photographs of animals. The second slide was captioned “To Animals All People Are Nazis.” The slide has an image of concentration camp inmates crammed together in bunk beds on the left and an image of chickens in batteries on the right.¹⁵ Setting aside the comparison itself, I want to think briefly about the caption. Where the Daleks' connotation suggested that all human beings were Jews, here we have the reverse version, that all human beings, including Jews, are Nazi exterminators. Though an aspect of the caption's power comes from this claim about the treatment of animals, the emotional overdetermination comes from the generalized Western traumatic involvement in the Holocaust. In LaCapra's terms we are all always already within the tragic grid of Holocaust trauma. More subtly, the caption acknowledges that any person brought up with the values of Western civilization could have acted as did the Nazis if the circumstances were similar. It is sometimes suggested that Britain would have been different. If we think again about collaboration, a very vexed matter certainly, we should remember that, on the Channel Islands, the only part of the United Kingdom to be occupied by the Nazis, the rounding up and deportation of Jews was implemented by officers of

the Islands' British Royal Courts. Britain was also a part of the Western epistemic system based on representation in which Jews had an ambiguous status.

In another example of the generalization of the Holocaust as referent, in 1995, the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, the Japanese designer Rei Kawakubo, working for the French-based fashion house *Comme des Garçons*, presented a show in which models dressed in striped pajama-type clothes, some with numbers on them, like those worn by concentration camp inmates. Kawakubo claimed that the theme of her collection was sleep and relaxation and that she never meant the reference to the concentration camp experience. Whether she did or not, the clothing, the apparent emaciation of the models and their haircuts, were enough to trigger collective Western knowledge of what camp inmates looked like. Complicating this story, Kawakubo was married to the managing director of *Comme des Garçons*, Adrian Joffe, who happens to be Jewish and who claimed not to have made the connection between his wife's designs and the camp clothing—a claim that could be read in terms of repression. The outrage, and not just from Jews, was such that Kawakubo was forced to apologize.

The transformation of the Holocaust into a generalized referent is complex. Approximately four years ago I was in a lift in Naples. I noticed that it was made by "Schindler." A common enough name, but now one that I immediately associate with Spielberg's film, *Schindler's List*, and, from there, with the Holocaust rather than with the Swiss engineering firm that specializes in elevators and escalators and which had actually built the lift. But, I wonder, is this just me with my Jewish anxieties? Certainly, probably most people do not get echoes of the Holocaust as I did when I went to the Cat Haven and found that any cats not taken by visitors were put down to make way for more strays and dumped kittens. I took two. I discuss the inheritance of Holocaust trauma by those of us with a Jewish parent but who would not be conventionally thought of as second generation Holocaust survivors using autobiographical material in chapter 7.

Buettner argues that there is developing a new "pattern of representation [which] constitutes an epistemological move in that it is about the use of a sort of template in the development of an aesthetics of catastrophe."¹⁶ That template, she suggests, is the Holocaust. I would take this argument further. It seems to me that the Holocaust is increasingly a referent across very many cultural practices not just for how we experience catastrophes. This is not to say only, as, for example, Tim Cole has argued, that the Holocaust has become commodified.¹⁷ Rather, it is to recognize that experientially, the Holocaust is a pervasive optic through which all people in the West, not just Jews, or for that matter Germans, since the 1980s have come to see the world.

LaCapra writes that: "To the extent an event is traumatic, so it creates a gap or hole in experience."¹⁸ While this is particularly the case for Jews and,

in a very different moral order, for Germans, it is so also for Europeans and, indeed, Westerners generally. The effect is a generalized acting-out, and, perhaps, working-through, of the Holocaust. We can see this in the way the Holocaust is narrativized by following generations. This is the focus of the final three chapters. For the second generation, the generation after the Holocaust, the Holocaust is written about as something close, it often occupies the narrative, but from which they are separated. The final scene in *Schindler's List* with the survivors works, among other things, to emphasize the second generation's separation from the Holocaust even as it asserts a minimization of that distance. Lisa Appignanesi's novel *The Memory Man* performs this same action in a different way. Here, two narratives run side by side, the story of the main character's survival through the Holocaust and the story in the present of his revisiting the place where he grew up and lived that life.

For the third generation, there is a life, a world, after the Holocaust and which contextualizes it. The Holocaust is now in the past. We might think of Jonathan Safran Foer's *Everything Is Illuminated*. In this novel the Jewish main character, called Jonathan Safran Foer, travels to the Ukraine to find Augustine, the woman who saved his grandfather from the Nazis. Traveling through space, the novel also takes us through time and, at the heart of the novel lies a description of the Nazis' destruction of the *shtetls* of Trachimbrod and Kolki. Here, the Holocaust fixes the reality that spreads out across the narrative. Indeed, the novel acknowledges that the Holocaust is a shared trauma. The Ukrainian grandfather who is employed to help Foer find Augustine and Trachimbrod is revealed to have given up his best friend, the Jewish Herschel, to the Nazis. The choice of the grandfather, who had a wife and young child, was either to save Herschel, who was single, or himself. Though the Holocaust is central to the novel, life has gone on, and continues to do so. The traumatic gap in culture is still present, and still dominates the story, but it does not dominate the narrative in the sense that this is not (just) a Holocaust novel. The trauma of the Holocaust reaches into the lives of the second and third generation of the grandfather's family but this is the story of their lives, as it is of the protagonist Foer's life, not of the Holocaust.

The shift is even more pronounced in Nicole Krauss' *The History of Love*. Here, the protagonist, a Jewish-American girl of fourteen, attempts to make sense of the pieces of a world shattered by the Holocaust in the context of a new world, not only in the sense that she lives in the New World of America where the Holocaust did not take place—though it is still a part of the West—but in the sense that she is a part of a world that has gone on living and transforming since the time of the Holocaust. She has, though, connections back to that world. She is named after a woman in a book, called *The History of Love*, written on the eve of the Holocaust. The Holocaust does not feature as such here, there is no question over representability, because it is the effects of the Holocaust as they ripple down the generations that are important, not the Holocaust itself.

This, then, is not a book about the Holocaust per se. Rather, it is an attempt to place the Holocaust and its effects in the context of discussions about the place of Jews in the modern world. To this end the chapters move from historical discussions of Jews in modernity to discussions of representation and violence to the relation of trauma to the Holocaust both as a personal condition and as a cultural condition. I am not so concerned with discussing intellectual debates as using intellectual insights to help position and further my arguments. Thus, for example, some people might be surprised that in my use of Cathy Caruth's and Ruth Leys' discussions of trauma I do not acknowledge the lengthy attack that Leys makes on Caruth in the final chapter of Leys' book, *Trauma: A Genealogy*. For my purposes, both writers have something important to say and I have been less interested in documenting disagreements like theirs than in attempting to make clear the points that I want to make using, where I can, the insights of others to help me. This is not to say that I am not aware that the kind of attack that Leys makes on Caruth's work is founded on fundamental epistemological differences. Rather, it is to say that I want to make use of their work, and that of others, with this awareness in order to make my own arguments.

CHAPTER ONE

Producing the “Jewish Problem”: Othering the Jews and Homogenizing Europe

Expulsions and massacres of Jews bookend modernity. Climaxing, but not ending, with the great expulsion of Sephardi Jews from Spain in 1492, and from the Spanish possessions of Sardinia and Sicily by January 1493, the Jews were almost expunged from what we think of as Western Europe by the middle of the sixteenth century. As Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi writes, the expulsion from Spain was “emblematic, the quintessential symbol of a process through which, step by step, the Jewish presence was virtually eliminated from Western Europe and the global locus of Jewish life shifted from West to East.”¹ However, by the end of the sixteenth century Jews were being allowed back, and sometimes invited back, into the areas from which they had been expelled—now, though, under quite different circumstances. One of the most important of these, as we shall see, was the gradual formation of the state system, the development of the modern state from its origins in what is now called the Absolutist state. From this time on Jews lived more or less uncomfortably in Western Europe, with ongoing questions about allegiance and assimilation, but preponderantly on the edges of Europe, in Eastern Europe, where they were more prone to pogroms, until the great destruction of the 1940s; until, that is, the Holocaust.²

This, then, is a story about the Jews, but it is also about the historical, and more importantly, the conceptual, limits of modernity. Central to this understanding is the ideological development of what we think of in epistemological terms as the idea of the Other, the production of the possibility of radical difference. That this way of thinking is historically produced is not news, as we shall see both Enrique Dussel and Tzvetan Todorov have made this argument in connection with the “discovery” of what we call the American continent.³ Certainly this was a crucial moment. However, the process began earlier and was bound up with an increasing preoccupation with what is best described as Sameness, the unity of a self, expressed when it comes to populations in terms of a claim to homogeneity, in relation to which Otherness is constructed.

The fifteenth and sixteenth century eradication of Jewry from what, by the sixteenth century, is beginning to be self-consciously thought of as Europe was a crucial step in that preoccupation with homogeneity. This meant that when the Jews returned to Europe they could be marginalized, stigmatized as Other, and, literally, until the Absolutist state transformed into the modern state based on a claim to represent the will of its homogeneous national population, ghettoized. In the modern state, as I have discussed elsewhere,⁴ the emphasis lay on citizenship and assimilation into a homogeneous national population at the ultimate discretion of the dominant group. But this is not my concern here. Here, I want to examine how the Jews got produced, albeit to some extent ambiguously, as Other.

Place and Traveling Culture

This production of the Jews as Other took place in the context of a transformation in the understanding of space, particularly in the experience of “place” and the primacy given to place. One of the characteristics of the modern world was that place became the site on which national identity was formed. Discussing the postmodern reformulation in the experience of place, Doreen Massey suggests that: “An (idealized) notion of an era when places were (supposedly) inhabited by coherent and homogeneous communities is set against the current fragmentation and disruption.”⁵ In that modern world, travel became thought of as movement away from place, signaling again the primacy of place. In the Prologue to his book on the importance of travel, *Routes*, James Clifford writes that:

During the course of this work, *travel* emerged as an increasingly complex range of experiences: practices of crossing and interaction that troubled the localism of many common assumptions about culture. In these assumptions authentic social existence is, or should be centered in circumscribed places—like the gardens where the word “culture” derived its European meanings.⁶

The assumptions about which Clifford writes are fundamentally modern. It was this privileging of place which enabled the spatial organization of Us and Them, whether the us was national or European, whether the them was ultimately a part of a larger us or to be thought of as fundamentally distinct, Other.

We get a sense of this increasingly important understanding of place at the beginning of Columbus’ *Journal*. Here he writes, in what at first sight appears to be an odd yoking together of concerns:

So after expelling the Jews from your dominions, your Highnesses, in the same month of January, ordered me to proceed with a sufficient

armament to the said regions of India, and for that purpose granted me great favors, and ennobled me that henceforth I might call myself Don, and be High Admiral of the Sea, and perpetual Viceroy and Governor in all the islands and continents which I might discover and acquire.⁷

Why does Columbus begin by writing about the expulsion of the Jews when his concern is with establishing what privileges Ferdinand and Isabella have given him? It is because Columbus is setting out what is still a new way of thinking about place. He is leaving Spain, a place which as he writes a little earlier, has just finally been taken from the Moors, and which the validity of its place-ness is confirmed by the expulsion of those ambiguously situated in that place, the Jews. Columbus is going from this place into a new space, a space of the unknown where he may find new islands and continents which, and this is the novel counterpart in this new thinking about place, he can discover and acquire. These islands and continents are now new places to be possessed, not simply visited as part of, say, trade in a system of trading relations. Moreover, Columbus' thinking about place is hierarchical. He travels from Spain, now fully conquered for Catholicism, its population now clearly marked as conquering Christians and conquered Muslims, with the Jews who upset this clarity of spatial order, expelled. The places that he finds he will appropriate. Travel is a means to an end.

We can contrast this with Jael Silliman's account of the way of life of the Baghdadi Jewish community in Calcutta during the nineteenth century. Making sense of this international trading community, Silliman writes that:

Because they traveled and lived as part of a community, their experience was not one of displacement. To be a part of a diaspora and not rooted in one place is distinct from being "displaced," which suggests that one is out of place and disoriented or disconnected from community. The Baghdadi community rooted its members and provided them with a sense of belonging in diverse settings.⁸

In this way of thinking it is not specific geographical space which is important. Rather, it is the continuity of communities, wherever they might be found. As Silliman puts it, these people "dwell in traveling." Travel is not thought of as displacement. She writes that:

The idea of "citizenship"—by which I mean, above all, identifying with a place—meant little to my grandmother and great-grandmother. Largely a product of nationalism (a twentieth century phenomenon in much of the world), the notion of citizenship, an allegiance to a geographic place, had little significance—practical or conceptual—in their lives.⁹

Silliman's book traces the loss of her great-grandmother's way of living, and thinking, over four generations. The emphasis on kinship and community rather than territory is nonmodern, and one we will come across again.

For Columbus, and the other "explorers" of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, place, and discovery and conquest, had already replaced community, dwelling-in-traveling, and trade among non-commensurable and diverse peoples. This is not to say that trade withered away. It most certainly did not. However, it was considered marginal in the feudal, agricultural society of medieval times and, thinking particularly of international trade, continued to occupy a problematic situation as necessary but secondary to the agricultural economy in the Absolutist states. Given this, it is not surprising that it was the Jews who, excluded from the agrarian economy and themselves being increasingly seen as marginal, took on the role of traders. The complexity of this positioning is well-illustrated by what happened in Portugal after 1492. Here, Jews were not expelled as in Spain. As a consequence a large number of Jews moved from Spain to Portugal. Bowing to pressure, in 1497 King Manuel ordered the forced baptism of all the Jews in Portugal, about 70,000.¹⁰ Nevertheless, no Jews were persecuted for practicing their faith until King John III obtained permission from the pope to establish an Inquisition in 1536. Frédéric Mauro tells us that:

during the period 1497–1536, the New Christians in Portugal had time to expand their economic activities. Documents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, even official ones, indicate that finance and international trade were completely monopolized by the New Christians.¹¹

Here we can see some of the tensions around Jews getting played out. On the one hand, from the point of view of the king, the presence of Jews was a good thing. Their knowledge of trade, their community connections, often with kin, in other cities, their access to finance through other Jews involved in usury and banking, all contributed to their usefulness. On the other hand, as a large non-Christian group they threatened the success of the new preoccupation with social homogeneity. In Portugal the concern with homogeneity triumphed, which is a way of saying that the combination of place, identity and uniformity, the construction of Sameness, was, at this time, accepted as more important than the practice of trade.

When the Jews returned to Europe through the modern era they were thought of as always already out of place, as displaced. Timothy Brennan notes that: "Any student of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is aware that 'cosmopolitan' was a code word in Eastern Europe for the Jew, where rootlessness was a condemnation and a proof of nonbelonging precisely *there*."¹² And not just in Eastern Europe, the rootless, cosmopolitan Jew was an antithetical figure to the member of

the nation, nations being identified with particular places, everywhere in Europe. It was, of course, an image picked up and used a great deal by the Nazis. As early as 1927 Joseph Goebbels wrote in an essay entitled "Hail Moscow!" (*Heil Moskau!*) that: "The Jew is rootless, a ferment of decomposition."¹³

The Expulsion of the Jews

Jews were considered to be an integral element in Christian medieval society. As Anna Foa writes: "Whatever position it took regarding the Jews, the Church never seriously put Jewish presence in doubt, at least not until the sixteenth century."¹⁴ Foa explains that Jews:

served as witnesses to the truth of Christianity, according to St. Paul and later St. Augustine (who would more fully elaborate Paul's theory). According to the evolving doctrine, the people of God had been stripped of their primogeniture and had ceded their place to the true Israel, Christianity. . . . Although the older brethren had lost their primogeniture, they were not to disappear; they would have a place within Christian society, a subordinate position that would be fully defined only in the course of subsequent centuries.¹⁵

Jews were the only non-Christian people to be tolerated in Christian society. Kenneth Stow writes that:

As permanent residents of the Carolingian Empire who were considered a *genus*, or one of its peoples, Jews were entitled to this right [to live according to their own laws] as a matter of course. In the early Middle Ages, each *genus* lived by its own or personal law. Territorial law, that which today we call the law of the land, reappeared only in subsequent centuries.¹⁶

The reappearance of territorial law, after its loss along with the western Roman Empire, was one of the markers of the new concern with place in later centuries. As Stow implies, it was a part of the shift of emphasis from community to territory, to the new state. A state, Anthony Giddens tells us, "can be defined as a political organization whose rule is territorially ordered and which is able to mobilize the means of violence to sustain that rule."¹⁷ Here lay an element in the problem that Jews posed for the modern, that is post-Absolutist, state: to be both individuals within the law of the overarching state, and to remain in some sense a *genus*, a special people.

The status of the Jews within the medieval *societas christiana* was formally established by the bull *Etsi Iudaeos*, issued by Pope Innocent III in 1205. This described the Jews as being in a situation of "perpetual

servitude” which Foa glosses as “a term understood as meaning a position of inferiority sanctioned and formalized by clauses limiting freedom.”¹⁸ In this feudal society where Jews had their own law, they were “owned” by the pope, or more directly by the king (or queen) within whose realm they lived. Ownership here implies responsibility, in particular protection—a protection for which the Jews paid.

The first sign of the beginning of the end of this special relationship, caused by the gradual evolution of a state structure, came with the expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290. The immediate context here was Edward I’s need for funds coupled with a battle over land tenure between Edward and the barons. Following this expulsion, the Jews were first expelled from France in 1306, though they were not definitively expelled until 1394. Agitation against the Jews increased during the fourteenth century. One climax came with the Black Death (1348–1349) when as Jonathan Israel describes, horrific massacres of Jews occurred across Germany after they were accused of spreading the plague by poisoning wells.¹⁹ The pace of expulsions picked up in the early fifteenth century. Stow writes that: “The story of the Jews’ final decades in the kingdoms of Europe . . . is a sorry tale of exorbitant taxation, arrests, false charges, libels, executions and spoliation.”²⁰ In 1421 they were massacred in Vienna and then banned from the city. They were expelled from Linz (1421), Cologne (1424), Augsburg (1439), Bavaria (1442 and 1450), and the crown cities of Moravia (1454).²¹ In 1481 the Inquisition was installed in Spain and then, in 1492, came the expulsion of all those who refused baptism. This was followed by the Jews’ forced conversion in Portugal in 1497 and their expulsion from Navarre in 1498. The 1480s saw a wave of violence and expulsions across the Italian cities: Perugia (1485), Vicenza (1486), Parma (1488), Milan and Lucca (1489). The Medicis had protected the Jews and, indeed, encouraged their settlement to increase trade in areas controlled by Florence, however, after the overthrow of the Medicis in 1494 the Jews were driven from there also. The list could easily be expanded but the point is made. By the sixteenth century what was coming to be thought of as Europe, and we shall look at this process shortly, was virtually free of overtly practicing Jews.

The sequence of expulsions, as Israel writes, “was essentially a product of the dawning modern era—of the age of the Renaissance—rather than the Middle Ages.”²² It is worth pausing here to think about one important effect on the Jews of these expulsions. Foa writes that:

Three distinct areas were thus defined: one characterized by immobility and insularity, and the other two by mobility. The latter two, however, were markedly different from one another. One was Sephardic, and its mobile quality derived from international commerce, cosmopolitanism, and the movement of merchants and capital. The other was Ashkenazic and was characterized by migration and settlement in new lands where Jews were afforded a greater chance

of survival both by entering into new occupations and by dispersing in many small villages.²³

By contrasting what happened to the Jews who remained, or returned, to Europe with those who left in terms of immobility and mobility, Foa confuses the distinction. Traditionally, Sephardi Jews are thought of as those descended from the exiles of the Iberian Peninsula, large numbers of whom went to southern Italy, North Africa and the Levant. Their history in Muslim Spain, and subsequently outside of Europe, is thought to give them a "non-European" quality, unlike the Ashkenazi Jews of Western Europe and the Poland/Lithuania axis. However, the distinction needs to be understood differently.

What gives a privileged status to Ashkenazi Jews of Eastern Europe is precisely their settled quality. In the feudal era, Jews were barred from owning land. This positioned them outside the ordinary system of feudal economic relations. However, there was no equivalent exclusion in the modern world of industrial capitalism. The Jews of Yiddishkeit, especially, helped to pioneer industrial production in the nineteenth century. As Zygmunt Bauman writes:

If in the West the most stubborn resistance to the new industrial order came mostly from the ranks of urban and rural smallholders, in the East a broad anti-capitalist, anti-urban and anti-liberal front was the standard response. . . . With native elites indifferent or hostile to the challenge of modernization, the Jews—accepted as culturally alien—were one of the few categories free from the deadly grip of genteel values, and hence able and willing to pick up the opportunities opened by industrial, financial and technological revolutions in the West.²⁴

This development, which functionally, but not socially, integrated them into modern society, gave these Jews a stake in the modern emphasis on place and fixity. Further, these Jews in the area of Lithuania and the Pale were established there for more than 400 years, significantly increasing in numbers during the sixteenth century. By the nineteenth century they had a very similar attitude to place as the members of the new nations of Europe. As I have noted elsewhere, in *Jewish State or Israeli Nation?* Boas Evron has argued that by the late nineteenth century the Jews of the Pale had evolved into a proto-nation.²⁵ The Sephardi Jews, however, had a history as traders and, scattered around the Mediterranean, and in Antwerp and Amsterdam, they remained mainly financiers and traders for a long time. They utilized kin networks and lived in a traveling community. In this sense the Sephardis continued to be, to some extent, nonmodern. Zionism, and the preoccupation with the creation of a Jewish state, came out of the modern Ashkenazi assumptions in both Western and Eastern Europe about nation and place. The preponderance of Sephardi Jews,

though by no means all, remained both geographically and ideologically on the fringe of modernity.²⁶

The distinction between the two western Jewries also situates them hierarchically. This is most obvious in Israel. Ella Shohat has described how:

The Zionist denial of the Arab and Palestinian East has as its corollary the denial of the Jewish “Mizrahim” (the Eastern ones) who, like the Palestinians, but by more subtle and less obviously brutal mechanisms, have been stripped of the right of self-representation. Within Israel, and on the stage of world opinion, the hegemonic voice of Israel has almost inevitably been that of the European Jews, the Ashkenazim, while the Palestinian as well as the Sephardi voice has been largely muffled or silenced.²⁷

Ashkenazi Jews construct themselves as the modern, European Jews while Sephardi and Mizrahi Jews—Shohat may be collapsing the categories in this quotation—are identified, by implication, as nonmodern, non-European and, in a general sense, as more primitive. Within dominant European thought the normative Jew is the Ashkenazi Jew.

It is, then, perhaps not so surprising that the majority of work on the Jews in Europe has concerned itself with the Ashkenazi Jews. The circumstances of these Jews have been more congenial to Western ways of thinking. To put it another way, the Ashkenazi Jews assimilated more of the modern ways of thinking into how they lived, how they organized their understanding of the world. In an article entitled “Notes on Travel and Theory” Clifford makes this observation:

The Greek term *theorein*: a practice of travel and observation, a man sent by the polis in another city to witness a religious ceremony. “Theory” is a product of displacement, comparison, a certain distance. To theorize, one leaves home. But like any act of travel, theory begins and ends somewhere.²⁸

Theory that provides the critical tools for analysis is a modern practice. It requires a distancing which, itself, needs a place, a home, from which one can be distanced, displaced. When Edward Said developed the idea of traveling theory, in a piece by that name in *The World, the Text and the Critic*, he argued that: “Like people and schools of criticism, ideas and theories travel—from person to person, from situation to situation, from period to period.”²⁹ Said’s concern was with how specific theories are transformed in use as they are taken up in different circumstances from those that gave rise to them. Even here, then, the understanding of theory and its practice are being informed by place—and by the travel that is understood in relation to fixity. While modern theory has been useful for thinking about Ashkenazi Jews who have tended to be understood within the taken-for-granted problematic of modernity,

the problematic that produced the so-called "Jewish Problem," it is not so useful as an approach to Sephardi Jews who have dwelt-in-travel. Dwelling-in-travel suggests precisely the *lack* of a displacement, of a distantiating occasioned by travel from a place, from home. It makes an empathetic appreciation of the nonmodern Sephardi experience on the borders of Europe by means of theoretical engagement more difficult, more unlikely.

To return—to use a metaphor of modern travel. How were the Jews repositioned as they were exiled from Europe? First, the idea of the Jews as a necessary and tolerated element of a Christian society disappeared. In its place there was a new concern with homogeneity, at this time still thought of in religious terms. Foa writes that, "growing intolerance and pressure for cultural and religious uniformity often accompanied the transformation of the medieval world and its passage to the modern era."³⁰ Thus, Jews were frequently given the choice of baptism or either death or expulsion. Here we have the formation of Sameness. At the same time, the conditions for the Othering of Jews began to be established. For example, in 1553 the pope, Paul IV, condemned the Talmud as sacrilegious and blasphemous.³¹ In 1554 there was an attempt to place the Talmud on the list of banned books. After Paul IV's death a compromise was reached, "whereby the Index of 1564 prohibited the 'Talmud', but stipulated that, if the title 'Talmud' and specified passages were removed, the text could be used."³² The Talmud is the defining Jewish text, the basis of religious practice and Jewish law. The papal attempt to ban this book signals the formal end of the integration of the Jews in Christian society. Throughout Europe it made the Jews equivalent to Muslims.

In *reconquista* Spain, where this equivalence was much easier to make, this slippage had already taken place. Here, though, the differentiation was made in secular terms that pioneered what would become common in modernity. Foa writes that:

Discriminatory measures directed at new Christians converted after 1391 first appeared in the middle of the fifteenth century and prevented them from entering government service, religious orders, and guilds. Such measures subsequently multiplied, until they assumed the force of law by the middle of the sixteenth century.³³

In a society dominated by Christian concepts, conversion founded in baptism should have been enough to make a person a Christian. However, "the fifteenth century gave rise to a totally new idea, that of pure blood (*limpieza de sangre*), which profoundly altered the ideological framework of relations between Christians and Jews."³⁴ This idea, both secular and essentialist, began to override the older Christian idea. While, terminologically, "race" did not become important as a means of differentiating peoples until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, we can find in this notion of "pure blood" the beginnings of that discourse. Pure blood, like

its successor race, was another important element in the new production of the Jews as Other because it offered the possibility of an essentialized distinction.³⁵

Not only the Jews, though. Shohat comments that: "The campaigns against Muslims and Jews as well as against other 'agents of Satan', heretics, and witches, made available a mammoth apparatus of racism and sexism for recycling in the 'new' continents."³⁶ She goes on to argue that: "The point is not that there is a complete equivalence between Europe's oppressive relations toward Jews and Muslims and toward indigenous peoples; the point is that European Christian demonology prefigured colonialist racism."³⁷ However, there *was* an equivalence. At a conceptual level the Othering of the Jews, this new ideological practice of constructing radical differences within the space that was becoming the place of Europe, was complemented outside of that space by the Othering of all non-Europeans. As Shohat argues:

The *reconquista* policies of settling Christians in the newly (re)conquered areas of Spain, as well as the gradual institutionalization of expulsions, conversions, and killings of Muslims and Jews in Christian territories, prepared the grounds for similar *conquista* practices across the Atlantic.³⁸

The massacres and expulsions of Jews throughout the fifteenth century found their extreme repetition in the massacres and destruction of the non-Christian peoples of the New World, the same peoples that Columbus and others following him had every intention of Christianizing.

Here, we need to say something briefly about the idea of "Europe." Denys Hay, in his history of the idea, explains that: "The use, and the emotional content, of the word Europe significantly increased in the fourteenth and especially in the fifteenth centuries."³⁹ With the Turks pushing westwards, in the fifteenth century: "The old Christendom was confined to Europe."⁴⁰ Constantinople was conquered in 1453. Vienna was besieged in 1525 and again in 1683. Up until the fifteenth century people had thought in terms of what they had in common, that they were Christians. The geographic place was not important. The concern of the *reconquista* was to re-Christianize an area lost to Muslim invaders. However, by the time Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini became Pius II in 1458, "Europe" was becoming more common. Hay tells us that: "The works of Pius II, both before and after his elevation to the papal throne, are full of the use of the word Europe and it would be tedious to rehearse examples."⁴¹

Pius II also seems to have begun the use of "European" as an adjective. This is a defining moment in the identity construction of those living within that new geographic place, Europe. The general use of the adjective, Hay writes, "makes a rapid advance in the sixteenth century."⁴² At the same time: "When Lemaire de Belges is found referring in a proprietorial way to 'nostre Europe'—and he was not the only writer to use the

phrase, even in the early sixteenth century—it is clear that the notion has acquired a positive meaning.”⁴³ This is reflected in the allegorical images that decorate Mercator’s sixteenth map of the world, published in 1595 after his death a year earlier. José Rabasa writes that:

Europe, which in analogous allegories is invested with a sphere and a cross emblematic of Catholicism, assumes a secular version where science and knowledge define her supremacy and universality. The remaining parts of the world are posited outside of truth, since Europe holds the secret of their being.⁴⁴

Mercator was expressing the increasingly established shift in understanding. Over the fifteenth century, Europe, the place, begins to supplant Christendom, the people. Europe, with its geographical boundaries, comes to signify the place where Europeans, who are Christians, and are increasingly identifying themselves as in some sense—pure blood and subsequently, through race—a special people, live. Establishing the place of Europe was the basis for then being able to think of that limited place as needing to have a homogeneous population. When Columbus sets out in 1492 he writes in his *Journal* that the “Most Christian, High, Excellent, and Powerful Princes, King and Queen of Spain and of the islands of the Sea . . . had terminated the war with the Moors reigning in Europe.” The Jews, no longer a tolerated element in a Christian society, are Othered and excluded from this new place Europe, full, at this time, of Christian Europeans.

The Jews were not considered to be European in the new usage of the term.⁴⁵ Some Jews, at least, understood this. Yerushalmi tells us that a generation after the Spanish expulsion and the Portuguese conversion,

we for the first time hear a Jew, in this case the former Marrano Samuel Usque, indict not one particular country but cry out: “Europe, which swallowed me with its noxious mouth, now vomits me out.” And again: “Now Europe, O Europe, my hell on earth.”⁴⁶

Constructing Otherness

It is Enrique Dussel who most clearly makes the argument for the post-Columbian construction of the peoples of the New World as Other. However, like Todorov who makes a similar claim, Dussel appears to suggest that the process of Othering was in some way a consequence of the invaders’ attempts to relate to a world entirely outside of their comprehension. I am arguing, to the contrary, that the ideology of Othering was evolving in the transformation from Christendom to Europe during the century before Columbus’ voyages. In *The Conquest of America* Todorov

argues, as I have noted elsewhere,⁴⁷ that a shift in understanding occurs between Columbus and the conquistador Hernán Cortés. While this may be, the confrontation with the incomprehensible only helped along a process well under way, a process of which the Jews had already been the first casualty.

Dussel writes that: "For the modern *ego* the inhabitants of the discovered lands never appeared as Other, but as the possessions of the Same to be conquered, colonized, modernized, civilized, as if they were the modern *ego's material*."⁴⁸ In his use of "Other," Dussel seems to collapse the historical, ideological process caught by the term with the entity being described as Other. To think of an entity as Other, as radically different, is an historically formed phenomenon. Once we understand this we can read Dussel's point as being that, even as the indigenous peoples were Othered they were not respected in the Otherness given them. Rather, the construction of these people as Other enabled the Europeans, if we can now use that word for how the people of this time had begun to have a sense of themselves, violently to reduce the people they had "discovered" and incorporate them as subjects of the Same. Conquest is the key term in this process and, for Dussel: "The conquistador was the first modern, active practical human being to impose his violent individuality on the Other."⁴⁹ Like Todorov, Dussel takes Cortés to be the typification of this individual.

This ideological structuring of Same and Other is experienced in terms of the radically distinguished "us" and "them." In 1625, commenting on the naval power of Europe, Samuel Purchas could write: "Asia yeerely sends us her Spices, Silkes and Gemmes; Africa her Gold and Ivory; America receiveth severer Customers and Tax-Masters, almost everywhere admitting European Colonies."⁵⁰ "Us" are Europeans who, by force of arms, have conquered and made tribute the rest of the world, forced to allow in—in this early meaning of colony—European settlements. Thus we have the typical binary structure of modernity in this case expressed as colonizer and colonized.

It was this system that Albert Memmi, from a Jewish-Tunisian background, critically discussed in *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, first published in French in 1957. Clearly thinking of North Africa, Memmi describes the problematic positioning of Jews in colonial countries. He notes "[t]heir constant and very justifiable ambition . . . to escape from their colonized condition," and how: "To that end, they endeavor to resemble the colonizer in the frank hope that he may cease to consider them different from him."⁵¹ Ultimately though, Memmi suggests this attempt fails:

Rejected by the colonizer, they share in part the physical conditions of the colonized and have a communion of interests with him; on the other hand, they reject the values of the colonized as belonging to a decayed world from which they eventually hope to escape.⁵²

Memmi is describing the process by which the Jews of colonized countries get absorbed into the colonial binary, a hierarchical binary structured

by force. Referencing Memmi, Silliman makes the same point as she describes the demise of the nonmodern dwelling-in-traveling life of her ancestors. The Baghdadi Jews had lived in a nontotalizing system, possibly hierarchic but not overdetermined by a binarizing, expansionary force. "Thus," Silliman writes,

they were of India, but they did not see themselves as Indian. The in-between-ness of their location in race-based British imperial structures complicates colonial discourses that are conceived of in terms of two analytical categories only—the colonizer or the colonized.⁵³

The British moved to reposition the Baghdadi Jews within the colonizing order that they had imposed:

Colonial practices encouraged Jews to develop a sense of distinctiveness vis-à-vis the Hindu and Muslim population. Under the British, the Indian Jews were encouraged to manifest and articulate an ethnic identity that could not be defined within the caste framework.⁵⁴

By World War II the last vestiges of the precolonial life of the Baghdadi Jews had disappeared. The trading system of which they had been an integral part had been replaced by a colonial structure which ordered the world in terms of place, Britain/Europe and India, and binarizing hierarchy, usually expressed in the discourse of race, a hierarchy in which these Jews of the colonies were inevitably ambiguously positioned.

What Silliman describes with such intimacy and subtlety can be thought of as a small, and late, supplanting of the premodern economic world system described by Janet Abu-Lughod by the modern world system. What characterized the premodern world system for Abu-Lughod was its luxuriant diversity:

[W]hat is noteworthy in the world system of the thirteenth century is that a wide variety of cultural systems coexisted and cooperated, and that societies organized very differently from those in the west dominated the system. Christianity, Buddhism, Confucianism, Islam, Zoroastrianism, and numerous other smaller sects often dismissed as "pagan" all seem to have permitted and indeed facilitated lively commerce, production, exchange, risk taking and the like.⁵⁵

To this list we need to add Judaism.⁵⁶ Abu-Lughod explains that: "Similarly, a variety of economic systems coexisted in the thirteenth century—from 'near' private capitalism, albeit supported by state power, to 'near' state production, albeit assisted by private merchants."⁵⁷ It was into this nontotalizing, multifaceted system that European expansionism was launched, beginning with the Portuguese voyages of exploration in the mid-fifteenth century.

The modern world system was to be entirely different. Based on a single economic form, capitalism, it operated as Immanuel Wallerstein writes, as an extractive core–periphery structure centered on that new entity, Europe, and in particular, after Portugal and Spain laid the groundwork, on northwestern Europe.⁵⁸ Why this new system developed need not concern us here. Wallerstein argues that: “The territorial expansion of Europe . . . was theoretically a key prerequisite to a solution for the ‘crisis of feudalism.’”⁵⁹ It is its form that is central for my argument: an imbalanced binary structure of European core and colonial periphery based on the Same/Other ideology and functioning through the exercise of conquest and the continual use of force. Overall, the emphasis was on place, and relations between places.

Trading Jews

The destruction of European Jewry in the fifteenth century was a consequence of the developing relationship between place and identity, and the new preoccupation with homogeneity—the lived experience of Sameness. At the same time what the Jews had to offer, and especially the Sephardi Jews now exiled around the Mediterranean, was a trading system. By the end of the sixteenth century international trade was assuming increasing importance. Israel identifies the new mercantilist attitudes, often closely allied to the evolving Absolutist states, as the key to the reentry of Jews to Europe. In Italy, without the imperatives to homogeneity exercised in the more centralized states of Portugal and Spain, and closer to the Muslim countries on the eastern side of the Mediterranean, a concern with trade as a way to prosperity developed early:

In Italy, as in Germany, Bohemia, and the Netherlands, the decisive turning-point comes in the 1570s. But in Italy unmistakable signs of a dawning mercantilist attitude toward the Jews had appeared sporadically in the earlier sixteenth century even before the Counter-Reformation took hold. . . . In the years around 1530, it was the increasing ascendancy of Sephardi Jews in Balkan commerce which had first induced Italian princes to disregard local vested interests and privileges and grant generous concessions to those Jews who had connections with the Ottoman [E]mpire, that is in the main to Spanish and Portuguese exiles drifting into Italy from the Ottoman [E]mpire.⁶⁰

As he notes, Israel is not using mercantilism here in its technical, economic sense. Rather, he is thinking of it more broadly as a novel preoccupation with trade as a means to wealth. In 1593, as a result of trading competition with Venice, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand I Medici, issued a charter for the port of Livorno guaranteeing the Sephardi Jews

who settled there "unprecedented freedoms and privileges besides full protection from pursuit by papal Inquisitors."⁶¹ Jews had been encouraged to Livorno before but this new ruling meant that around the turn of the seventeenth century Jews made up twenty per cent of the population and, by 1655, Livorno had become the most important port in the Mediterranean.⁶²

In Central and Northern Europe the Jews were allowed, and sometimes encouraged, to return from around the 1570s onwards. In the 1570s Rudolph II of Austria "issued a charter to Bohemian Jewry, assigning major new privileges and promising that they would never again be expelled from Prague or the realm as a whole."⁶³ By the early seventeenth century Prague had the largest urban Jewish population after Rome in Europe. In Frankfurt during the same period a relaxation of the old restrictions led to a significantly enlarged Jewish population. Similar changes occurred across Germany. In France also Jews returned in numbers in the 1570s. Finally, Jews were gradually allowed back into England after 1655.

Previously I have distinguished between Sephardi and Ashkenazi Jews in terms of their respective relations to mobility and place. If the Sephardi Jews may be generalized as international traders living and working in the maritime ports of Europe—Jacob Katz identifies their presence in Holland, England and southern France,⁶⁴ to which we can add Italy and Salonica, since 1430 under Ottoman rule—it was the Ashkenazi Jews who returned to the inland cities of Germany and Austro-Hungary. These Jews settled more into urban life as merchants, but also as bankers financing the new state governments, and supplying the new, enlarged armies of the Absolutist states. Jacob Katz tells us that:

As money became more important for conducting the affairs of the centralized state, Jewish capitalists had a better chance of admittance. The court Jew became a ubiquitous figure in German principalities after the middle of the seventeenth century. He served as an agent, purveyor, contractor, mediator, and banker.⁶⁵

Ultimately, as we have seen, these Jews became involved in the new industrial ventures as either workers or owners. By the nineteenth century the urban-living Ashkenazi Jews were also an important element in the literary and entertainment worlds of the European cities.

The State and the Ghettos

The return of the Jews to Europe took place in the context of the rise of the Absolutist state. As Perry Anderson writes:

In the course of the 16th century, the Absolutist State emerged in the West. The centralised monarchies of France, England and

Spain represented a divisive rupture with the pyramidal, paralysed sovereignty of the medieval social formations, with their estates and liege-systems.⁶⁶

It is not, of course, a coincidence that England and France both expelled the Jews early, and that Spain expelled them as soon as the *reconquista* was complete. The states revived Roman law, “the most powerful intellectual weapon available for their typical programme of territorial integration and administrative centralism.”⁶⁷ Here we find played out the new emphasis on territory. In this context, “[t]he Absolute monarchies introduced standing armies, a permanent bureaucracy, national taxation, a codified law, and the beginnings of a unified market.”⁶⁸ Even if, as Anderson argues, “Absolutism was a *redeployed and recharged apparatus of feudal domination*”⁶⁹ all this centralization required a group of people able to staff the bureaucracy, run the taxation system and develop trade. The Jews were the most likely recruits to these nonfeudal occupations.

Nevertheless, the Jews returned to Europe as Other, albeit as a European Other. They were thought of as having a distinct religion and, often, following from this, as being a distinct people. In 1793, arguing against the granting of citizenship to Jews but for giving them human rights because of their humanity, Johann Fichte, the German philosopher, wrote that: “The Jewish nation excluded itself from our meals, from our festive toasts, and from sweet, heart-to-heart exchanges of happiness with us by the most binding element of mankind—religion.”⁷⁰ Fichte describes the Jews as a state within a state—an idea taken up by Hitler in *Mein Kampf*⁷¹—and goes so far as to suggest that he sees “absolutely no way of giving them civic rights, except, perhaps, if one might chop off all their heads and replace them with new ones, in which there would not be a single Jewish idea,”⁷² a gruesome image which subliminally conjures the treatment meted out to colonized peoples. Finally, in the nineteenth century, the Jews were to be racialized.

There was another aspect to this increasing thinking in terms of territorialized place. In 1555 Pius IV issued the bull *Cum nimis absurdum*. This initiated the ghetto of Rome. It also forced Jews in other areas of the papal states to live in one street apart from Christians. This street was to have one entrance which should be able to be locked.⁷³ Although the first ghetto had been authorized in Venice in 1516, it was the Rome ghetto which became the pattern for the ghettoization of Jews in Italy. Until the 1700s, as Foa writes, “all the Italian states that did not expel the Jews enclosed them in ghettos.”⁷⁴ The ghetto was a way of ensuring the segregation of the Jews. Foa sees the ghetto as a compromise, continuing the Church’s medieval concern that Jews should have a place in Christian society while establishing their separation and subordination. Ultimately, “[t]he ghetto ended up being the main tool of the conversionist policy undertaken by the Church of the Counter-Reformation.”⁷⁵ In an important insight Foa writes that: “Ghettoization ended up being a kind of expulsion, although the place in which Jews were forced to live was inside the walls instead of outside them.”⁷⁶

Collecting the Jews in one place homogenized the Christian population. In northern Europe a form of ghetto was instituted in Frankfurt am Main in 1462 and, Foa tells us, "similar quarters characterized many other imperial cities."⁷⁷ Where ghettos were not introduced there were rulings about where Jews could or could not live: "by and large, Jewish segregation in pre-1620 Germany took the form of confining Jews to villages and small towns close enough to the main centres for purposes of commerce but too remote for participation in cultural and social life."⁷⁸ Following the partitioning of Poland, Tsar Nicholas I established the Pale of Settlement, the area within which Jews were allowed to live, in 1835. This, however, was very late.

The segregation of the Jews as they returned to the newly developing Absolutist states was, as I have remarked, connected with the new concern with the organization of people in space. Stow remarks that:

The notion that a highly supervised, disciplined ghetto life might make Jews change their ways went hand in hand with the novel sixteenth-century social theory that criminal incarceration and the enforced regimen of life in a "workhouse" could personally reform and socially reintegrate criminals and indigents.⁷⁹

The point here is really about segregation. Michel Foucault identifies the transformation in the understanding of space as happening later, in the eighteenth century. He is concerned with how the new way of thinking about space was related to the new disciplining of the body:

Discipline sometimes requires *enclosure*, the specification of a place heterogeneous to all others and closed in upon itself. There was the great "confinement" of vagabonds and paupers; there were other more discreet, but insidious and effective ones.⁸⁰

Foucault is thinking of the new way of schooling, and of army barracks. Stow has pushed back Foucault's argument 200 years. A way of understanding what is going on here is to distinguish between that segregation that excludes a category of people from citizenship of the state and that which includes them but defines them off for some reason from the general population. It is in the terms of this binary that ghettos and the embryonic workhouses described by Stow were established before the putting in place of the disciplining project identified by Foucault. Such thinking suggests the possibility of enclosures not just heterogeneous in their own right but as places for those people considered to be heterogeneous, Other, to the general population. This happens before the use of enclosures for people, individuals who are citizens but distinct in some way. The ghetto and its weaker analogues as enclosed places for Jews are examples.

In an incipient state system that still thought in terms of Christians and others, the newly Othered Jews, when accepted back and given a status as

in some sense European though not fully, needed to be kept differentiated. This was to last until the advent of the modern state based on a claim to individual Sameness—though it must be remembered, a racially-based “white” Sameness—when Jews were emancipated in a bargain that entailed them giving up a distinctive Jewish identity which would enable them to be assimilated into the nation-state. Judaism became the religion subscribers to which were thought of as Jews, and Judaism was argued ethically to precurse Christianity. There are two benchmarks here, the granting of citizenship to French Jews in 1791 after the 1789 Revolution, and the opening of the Italian ghettos by the Napoleonic armies in the late 1790s.

Segregation and Racialization

Racialized understandings as a basis for differentiating between groups of people were of central importance in the European colonies. In particular, colonial practices were extensions of this same thinking that distinguished, organized, and even removed populations across space as place within the new European states. For example, in British Malaya, by the early years of the twentieth century, the British government classified people into four basic groupings, Chinese, Indians, Malays and Others, where Others included primarily Europeans and Eurasians. This helped formalize a high degree of spatialized separation. In South Africa the development of the apartheid system, with the spatial distribution of race that went along with it, was an extreme revision of the racialized and spatialized system introduced by the British. The *Population Registration Act* of 1950, which classified people into African, colored, Indian or white, also provided the foundation for a formal physical spatialization, regularized in the *Group Areas Act* passed the same year, that had been incipiently present since the nineteenth century.

The bargain of Jewish acceptance in the European nation-states was premised on the modern understanding of place as a site for homogeneous inclusion of appropriate insiders. Who was appropriate was increasingly defined by race. The Nazi racialization of the Jews as non-“white” and non-European, as Other, ended this bargain. Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Ippermann have argued that:

Responsibility for fusing racial-hygienic and Social Darwinist ideas with anti-Semitism may be attributed to the (elective German) English-born Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855–1927). According to Chamberlain, the Germanic peoples, but especially the Germans in the narrow sense, were superior to all other peoples in every respect. This superiority, which was based upon intellectual abilities rather than physical characteristics, was being threatened by another race, namely the Jews. For Chamberlain, the Jews were the Devil incarnate.⁸¹

By reclassifying the Jews in a way that echoes Fichte's argument, as a distinct people, rather than as individuals subscribing to a different but proto-Christian religion, it became possible to reintroduce ghettos as a way of segregating Jews within the territorial place of the post-Absolutist, modern state. In charge of solving the "Jewish Problem" in the newly conquered lands of Poland, Reinhard Heydrich, at this time head of Nazi Germany's Reich Main Security Office, sent a secret directive on September 21, 1939, to the chiefs of the *Einsatzgruppen*. This directive was titled "The Jewish Question in Occupied Territory." It detailed how Jews should be gathered together into specific areas of large cities with the intention that they should then be moved elsewhere. The clearance of Jews, the making of certain areas *judenrein*, would, in colonial fashion, facilitate the settlement of ethnic Germans.

Raul Hilberg explains that expulsions formed the first part of Heydrich's program and ghettos the second part, a consequence of the first. Hilberg identifies three expulsion movements from west to east between the autumns of 1939 and 1941:

- (1) Jews (and Poles) from the incorporated territories to the *Generalgouvernement*; (2) Jews (and Gypsies) from the Reich-*Protektorat* area to the *Generalgouvernement*, and; (3) Jews (and Gypsies) from the Reich-*Protektorat* to the incorporated territories.⁸²

Not surprisingly, given Zionism's fundamentally modern genesis, similar colonial policies for the clearance of the indigenous people from the land, and expulsion, if not ghettoization, were instigated in the new Israeli state. In an eerie reminder of the title of Heydrich's directive, Yosef Weitz, at this time head of the as yet not formally established Transfer Committee, in June 1948 gave Israeli prime minister and defence minister David Ben-Gurion a three page memorandum entitled "Retroactive Transfer: A Scheme for the Solution of the Arab Question in the State of Israel."⁸³ This is not to say that Heydrich and Weitz advocated the same ultimate "solution" but, rather, that both started from the position embedded in colonial discourse that the people who lived on the land could be cleared off so that it could be resettled with people more deserving.

The degree of similarity between German and Israeli colonial practices should not come as a surprise. It has a history. Gershon Shafir has explained that, after the failure of Baron Edmund de Rothschild's attempt to imitate the French model of colonization used in Algeria and Tunisia, in the first decade of the twentieth century:

Otto Warburg and Arthur Ruppin, the heads of the World Zionist Organization's Palestine Land Development Company [PLDC], highly consciously tried to reproduce the "internal colonization" model developed by the Prussian government to create a German

majority in some of the eastern, ethnically Polish territories, as well as to utilize the Polish measures developed to counter the policy.⁸⁴

Weitz had worked for the Jewish National Fund which, in the 1920s and early 1930s, has used the PLDC as its purchasing arm.⁸⁵

In a diary entry from 1940, made at the same time that Heydrich's orders were being carried out in Poland, Weitz, at that time Director of the Jewish National Fund's Land Settlement Department, wrote:

[I]t must be clear that there is no room in the country for both peoples.... If the Arabs leave it, the country will become wide and spacious for us.... The only solution is a Land of Israel, at least a [W]estern Land of Israel [i.e., Palestine], without Arabs. There is no room here for compromises.... There is no way but to transfer the Arabs from here to the neighbouring countries, to transfer all of them, save perhaps for [the Arabs of] Bethlehem, Nazareth and old Jerusalem. Not one village must be left, not one [Bedouin] tribe.... And only after this transfer will the country be able to absorb millions of our brothers and the Jewish problem will cease to exist. There is no other solution.⁸⁶

Both Heydrich and Weitz were seeking a solution to the "Jewish Problem." Both solutions involved removing the Jews from Europe, and both involved the colonial practice of moving people off of land on which they had long lived. For Weitz the solution to the Jewish Problem involved solving the Arab Problem—the term that Benny Morris writes was commonly used in the Yishuv, the Jewish community in Palestine before the proclamation of the state of Israel.⁸⁷ Weitz's Transfer Committee worked on this process in Palestine/Israel. In his discussion of refugee numbers Morris notes the discrepancy between Arab claims of around 900,000 refugees and the Israeli claim of about 520,000. Around 800,000 would seem to be the most accurate figure.⁸⁸ Furthermore, during the Arab–Israeli conflict, in the 1948 clearances which removed approximately 430,000 Palestinians from Israeli territory, there was a now well-known massacre at Deir Yasin, where around 250 people were murdered, and also cases of mutilation and rape,⁸⁹ and another massacre at Ad Dawayima in the Hebron foothills.⁹⁰ There were, as Morris tells us, many other cases of atrocities and massacres.⁹¹ This is by no means evidence of a policy of extermination but it does point to colonial practices conventionally used against peoples generally regarded by the aggressor as inferior. It is not surprising that Morris can quote Weitz writing in April 1948 about the clearance of the semi-nomadic Bedouin from the southern end of the Haifa bay area that "the operation must still be completed... we must be rid of the parasites."⁹² In Fritz Hippler's anti-Semitic film *Der ewige Jude* (*The Eternal Jew*), released in 1940, as Eric Rentschler puts it: "Jews appear as nomadic parasites."⁹³ For Hippler the most apt visual metaphor was rats. Hippler was following Hitler's lead. Hitler considered Jews were worse

than nomads. In *Mein Kampf*, published in 1925/26, he wrote that the Jew "was never a nomad, but only and always a *parasite*."⁹⁴ In a modern world preoccupied with a people's ties to place, nomadism reinforced racial inferiority and, for their enemies, it was a quality of both Jews and Bedouin. Conventionally, parasites are creatures that live off the blood of others, possibly killing them in the process. For Hitler, Jews were subhumans who did not work themselves but lived off the work of others. Weitz appears to have thought similarly of the semi-nomadic Bedouin. In nineteenth- and early twentieth-century colonial discourse, nomadic hunter-gatherers were thought of as "primitive" peoples who did not work.⁹⁵ These people were considered to have no rights in the land on which they lived because they were not thought to work it. One ulterior purpose of the use of colonial practices such as have been outlined above has been intimidation, often, as in the Israeli case, to speed land clearance.

The Nazis established their first ghetto for Jews on October 8, 1939, at Piotrkow. The Lodz ghetto was established on February 8, 1940, and sealed on May 1. It had an area of one and a half square miles and contained 150,000 Jews. The Warsaw ghetto was founded on October 16, 1940 and sealed on November 16. It contained around 500,000 Jews. There were many others. These ghettos were a step on the road to the eradication of Jews from Europe. The report of the Wannsee Conference, held by the Nazis in 1942, describes Heydrich opening proceedings "by addressing the executive charged by the Reich Marshal [Goering] with the preparation of the Final Solution of the European Jewish question."⁹⁶ For this purpose a list was drawn up identifying the total number of Jews in Europe—more than eleven million—and the countries in which they lived. Europe, here, was understood as a geographical entity that included the Ukraine and the Soviet Union as well as the "European part" of Turkey, that area to the west of the Bosphorus. At the other end of modernity, in 1480, as "Europe" was coming into existence, twelve years before the expulsion from Spain, a Spanish royal edict "imposed a kind of segregation so similar to ghettoization, even in its ideological motivations, that some scholars have adopted the word 'ghetto' in this context as well."⁹⁷ The similarity to which Foa here refers is to the sixteenth-century Italian ghettoization, however, the structure—the attempt to isolate and subsequently eliminate Jewish presence—echoes down the centuries to the Holocaust, and should also remind the reader of countless European "resettlements" and exterminations of colonized peoples, including the Israeli treatment of the Palestinians. In chapter 3 we will discuss how the Nazi destruction of European Jewry was accomplished within the discursive order of European colonialism.

CHAPTER TWO

Life on the Edge: Liminality and the (European) Jews

[U]pon arriving in Paris a long time ago, I went to see an old writer, French-Jewish as people said back then. I told him about my perplexity in the face of my triple identity: Jew, Tunisian, and Frenchman. After listening to me he replied: “Well, keep it all; be everything at once.”

Albert Memmi, “Jews,
Tunisians, and Frenchmen.”¹

As we have seen, the modern world was constructed in terms of Same and Other, European and the Rest, “white” and “colored.” Writing about the state, Bauman describes how:

In the intellectual and political realms alike, the order must be both exclusive and comprehensive. Hence the two-pronged task merges into one: that of making the boundary of the “organic structure” sharp and clearly marked, which means “excluding the middle,” suppressing or exterminating everything ambiguous, everything that sits astride the barricade and thus compromises the vital distinction between inside and outside. Building and keeping order means making friends and fighting enemies. First and foremost, however, it means purging ambivalence.²

The state was an example of the fundamental pattern of the modern world. What Bauman outlines was true also for that new discursively constructed geographical area “Europe.” The usual narrative about the Jews, and one of which I told a version in the previous chapter, is that, having been expelled from the area that was becoming identified as “Europe,” the Jews were allowed to return to the states of the newly forming modern order where they lived more or less tolerated, mostly in the eastern marches where “Europe” faded into “Asia,” until the Nazi destruction. This is the extermination that Bauman has uppermost in his mind. This

narrative primarily concerns the problematic place of Jews within Europe, within the increasingly homogeneous states as they transformed from Absolutist to nation-states. This is the narrative of Ashkenazi Jews, the Jews of Germany and the East. However, the presence of the Jews not only unsettled the internal binary certainties of Europe. It also blurred the discursive boundaries of Europe itself. It is with this blurring that this chapter is concerned.

As Jews problematized the binary epistemological divide between Europe and its Others so they also contributed to the further problematization of that discursive construction "Jews." If "Jews" were "European," then what was the status of the Jews of North Africa and of the lands of the East, the Ottoman Empire and India, Jews who had never been to Europe? But, if Jews were not European, identified as coming originally from the Holy Land, then what could be the status of the Jews of Europe who had resided in that geographical area well before the modern reconstruction of space, through the so-called Middle Ages? At the heart of this problem, because their lives unsettled the binary divide on which the European self-conception was founded, were the Sephardi Jews, the Jews of the Iberian exile. Whereas the Jews who could not be fitted into the new, modern categories of state, and nation, became the subject of that growing preoccupation known as "The Jewish Question," the Jews who disturbed the new, and actually more fundamental, boundary between Europe and the non-West, were written out of existence. For example, even today the most well-known, general historical accounts of early modern Europe omit discussions of the important trade routes around the Mediterranean where Sephardi Jews played a significant role, to concentrate on the explorers, the "discovery" of the New World, and the development of the new Atlantic trade routes. Here, too, as we shall see, Sephardi Jews played an important role but one excluded from general accounts—an example of what Bauman calls suppression. The effect of this exclusion had been to make it easier to construct a historical narrative of triumphant European expansionism founded on a clearly established binary system.

This has been reinforced, indeed, from the point of view of ideology underpinned, by a modern philosophical tradition, started albeit unwittingly by Spinoza, which has excluded the Jews from History. Moreover, European thought has replicated the binary thinking of European/non-European in the binary conceptual structure of colonialism as organized between colonizer and colonized, a structure related to Hegel's now notorious phenomenological description of the master and slave relationship. In his very fine account of the Eurocentrism of modern philosophy's understanding of History, *White Mythologies*, Robert Young writes that:

Hegel articulates a philosophical structure of the appropriation of the other as a form of knowledge which uncannily simulates the project of nineteenth-century imperialism; the construction of knowledges

which all operate through forms of expropriation and incorporation of the other mimics at a conceptual level the geographical and economic absorption of the non-European world by the West. Marxism's standing Hegel on his head may have reversed his idealism, but it did not change the mode of operation of a conceptual system which remains collusively Eurocentric.³

Yet, having begun by referring to Hélène Cixous' account in *The Newly Born Woman* of growing up as a Jew in French Algeria, as a way into making this crucial point about Hegel's philosophy, Young himself writes Jews out of the rest of *White Mythologies*. Indeed, "Jews" do not even have a place in the index to mark the discussion of Cixous. The consequence is that, at least as far as the Jews are concerned, Young repeats the Hegelian move even as he critiques it.

The epistemological troping of the Same/Other binary into the colonizer/colonized binary has had effects that reach into the founding problematic of postcolonial critique. It is becoming conventional to think of the founding fathers of postcolonial theory as Aimé Césaire, Frantz Fanon and Albert Memmi. Of these three, Memmi is the least discussed and only his third book *Portrait du colonisé précédé du portrait du colonisateur*, first published in French in 1957 and in English in 1965 as *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, and a much later book, *L'Homme dominé* (1968, translated as *Dominated Man* in that same year) are usually referenced.⁴ That Memmi is Jewish is hardly ever mentioned. Leela Gandhi, for example, in her justifiably well-used introductory text *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*, identified Memmi as "the Tunisian anti-colonial revolutionary and intellectual."⁵

Memmi's father came from a Jewish-Italian family, which would suggest they were most likely Sephardi, and his mother was a Jewish-Berber who spoke only Judeo-Arabic.⁶ Memmi's written work can be crudely divided into two groups: his novels and philosophical writings which deal with Jewish issues, including oppression, and those works, such as the two already mentioned, which discuss colonialism. Rarely, with the important exception of an article which I shall discuss later, does Memmi bring together the two sets of concerns. The reason can be stated shortly and simply. The modern philosophical order in which Memmi received his intellectual training in Paris militates against any disruption of the binary structure. Jews, as I have already mentioned, are written out of History, and Memmi's own Jewishness, along with his attempts to come to terms with being a member of an oppressed group within a Muslim society which had been colonized by a European power, the French, is elided in the established postcolonial theoretical formulation which, in its dominant form, inverts the valence of the colonizer/colonized structure but does not deconstruct it.⁷

We can now briefly elaborate the theoretical consequences of the identification of the Jewish disruption of the binary division of Europe from

the Rest as it relates to the thinking of colonialism. First of all, there is the acknowledgement of the possibility of thinking about the Jews within Europe as being colonized.⁸ That is, we can think about the modernization of European Jewry as a colonial project. In this project the Jews of Germany and Western Europe were modernized first, the process then spreading to Eastern Europe and the Pale. Thinking of the modern history of European Jewry as a colonial history offers a context for understanding why it was so easy for the Nazis to employ colonial techniques in order to implement what was itself a colonial practice, extermination.

If the Jews of Europe can be thought of as colonized, it is also the case that European Jews settled around the world as part of the European colonial diaspora. In the first instance this dispersion was mostly of Sephardi Jews extending their trading networks. Thus, for example, after the Dutch conquest of northeast Brazil in 1630, by 1644 there were 1,450 Jews in Dutch Brazil, approximately two-thirds of the European civil population of the colony.⁹ Later, in the outpouring of Ashkenazi Jews from the Pale in the latter part of the nineteenth century, these Jews not only settled in Western Europe and the United States but established themselves across the range of European colonial settlements from Argentina to South Africa.

However, we need to remember that Europeans commonly made a distinction between the acceptable, "white" Western European Jews and these premodern Yiddish-speaking, Eastern European Jews. This division was important in colonial societies. For example, in that most racialized of colonies, South Africa, highly assimilated Western European Jews were ambivalently accepted but:

at the beginning of the twentieth century, whites often categorized [Eastern European] Jews with blacks. Both perceptually and in terms of legislation, Jews were classified with the indentured Chinese and Indian labourers who had been imported into the country at the same time as the arrival of the Jewish immigrants, as well as with the indigenous "kaffirs."¹⁰

So, while some, we might say already colonized, European Jews were able to occupy the space of the colonizer while not necessarily being accepted as fully equal, as yet uncolonized Jews from the problematically defined eastern borders of Europe were being classified with the colonized.

The ambiguities and confusions of this situation were compounded in areas such as North Africa where there was a Jewish population prior to colonization. Indeed, to complicate matters even more, in North Africa there were two Jewish populations which, over the centuries, had to some extent merged but in some places were still quite distinct. There was the Judeo-Arab community whose presence could be traced back to Roman times and then there was the Sephardi community which arrived in North Africa after the Spanish expulsion in 1492 and the Portuguese

forced conversion of 1497. In Tunisia, for example, André Chouraqui writes that:

The two communities did not finally fuse till the last years of the nineteenth century, when the spread of modern concepts under French influence and the intermingling of the youth in the schools of the Alliance Israélite Universelle facilitated the process.¹¹

Here, consolidation of the Jewish communities was a consequence of French colonization—set in train by the French Jewish organization established for modernizing non-European Jews. We should remember that French Jews were emancipated in 1791. Tunisia became a French Protectorate in 1881. Here, as in other North African colonies, the presence of a Jewish population among the colonized had the potential to undermine the binary categories on which the colonizer/colonized distinction was built.

Sephardim and Non-European Jews **on the North-African Border of Europe**

Where did the Sephardim go when they were expelled from the Iberian Peninsula? Esther Benbassa and Aron Rodrigue write that: “While North Africa was an important refuge for the exiles, it is quite understandable why this region, though nearest to Spain, did not become the destination for the majority.”¹² The reasons they give include the Portuguese and Spanish expansionary moves along the coast and the lack of any long-lasting centralized authority with enough power to offer the Sephardim permanent protection. Instead, Benbassa and Rodrigue write that the majority of the Sephardi exiles went to the Ottoman Levant. Here:

While the great majority of the Sephardim were involved in small-scale trade, artisanal and craft occupations, and in shop-keeping, and were integrated into local economies, a smaller elite emerged that became significant in often interlinked areas such as finance, international commerce and brokerage, and the manufacture and marketing of textiles.¹³

Benbassa and Rodrigue tell us that: “It was a configuration of an ethnically based network of trade that catapulted some Sephardi Jewish merchants and traders into leadership positions in international commerce in the sixteenth century.”¹⁴

The expulsion scattered the extended Sephardi families all along the Mediterranean coasts. Some Sephardim stopped in Italy and, reinforced by those fleeing Portugal after the establishment of the Inquisition there

in 1533–1536, there developed an Italian–Ottoman trading axis.¹⁵ While much of this trade went through Venice a new trading port was deliberately developed by the Medicis at Livorno. Seizing the opportunity brought about by the Iberian dispersals, Cosimo I opened up Livorno in 1548 to all traders regardless of their religion. In 1593 Ferdinand I extended this invitation guaranteeing freedom of worship, Tuscan citizenship, the right to own property, and giving the Jews jurisdiction over their own civil conflicts. By 1689 there were approximately three thousand Jews in Livorno.

Benbassa and Rodrigue note that: “One of the major reasons for Sephardi pre-eminence in [international trade] was the international Jewish family and community networks that spanned the Christian and Muslim worlds.”¹⁶ Where European Christians and Levantine Muslims were separated by religion and, therefore, limited family networks in a time when long-distance trade was still where possible family-based, the Jews were able to span both regions. This was not new. Jane Gerber makes the same point for Muslim Spain. She describes how, as early as the ninth century, a Jewish firm based in either Spain or Southern France had trade routes that stretched northward through Europe, along the Mediterranean littoral to Iran and Iraq and another that went by sea and land to China.¹⁷ With the rise of Livorno through the seventeenth century, the Jewish merchants of this city were particularly important in the trade with Tunis.¹⁸ Thus, in the sixteenth century and in the following centuries as well, Sephardi Jewry was especially important in trading links between Europe and its neighbors around the Mediterranean.

While the importance of the area as a trading region declined with the opening up of the Atlantic trade routes, Sephardi Jews continued to be prominent. For example, after the British capture of Gibraltar, ceded to the British in perpetuity in 1713, the Livornese used it as an entrepôt for trade between Morocco and England.¹⁹ In the eighteenth century, in the Ottoman Aegean port of Izmir: “the trade with Livorno, Holland, and England continued. Sixteen out of 22 firms doing business with Livorno in 1724, and 14 out of 19 exporters to Amsterdam in 1725 were Jewish.”²⁰ The dominance of Sephardi Jews in international trade in the Mediterranean basin continued until the time of French colonization.

In Algeria it seems that the intervention of the Dey of Algiers in an attempt to get French merchants to pay their debts to the Jewish merchant company of Bacri and Busmach—the latter family was previously from Livorno—provided the pretext for the French invasion of 1830. According to Chouraqui, who tells this story, the two families had “formed a consortium that was responsible for the major part of the Algerian principality’s foreign trade.”²¹ With the French occupation and the development of settler colonialism, the whole structure of Algerian international trade was transformed. More, with the advent of the binarizing colonial system of colonizer and colonized the position of the Sephardi Jewish traders was radically altered right across the length of French North Africa.

We can now appreciate that there was another side to the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492. Certainly this needs to be understood as part of the long-term transformation of Europe into a homogeneous entity, thought of first of all as Christian and subsequently as "white." However, the scattering of the Sephardim had an unintended consequence. Putting their expertise as traders to good use, the Sephardim increased trade between the new discursive entity "Europe" and the Muslim regions of North Africa and the Levant. These economic ties undermined the European attempt to distinguish Europe as a radically distinct area. At the same time the importance of the Mediterranean trading routes declined as the Portuguese and Spanish, in the first instance, opened up the new Atlantic routes and coupled exploration with control of trading rights and colonization.

Sephardim became involved in this development also. By 1549, there were practically no Jews left in the Netherlands except for a small group of Marranos allowed to remain in Antwerp.²² However, in 1595, with the Dutch blockading Antwerp, Amsterdam allowed in a crypto-Jewish community which took over the trade with the New Christian exporters of Lisbon and Oporto.²³ Jonathan Israel argues that the burgeoning local bourgeoisie allowed the Jews back because they were not in competition. This new trade, consisting of sugar, Brazil-wood, Indian diamonds, cinnamon from Ceylon, "came from Portuguese colonies where the Dutch East India Company had as yet failed to penetrate."²⁴ Here, also, we find the Jews successful because they were able to utilize family and religious connections.

I have already mentioned the role of Sephardim in the short-lived Dutch colony in northeast Brazil. Israel writes that these Jews "handled a large part of the colony's trade with Holland and stood high in the favor of the West India Company, the directors of which regarded them, their skills, and their resources, as indispensable."²⁵ Here, the Sephardim were in a very different position to their counterparts around the Mediterranean. Only recently allowed back into Amsterdam, tolerated for their trading skills but not regarded as properly European, in Brazil the Sephardim were positioned differently, given the same rights as the Dutch colonizers.

When Dutch Brazil collapsed in 1654 many of the Sephardim stayed on in the Caribbean:

The increasingly pivotal role of Dutch Jewry in the Jewish world generally was due also to the rise of the Dutch Sephardi colonies in the Caribbean. Jewish Amsterdam now became one corner of a trans-Atlantic triangle, tightly linked, as from the 1660s, with Curaçao and from the 1670s with Surinam. Curaçao was the largest of the Sephardi communities which arose in the West Indies during the second half of the seventeenth century and acted as a hub for the lesser communities on Barbados, Jamaica, Martinique, Tobago, and other islands.²⁶

The Sephardim on Curaçao had “contacts and patents for Jewish colonization signed and issued by the [Dutch West India] Company in 1651, 1652 and 1659.”²⁷ By 1700 Israel tells us that there were around 4,000 Sephardim in the West Indies; some of these had come from Livorno under Dutch auspices.

In this colonial New World the Sephardim constructed the same trading organization based on family and community connections, and underpinned by common religious assumptions, that their ancestors had utilized for hundreds of years. Only now, the dominant environment was quite different. These Jews were positioned as part of the colonial project and, furthermore, were operating within one of the new trading companies which were considered to be the best way to exploit colonial potential. Thus, as the seventeenth century wore on, the Sephardim became increasingly integrated into the state-run colonial trading companies:

Another significant function, at any rate of the Sephardi agents, was their role in the state management of colonial trade outside Britain and France...the Nunes da Costa, in Amsterdam and Hamburg, were leading participants in the setting up of the Portuguese Brazil Company, and aided the colonial schemes of Duke James of Courland, while the Belmontes were intimately connected with the Spanish slaving *asientos* signed in favor of the Dutch.²⁸

Israel goes on to identify other evidence of Jewish involvement in colonial policy. For example: “The Danish Guinea, West India and East India Companies all relied quite heavily on Sephardi factors in Glückstadt, Hamburg and Amsterdam.”²⁹ As the trading structure of the binarized colonial system was established Jews, particularly Sephardi Jews, were for a long time important in the new entrepreneurial organization.

For centuries Jews had functioned as unplaced traders connecting regions and communities across the European and Mediterranean trade routes. In southern Europe, North Africa and the Ottoman Empire the Sephardim continued in this role until the dissolution of the Empire and the French colonization of North Africa through the late nineteenth century. In northern Europe, the Netherlands in particular, Sephardim became part of the colonial trading enterprise. In both cases the Jews not only blurred the fundamental epistemological distinction between Europe and the Rest but, given their problematic status as Europeans, disturbed the desired clear-cut colonial distinction between European and colonized, Christian and pagan, white and colored. This problematization was especially extreme in French colonial North Africa where, as we have seen, there were two precolonial Jewish populations.

In Muslim countries Jews had traditionally lived as a tolerated and inferior community. In Morocco and Tunisia they lived in separated areas known, respectively, as *mellah* and *hara*. By all accounts by the nineteenth century the Jews of North Africa were in the main impoverished and

dreadfully oppressed. Chouraqui describes the situation in Algeria, which was possibly a little better than in Morocco and Tunisia, in this way:

Above the mass of abjectly miserable Jews, and at times on its ruins, lived the class of wealthier dealers, the most affluent of whom, living in the port cities, brought to the Maghreb the riches of the wide world... Real wealth, however, was rare among the Jews of North Africa. At the end of the nineteenth century, there were perhaps three wealthy families in Marrakesh... and the situation was similar in all parts of the Maghreb.³⁰

It is not surprising, then, that when the French came to Algeria the local Jews supported them.

The Act of Capitulation of July 5, 1830, stated that: "The liberty of the inhabitants of all classes, their religions, their properties, their trade, their industry, will not be violated; their women will be respected."³¹ Chouraqui writes that:

This text implied the abolition of the traditional relationships between Moslems and Jews. Nevertheless, a distinction was maintained between the two, based, not on religion, but on the concept of nationality.³²

The shift away from a religious distinction was crucial. Not only was religion no longer formally used by the French state to differentiate groups in this post-Enlightenment, post-Revolutionary era but it was Islam which decreed how Jews should be treated in the Muslim world. Further, preserving the distinction between Jews and Muslims (Arabs) in Algeria recognized a connection between the Jews of Algeria and the Jews of France—European Jews. Algerian Jews were "subject to French rule but [had] the right of separate administration."³³ From this time on there were moves to integrate Algerian Jewry into the governmental system of France, a development endorsed by the General Consistory of the Jews of France.

At the same time, there was an attempt to integrate Algeria itself into France. In 1848 Adolphe Crémieux, the minister of justice in the new government of the Second Republic, declared that: "The Republic desires the assimilation of Algeria with France."³⁴ In 1870 Crémieux, who also happened to be Jewish, presented nine decrees laying out political, legal and administrative reforms for Algeria. Just one, the seventh, is now known as the Crémieux decree. This stated:

The Jews indigenous to the departments of Algeria are declared citizens of France. In consequence their civil status and their personal status will be regulated according to French law, effective with the promulgation of the present decree: all rights acquitted to this day remain inviolate.³⁵

From a Jewish point of view this decree is considered a triumph for Algerian Jewry. From a colonial point of view this step helped to integrate Algeria into France by recognizing the commonality between Algerian Jews and French Jews. In doing so, it formally placed the Algerian Jews on the same legal footing as the French colonial settlers. In this way the Jewish presence in Algeria helped to blur further the borders of Europe—or, alternatively, helped to extend that border to North Africa.

The “Jewish effect” in the North African blurring of Europe’s border reappears during the Holocaust. At the Wannsee Conference in 1942 France is listed as containing 700,000 Jews. Edith Shaked has argued that since there were only about 300,000 Jews in mainland France, and since France’s North African territories—Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia—had about 400,000 Jews altogether, the Nazi figure must include the Jews of these territories.³⁶ It is important to remember that, for France, Algeria had a very different status from Tunisia and Morocco. Both the latter were Protectorates, Tunisia from the Treaty of Bardo in 1881 and Morocco from Sultan Moulay Abd al-Hafid’s arrangement with the French in 1912. Thus, the Wannsee inclusion of the Jews of these countries in the plan to destroy the Jews of Europe extended the geographical idea of Europe much further across North Africa than the French had been prepared to do.

The Nazi inclusion of French North Africa as European is clear from the events during the Nazi occupation of part of Tunisia from November 1942 to May 1943. Shortly after arriving in Tunis, Rudolph Rann, the German plenipotentiary minister, reported that “instigating the looting of Jewish shops, protests and pogroms, etc. . . will not be feasible until our troops have reached the Algerian border, at the very least.”³⁷ Nevertheless numerous Jews were executed, homes were looted, and a very small number were deported to Auschwitz and Buchenwald. Five thousand Jews were placed in forced labor camps.³⁸ Albert Memmi was himself interned in one of these camps. Shaked claims that an SS unit was preparing gas chambers near Kairouan for the extermination of the Tunisian Jews. These plans were interrupted by the Allied liberation.³⁹ The Nazis thought of Tunisian Jews as of the same race as European Jews—in this thinking all Jews are of the Jewish race—and set about treating them the same way. Indeed, the Nazis must have regarded Tunisia as a part of Europe.

Jews As the European Subject

How can we think about the Jews of Europe in modernity? Here I am referring to both Ashkenazim and Sephardim. These Jews who had been expelled as that new discursive construct, Europe, was being produced and then lived in the borderlands, both literal and metaphorical, recognized as both of Europe but as radically not of Europe; these Jews who were at one and the same time unwanted in Europe, indeed felt to be threatening to the new European order of sovereign states, and yet who conducted

such a large amount of Europe's banking and international trade. How to theorize these Jews who, expelled beyond the border of Europe, and then, allowed back primarily for pragmatic reasons, threatened the distinctiveness of that binary divide which established Europe's unique identity?

These Jews included Samuel Usque who was quoted in the previous chapter, a generation after the Iberian disaster, crying out: "Europe, which swallowed me with its noxious mouth, now vomits me out." Julia Kristeva defines the abject as "something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object."⁴⁰ Kristeva thinks of the abject as something which has been a part of a person but which is expelled, however, something that is never fully differentiated. Writing about the corporeal expression of the process of abjection, Kristeva literalizes Usque's metaphor as she describes: "The spasms and vomiting that protect me."⁴¹ She goes on to write: "I give birth to myself amid the violence of sobs, of vomit."⁴² Kristeva thinks of identity as being formed as a consequence of abject expulsion. However, this is not a process of objectification. As she writes: "The abject has only one quality of the object—that of being opposed to *I*."⁴³ This thing which is not objectified, which remains a part of one even when it has been expelled, is also experienced as a threat: "what is *abject* . . . the jettisoned object, is radically excluded and draws me to the place where meaning collapses."⁴⁴ Identity, the modern "I," is demarcated through the expulsion of that which, in the act of expulsion, becomes abject. The border, most obviously the corporeal border, is simultaneously validated and threatened by this part of me which, now beyond my border, does not become objectified but remains in some sense a part of me.

Here we have a psychoanalytic way of thinking about the Sephardim, expelled from "Europe" but nevertheless remaining in some degree European. The expulsion, and uncertain conversion, of the Sephardim, as of the Ashkenazi Jews, can, in Kristeva's theorization of the abject, be understood in terms of the formation of European identity. These Jews, who were vomited out amid the birth pangs of that identity, remain connected with Europe across the binary divide which produces the specificity of Europe as an entity in its own right. Connecting across the border, the Sephardim blur and problematize the border, threaten the new space of meaning, even while, in their abjected expulsion, they enable that European identity to be asserted.

We must watch our language here. We must be very careful. Troping Kristeva's description of the abject into a historical frame where it refers to modern Europe makes apparent a worrying politics. Kristeva writes at the very beginning of her treatise:

There looms, within abjection, one of those violent, dark revolts of being, directed against a threat that seems to emanate from an exorbitant outside or inside, ejected beyond the scope of the possible, the tolerable, the thinkable. It lies there, quite close, but it cannot be assimilated.⁴⁵

Here we have the language of suspicion, of fear, perhaps even terror. The abject is a threat and it cannot be assimilated. Indeed, given that integrity, identity is only fully achieved with the expulsion of that which is part of us, but which is not properly us—there is some suggestion in *Powers of Horror* that it is the image of the father, as the fantasmatic Father, that is the primary abjection. Abjection may be understood in terms of the modern project of producing Sameness as the foundation of identity. Remembering Bauman's comment, we can say that the abject has an ambiguous quality. For Kristeva, identity is only preserved by keeping the abject at bay. This is the rhetoric of modern nationalism, ultimately of Nazism.

It is not a surprise, then, to find Kristeva so ambivalent about her feelings for Céline, the French novelist, poet, and Nazi sympathizer. She writes that: "His adhering to Nazism, ambivalent and paltry as that action was, is not one that can be explained away."⁴⁶ Kristeva understands how Céline could experience the Jews as a threat:

His fascination with Jews, which was full of hatred and which he maintained to the end of his life, the simpleminded anti-[S]emitism that besots the tumultuous pages of the pamphlets, are no accident; they thwart the disintegration of identity with a script that affects the most archaic distinctions, that bridges the gaps insuring life and meaning.⁴⁷

Yet she finds his work attractive: "A universe of borders, seesaws, fragile and mingled identities, wanderings of the subject and its objects, fears and struggles, abjections and lyricism."⁴⁸ Kristeva's speaking position is that of the dominant.

Elizabeth Grosz, perhaps sensitized to the Jewishness of the abject as a concept by her own Jewishness,⁴⁹ suggests that Kristeva's argument about abjection and identity lifts off from Freud's discussions in *Totem and Taboo* and *Civilisation and Its Discontents*. However: "What is new about Kristeva's position is her claim that what must be expelled from the subject's corporeal functioning can never be obliterated but hovers at the border of the subject's identity, threatening apparent unities and stabilities with disruption and possible dissolution."⁵⁰ Grosz explains clearly Kristeva's understanding of the abject as a threat. In language so often applied to the Jews in modernity, Kristeva writes that: "Abjection... is immoral, sinister, scheming, and shady: a terror that disassembles, a hatred that smiles, a passion that uses the body for barter instead of inflaming it, a debtor who sells you up, a friend who stabs you..."⁵¹ It is again not surprising, because it suggests the anxiety that is a product of repression, that Kristeva's next paragraph should be about Auschwitz and the abjection of the Nazi crime in transforming that which is supposed to save us from death into a means of causing death. However, this displacement only reinforces the anxiety of a text which discusses abjection from the point of view of the site of power.

Judith Butler shifts the terms on which the abject can be thought. Since, as I have just demonstrated, speaking positions are important in this kind of politicizing discussion, we should note first that Butler writes in *Bodies That Matter* as a self-described deconstructionist.⁵² Now, deconstruction as a philosophical method has been elaborated by Jacques Derrida, a Jew originally from Algeria, like Cixous complexly positioned within the colonial order.⁵³ Although it is not the focus of this argument it is important to add that, like the Jews in Algeria, in the most specific sense deconstruction works to disturb, to unsettle the binary order of all Western, but especially modern, philosophy.⁵⁴ It is, perhaps, not surprising then that Butler, writing as a deconstructionist, also writes out of a Jewish background and that she thinks of abjection as central to the production of identity.⁵⁵

Butler's discussion of abjection takes place in the context of her concern with the social production of gender. Contra Kristeva, she acknowledges the formative importance of the abject in the production of identity. She writes that the:

exclusionary matrix by which subjects are formed thus requires the simultaneous production of a domain of abject beings, those who are not yet "subjects," but who form the constitutive outside to the domain of the subject. The abject designates here precisely those "unlivable" and "uninhabitable" zones of social life which are nevertheless densely populated by those who do not enjoy the status of the subject, but whose living under the sign of the "unlivable" is required to circumscribe the domain of the subject.⁵⁶

Here it is the abject, in this case those excluded from full subjectivity, who give meaning to accepted subjective identifications. It is the exclusionary force of abjecting and, indeed, those non-subjects who have been abjected, which produce the boundaries that delineate subjectivity. Europe, we might say, discovered its boundaries when, over the course of approximately a hundred years, and with particular reference to the Spanish expulsion, the Jews were exiled from Europe.

More, in Butler's way of thinking about abjection, the projection of the Jews as not-quite-European, not-quite-white, perhaps even non-quite-human, was necessary for the identification of the human, white, European subject. Butler remarks that:

the construction of gender operates through *exclusionary* means, such that the human is not only produced over and against the inhuman, but through a set of foreclosures, radical erasures, that are, strictly speaking, refused the possibility of cultural articulation. Hence, it is not enough to claim that human subjects are constructed, for the construction of the human is a differential operation that produces the more and the less "human," the inhuman, the humanly unthinkable.⁵⁷

At the core of this argument is the recognition, as with Kristeva, that a—if not the—defining quality of the abject is its common ground with that which abjects it. The differential construction of the human provides a cut-off between the abject and the Other. In a racialized hierarchy of inclusion where “white” equates with “human,” there is an implicit, and sometimes explicit, questioning of how human various non-“white” races are. The abject is definitionally, problematically connected with the dominant. The Other is radically differentiated. It was when the Nazis had Othered the Jews as subhuman, that is as not human, that they were able to destroy them rather than just be revolted by them.

The abject undoes the binary order of modern thought even as it establishes the border which enables that binary order. As I have already intimated, Western philosophy’s solution to this problem has been to exclude the Jews from History, thus privileging a dialectical methodology both temporally, in the Hegelian and Marxian understanding of historical change, and spatially, in the distinction between Europe, or the West, and the rest of the world; in the colonizer/colonized structure.

Memmi and the Theorization of Colonialism

I have already referred briefly to the problem Memmi encountered attempting to reinscribe the Jews in philosophical thinking about colonialism. This is well exemplified in his first book, a novel entitled *La Statue de Sel* (The Pillar of Salt). As with his other early novels *The Pillar of Salt* has an autobiographical aspect to it. The book begins with a Prologue which describes the narrator, Alexander Mordechai Benillouche, going to his philosophy exam at a French university. The exam lasts for seven hours during which time the students have to write on the topic: “Analyze the influence of Condillac on John Stuart Mill.” Benillouche has become utterly alienated. He comments: “How was I ever able to be interested in these games that now seem so absurdly futile?”⁵⁸ Instead, he spends his time writing his life story, which is the book that we now have. Benillouche is a Tunisian Jew who cannot find the relevance in Western philosophy as exemplified in the French Enlightenment thinker and the English Utilitarian.

Heidi Grunebaum-Ralph has insightfully discussed Benillouche’s name which, in its three components, signals his colonial Western (Alexander for the conqueror), Jewish and North African heritage.⁵⁹ Memmi has Benillouche in the book describe his family name as being a version of the Berber-Arabic patois “Ben-Ilouch” meaning “the son of the lamb.” Grunebaum-Ralph describes this as being “the subverted patriarchal referent of ontogenesis.”⁶⁰ This name, though, can also be read as French. Grunebaum-Ralph mentions that it contains *louche*, meaning of shady or suspicious, an aspect of the typical anti-Semitic stereotype of Jews. She suggests that, “contained in the Berber-Arabic patronymic Benillouche, [it] confirms the narrator’s double-edged anxiety regarding his name

which represents him as Other to others (and to himself) as well as the very project of self-portraiture which attempts to represent identity as fixed, and fixable.”⁶¹ However, Benillouche is more French than this. The name also contains “*béni*” meaning blessed, with a connotation of chosenness. Memmi’s family name for his protagonist, then, has a dual origin, only one aspect of which Memmi offers his readers. As a novel written in French, the meaning Memmi does not offer, that combines blessed/chosen with shady/suspicious, signaling both Jew and anti-Semitic construction of the Jew, overdetermines the meaning he does offer and suggests that France offers no solution to the protagonist’s search for a haven.

Grunebaum-Ralph also suggests that:

Memmi’s exposition and critical analysis of colonialism as predicated upon a binary structure of oppositional relationships fixed by dominant power discourses . . . is expressed in *La Statue de Sel* in terms of an ahistorically and psychoanalytically framed interiority.⁶²

Here, however, our views diverge. Where Grunebaum-Ralph thinks of the novel as privileging a binary structure, I would argue that Memmi uses the novel form as a way of explicating his own inability to inscribe his triple heritage into the binary order of Western philosophy—an order, and indeed a history, replicated in the exclusivity of the very exam topic found in the influence of one modern, European philosopher on another. Excluded, indeed silenced by Western philosophy, Memmi wrote a novel in which the relationship between his triple heritages, his non-Western as well as Western influences, is expressed through the complexities of the narrator’s identity.

How did it come about that Memmi’s resolution to a philosophical problem was to write a novel about identity? To understand this we need to examine briefly how the Jews, as the third term within modern European thought—the internal Other, if you like—have been methodologically excluded from modern philosophical interpretations of History. Yirmiahu Yovel argues that the modern historical outlook is secular and that “reason *itself* had to manifest such patterns as might give secular history meaning as a totality.”⁶³ In this tradition Judaism, and Jews as believers in Judaism, get sidelined as anachronistic in favor of a Christocentric telos. For Spinoza, “the Mosaic religion [was] the political constitution of the ancient Jews (the Hebrews), created by a social contract in which Jews decided to make God their political sovereign.”⁶⁴ The consequences of this is that for Spinoza, “Jewish life in the Diaspora [is] outdated because it has lost its political *raison d’être*.”⁶⁵ Here we have the beginnings of the modern philosophical exclusion of Jews from the modern world.

In *Religion within the Boundaries of Reason Alone*, Kant took up Spinoza’s idea and placed Judaism at the bottom, if not outside, his evolutionary order of religions. As Yovel writes: “Judaism is not only the lowest religion; it

is not a religion at all, but merely a political constitution.”⁶⁶ Thus “Jewish individuals . . . can have a developed—even an intense—moral mind, since they are rational beings, but this applies to them as individuals; as Jews, they possess only a political constitution, devoid of moral and spiritual value.”⁶⁷ Yovel teases out from Kant’s thinking what became the modern bargain offered to the Jews: assimilation as individuals, grudgingly allowed a personal religion other than Christian, or exclusion as a distinct entity whether founded on religious or racial difference.

Hegel followed in this tradition, understanding Judaism as an anachronism in the modern world. Yovel sums up Hegel’s view: “If Judaism has a unique peculiarity, it is precisely this *non*-historical existence to which it condemned itself (in antiquity), after Jesus and the destruction of the Temple.”⁶⁸ By refusing to accept Jesus and the moral ideas which he offered, the Jews turned themselves out of History, surviving only as an unfortunate and persecuted remnant. For Hegel, Judaism was a foundational moment of the Historical binary, the dialectic. Judaism provided a new understanding of spirit and freedom but alienated the absolute, God, from humanity. As Yovel writes: “The Jewish revolution did not announce Christianity only, but also the fundamental principle of the Hegelian system.”⁶⁹ With this simultaneously incorporative but exclusionary move, excluding the Jews as a group from modern relevance, Hegel was able to clear the way for the privileging of a system of thought that constructed reality in binary terms.

In his early text, *The Spirit of Christianity and Its Fate*, Hegel is clear about the destruction wreaked by Judaism on community:

The spirit of Judaism is represented by the patriarch, Abraham. Abraham is an unrelenting wanderer who severs all his ties to life, nature, a particular place, family, and love, in order to be absolutely free, but thereby becomes alienated and dehumanised.⁷⁰

Here, the conundrum set in dialectical motion by Judaism was how to reconcile freedom and community. The solution Hegel found, the working through of Spirit in society, was the state. As Raymond Plant writes: “Hegel’s conception of the role of the state at . . . all subsequent stages of his thinking is linked closely to the ideals which he had held as a youth, overcoming the fragmentation of society and the enervation of the person.”⁷¹ Thus: “The modern state, providing the reality of political community when comprehended philosophically, could therefore be seen as the highest articulation of Spirit or God in the contemporary world.”⁷²

Hegel makes no connection between his argument about Judaism, and the Jews to the extent that they are a product of Judaism, and his argument about the community and the state. That link, without Hegel’s philosophical trappings, would be made by Hitler and the Nazis. In Hegel’s thinking it is enough that the exclusion of the Jews from History after the coming of Christianity legitimates the dialectic system. What happens,

we should ask, to those geographically excluded from the dialectic? Clark Butler tells us that:

Hegel's philosophy of history conveys the notion that civilization "goes West," that is, that it originates in China, migrates to India, from there moves to the Middle East, Greece, Rome, and then northern, Germanic Europe, until it finally jumps across the Atlantic to America.⁷³

In this movement, which culminates with the modern, European state, not only is the world outside of Europe left behind but Africa, for example, never enters History at all. Hegel's History, that is the Eurocentric history of what modernity understood as civilization, leaves open the possibility for empirical appropriation—of land, people, goods—just as, as I have quoted Young remarking, Hegel's philosophical structure more generally "uncannily simulates the project of nineteenth century imperialism."

If we want to understand Fanon and Memmi's work we need to reflect on how Jean-Paul Sartre was influenced by Hegel, and especially Hegel's ideas about History, because Sartre's work provided the conceptual tools for both Fanon and Memmi. This needs a qualification. Where Fanon's major influences would seem to have been Césaire, Freud and Sartre (Fanon's title, *The Wretched of the Earth*, echoes Louis Céline's: "Most people die at the last minute; others twenty years beforehand, some even earlier. They are the wretched of the earth."), Memmi seems to have taken his historical philosophy more from Hegel than from Sartre. The question that this leaves open is how Memmi, apparently so alienated from Western philosophy at the time of writing *La Statue de Sel*, could subsequently have become so accepting of Hegelian ideas. Of course, Benillouche is not Memmi; Memmi does not seem to have ever flunked a philosophy exam! A more philosophical answer can be found in Gary Wilder's interview with Memmi. Wilder asked Memmi about his seemingly more accepting attitude to humanism in his later work. Memmi replies:

I have never had reservations about humanism as a philosophy. I have had reservations about the uses of humanism... I've never changed my opinion on this question. In situations of oppression, the dominant party always has a tendency to cheat with philosophy, to pretend that his own singularity is universal.⁷⁴

We can now understand better Memmi's resort to the novel form as a way to sketch his triple identity problem. Humanism is central to the novel of character. Memmi never rejected modern Western philosophy as such, just the Western bias in that philosophy, its tendency to universalize from its own speaking position, in the humanistic terms of Hegelian philosophy, its own singularity.

For both Fanon and Memmi, Sartre's *Anti-Semite and Jew*, first published in French as *Réflexions sur la Question Juive* in 1946, was a crucial text. In

Black Skin, White Masks, Fanon writes that: "Certain pages of *Anti-Semite and Jew* are the finest I have ever read. The finest, because the problem discussed in them grips us in our guts."⁷⁵ *Anti-Semite and Jew* is a book that is concerned with the existential interaction between anti-Semites and "Jews." Notoriously, for Sartre the Jew is a product of anti-Semitism. The existential relation between the anti-Semite and the Jew is dialectical only in the sense that it forms the Jew's character.

In *Portrait of a Jew*, Memmi writes, in part, in opposition to the image that Sartre created in *Anti-Semite and Jew*. Memmi comments that:

Later [Sartre] acknowledged that he was greatly surprised on reading certain Jewish authors, to discover that the Jew had another existence. And I am convinced that if the eminent author were to re-write his book, he would develop those aspects more fully.⁷⁶

Nevertheless, constructing Jews as an empty category had the advantage for Sartre of not having to deal with the problem of their historicity. Jonathan Judaken argues that in *Anti-Semite and Jew*:

The Jews, unlike the French, are denied a collective history and must accept only a collective memory of exodus, admonishment, banishment and exclusion; in short, a memory of collective martyrdom and suffering. Moreover Sartre claims that the Jewish religion is only an inauthentic substitute for the rootedness of a national community.⁷⁷

Well-intentioned as *Anti-Semite and Jew* undoubtedly was, Sartre repeats Hegel's exclusion of Jews as a distinct entity from modern History. It is, then, not so surprising that, in commenting on Claude Lévi-Strauss' attack on Sartre's monumental *Critique of Dialectical Reason* in *The Savage Mind*, Young sums up by writing that:

For Sartre "human history" was identified with the history of the West, and it was for this reason that Lévi-Strauss contested Sartre's claim to have established the human foundation of "a structural and historical anthropology for Marxism." In retrospect, it was highly significant that resistance to Sartre's "History" began by drawing attention to its ethnocentrism and Eurocentrism.⁷⁸

This said, we need also to remember that, if Sartre's philosophical assumptions were irredeemably Hegelian, he was at the same time the French intellectual who championed both Memmi and Fanon, writing introductions for Memmi's *The Colonizer and the Colonized* and for Fanon's first book, an account of racism in which he works over Sartre's description of anti-Semitism as the basis for his own more radical account of Negrophobia. In Sartre's Hegelian Marxism we can see the Hegelian formation of postcolonial theory taking place; the preservation of the binary

structure but now with a privileging of the subordinate term, here the colonized.

Homi Bhabha has argued that:

It is one of the original and disturbing qualities of *Black Skin, White Masks* that it rarely historicizes the colonial experience. There is no master narrative or realist perspective that provides a background of social and historical fact against which emerge the problems of the individual or collective psyche.⁷⁹

We can appreciate that this lack of historicity, for good and bad, comes from Sartre's lack of History for the Jews in *Anti-Semite and Jew*. While this text serves for Memmi to work against in *Portrait of a Jew*, it is Hegel's phenomenology which underpins Memmi's account of the colonial experience.

Earlier I asked what happens to those excluded from Hegel's civilizing History. Memmi models the dialectical relationship of colonizer and colonized on Hegel's description of the master and slave relationship in *The Phenomenology of the Spirit*—and we have already noted how Hegel's philosophy reproduces nineteenth-century imperialism. Yovel explains how Hegel's development of the master and slave relation came out of Hegel's interpretation of Judaism where: "Between the Jewish God and his people there is a permanent relation of master and slave."⁸⁰ Subsequently, Hegel elides this Judaic origin to theorize the relation in more general terms. There is a certain irony, then, that Memmi's assertions of the colonizer/colonized relationship beyond all possibility of complexification is an effect of his Hegelian model.

In his 1965 Preface to *The Colonizer and the Colonized* Memmi describes how, having written *The Pillar of Salt* and another novel, *Strangers*, about a Jewish mixed marriage, he "felt that to understand the failure of this undertaking, that of a mixed marriage in a colony, I first had to understand the colonizer and the colonized, perhaps the entire colonial relationship and situation."⁸¹ Remembering that both novels have a Jewish concern, we can read this statement as distinguishing between the particularity of the Jewish circumstance and its context here in colonialism. *The Colonizer and the Colonized* is itself preoccupied with colonialism as constructed in the terms of that colonial binary. Echoing Hegel's dialectical structure, Memmi writes that:

The distance which colonization places between [the colonizer] and the colonized must be accounted for and, to justify himself, he increases the distance still further by placing the two figures irretrievably in opposition; his glorious position and the despicable one of the colonized.⁸²

Within this structure, Memmi, unlike Fanon, recognizes the existence of groups who do not fit this overdetermining organization. Memmi spends

a paragraph early on in the book discussing the position of Jews in a colony where, he writes:

They live in painful and constant ambiguity. Rejected by the colonizer, they share in part the physical conditions of the colonized and have a communion of interests with him; on the other hand, they reject the values of the colonized as belonging to a decayed world from which they eventually hope to escape.⁸³

On the one hand, Jews occupy an ambiguous position, blurring the boundary of the ideologically constructed binary division between colonizer and colonized. On the other hand it seems, as Memmi suggests in *Portrait of a Jew*, Jews are not really a part of this colonial structuration, even though they share the lot of the colonized.

Ultimately, Memmi's solution to the problem of the differential statuses that he gives to Jews and to the colonized was to consider a universalizing theory of oppression. Memmi begins the Preface of *Dominated Man* by writing:

I had promised myself not to undertake a general portrait of the oppressed until I had understood the majority of contemporary oppressed peoples, undoubtedly a large number remain to be heard.

Thus, this book is a first attempt; I shall have to return to the problem at a later time. These various studies are the first steps towards a major book on oppression, which I am always planning, which I might never achieve, but towards which I advance every day.⁸⁴

Gearhart argues that, for Memmi, "it is only in terms of such a 'global theory' of oppression that the full significance of the colonized can be understood."⁸⁵ However, I think this misconstrues the problem. Thinking in terms of oppression is a way for Memmi to reconcile his two different concerns: the oppression that is an inevitable aspect of colonialism and what he sees as the historically universal oppression of the Jews. However, as he writes, he may never be able to write that book, which suggests that he himself is not sure that he can unify his divergent topics.

Hegel's influence on Memmi is perhaps most apparent in the chapter on "Situations of the Colonized." Here Memmi writes that:

The most serious blow suffered by the colonized is being removed from history and from the community. Colonization usurps any free role in either war or peace, every decision contributing to his destiny and that of the world, and all cultural and social responsibility.⁸⁶

For Hegel those people colonized would always already have been outside of History, but Memmi makes it a function of the colonial relation, as too he makes the colonized's removal from community.

As I have already suggested, this sense of the separateness of Jews comes through in *Portrait of a Jew*, Memmi's next book. Here, he does not write in terms of colonialism. Rather, the Jewish experience is founded on their permanent exclusion from History.

All that the Jews are can be explained, in large part, by all that we have not been allowed to be. And all that we have not been is explained in large part by oppression.⁸⁷

Memmi's Jews in this book have little in the way of historical, or for that matter geographical, specificity. There is, here, a universal quality to Memmi's category of "the Jew." These Jews are not European, nor for that matter Tunisian and under Muslim rule. Memmi's Jews are members of a distinct people and they have been oppressed everywhere. Certainly, unlike Sartre's Jews, Memmi's have a positive existence. However, it has been everywhere uniquely restricted. As Memmi writes: "Unlike the colonized, the Jew has been oppressed for so long that he no longer even believes strongly in his right to live among other men."⁸⁸ In Jews' universal oppression, the particularity of the colonizer and colonized relation is set aside. Unlike the colonizer and colonized who, as in Hegel's master and slave, construct each other's identity, the Jews preexist their oppression.

There is one article where Memmi brings together his Hegelian argument about colonialism and the situation of Jews when they are the inhabitants of colonized countries. To be found in Memmi's collection entitled *Jews and Arabs*, "The Colonised Jew" was first published in French in 1967. Here, Memmi begins by acknowledging that: "I wrote an entire book on colonization, in which I sketched a portrait of 'the colonizer and the colonized,' but how much of that did I devote to the colonized Jew? Only a few lines."⁸⁹ He goes on to assert that "*the situation of the North African Jew is also that of the colonized man.*"⁹⁰ He argues, though, that whereas the colonized can return to their own culture when their attempt at assimilation is rejected, the Jew cannot. Memmi is here thinking of culture as a function of the nation, of nationalism as a response to colonial oppression. Implicitly, he is countering his claim that the colonized are removed from History with the neo-Hegelian assumption that national liberation, the production of an independent state, will return a people to History. However, this new state is not for the local Jewish population because it does not express their culture. As for modernity, as for Hegel, Memmi thinks of the state as expressing the national culture of a single people.

In his youth, Memmi had been a Zionist. Now, his solution, as it had been then, is "Zionism and the departure for Israel."⁹¹ While Memmi acknowledges that, in practise, no single solution will suit everybody, his Hegelian equation of state and community leads him to end by suggesting that, "the genuine and specific rebirth of the Maghreb Jews, would consist of their national reconstruction and assimilation, in other words,

the State of Israel.”⁹² Memmi is not alone in this Hegelian legitimation for the existence of Israel. Jonathan Boyarin comments on Emil Fackenheim’s Hegelianism in his 1978 book, *The Jewish Return into History*, that: “The Holocaust and the establishment of Israel have been described as ‘the Jewish return to history.’ This is only true within a Hegelian conception of history as the history of states.”⁹³ Or, indeed, of states as the culmination of the working out of History. In this understanding, the Jews become a legitimate people only by virtue of their having a state of their own. Israel is here the solution to Europe’s, and Western philosophy’s, exclusion of the third term in the binary construction of Same and Other, the abjected Jews.

CHAPTER THREE

It Almost Needn't Have Been the Germans: The State, Colonial Violence, and the Holocaust

The starting point for this chapter is one that many people will find highly contentious, that in order to understand the Holocaust as a practice we need to set it into the context of the history of colonial violence.¹ I am, though, not the first person to make this connection. Sven Lindqvist makes a similar connection in *Exterminate All the Brutes*, first published in Swedish in 1992.² In order to contextualize the role of colonial violence we need to understand how violence—and I will want to talk about the discourse of violence to enable us to confront the understanding of violence as a culturally constituted practice—in modernity was conjoined with terror as a way of constituting the order which is the achievement of the modern state as a political form. Articulated with this practice of the state has been the emphasis on the social homogeneity of the population which has been constructed in terms of a binary of inclusion or exclusion. Following down this path we find a history of those the state punishes, either locked up in prisons or deported to a prison colony elsewhere, though European states began to discontinue this latter practice in the second half of the nineteenth century. This history needs to be distinguished from the history of those that the state excludes, casts out or does not allow in, a practise which is the other side of the coin from the emphasis in the modern state on internal homogeneity. All this, then, provides a context for thinking about the history of concentration and death camps, for these are not *sui generis*, they too have a modern history.

Ward Churchill has argued that: “The experience of the Jewish people under Nazism is unique only in the sense that all such phenomena exhibit unique characteristics.”³ This seems to me to be an eminently reasonable position. Acknowledging that what happened to the Jews did have some unique characteristics, we might, for example, think here of Zygmunt Bauman’s argument in *Modernity and the Holocaust* concerning the use of instrumental reason, bureaucracies and industrialized killing systems,⁴

while at the same time placing the Holocaust within the historical frame not only of the previous Turkish attempt to exterminate the Armenians but also, as Churchill implies elsewhere, the long list of modern annihilations. He includes Cortés's butchery of an estimated 20,000 Mexicans (Aztecs) per day, ultimately putting to the sword more than 300,000 as he set his men to systematically reducing all evidence of their civilization to rubble, and on, right through to Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, East Timor, Bosnia, and Rwanda.⁵ The point here is the centrality of violence not only to the modern state itself but also to the way the state, or perhaps we should better say the modern subject, deals with those not yet incorporated into modernity, or more specifically, the order of the modern state. Thus, I will be arguing, the violence and terror which are naturalized as the basis for the order of the modern state—*pace* that bourgeois theorist of the state Jean-Jacques Rousseau—is expressed in its full force on the borders of modernity, beyond the edges of the European state system.

We can argue, then, for a genealogy of the Holocaust which places it in a history which goes back as far as Cortés' massacre of the Aztecs, and understands the Nazi extermination of the Jews as part of a genocidal history which is as central to modernity as the humanism for which the "West" likes to be known. I use the word genocide deliberately here. As is well-known, Raphael Lemkin introduced the neologism in *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, published in 1944. He argued that it denoted "an old practice in its modern development,"⁶ by which he meant that: "Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity."⁷ This usage of the term requires the modern self-identification of a group as a nation. However, what Churchill is doing, and I concur, is not to use the term genocide depending on the way the group being exterminated think of themselves but how the group doing the exterminating construct those they are exterminating and, in the process, legitimate that extermination. It is with this shift in emphasis that we can think of genocide as a typifying feature of the modern world.⁸

Distinguishing the Holocaust, and Stalin's exterminations, from earlier genocides in modernity, Bauman writes that:

*Modern genocide is genocide with a purpose. Getting rid of the adversary is not an end in itself. It is a means to an end; a necessity that stems from the ultimate objective, a step that one has to take if one wants to reach the end of the road. The end of the road is a grand vision of a better, and radically different society.*⁹

Earlier modern genocides, though, were also not ends in themselves. It is just that they were not thought through as deliberately and carried out in such methodical, rational fashion. As we track what came to be called genocide from its modern origins we shall also notice the increasing self-consciousness and intent with which it has been practiced. The Holocaust was a state-based triumph of instrumental rationality used for genocidal purposes.

It was Aimé Césaire in *Discourse on Colonialism*, first published in French in 1955, who first made the connection between what the Nazis did in Europe during World War II and what Europeans had been doing in the colonies. Césaire wrote that:

what [the European bourgeois] cannot forgive Hitler for is not crime in itself, The crime against man, it is not the humiliation of man as such, it is the crime against the white man, the humiliation of the white man, and the fact that he applied to Europe colonialist procedures which until then had been reserved exclusively for the Arabs of Algeria, the coolies of India, and the blacks of Africa.¹⁰

Césaire does not identify here what colonialist procedures he has in mind. Later though, he writes of the colonizer treating the colonized as an animal,¹¹ and goes on to expand on this: "Between colonizer and colonized there is room only for forced labor, intimidation, pressure, the police, taxation, theft, rape, compulsory crops, contempt, mistrust, arrogance, self-complacency, swinishness, brainless élites, degraded masses."¹² Césaire does not mention violence, terror, concentration and death camps, genocide, but these practices complement the more specific ones he does list.

Césaire's point in the former quotation is that what horrified Europeans was not what the Nazis did but to whom they did it. They took European colonial practices and applied them to their own race, white people. This is where we need to be careful because, it would seem, Césaire does not differentiate between Jews, Poles, Slavs, Gypsies (Sinti and Roma), Russians, and all the other groups, including political and sexual undesirables that the Nazis rounded up, placed in concentration camps and exterminated. In one sense, of course, Césaire is right not to make a distinction. For Europeans, what the Nazis did was so horrific precisely because it was done within Europe, albeit on the eastern border, and to whites. However, this is where the very good point needs to be problematized because, for the Nazis, Jews, Gypsies and other Eastern European groups were identified as inferior races.

It is important here to detour and expand on this point. Germany had a tradition, legitimized in intellectual work, of viewing Eastern Europe as uncivilized. Michael Burleigh argues that, through the nineteenth century, "[r]elations between Germans and Slavs were gradually hypostatized in terms of a West/East 'cultural gradient' (*Kulturgefälle*) declining from the 'civilised' West towards the 'uncivilised' East."¹³ By the time Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf*, published in 1925/26, this modern distinction between civilization and the uncivilized had been racialized in an increasingly scientific form for around two centuries. Thus Hitler could write that:

the organisation of a Russian state formation was not the result of the political abilities of the Slavs in Russia, but only a wonderful example of the state-forming efficiency of the German elements in

an inferior race... For centuries Russia drew nourishment from the German nucleus of its upper leading strata. Today it can be regarded as almost totally exterminated and extinguished. It has been replaced by the Jew... And the end of Jewish rule in Russia will also be the end of Russia as a state.¹⁴

It was this racialization of the occupants of Eastern Europe, the indigenous people we might say, that legitimated the use of colonizing practices in what was, as we shall see, a Nazi colonial expansion for Germany.

What complicates this description is that the Yiddish-speaking Jews of Eastern Europe neither regarded themselves nor were regarded by the Poles and Russians as a group having a primordial presence even though, as I have argued elsewhere,¹⁵ they were beginning to develop some of the characteristics of a nation. Thus, the use of colonial practices against the Jews meant that they were treated *as if* they were a colonial people. Technically, unlike Poles and Russians, Jews, and Gypsies were not thought of as an indigenous population. Nevertheless, like those who were thought of as more or less indigenous, they had to be removed to make way for German colonial settlement. However, not thinking of them as indigenous enabled the Nazis to use these colonial practices against Jews throughout Europe.

Indigenous people were racialized. To put it differently, as secularization took hold as a crucial aspect of modernization in Europe so race replaced religion as the foundational moment of Othering. By the nineteenth century European thought legitimated extermination through scientific racist arguments that taught that inferior nonwhite races were inevitably doomed to extinction. This is how Patrick Brantlinger has described the general tenor of nineteenth-century racist thought:

When "savagery" is not identified as a direct cause of racial extinction, with "civilization" its self-evident, supposedly humane cure, then it is frequently held that some groups of "savages," at least, cannot be civilized, and are doomed to fall by the wayside no matter what customs they practice or fail to practice. And "doomed" is the operative word: a third feature of such rationalizations (the ideological corollaries of imperialism) is that the extinction of at least certain primitive peoples—those incapable of becoming civilized—is viewed as inevitable.¹⁶

Brantlinger discusses how these ideas were given a scientific basis in Dr Robert Knox's historically important book, *The Races of Man*, published in 1850, where "a racial essentialism... makes genocide (or the 'extinction' of 'inferior races,' to use Knox's language) the inevitable result of the 'progressive' nature of the white 'races.'"¹⁷ Brantlinger quotes Knox:

[The Saxon's] onward principle diffused and spread him over the colony [South Africa]; the go-ahead principle was at work; this, *of course*,

led him to the seizure of land, the plunder and massacre... of the simple aborigines... while I now write, the struggle is recommencing with a dark race (the Caffre), to terminate, *of course*, in their extinction.¹⁸

And again:

What a field of extermination lies before the Saxon Celtic and Sarmatian races! The Saxon will not mingle with any dark race, nor will he allow him to hold an acre of land in the country occupied by him; this, at least, is the law of Anglo-Saxon America. The fate, then, of the Mexicans, Peruvians, and Chileans, is in no shape doubtful. Extinction of the race—sure extinction, it is not even denied.¹⁹

In these quotations we can see, first of all, that the extermination of non-white races was quite apparent to Knox and, second, how Knox understood this practice of European colonialism in racial terms, as the consequence of qualities associated with the white race. The effect was to legitimate the clearing of indigenous people from the land being colonized and settled, and the extermination of those people, by constructing these practices as inevitable, as part of the geographical spread of civilization.

We can now return to Césaire. Césaire's point is that what is shocking for Europeans is the spectacle of white Germans using colonial procedures on other white people. However, for the Nazis, as we have seen, Poles, Russians, Jews, Gypsies and others were not regarded as members of the white race. This was what made their colonial subjection possible. Jonathan Boyarin, who has also discussed this passage of Césaire's, suggests that Césaire is being ironic here. He writes:

Note well that the reference to Hitler's "crime against the white man" does not itself obscure the focus on eliminating Jews: what Césaire is mocking is the bourgeois Christian European's fantasy that he had brought the Jew *as* "white man" under the protective umbrella of civilization, safe from the colonial storm.²⁰

It seems to me that, rather than an irony, Césaire is acknowledging that within Europe Jews, and the other groups racialized as nonwhite by the Nazis, have predominantly been understood as "white."²¹

For Césaire, writing as a black Martinican, the distinction underlying his argument is between Europeans and the rest of the world, whites and non-whites, colonizers and colonized. Nevertheless, from a Jewish point of view, Boyarin is making an important point, the recognition of the complexities of the incorporation of European Jews into "whiteness." As he writes elsewhere in the context of a discussion about empathy: "In popular-culture representations of the Holocaust, the particular horror of the Nazi genocide is emphasized by an image of Jews as normal Europeans, 'just like us.'"²²

If, for Hitler, Eastern Europe was a land to be settled, occupied by a people to be colonized, this was not the perception of the rest of Europe. For other Europeans, Hitler was indeed bringing into the core of civilization, the heartland of modernity, practices, and especially violence and terror, which were only allowable when imposed on racially Othered peoples. Let us, then, begin to think about the practice of violence in modernity.

Premodern Violence

A characteristic of premodern Europe was its fundamentally different understanding of violence. In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault describes how, in premodern Europe, the aim of the public execution was “not so much to re-establish a balance as to bring into play, as its extreme point, the dissymmetry between the subject who has dared to violate the law and the all-powerful sovereign who displays his strength.”²³ Foucault makes a similar point about torture, it “made the body of the condemned man the place where the vengeance of the sovereign was applied, the anchoring point for a manifestation of power, an opportunity of affirming the dissymmetry of forces.”²⁴ In this pre-state system, power was not distributed evenly across the governed area. Rather, power was manifested and expressed in a much more personal dynamic. Physical violence, violence on the body, was the key way in which the proper relationship between the person who was more powerful, let us say, the sovereign, and the less powerful who transgressed the will of sovereign was expressed in the law.

Physical violence inscribed on the body the proper hierarchical relations which articulated order. Foucault describes how:

[T]he punishment is carried out in such a way as to give a spectacle not of measure, but of imbalance and excess; in this liturgy of punishment, there must be an emphatic affirmation of power and of its intrinsic superiority. And this superiority is not simply that of right, but that of the physical strength of the sovereign beating down upon the body of his adversary and mastering it . . .²⁵

What is clear in this discourse of violence is that the practice of violence upon the body is a manifestation of the legitimate exercise of power of the sovereign, and establishes that power. Because of the imbalance and excess in the violent spectacle, it is also clear that the purpose of the violence is not just punishment but, more, the instillation in the viewers, in the rest of the populace, of the power of the sovereign.

Foucault comments on the public execution that: “The ceremony of punishment, then, is an exercise of ‘terror.’”²⁶ Terror, articulated with violence, is a crucial aspect of the practice of this discourse of violence as it, in turn, articulates with the exercise of power. Indeed, Foucault

goes on to describe how what maintained the use of torture was not “an economy of example” but rather “a policy of terror: to make everyone aware, through the body of the criminal, of the unrestrained presence of the sovereign.”²⁷ In this governmental regime physical violence produces the terror which maintains order.

And then something happens. Around the end of the eighteenth century in France, around the time of the French Revolution, there is a movement for reform. As Foucault puts it:

The true object of the reform movement, even in its most general formulations, was not so much to establish a new right to punish based on more equitable principles, as to set up a new “economy” of the power to punish, to assure its better distribution... so that it should be distributed in homogeneous circuits capable of operating everywhere, in a continuous way, down to the finest grain of the social body.²⁸

Violence and punishment are no longer signally linked in an expression of power designed to keep the populace in terror of the sovereign until the next spectacle. Rather, the threat of punishment is decentered, it operates everywhere all the time, and it does not even need to be connected to violence, or at least the practice of violence. As Foucault writes, “within a short space of time, detention became the essential form of punishment. In the penal code of 1810, between death and fines, it occupies, in a number of forms, almost the whole field of possible punishments.”²⁹ Incarceration has taken the place of physical violence, and done so within a decentered regime of power where power is permanently exercised right across the social body.

In this new regime, violence is now reserved as a potential and incarceration is made possible through the continuous presence of power. Indeed, incarceration is an expression of the new territorialization of power. From this time on there develops an increasingly graded scheme of detentory punishments linked to an increasingly specified array of crimes. There is no longer spectacularly excessive violence. Instead, there is the state and its law.³⁰

Terror and the State

Describing this new environment, Henri Lefebvre distinguishes between two kinds of terrorist society. He writes:

According to our theory a society where violence and bloodshed reign is not a “terrorist” society, for whether red or white, political terror is short-lived; it is a means used by a specific faction to establish and maintain dictatorship; political terror is localized, it cannot

be imputed to the social “body,” and such a society is terrorized rather than terrorist. In a terrorist society terror is diffuse, violence is always latent, pressure is exerted from all sides on its members, who can only avoid it and shift its weight by a superhuman effort...³¹

Working over Lefebvre’s distinction, it would be fair to say that a terrorized society ruled by political terror is a special case of a terrorist society for it is a society, a state I would prefer to say, in which violence is practiced in order to establish and preserve power through consciously experienced terror. That is to say, the citizens allow the dictator to remain in power because they feel terrorized. In a terrorist state, however, that is, in the modern state, terror is decentered, it operates in the very functioning of the social interaction of everyday life. To continue with the quotation from Lefebvre:

[E]ach member is a terrorist because he wants to be in power (if only briefly); thus there is no need for a dictator; each member betrays and chastises himself; terror cannot be located, for it comes from everywhere and from every specific thing; the “system” (in so far as it can be called a “system”) has a hold on every member separately and submits every member to the whole, that is, to a strategy, a hidden end, objectives unknown to all but those in power, and that no one questions.³²

What Lefebvre is making clear here is that there is a controlling site to the terror. The institutional structure of government reproduces the terror but this is not expressed, under normal circumstances, in violence. Rather terror is invested in the very form of our experience of everyday life in the modern state. Thus terror is naturalized and the modern state, under normal, that is non-dictatorial, conditions is portrayed as a peaceable place, ideally a site of humanistic generosity and liberal, individual freedom, in which the state protects its citizens from acts of violence and punishes, by detention, those who transgress this rule.

If we begin to think of the key to the modern state as the naturalization of terror, and the concomitant institutional removal of violence to a reserve capacity, then how did this come about? To answer this we can turn to the locus classicus of state terror, the French Revolution, for our clearest example. On the September 5, 1793 the Convention was surrounded and invaded by the sansculottes. Amongst other demands to which the Convention acceded was that suspects, people suspected of hindering the Revolution, should be arrested. On September 17 this measure was given legal form as the Law of Suspects. This law overtly introduces terror as an aspect of government of the modern state. As Claude Lefort writes:

But when the Convention places Terror on the agenda (and it is impossible to imagine a tyrant or his advisors pronouncing the formula), it creates a new political space, and gives substance to what was no more than an attribute of arbitrary power. When it is named

and, so to speak, exposed to the gaze of all or sanctioned, the Terror is set free. It is now impossible to assign it a master. The individual now has no alternative but to serve it, to will it, just as one wills virtue or wills freedom.³³

In this new political space of terror, terror is always displaced. Terror binds the state together by diffusing terror through the population. Suspicion connects the institutional order of the state with the experience of the individuated members of the state. It is impossible for an individual to place her/himself beyond suspicion—unless it is at that fantasmatic, panoptic point of the state's gaze from which suspicion is controlled. Here we have a way of understanding why Lefebvre's terroristic individual wants power. It is the fantasy of being relieved of the burden of suspicion. However, as Lefort also argues: "The Terror is revolutionary in that it forbids anyone to occupy the place of power, and in that sense it has a democratic character."³⁴ If Lefort is writing here specifically about the French Revolutionary Terror, the point is equally appropriate to the generalized and naturalized terror of the modern state. Lefort explains that: "The primary reason why [the Terror] poses a particular problem, and why it has exercised—and still does—such a fascination over those who have studied the event is that it was combined with a quest for liberty."³⁵ The exercise of terror is a function of the law of the state.

It was within the space of that law, within the territory of the state, that liberty, freedom, and the other humanistic values of modernity could flourish. To take the pertinent example of the Jews, emancipation brought them within the rule of law of the state, placed them along with all other citizens in the space of naturalized terror, and, by means of that same rule of law which deals in detention rather than exemplary violence, offered them the same protection from violence given to other citizens. With this consequence, that, in the Holocaust: "Violence [was] turned into a technique."³⁶

What protects from violence and produces, and limits, the effects of terror is the law. Working over an argument of Bauman's in *Ambivalence and Modernity*, I have argued elsewhere that the state can be understood as "a machine which produces strangers as it produces friends and enemies,"³⁷ us and them. Crucially for my argument here, the state produces a binary distinction between those subject to its laws and those outside of that subjectification, outside of the "protection" of the law. There have been two possible options for dealing with those who transgress the law: assuming that the state wishes to preserve them as its responsibility, they can either be contained within the state, in a special area, that is they can be detained in prison, or they can be expelled from the state and detained elsewhere. Through the nineteenth century, both France and Britain used both systems as a way of dealing with criminals. If the state wishes to withdraw citizenship rights completely from a person or group of people,

withdraw their subjectification to the “protection” of the law, they can be expelled from the state.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault is well known for discussing the evolution of panoptic surveillance by way of the example of Jeremy Bentham’s advocacy of a prison called the Panopticon. What Foucault does not mention is that Bentham also wrote two letters to Lord Pelham published in London in 1812 under the title *Panopticon versus New South Wales; or, The Panopticon Penitentiary System and the Penal Colonization System Compared*. Now, remember that we are here talking about citizens of the state. Transportation was, in this case, an aspect of colonization, not a means of expelling those unwanted as citizens. Bentham clearly recognized the binary punishment system made possible by the development of the state. It is important to keep a conceptual distinction between the deportation of criminals and the expulsion of those from whom the state withholds, or withdraws, citizenship.

Before the Nazis began exterminating Jews, they had first withdrawn citizenship rights from Jews within Germany and “encouraged” Jews to leave. Jewish emancipation had been completed in Germany in 1871, the year of unification. The gradual withdrawal of citizenship rights began on July 14, 1933 with the passing of the Law for the Repeal of Naturalization and Recognition of German Citizenship. This cancelled the naturalizations of Eastern European Jews that had taken place between November 9, 1918 and January 30, 1933.³⁸ In September 1935 the Nazis passed what have become known as the Nuremberg laws at the only meeting of the Reichstag held outside Berlin during Hitler’s rule. As Saul Friedlander tells it:

The second [law], the Citizenship Law, established the fundamental distinction between “citizens of the Reich,” who were entitled to full political and civic rights, and “subjects,” who were now deprived of those rights. Only those of German or related blood could be citizens. Thus, from that moment on, in terms of their civic rights, the Jews had in fact a status similar to foreigners.³⁹

The third law, the Law for the Defense of German Blood and Honor, ensured that this distinction did not become blurred. It “forbade marriages and extramarital relations between Jews and citizens of German or kindred blood.”⁴⁰ During the conquest of the East, when very large numbers of Jews outside of the Reich came under German power, there were discussions about setting up a reservation, followed by the advocacy of deportation. Where the treatment of German Jews needs to be understood in terms of the state’s creation of “us” and “them,” Aryan Germans and those of inferior race, the treatment of Jews outside of Germany followed colonial practice. Ultimately, the Othering, the racialization of the Jews within Germany and the withdrawal from them of citizenship rights, meant they too could be treated as a colonial people, as a people not only

outside of the law of Germany but also outside of the rights afforded to other Europeans, to “white” people.

So far I have dealt with the transformation in the discourse of violence, and its association with terror, within Europe. It is now time to turn to what happened outside of Europe, outside of the rule of law of the modern states, and, especially, what happened when Europeans confronted those it identified as Other, non-“white.” From the beginnings of European expansion, and of course well before the transformation in the discourse of violence in connection with the evolution of the modern state that I have been describing, Europeans destroyed and decimated those whom they Othered. This is not the place to discuss the historical construction of Europe and those Othered people but we can, at least, note its concurrence with European expansion into the American continent.⁴¹

Colonial Violence

Churchill tells us that:

On October 12, 1492, the day Christopher Columbus first landed in what came to be called the “New World,” the [W]estern hemisphere was inhabited by a population of well over 100 million people. Two centuries later, it is estimated that the indigenous population of the Americas had been diminished by some 90 per-cent and was continuing to fall steadily.⁴²

Churchill goes on to note that, “the average nadir population for surviving indigenous peoples everywhere in the Americas is about 5 percent (meaning we experienced a reduction of 97–98 percent during the history of invasion, conquest, and colonization which afflicted us all).”⁴³ This extermination of the indigenous population took place with extreme violence, and terror, and was coupled often with the use of this same population as forced labor or slave labor to extract precious metals to send back to Europe.

This European extermination of those Othered is so pervasive that it defies specific examples. Nevertheless, to take just one instance from 1909, during the rubber boom in the Putumayo area on the border of Colombia and Peru, Michael Taussig writes this:

In a letter written to Hardenburg [an American engineer and adventurer] in 1909 by an employee of the [rubber] company and subsequently published in his book, we read how a “commission” was sent out by a rubber station manager to exterminate a group of Indians for not bringing in sufficient rubber. The commission returned in four days with fingers, ears, and severed heads of Indians to prove

that they had carried out their orders. The writer thereafter witnessed Indian prisoners shot and burned, the smoldering pile of flesh remaining only 150 meters from the rubber station itself.⁴⁴

Taussig concludes this account from the letter to Hardenburg with the manager of the rubber station slaughtering over 150 Indians while shouting: "I want to exterminate all the Indians who do not obey my orders about the rubber that I require them to bring in."⁴⁵ The first point to make here, and I make it with the Holocaust in mind, is of a modern European mindset that thinks of the extermination of non-Europeans, nonwhites, as acceptable. Joseph Conrad was expressing the same vision in *Heart of Darkness*, his fictionalized account of Belgian colonial practices in the Belgian Congo⁴⁶ first published in serial form in 1899, when he has Kurtz scrawl on the pamphlet he has written for the International Society for the Suppression of Savage Customs, "Exterminate all the brutes." Lindqvist makes investigating this invocation of Kurtz' the basis for the first part of his book. He finds that Herbert Spencer, the English social philosopher, writes in *Social Statics* in 1851 that: "The forces which are working out the great scheme of perfect happiness, taking no account of incidental suffering, exterminate such sections of mankind as stand in their way . . . Be he human or be he brute—the hindrance must be got rid of."⁴⁷ Lindqvist notes that the German philosopher Eduard von Hartmann wrote in a book that Conrad read in translation that:

As little as a favor is done the dog whose tail is to be cut off, when one cuts it off inch by inch, so little is there humanity in artificially prolonging the death struggles of savages who are on the verge of extinction . . . The true philanthropist, if he has comprehended the natural law of anthropological evolution, cannot avoid desiring an acceleration of the last convulsion, and labor for that end.⁴⁸

Ultimately, Lindqvist realizes that it is pointless looking for a single origin for the sentence Conrad gives Kurtz because the idea it summed up was pervasive through the latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Building on a similar insight, Taussig comments on the accounts that he works upon that, "it is also obvious that torture and terror are ritualized art forms and that, far from being spontaneous, *sui generis*, and an abandonment of what are often called the values of civilisation, such rites of terror have a deep history deriving power and meaning from those very values."⁴⁹

If extermination is a common mode of European behavior toward the Other, then we can note how, to some extent, it gets filtered through a premodern use of violence to create terror and force acknowledgement of European rights of power. While it is not my main line of argument here,

we can also recognize how the colonial periphery operated, or should I say operates, as a site of fantastic fulfillment, where you do not need to pay workers, not even survival wages. Here you can either use the natives as forced labor or, better still, use them as slave labor and simply work them to death, thus having no overheads, in the further fantastic belief that there is an infinite supply of this indigenous labor. At this time I shall just point to the German industrial use of forced and slave labor from the concentration camps; not just Jews of course, but also Poles, Russians and members of the other "inferior" races.

To return to the main line of argument, if violence and terror were associated with European power then, as Taussig explains, they created a space of death. Taussig describes this as having "a long and rich culture" in the Western tradition, "where the social imagination has populated its metamorphizing images of evil and the underworld."⁵⁰ In modernity, in the era of the state, the space of death was positioned in the colonies, outside of the European order, away from the law of the states. By redefining certain peoples as non-white, and non-European, who were normatively thought of as white and European, the Nazis brought the space of death, literalized as the death camps, to Europe—at least, discursively, following Taussig, this is how they have been narrativized in the discourse of the Holocaust.

It was not only in the Americas that such genocidal exterminations took place. I want to move on now to Australia, not to demonstrate the same points that I have made in the context of the Americas but, rather, to think through how violence and terror function outside of the area ruled by the law of the state. Australia was settled at the time of the French Revolution, 1789. One thing that Australian colonialism had in common with the Americas was the extermination of the indigenous people. Indeed Raymond Evans quotes Taussig's use of the phrase "death space in the land of the living" to describe what happened to the Aborigines.⁵¹

Much of this genocide was a consequence of settler colonialism's need to clear the land for white farmers, a point to which we will need to return. However, some of the violence had a different purpose. Quoting Deborah Bird Rose, Bain Attwood remarks that:

[e]xcessive and unrestrained violence was a key feature of European colonisation—"people were routinely shot, poisoned or beaten to death"—but the violence at one moment understood to be essential, was at a later moment denied or simply lost to [European] memory.⁵²

Now, the question we must ask is, why was this violence deemed essential? One answer, as I have indicated, is that it was necessary to clear the land, to produce in reality what the law had already decreed, that Australia was *terra nullius*.⁵³ However, there is a second answer. Let us

listen to Watkin Tench describing the purpose of an expedition sent against the local Aboriginal population in the area of Botany Bay by Governor Phillip in 1790. Tench was the leader of the expedition. He wrote:

His Excellency was now pleased to enter into the reasons which had induced him to adopt measures of such severity. He said that since our arrival in the country, no less than seventeen of our people had either been killed or wounded by the natives:—that he looked upon the tribe known by the name of Bid-ee-'gal, living on the before-mentioned peninsula, and chiefly on the north arm of Botany Bay, to be the principal aggressors—that against this tribe he was determined to strike a decisive blow, in order, at once to convince them of our superiority, and to infuse an universal terror, which might operate to prevent further mischief.⁵⁴

Here we have, to put it simply, the state reaching out beyond the territorial limits of the law to exercise violence and terror in their premodern form as a strategy of the exertion of power. There are many more examples of this same practice, as Henry Reynolds puts it: “Phillip’s desire to ‘infuse an universal terror’ was echoed again and again by his successors.”⁵⁵

Tench’s original instructions “were to capture two members of the clans around Botany Bay and kill ten others whose heads were to be chopped off and carried into the settlement.”⁵⁶ Subsequently Tench got these instructions moderated. “He was to capture six blacks and return them to the settlement. Two were to be hanged and four sent to Norfolk Island.”⁵⁷ Norfolk Island was the penal colony’s penal colony. In Tench’s instructions we can find a combination of the premodern discourse of violence, with a modern, state-underpinned, attempt to mete out punishment for crime—in other words, an attempt to exercise the state’s law over those not yet incorporated within the run of that law. We can see here, the manner in which the premodern exercise of violence forms the basis for the apparently violence-free, but terroristic, society of the state. Tench’s expedition—actually, he led two, both in vain—serves a dual purpose. First of all, it was punitively violent in the fashion of premodern violence to teach a lesson of power to those beyond the law, but, second, it was part of the gradual extension of Phillip’s rule of law to incorporate those beyond its boundaries by, in the first place, getting them to obey through the exercise of terror. The point here inflects my previous point, if the concentration camp may be understood as the space of death, what provides it with its limits in the context of the state is the placing of concentration camps, and death camps, outside of the rule of law of the state. The camp becomes an arena of actual and unfettered violence, and overt terror, beyond the generalized rule of law of the state.

Germany and South West Africa

I have already mentioned that one reason behind the extermination of indigenous peoples in colonized areas was land clearance for colonial settlers. I want to exemplify this point using the German settler-colonization of South West Africa as my example. The ulterior motive is to address the continuity of practices in turn-of-the-century South West Africa and Poland thirty to forty years later. Paul Gilroy, suggesting a murky sediment "over which the streams of modernity have flowed"⁵⁸ asks, among other provocative questions: "How many of the ordinary men and women who became Hitler's willing executioners had previously served in the German colonial forces or had other experiences of Germany's blood-soaked imperial adventures?"⁵⁹ As I have made a start at showing, for other than moral reasons, it is unnecessary to answer this question. First of all, Germany's colonial history was no more bloodthirsty than that of other European nation-states. Second, the modern alteric binary, founded most significantly on a hierarchical racialization, meant that, once a group was racially distinguished as Other, ordinary women and men from all countries found it quite easy to practice extermination. However, having acknowledged these points, it remains important, not least to emphasize the centrality of colonialism and colonial practices to the Holocaust, to demonstrate the historical continuity between German practices in Africa, and especially South West Africa, and Poland.

Germany came later to statehood than Britain or France. When unification was achieved in 1871 it was almost too late to acquire colonies. By 1879 powerful industrial forces in Germany were urging the creation of trading colonies in order to broaden economic markets.⁶⁰ At the same time, in some quarters there was developing an increasing concern with a perception of Germany's population increase. In this same year Friedrich Fabri, a missionary and prominent colonial activist, published *Bedarf Deutschland der Colonien?* (Does Germany Need Colonies?). Fabri's answer was indisputably in the affirmative. He "adopted the accepted emigrationist version of colonialism, which held that colonies should be settlements of German farmers and small bourgeois located in temperate countries with an agricultural economy and a traditional middle-class society."⁶¹ Fabri was joined by other advocates of emigrationist, or settler, colonialism such as Wilhelm Hübbe-Schleiden, a Hamburg lawyer, and Carl Peters who, adventuristically, in 1884 declared the coast of East Africa a German protectorate. Bismarck, the great political unifier of Germany and its first Chancellor, was swayed towards colonial expansion and, in 1883, allowed the signing of a treaty with a "Hottentot" chief in South West Africa.⁶² What became Togo and Cameroon were made protectorates in 1884.

As the century drew to a close more and more of the land of the Herero, the largest tribal grouping in South West Africa, and a people who were primarily cattle herders, was expropriated for the use of German

farmer-settlers. In 1897 the Herero were removed from their lands and placed on reservations to make way for an increasing influx of German settlers. These increased in number from 3,743 in 1901 to 14,816 in 1912.⁶³ Finally, in January 1904, the Herero rose in revolt. They had immediate success. However, in June 1904 General Lothar von Trotha arrived to take charge of the war for the Germans. In November 1904 von Trotha, a career soldier, made his plan clear in a letter to Governor Leutwein:

I know enough tribes in Africa. They all have the same mentality insofar as they yield only to force. It was and remains my policy to apply this force by unmitigated terrorism and even cruelty. I shall destroy the rebellious tribes by shedding rivers of blood and money. Only thus will it be possible to sow the seeds of something new that will endure.⁶⁴

On October 2, 1904, von Trotha issued a proclamation which became known as the Extermination Order. In it, in part, he announced:

The Herero people will have to leave the country. Otherwise I shall force them to do so by means of guns. Within the German boundaries, every Herero, whether found armed or unarmed, with or without cattle, will be shot. I shall not accept any more women and children. I shall drive them back to their people—otherwise I shall order shots to be fired at them. These are my words to the Herero people.⁶⁵

Von Trotha subsequently set about the annihilation of the Herero. He did not succeed, though not for want of trying. The Herero population was reduced from around 70,000 people to probably a bit under 20,000. To his great anger, von Trotha was ordered to rescind his policy because of the difficulty in executing it. In early 1905 von Trotha set up what are best described as concentration camps, herding the remaining Herero into them where they performed slave labor, “the most gruelling jobs on the railway line under construction there being assigned to them.”⁶⁶ After seven months the camps were dismantled and the farming settlers’ labor shortage resolved by the distribution of the remaining Herero among the settlers.⁶⁷

I have concentrated in some small degree on the German adventure in South West Africa for two reasons. First, it was, perhaps, the first time that total extermination of a people, genocide, was espoused as official policy and, second, because in this it provides a direct precursor to subsequent German policy in respect of the Jews. The difference being, as I have remarked before, that the Jews were not an indigenous people. They were, however, racialized and treated using the same colonial techniques.

German practices in South West Africa were unique only in their extremity.⁶⁸ Julius Graf Zech, governor of Togo between 1903 and 1910, gave Togo a reputation for humanitarian colonialism. Nevertheless, “[e]ven Zech, a self-confessed humanitarian, created concentration

camps for political prisoners and developed means of assembling forced labor.”⁶⁹ In the Cameroon, where the Germans had to rely on the help of a local people, the Duda, the governor, Jesko von Puttkamer (1894–1906) denounced them as the “laziest, falsest, and meanest rabble on whom the sun ever shone, and it would certainly have been best when the country was conquered in 1884 if they had been, if not exterminated, at least expelled from the land.”⁷⁰

German Colonization in Europe

Where other European nation-states with longer histories distinguished between a more or less fixed territorial system within Europe and colonial territorial gains outside of Europe, many in Germany did not. During World War I there developed among radical conservatives in Germany what became known as the annexationist position. Annexationists “sought large, conquered regions in which Germans could be settled as military conquerors and as peasant farmers.”⁷¹ Heinrich Class, a leading annexationist wanted “much of Belgium, northern France and Poland.”⁷² Others felt that Germans could be settled in the Ukraine. In July 1915, 352 professors signed the *Intellektuelleneingabe*. They “subscribed to the view that Germany should take advantage of the military situation by annexing and settling a belt of territory to guarantee its strategic *and* ethnic survival and, of course, its stock of strategic resources.”⁷³ Throughout this period people like Otto Hoetzsch, professor of history at the Prussian Royal Academy in Posen since 1906, proposed expansion into Poland. As Burleigh writes, it was thought that “[n]ew settlement lands in the East would contribute to the ‘physical, moral, and spiritual health’ of the nation.”⁷⁴

More, there had evolved a German ideology which associated the push to the East with German destiny, and identity. Robert-Jan van Pelt tells us that: “In 1934 the German anthropologist Josef Nadler identified the German ‘push to the east’ as the event that had shaped the Germans into a *Weltvolk*, involving all the German tribes which had remained politically, culturally, and also partly linguistically independent.”⁷⁵ Pelt also quotes a popular history of the push to the East published in 1937 which asserts that: “The German settlement of the East proves itself as the central pillar in the total make-up of the German nation.”⁷⁶ As Pelt points out, what was central to the push to the East was settlement:

The geopolitical doctrine of *Lebensraum* which formed the foundation of Germany’s infatuation with the East implied that a nation gained nothing by conquering other nations in order to rule them for economic profit. The only purpose of colonization was settlement.⁷⁷

European territorial expansion of Germany, especially to the East, into the areas that were only ambiguously “European” was equated with

settler colonialism in Africa. Building on this, Friedrich Ratzel developed a theory “that certain peoples were genetically ‘passive’ and ‘inferior.’”⁷⁸ Thomas Vogler tells us that: “In his 1897 *Politische Geographie*, [Ratzel] classed together Jews, Gypsies, and the stunted hunting people of the African interior (i.e., the Herero) in the category of scattered people with no land.”⁷⁹ Vogler goes on to write that Ratzel’s book impressed Hitler “when he read it in 1924, the year he wrote *Mein Kampf*.”⁸⁰ Here we have, for Hitler, a pseudo-scientific legitimization connecting the eradication of the Jews in the East, and then all Jews, with the virtual extermination of the Herero.

When the Nazis gained power in Germany, Hitler clearly preferred territorial expansion in the East as an opportunity for German resettlement through colonial expansion: “In 1938 when offered the African colonies [taken from Germany after her defeat in World War I] in return for passing up Czechoslovakia, Hitler had no reluctance in choosing continental expansion over colonial.”⁸¹ Thus was the scene set for the importation of colonial practices, violence, terror, concentration camps, extermination, to Europe. And the same techniques, used against the “inferior races” who lived in Poland and Russia, would also be used against the Jews, very large numbers of whom also happened to live in Poland and the Pale more generally.

Concentration and Death Camps

Concentration camps are rarely theorized so it is difficult to know what is meant when the term is used, and what particular places should be given the term. Mostly, concern has focused on the experience within the camps, on the *L’Univers concentrationnaire* as David Rousset called it in his foundational book first published in 1946. Since then the term “concentration camp universe” has become a recognized way of referring to life in the Nazi concentration camps. Hannah Arendt has provided the most sustained discussion of the purpose of concentration camps in her magnum opus, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*.⁸² She writes that:

Totalitarianism in power uses the state administration for its long-range goal of world conquest and for the direction of the branches of the movement; it establishes the secret police as the executors and guardians of its domestic experiment in constantly transforming reality into fiction; and it finally erects concentration camps as special laboratories to carry through its experiment in total domination.⁸³

For Arendt, concentration camps are intimately connected to the existence of totalitarian regimes, of which her major examples are Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Writing from a humanist position, Arendt understands concentration camps as places for the most extreme destruction of the

individual will, places which can demonstrate the totalitarian success in utter subordination and subjectification.

Arendt views totalitarian regimes not as a variant state system but as fundamentally transgressive of lawful government which she describes in this way: "By lawful government we understand a body politic in which positive laws are needed to translate and realize the immutable *ius naturale* or the eternal commandments of God into standards of right and wrong."⁸⁴ In contrast, she writes, "[i]n the body politic of totalitarian government, this place of positive laws is taken by total terror."⁸⁵ For Arendt, terror is what organizes the totally dominating order of totalitarian regimes and, if "terror is the essence of totalitarian domination,"⁸⁶ then concentration and extermination camps are where that domination is most complete—and, by implication, the most important site for the production of the terror so necessary to totalitarian regimes. The close connection between concentration and death camps, and terror is exemplified in the title of Wolfgang Sofsky's book *The Order of Terror: The Concentration Camp*.⁸⁷ For Arendt the use of concentration camps, and terror, is limited to transgressive, totalitarian regimes. However, we have already seen that this is not the case. Nor is it the case that the use of terror is limited to such regimes, though we should remember Lefebvre's distinction between political terrorism and terrorist society.

The name, concentration camp, seems to come from its usage in the Cuban guerrilla war of independence in 1895. Here, it seems, the war went badly for the Spanish colonial authority until the arrival of General Valeriano Weyler. Weyler, Walter Laqueur writes, "responded to terror with counter-terror, sealing off the eastern part of the country more or less effectively by means of ditches, walls and blockhouses; he used *reconcentraciones* (concentration camps) to remove civilians from the battle areas."⁸⁸ One purpose of this use of concentration camps was to stop the local peasantry giving aid and succor to the guerrillas. In the Boer War, starting from 1901, the British also made use of what they called concentration camps. No doubt modeled on the Spanish use, the British burnt the Boer farms and rounded up the wives and children of the Boer farmer-soldiers to ensure that they could not give material support to their menfolk. Laqueur goes to some pains to distinguish the Spanish and British concentration camps from those of the Nazis.⁸⁹ However, from a different perspective the difference would appear to be more one of degree.

In both the Spanish and British cases we have colonizing powers in a colonial situation using concentration camps to control a rebellious local population. In both cases, though, we have the camps used for European-originated people. In neither case were the camps used for those considered to be of an "inferior" race. However, tracking a genealogy of concentration camps by way of the invention of the term itself is misleading. Concentration camps have a conceptual similarity to other forms of concentration used for colonial peoples such as reservations. Concentrations of people were useful, for example, for providing the reservoir of slave

labor. In Nazi concentration camps slave laborers were often worked to death, echoing the colonial practice that has already been mentioned. Reservations were also used as places in which to put people when they had been removed from the land so that Europeans could settle that land. The use of reservations in the United States is the most well-known example but it is by no means unique.⁹⁰ Reservations were a common technique in settler colonies. Concentration camps for Othered groups, those considered racially inferior, were not only outside the law of the instituting state but offered the possibility of treating those people with the exterminating contempt that European racial ideology legitimated.

What we need to do here is retheorize the concentration camp. Concentration camps become possible with the advent of the modern, territorial state with its rule of law that runs across the state to its borders and, paralleling this, its dichotomous punishment systems, either containment in prison or transportation to somewhere outside of the state but where the prisoner would still be within the control of the state. If the state can deal with its own citizens who break the law by either containing them in a special place within the state or sending them to a special place outside of the territory of the state but still within the law of the state, then it can deal similarly, but in more extreme fashion with those it excludes from membership of the state for whatever reason. What makes concentration camps possible, meaningful, is that they function as a kind of transgressive mirror image of the state. Concentration camps, as compared to prisons, stand outside of the rule of law. From this point of view the extermination or death camp can be understood as taking the concentration camp to its limit, combining the binary possibilities of both containment and expulsion as ways to deal with those unwanted by the state. The death camp contains, but it also expels in the most extreme way by eradicating those contained there. If, as we have seen, and in contradiction to Arendt, the modern state is founded on the naturalization of terror kept in check by the rule of law which displaces violence with detention, or transportation, then concentration and death camps are places where the rule of law does not run, where, instead, violence and overt terror are the feature of everyday life.

These camps, along with the colonial periphery, are the sites of the modern space of death. Thus, we should expect that, in some form, concentration camps should have come into existence around the same time as the modern state. This is the case. In fiction, the first concentration camp can be identified as the chateau in the Marquis de Sade's notorious *The One Hundred and Twenty Days of Sodom* in which the highly regulated sexual coupling leads inexorably to terror, torture and murder. As de Sade narrates it, this chateau is in a place far remote from the laws of France. To get there the participants travel to Basel, then cross the Rhine and enter the Black Forest. Passing through a hamlet, they "scale a mountain almost as high as the Saint-Bernard and infinitely more difficult to ascend."⁹¹ When they finally reach the Chateau of Silling, Durcet and

his companions ensure that it is sealed off from the rest of the world. At the end of his narrative, de Sade provides a balance sheet and tells us that, out of the forty-six people who went to the chateau, sixteen returned to Paris.⁹² Discursively, de Sade's story, written in 1785, exemplifies the key conditions for the concentration camp: a place of containment; a place not subject to state law; a place of torture, terror and random violence imposed by those in power; a space of death. We can describe de Sade's chateau as a dystopian, heterotopic space. Interestingly, and perhaps not surprisingly, Auschwitz partakes of the same myth. As Pelt writes, "the essential myth of Auschwitz [is] the idea that it was quite literally 'the end of the world,' a place far away from everywhere else."⁹³ Pelt's point is precisely that this is a myth, that the camp was hard by a major town.

Where de Sade gives us a fictional account which works within the discursive assumptions of the concentration and death camp, the French Revolution, which as we have seen officially established the naturalized order of terror by means of the Law of Suspects, also offers us the first distinctly modern linking of extermination and concentration/death camp. Joan Dayan connects de Sade's work with the history of French colonial practice. She writes that: "The one living model for *The One Hundred and Twenty Days of Sodom* was slavery in the French Antilles, a fact ignored by all critics of Sade."⁹⁴ She goes on to comment that: "Sade brought the plantation hell and its excesses into enlightenment Europe."⁹⁵ Taking Dayan's argument on board, we can recognize that, 150 years before the Nazis did it for real, de Sade used fiction to bring the extreme depredations of the colonial periphery to Europe. But there was a harbinger of this importation of extreme violence from the colonies in France's own attempt to establish itself as a modern state.

In the same year, 1793, that the Convention passed the Law of Suspects, the Vendée rose in open counterrevolution. Indeed, one of the motivating forces in the passing of the Law of Suspects was the kind of lawlessness which was eventuating in the Vendée. The people of the Vendée were primarily rural peasants, Catholics, they resented the social transformation being imposed by Paris. Their rebellion was not only put down with the utmost savagery but, they being outside the rule of French law, and being to some extent racialized, the state moved to exterminate them. Thus, for example Bertrand Barère de Vieuzac announced in the Convention that, "[m]easures were being taken to exterminate this race of rebels by destroying their sanctuaries, burning down their forests, and cutting off their supplies."⁹⁶ Although this war is usually styled a civil war, what we need to understand is that the new republican French state was trying to establish itself using the new means of the rule of law, detention and naturalized terror. In this context, the war in the Vendée takes on the characteristics of a colonial war. This makes Barère's calls for extermination more understandable. When the republican forces were defeated at Torfou and Saint-Fulgent, "Barère asked the Convention to declare that 'the nation's safety and salvation demands that the bandits of the execrable

war in the Vendée be exterminated by the end of the month’.”⁹⁷ Barère finally got what he had asked for. In late December 1793 the rebellion was finally crushed amid massive massacres. General Westermann sent a letter to the Committee of Public Safety which read in part:

There is no more Vendée, my republican fellow citizens! It died beneath our sabers along with its women and children. I just buried them in the swamps and woods of Savenay. According to your orders, the children were trampled to death beneath the hooves of our horses, their women were slaughtered so that they couldn't bring any more soldiers into the world. The streets are full of corpses, in many places they form entire pyramids.

Westermann was it seems a truly adequate precursor to von Trotha.

If the extermination in the Vendée sits with colonial exterminations of the Other, now inflected through the limits of the rule of law, then was there a version of a concentration/death camp? The answer is yes. Nantes, a city then of around 90,000 people was the nearest urban centre to the Vendée. Those not killed by the republican troops were channeled to Nantes. By the end of 1793 the city held about 10,000 prisoners in twelve jails and ships. As more and more prisoners arrived, the city became increasingly overwhelmed. Jean-Baptiste Carrier had been sent from Paris to govern Nantes. As Arno Mayer puts it: “Carrier presided over emergency trials, summary execution, and mass drownings in Nantes.”⁹⁸ Mayer spends some time distinguishing the mayhem at Nantes from Auschwitz. He writes that, “in their reason and purpose the deadly prisons of Nantes had nothing in common with Auschwitz.”⁹⁹ Strictly speaking, this is correct, but the prisons and the mass killings which operated outside the state's rule of law, complemented the extermination taking place. Nantes' prisons were an early version of the concentration/death camp's space of death.

There is a continuity, a trajectory that runs from the French Revolutionary state to the Nazi, totalitarian regime, from Nantes to Auschwitz. One site of this trajectory lies in the treatment of those Othered, racialized by the state and excluded from it. For this reason, as we have seen, after the French Revolution, the evolution of concentration camps, like the practices of land clearance and extermination with which concentration camps are associated—the development of “reservations” for indigenous people can be linked conceptually with concentration camps—takes place in colonial environments.

German Colonial Practice and the Jews

We can now conclude by turning this argument around. I have shown how Césaire was right to talk of the Nazi importation of colonial practices

to Europe. We can finish by examining how these were used against the Jews. It was the racialization of the Jews which enabled these practices to be used, and this racialization was combined with the beginnings of lawlessness against the Jews, the use of overt violence and terror, on *Kristallnacht*. I have discussed how the Othering of the Jews went hand in hand with the withdrawal of citizenship for German Jews. During this period Hitler wanted to expel the Jews, not as an indigenous people from their land but as non-Germans, people who were not members of the German nation (the Volk) and therefore not protected by the German state. Later, the plan changed, "In the autumn of 1939, Hitler, Himmler, and Heydrich had wanted to create a 'Jewish reservation of Lublin' on Poland's eastern border."¹⁰⁰ The idea of a reservation was, of course, a typical colonial manoeuvre. Indeed, I have noted the German use of reservations in South West Africa earlier in the century.

With the rapid German advance in the East, the Lublin reservation plan was replaced with a new idea. During June and July 1940 there evolved the idea of deporting the Jews to Madagascar. What was going on with the Jews was a kind of colonial inversion. Where these practices had previously been used on peoples in territories which were being colonized in order to be settled—they were being used on the Polish, and Russian, occupants, and also Jews, of Eastern Europe where Germany wanted to settle German farmers—they were used on the Jews of Europe more generally as a way of excising them from Europe. For the Nazis, the Jews were a non-European people within the limits of Europe. The Madagascar plan failed because of the logistics of transferring so many people from Europe to Madagascar. After its failure, the Nazis turned from using ghettos and concentration camps as means of isolating the Jews from Germany, the German conquered territories, and Europe more generally, and placing them outside of the law and therefore in an environment of violence and terror, to the idea of exterminating them. The Nazis had set up the first concentration camp in Germany, at Dachau in Bavaria, in 1933 as a camp for political dissidents. Jews—10,911 of them—were first brought to Dachau in November 1938 after *Kristallnacht*. At this time, the main purpose of bringing them there was to intimidate them into emigrating from Germany.¹⁰¹

Although construction had started on death camps in October 1941, the Wannsee Conference of 20 January 1942 formally supplanted the idea of forced emigration with that of extermination. In the end, there were six purpose-built death camps, Chelmno, Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, Majdanek, and Auschwitz–Birkenau. All, with the exception of Chelmno and Birkenau, were situated within the *Generalgouvernement* (General Government) of Poland. These latter were in areas annexed to Germany in 1939. Thus, all the extermination camps were in areas of colonial occupation. We must remember that extermination was not a novel idea, it had been practiced on the colonial periphery for centuries. In South West Africa, less than forty years earlier, the Germans themselves had

planned, under von Trotha, to exterminate the Herero. Having attempted the less radical colonial solutions to the presence of an unwanted people, the Nazis proceeded to the same solutions that Germany had previously used in South West Africa, and that had been used less formerly by other European colonial powers in other places: concentration camps, forced labor, slave labor, extermination. That the majority of European Jews lived in the Eastern European area that the Nazis, and Germans more generally, felt they had a right to colonize and settle made the transferrence of colonial practices to the racialized and Othered Jews elsewhere in Europe all the easier.

What the Nazis did in Europe could have been done by any of the European powers. The attitudes that enabled the genocides against the Jews and the Gypsies were embedded in the ideological assumptions of modernity. Indeed, as we have seen, both those attitudes and the techniques that the Germans used were common on the colonial periphery. The particular preoccupation with the Jews that the Nazis developed, and their racialized Othering, took to an extreme the racially based anti-Semitism that was more or less pervasive in Euro-American modernity. The status of the Jews in Europe was always ambiguous: the liberal, modern solution that being a Jew was simply a consequence of adhering to Judaism, the assumption being that European Jews were "white," was consistently undermined by claims that the Jews were "Oriental" or, as in the case of the Yiddish-speaking Jews of Eastern Europe, "black." The racialization of the Jews in Germany by the Nazis built on this virulent anti-Semitism. The Nazi use of technologies previously only utilized outside of Europe was aided by the long-held German assumption that Eastern Europe, beyond German national boundaries, was occupied by inferior races and was ripe for colonization. It was easy to transfer these technologies to another "inferior race."

CHAPTER FOUR

The Wall at the End of the World: Zionism, Colonialism, Messianism

Building a Wall

The building of the Wall began in July, 2002. It started in the north, near Jenin, in the fields of a village called Salem. Ostensibly a security project, the Wall was apparently first suggested by the military. Gush Shalom, in their discussion of the Wall, suggest that its origin lies in the unrest that followed the breakdown of the Camp David talks and Ariel Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount in Jerusalem.¹ When suicide bombers began blowing themselves up in Israeli cities there was an increasingly general call among Israelis for greater protection from the Palestinian threat.

It seems that, when the Wall was first mooted, it was supposed to follow the Green Line. This line, perhaps more correctly known as the 1949 Armistice Line, marks the internationally agreed distinguishing point at the end of the 1948–1949 war precipitated at Israel's declaration of independence. It is worth noting here, and it will enter discussion later on, that Israel has never defined the boundaries of the Israeli state. De facto, then, the Green Line became institutionalized as one of Israel's borders. However, after the 1967 war, known as the Six Day War, Israel had occupied the West Bank, formally under Jordan's rule, as well as the Sinai including the Gaza Strip, and the Golan Heights. In 1988 Jordan gave up its claim to the West Bank offering the possibility of a Palestinian state located, in the first instance, in the West Bank.

From an Israeli security point of view, then, the intent of the Wall was to separate Israelis from the Palestinians of the West Bank disregarding and overriding the increasingly intertwined economic, administrative and service institutions (roads, electricity, water) and personal connections that had ramified over thirty-five years of Israeli occupation. Making this disengagement more complicated still were the Israeli settlers (colonists?) in the West Bank. By 2001 there were approximately 140 Israeli settlements with a total population of around 130,000 people. Jeffrey Goldberg, in his article, "Among the Settlers," gives a much higher figure of "roughly two hundred

and thirty-five thousand settlers in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.”² Much of this difference would seem to be due to the distinction between official and unofficial settlements. Goldberg gives a figure of 7,500 settlers for the Gaza Strip and writes that:

Perhaps three-quarters of the Jews in the West Bank and Gaza could be considered economic settlers. Many of them moved to the West Bank for benefits unattainable inside the pre-1967 borders of Israel: space, tax breaks, and mountain air. They are reliable supporters of right-wing parties, but many of them are secular in their outlook.³

He describes the remaining settlers, “fifty thousand or so,” as “coming to the territories for reasons of faith.” These, Goldberg writes, are Biblical literalists and, among them: “The most hard-core settlers are impatient messianists, who profess indifference, even scorn, for the state; a faith in vigilantism; and loathing for the Arabs.” Had the Wall been constructed along the Green Line all these settlers would have been on the Palestinian side. It is no wonder, then, that they lobbied against the Wall.

As leader of Likud, Ariel Sharon was elected prime minister of Israel in February 2001. He was born in Palestine in 1928 at Kfar Malal and joined the Jewish defense organization, Haganah, in 1942. He is a long-term supporter of settlements. It is said that he did not support the Wall, not, one suspects, for altruistic reasons connected with the Palestinians, but because the Wall would reinforce the 1949 limits to Israel and, in the process, problematize not only the defense of the West Bank settlements but even more their very existence. As it turned out, with Sharon’s political input, the route of the Wall altered to include a number of “fingers” into Palestinian land to include settlements on the Israeli side. In addition, in many places the line of the Wall has been shifted into Palestinian territory enclosing fertile land. In *The Wall*, Gush Shalom estimates that the Wall will penetrate at some points up to twenty kilometers into the West Bank.

However, this is not the whole story. It may be that when the Wall was first envisioned it stretched from the Jordan River to the Dead Sea, thus securing access to Israel from within the West Bank. This is no longer the case. Present plans include an eastern element to the Wall. Indeed, now there are two walls, one in the north of the occupied territories and one in the south. What was a perimeter wall along the border of Israel has become two walls encircling the most densely populated areas of the West Bank. Israel will then control all the occupied land outside of the Wall and also control all entry and exit to the areas within the walls that constitute the Wall. As *The Wall* puts it, there will be “1.5 million people in the largest prison on earth.” Why, I wonder, does *The Wall* use this term “prison?” Gush Shalom’s pamphlet is against the building of the Wall and the writers know well that the Palestinians who will be walled in have done nothing wrong—except from the point of view of a Jewish-Israeli who believes in Greater Israel in which case the very presence of

the Palestinians on the land is transgressive. There are sites on the Web which describe the Wall as an instrument in the construction of an apartheid system and the enclosed areas as Palestinian versions of Bantustans. The problem here is that the interpretations of the Wall are always already colored and hence the task is to be critically aware of the various overdeterminations of the Wall.

In discussing the idea of the heterotopia, Michel Foucault writes that:

[T]he problem of siting or placement arises for mankind in terms of demography. The problem of the human site or living space is not simply that of knowing whether there will be enough space for men in the world...but also of knowing what relations of propinquity, what types of storage, circulation, marking, and classification of human elements should be adopted in a given situation in order to achieve a given end.⁴

That is, how you discursively construct a space depends on what you want it to do. Foucault's fifth, of six, principles in his definition of a heterotopia is that:

Heterotopias always presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable. In general, the heterotopic site is not freely accessible like a public space. Either entry is compulsory, as in the case of entering a barracks or a prison, or else the individual has to submit to rites and purification.⁵

In changing the line of the Wall, Sharon, on behalf of Israel, has, to an important extent, changed the nature of the space on either side of it. A Wall along the Green Line which limited entry (and, of course, exit but that was of less concern for security) into Israel would have reinforced the idea of Israel as a state, a heterotopic space, which guarded its borders. However, a wall which encircles a space, which defines an inside from an outside space which surrounds it, produces a heterotopic space inside the wall. Control now is not so much about entry to the space barred by the wall, in this case Israel, but about exit from the space now defined as heterotopic, the space within the wall. In other words, and in relation to the Wall, a discursive construction of the Wall as a defensive measure has been replaced by the empirical construction of the Wall which makes of it an offensive measure defining not Israel but the area the Wall encircles as the heterotopic space, the space of Otherness. The unsaid here, the trauma which is being displaced and reenacted, is the result of the impact of the modern form of spatialization on the Jews of Europe, Europe's internal Other. Here, beyond the border of Europe, and beyond the established if not formally accepted border of Israel, Israel reproduces the heterotopia of the ghetto. Indeed, *The Wall* heads one section "The Ghetto Revisited."

At this point we might, very briefly, consider the resonance of the Holocaust on the construction of the Wall. Writing about how Israelis came to accept the Holocaust as a part of Jewish history, Tom Segev offers an insight into the way Jewish-Israelis came to identify with the Jews of the Holocaust. He writes:

In 1967, on the eve of the Six Day War, everyone spoke about the danger of the Arabs “exterminating Israel.” The newspapers did not write that the Arabs would conquer the country or kill its citizens. The term used was the same one that described the Nazi genocide: *extermination*, thus speaking of a second Holocaust.⁶

Segev goes on to explain that Egypt’s president Gamal Abdal Nasser was characterized as Adolf Hitler and he describes how: “Consciousness of the Holocaust grew gradually until it became a central element in Israeli-Jewish identity.”⁷ Twenty-four years later, during the 1991 Gulf War: “The common assumption was that the missiles Iraq fired at Israel were equipped with German-made gas. Iraq’s president, Saddam Hussein, was identified with Hitler.”⁸ Even more relevant for my argument here, Esther Benbassa and Jean-Christophe Attias tell us that: “Binyamin Netanyahu described Arafat as a new Hitler.”⁹ As they go on to say, hardly a novel idea. The Wall, then, needs to be understood through this culturally based Holocaust anxiety. It bears connotations not only of modern ghetto walls but of the walls of the ghettos the Nazis created, and of the fences of the concentration and death camps. It is no wonder, then, that Israeli Jews would rather the Wall went around the Palestinians than around themselves.

But I am getting ahead of myself here. Let us think for a moment of the dimensions of this wall. Baha Abushaqra tells that it is 8 meters or twenty-five feet high and will now stretch for around 650 kilometers or 400 miles.¹⁰ Much of the actual wall will be composed of concrete slabs with watchtowers. Some of the wall will have electrified fences and parts will have elaborate ditch constructions. All up, the wall is expected to cost between 1.5 billion U.S. dollars (*The Wall*) and two billion U.S. dollars (“The Barrier to Peace”). Abushaqra estimates the cost per kilometer at roughly two million dollars. When it is finished around 45 percent of the West Bank territory will have been enclosed with Israel appropriating the remaining 55 percent on which, according to *The Wall*, 500,000 Palestinians will remain. These figures for the wall are huge. In height and length the wall is massive, and its cost, especially for a small country like Israel with a gross domestic product in 2002 of 103 billion U.S. dollars, is extraordinary. This disproportion between the height and length, and cost, of the wall and its original purpose helps to make clear why I am capitalizing the term Wall.

In this chapter I will be arguing that the actually existing wall that is being built is overdetermined by the meanings associated with the Wall in the

Israeli cultural imaginary. It is my intention to make a start on elaborating these meanings. I have already suggested the impact of the Holocaust on the way Israeli Jews think about the Wall. Through this chapter I will unpack the Wall further, suggesting its connections with Zionist understandings, with colonial understandings and messianic understandings.

Naming the Wall

For a “fact on the ground,” to use an Israeli phrase, with such a material presence, it is remarkably hard to find a generally accepted descriptor for the Wall—something not surprising given the amount of over-determination invested in it. Sharon, it appears, prefers the term “fence” while Abushaqa writes that: “It is being referred to as apartheid wall, transfer wall, separation wall and security fence.”¹¹ Each of these terms carries a set of connotations and, along with each set, a political freight: apartheid wall suggests the racial segregation and white dominance of South Africa; transfer wall refers back to the Balkan wars and ethnic cleansing; separation wall acknowledges the attempt to disentangle Israeli Jews and Palestinians in the West Bank; security fence refers to what appears to have been the original intent of the Wall, the protection of Israeli citizens from those Israel describes as terrorists, in particular, because they are so difficult to detect and can be so deadly, suicide bombers. Similarly, where “wall” has a sense of absoluteness about it, and of permanence, “fence” suggests something a little more permeable and a little more temporary. Houses have walls, gardens have fences (unless the houses are constantly being broken into) as do fields. At the same time, as I have already implied, it was fences that surrounded the concentration and death camps. Calling the Wall a fence conjures fearful images of a Palestinian genocide. It is not without historical cause or present anxiety that the Palestinians have named the 1948 clearances *al-Nakba*, the Great Catastrophe or, indeed, the Holocaust. Such images of a Palestinian genocide, we shall see, are a constant presence for some Israelis. However, in non-Holocaust discourse, a “fence” suggests something a little friendlier than a wall—no wonder Sharon, the long-term politician, should favor this term. Complementing this usage, Sharon’s government describes the “fence” as a “temporary security measure.” One issue here is how long a temporary security measure might last for a state that has no defined border and which has occupied this territory defined only by an Armistice agreement for forty years. What would be the circumstance which would lead Israel to take down this very expensive Wall?

Both walls and fences divide and distinguish. They mark a binary distinction. What all terms for the Wall have in common is the acceptance and entrenchment of difference. This fundamental structure of Othering is basic to European modernity and, within that, to the modern political

organization of the state. Edward Said has commented on the role of difference in Israeli thought:

As applied to “The Jewish People” on “The Land of Israel” difference takes many forms. Theologically, of course, “difference” here means “the chosen people” who have a different relationship to God from that enjoyed by any other group. But that sort of “difference” is, I confess, impossible for me to understand. On a purely secular plane, however, difference means the unique bond to the land of Palestine/Israel distinguishing Jews from all other peoples... Inside Israel, the “difference” that counts is between Jew and Non-Jew.¹²

Said here identifies three ways in which Israeli Jews think of difference. First, there is the Judaic claim to Jews being the people singled out and chosen by God. Second, there is the religious, and in secular terms Zionist, claim to the land of Israel by way of Biblical literalism. As we shall see, this suggestion is rather more complicated than Said implies when he describes it as “purely secular.” Third, Said refers to the state-driven differentiation between “Jew” and “Non-Jew,” a division which works off the Zionist ideological distinction of settler, or in more general terms colonizer, and indigene. A feature of the ideological power of the Wall is that it combines all three modes of difference into a single image of Othering.

However, in expressing this general difference, the Wall does not provide a ground for legitimating what is on the non-Israeli side of it. This is clear in the shift from a linear to circular wall. Slavoj Žižek has written that:

The big mystery apropos of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict is why does it persist for so long when everybody knows the only viable solution—the withdrawal of the Israelis from the West Bank and Gaza, the establishment of a Palestinian state, the renunciation by the Palestinians of the right of their refugees to return within the borders of pre-1967 Israel, as well as some kind of a compromise concerning Jerusalem?¹³

We can begin to answer Žižek’s question by way of an insight from Jacqueline Rose. She writes that:

if you listen to one dominant rhetoric, it seems as if Israel cannot grant statehood to the Palestinians, not just because of felt real and present danger, but also because so great is the charge of fantasy against such a possibility that, were it to be granted, the nation would lose all inner rationale and psychically collapse in on itself.¹⁴

One element of this charge is that the Israeli state defines itself against the Palestinian absence of a state. In this context, which will be examined in more detail below, the Wall can be understood as the insistent marker

of a Zionism, founded in modern assumptions, that is rapidly losing its relevance.

At the core of Zionism was a settler rhetoric now increasingly thought of in terms of colonialism. Zionism was meaningful for the production of the state but does not speak to the experience of living in an already existing “Jewish” state which is the present situation. Consequently, for that generation who still think in the ideological terms of settler Zionism, the Wall is an expression of the insistence that Israel is not yet a state, certainly not that paradox, the Zionist state.

In his 1999 book on post-Zionism Laurence Silberstein explains that:

In a general sense, post Zionism is a term applied to a current set of critical positions that problematise Zionist discourse, and the historical narratives and social and cultural representations it produced... The growing use of the term post-zionism is indicative of an increasing sense among many Israelis that the maps of meaning provided by Zionism are simply no longer adequate.¹⁵

To account for this we can think of Zionism as a victim of its own success. Israel has existed as a state with a population of Jews for over fifty years now. Tom Segev notes that:

There are third-and fourth generation Israelis; they speak Hebrew with their parents, go to the same schools their parents went to, serve in the same army units, have the same experiences. They have a common way of life, a common sense of humor, common expectations.¹⁶

In short, to use Benedict Anderson’s now well-known expression, Israelis now experience themselves as an imagined community, that is, as a grouping of people who, through common understandings and assumptions about the world and their place in it, think of themselves as members of a community, in this case of Israel.¹⁷ It is, then, little wonder that an ideology of pioneering colonialism should no longer be thought of by many of these people as relevant. From this point of view the Wall marks the assertion of the old, of Sharon’s generation, against the new.

The Zionist Wall

There is a history of a Wall in Zionist thought. In *The Jewish State*, Theodor Herzl wrote of his hope that the Sultan would give Palestine to the Jews in return for the Jews’ regulating Turkey’s finances. Herzl goes on:

We should there form a portion of the rampart [wall] of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as apposed to barbarism. We

should as a neutral State remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence.¹⁸

Herzl's view was typically nineteenth-century European—a binary structure of Othering which, in this case, thought of Arabs as “Asians” and “Asians” as the uncivilized Other when compared with civilized Europeans. In this thinking the Jews are Europeanized through the process of making a deal with Europe to protect the frontier, the border, of the new Jewish state in return for themselves being protected by Europe.

Herzl did not think of the “Jewish problem” in racial terms. Even though the Jews were being increasingly racialized through the second half of the nineteenth century, and especially in Germany where Wilhelm Marr's *The Victory of Jewry over Germandom* was published in 1879. Herzl, who published the *Jewish State* in 1896, thought that the Jewish problem lay in Jews being a nation without a state. Consequently, if the Jews could have a state of their own anti-Semitism would disappear. With their own state on the eastern edge of the Mediterranean, Europe could be pushed into Asia and, there, the Zionist state could form one section of Europe's defence against barbarism.

Charles Price has described how the European colonies of the Pacific rim—his particular interest was California, British Columbia, New Zealand and Australia—passed legislation to exclude non-Europeans. He writes that after 1888, by which time all the relevant countries had restricted the entry of the Chinese, “these young white nations of the Pacific gradually realized that there had been entering their domains other non-Europeans notably Indians and Japanese.”¹⁹ As a consequence the restrictions that had been placed on the Chinese were extended to all other non-Europeans. The result, Price writes, was that by the 1920s: “The Great White Walls of the Pacific, in short, were solid, high and guarded.”²⁰ Herzl saw the Jewish section of the Wall as protecting European civilization but, with the racialization of the Arabs, and the European racialization of the Jews culminating in Nazi racial theory, it was inevitable that Israeli Jews would want to understand themselves as not only European but, as European, “white” (I am here setting aside for one moment the Jewish racial hierarchy within Israel and emphasizing the role of European, Ashkenazi Jews in the production of the Israeli cultural imaginary) as opposed to the “Asian” Arabs.

If the Wall literalizes Herzl's idea of the Zionist state as a bulwark against Asian barbarism it does so in the context of, and as an anxious, conservative response to, the increasing diversity of Israel's own population. At present, Israel's population is a little over 6 million. Of this is 81 percent is Jewish according to the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics. However, this figure is challengeable depending on what definition of a Jew one is working with. More, within the Jewish population there is considerable racial diversity. For example, Israel now contains around 40,000 Falashas, Jews from Ethiopia who are racially similar to Ethiopians. Almost all the

remaining 19 percent of the Israeli population are Arab citizens of Israel. There are, in addition, rather over 200,000 foreign guest workers in Israel, mostly from Romania, Thailand and the Philippines. If the Arabs of the West Bank and Gaza strip are included in the Israeli figures, then:

the number of Jews and Arabs between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea will be roughly equal by the end of the decade. By 2020, the Israeli demographer Sergio Della Pergola has predicted, Jews would make up less than 47 percent of the population.²¹

Goldberg sees the Wall as the effect of Sharon's recognition of this consequence if the Palestinians of the West Bank were to be assimilated into Israel.

Discussing the impact of terrorism in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, destruction, Žižek, referencing the heightened awareness and increased surveillance at entry points into Europe, writes: "No wonder, then, that in a kind of echo of European unity, in June 2002, Israel started to raise the protective Wall against the West Bank's Arab settlements."²² This comparison would have been better made in reference to Europe's growing concern over the illegal immigration of non-Europeans.

The second important reference to a wall in Zionist thinking occurs in Vladimir Jabotinsky's two articles, "The Iron Wall: We and the Arabs," first published in Russian in 1923 and the follow-up "The Ethics of the Iron Wall," also published in 1923. Jabotinsky was the founder of the Revisionist Zionism movement, a militant form of Zionism which saw no likelihood of Arab conciliation and came to advocate a policy of Israeli expansion into Eretz Israel and the domination of Jews over Arabs. Politically, Revisionist Zionism situated itself within Likud.

Seeing through Zionist ideology, Jabotinsky was absolutely clear that what was happening in Palestine was colonization. He writes that:

Colonization itself has its own explanation, integral and inescapable, and understood by every Arab and every Jew with his wits about him. Colonization can have only one goal. For the Palestinian Arabs this goal is inadmissible.²³

Jabotinsky derives this recognition from a survey of European settlement. In all cases, he argues, "the native resisted both barbarian and civilized settler with the same degree of cruelty."²⁴ That is, the indigene always resists any attempt to take their land and they do so, and here Jabotinsky shows himself a man of his time, with the cruelty that marks a lack of civilization.

In common with Herzl and European Orientalism, Jabotinsky thought of the Arabs as uncivilized: "Culturally they are 500 years behind us, spiritually they do not have our endurance or our strength of will."²⁵ Here, the "our" is ambiguous. Is it "we, Europeans" or "we, Jews?" The answer

would seem to be both. Othered within Europe, and now positioned on the geographical frontier, Jews allow themselves to think that they are European as compared to those Othered outside of Europe, in this case the Arabs. Indeed, as Avi Shlaim writes:

Zionism was conceived by Jabotinsky not as the return of the Jews to their spiritual homeland but as an offshoot or implant of Western civilization in the East. This worldview translated into a geostrategic conception in which Zionism was to be permanently allied with European colonialism against all the Arabs of the eastern Mediterranean.²⁶

This view is very similar to that of Herzl's already outlined.

For Jabotinsky the Jewish colonial enterprise was morally just. Not, however, for Biblical reasons. In "The Ethics of the Iron Wall" he argues that while there are fifteen million Jews without a homeland there are thirty-eight million Arabs inhabiting Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli, Egypt, Syria, Arabia, and Iraq. He calculates that there are sixteen Arabs per square mile across all this land as compared to 352 people per square mile in Sicily and 669 people per square mile in England. On these numbers Jabotinsky goes on to assert that:

The soil does not belong to those who possess land in excess but to those who do not possess any. It is an act of simple justice to alienate part of their land from those nations who are numbered among the great landowners of the world, in order to provide a refuge for a homeless, wandering people.²⁷

Jabotinsky's claim here is a special case of a more general nineteenth-century European argument to justify settler colonialism which was based in the assertion that European countries were overcrowded and that settler colonies were one way of relieving the pressure of land within Europe. The Nazi preoccupation with *Lebensraum* in the East was a late version of this.

The justice of the case aside, Jabotinsky was certain that the Arabs would not voluntarily give Palestine to the Jews. Consequently, the solution was to occupy the land with the backing of as much military might as possible. Such a massive display of force was the only way to bring the Arabs to the negotiating table. He explains:

A living people makes such enormous concessions on such fateful questions only when there is no hope left. Only when not a single breach is visible in the iron wall, only then do extreme groups lose their sway, and influence transfers to moderate groups.²⁸

Jabotinsky's iron wall is a metaphor for the military might necessary to cow the Palestinians into submission. As Shlaim argues, the influence of

Jabotinsky's ideas can be found in the very significantly excessive fire-power of the Israeli army as compared to that of Israel's Arab neighbors.²⁹

The Colonial Wall

While the Wall was originally conceived as a defensive project, its reconfiguration to encircle the West Bank Arabs while appropriating much of their land reworks it as an offensive measure as, indeed, a concrete expression of Jabotinsky's iron wall. That iron wall and this actual, concrete wall also both function as the site of the binary divide between colonizer and colonized. In the case of Israel the colonial Other outside the Wall—or, perhaps, inside the ghetto—is the same as the indigenous Other within the colonial state of Israel. More, the homogeneity of the Palestinian Other within and outside of the state imposed on the land has meant that the understanding of the internal Other as indigenous is extended to the Palestinians outside of Israel, certainly to those in the occupied territories. Zionists, of course, liked to argue, with Biblical reference, that the Jews had prior claim to Palestine, that they were more the original people than the Arabs, and therefore that they were not colonists. The complexity of this position is well brought out in an anecdote of Segev's. He writes that during the interwar period of the British Mandate:

Zionists leaders in Palestine were furious at British administrators who classified them as *natives*, an insulting colonialist term. The Zionists maintained that the natives were the Arabs; they, the Zionists, represented European culture.³⁰

While the Zionists' ideological position was that they were returning to the land of their ancestors, like Jabotinsky their practical position was that they were displacing the established occupants of the land.

Terry Goldie, who has written an important book on colonial settler understandings of the indigene with reference to Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, sums up the problem this way:

The white Canadian looks at the Indian. The Indian is Other and therefore alien. But the Indian is indigenous and therefore cannot be alien. So the Canadian must be alien. But how can the Canadian be alien within Canada?³¹

Here we substitute Jew for Canadian and Palestinian for Indian. The further, Zionist reassurance in answer to the final question comes from a literal reading of the Torah. This, in turn, opens the way for the religious Zionists' and the messianists' claims to the land, or by now the Land, of Israel.

Goldie argues that there are two possible strategies for resolving the paradox he identifies: "The white culture can attempt to incorporate the Other...[or] the white culture may reject the indigene: 'This country really began with the arrival of the whites.'"³² These two general possibilities for action parallel Richard Terdiman's suggestion, which Goldie quotes, that there are

two symmetrical figures for representing the confrontation with the Other. These might be termed *penetration* (the forcible imposition of the dominator and his discursive system within the dominated space) and *appropriation* (the consumption enforced by the dominator of what belongs to the dominated).³³

Increasingly, as race has been delinked from evolutionary theory, so particularly from the 1950s and 1960s, settler states have shifted their attitudes toward the local indigenes from rejection and penetration to incorporation and appropriation. However, this has not happened in Israel—at least, not in the discursive areas where Zionism remains dominant. Incorporation and appropriation imply a certain recognition of the indigene and also the preparedness for a certain degree of hybridization determined by colonial dominance. Zionist ideology asserts that Israel should be the Jewish state, a state for Jews bonded and bounded by the Jewish culture. As a consequence, rejection and penetration of the Palestinians and their culture continues to be the Zionist-driven attitude. Here, though, I must briefly signal a caveat. Post-Zionism, which is related to the development of an Israeli culture and which considers that Zionism is no longer relevant, has, like the culture of which it is a manifestation, moved toward greater accommodation and synthesis with Palestinian Arab culture.

Shlaim argues that the principal focus of the early Zionists was the situation of the Jews in Europe. In regards to the Arab population in Palestine: "Although vaguely aware of the problem, they underestimated its seriousness and hoped that a solution would be found in due course."³⁴ European Orientalism provided the general context that allowed for such a dismissive attitude. Identifying the binary structure inherent in the process of European Othering, Said writes that:

The Orient was overvalued for its pantheism, its spirituality, its stability, its longevity, its primitivism, and so forth... Yet almost without exception such overestimation was followed by a counter-response: the Orient suddenly appeared lamentably under-humanized, anti-democratic, backward, barbaric, and so forth.³⁵

As with other places where settler colonialism was practised, the situation of the indigenous people in Palestine was not seriously taken into account by the settlers.

At its extreme, the settler ideal discounted the indigene to the point of non-existence. In Australia, for example, the land was claimed to be *terra nullius*.³⁶ Norman Finkelstein has discussed this mythic construction under the heading “The Virgin Land or ‘Wilderness’ Myth” and referred it to Zionist understandings of Palestine including Israel Zangwill’s now notorious slogan: “A land without people for a people without a land.”³⁷ The most egregious use of this myth, though, in respect of Palestine came as late as 1984 with the publication of Joan Peters’ book, *From Time Immemorial*. This argues that:

A significant proportion of the 700,000 Arabs residing in the part of Palestine that became Israel in 1949 had only recently settled there, and that they had emigrated to Palestine only because of the economic opportunities generated by Zionist settlement. Therefore, Peters claims, the industrious Jewish immigrants had as much, if not more, right to the territory than the Palestinian “newcomers.”³⁸

Boiled down like this, we can see that the thesis is a variant on the Zionist fantasy, combated by Jabotinsky, that the Arabs in Palestine would gladly accept the Jewish presence because it would raise the quality of life and provide new opportunities. Finkelstein has comprehensively demolished the “learning” on which this book claims to be based describing it as “among the most spectacular frauds ever published on the Arab–Israeli conflict.”³⁹ It is even possible that the book was deliberately concocted by elements associated with Israel to undermine the Palestinian cause.

On release the book had gained rave reviews and included a blurb by highly respected Holocaust historian, Lucy Dawidowicz. Finkelstein described the difficulty he had publishing his critique of the book. The point here is about the amount of acceptance still given to the rejection and penetration discourse in respect of Israel. For comparison, when, in 2002, the Australian historian Keith Windschuttle published *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History* in which he claimed that there was little violence against Aborigines during white settlement and that, indeed, the total estimated number of indigenes in Australia had been grossly exaggerated, there was an immediate outcry and many anthropologists and historians published rebuttals. Robert Manne edited a collection entitled *Whitewash: On Keith Windschuttle’s Fabrication of Aboriginal History*. Even with the strong movement to the right in Australian politics the rejection and penetration discourse has regained little acceptance.

Goldie argues that regardless of whether rejection and penetration or incorporation and appropriation is the dominant discourse there are certain fundamental tropes used in settler societies to characterize the indigene. The two most important are sex and violence. As he puts it, these “are poles of attraction and repulsion, temptation by the dusky maiden and fear of the demonic violence of the fiendish warrior.”⁴⁰ Goldie asks; “Could one create a more appropriate signifier for fear than the

treacherous redskin? He incorporates, in generous quantities, the terror of the impassioned, uncontrolled spirit of evil."⁴¹ For Israel the answer is, yes, the Palestinian Arab who is constructed with these same qualities. Thus, for example Finkelstein, summarizing Anita Shapira in *Land and Power*, writes that:

As the conflict between the Jewish settlers and the indigenous Arab population reached new peaks of violence in 1929 and 1936, the labor Zionist press "endlessly" denounced the Arabs as "murderers," "bands of robbers," bloodthirsty "rioters," "desert jackals," "high-way robbers," "treacherous murderers," "barbarians," "savages," "shedders of blood," etc.⁴²

Finkelstein tells us that in *The Jews and Their Land*, published in 1966, Izhak Ben-Zvi, Israel's second president writes, "[t]he Arabs, generally cast as Bedouins, are variously depicted as 'ransacking,' 'looting,' 'pillaging,' 'robbing,' 'cheating,' 'vandalizing,' 'plundering,' or 'terrorizing' the Jews."⁴³ Picking through these epithets, we find the characteristic construction of the indigene as emphasized through the discourse of rejection and penetration: the indigene as barbarously primitive and as a treacherous murderer.

These same constructions are still being used, most outspokenly by the religious far right. Goldberg quotes Moshe Feiglin, the head of the Jewish Leadership bloc within Likud and the man credited with ensuring the defeat of Sharon's referendum on disengagement from the Gaza Strip:

You can't teach a monkey to speak and you can't teach an Arab to be democratic. You're dealing with a culture of thieves and robbers. Muhammad, their prophet, was a robber and a killer and a liar. The Arab destroys everything he touches.⁴⁴

Even more extreme, and exemplifying the supernatural quality to which Goldie implicitly adverts, is this comment from Effie Eitam, described by Goldberg as "a hard-edged former general who leads the National Religious Party," a coalition partner in Sharon's government: "I don't call these people animals. These are creatures who once came out of the depths of darkness. It is not by chance that the State of Israel got the mission to pave the way for the rest of the world, to militarily get rid of these dark forces."⁴⁵ Here, the rhetoric of messianic Zionism is combined with the discourse of the Othered indigene. Eitam was Sharon's housing minister.

We can take this construction of the colonized indigene a step further. Goldie quotes Sander Gilman describing how, "[t]he 'bad' Other becomes the negative stereotype...that which we fear to become."⁴⁶ Finkelstein discusses *The Seventh Day* which he describes as "[a] canonical text of labor Zionism's distinctive ethos...an oral history of the June 1967 war

based on the 'soldiers' talk' of 'a group of young kibbutz members'.⁴⁷ Finkelstein finds the moral concerns expressed by the soldiers to be self-serving. He writes that: "The ethical qualms of *The Seventh Day* arise not from what Israel may have done to the Arabs, however, but from what it may have done to itself. Indeed, the soldier is seen as the war's salient victim, the one truly deserving of pity."⁴⁸

Finkelstein goes on to compare these feelings with those expressed by Himmler while overseeing the Holocaust and Rudolf Hoess, the commandant of Auschwitz, both of whom worried about the effects of so much killing on themselves and their subordinates. While the anxieties are expressed in relation to the acts committed, the fear would seem to lie elsewhere—in the potential for a brutalization of the self that might turn the self into a combination of the negative Other that the Nazis had constructed the Jews as, weak, vacillating, racially inferior, and the Zionist Jews of Israel had constructed the Arab as, barbarous, treacherous, murderous. What Gilman is suggesting is that we construct the "bad" Other as the embodiment of our greatest fears about what we might turn into.

If Israeli Jews have incessantly and obsessively constructed the negative image of the violent, male Arab, the opposite is the case in regards to that other trope that Goldie identifies, sex. Goldie discusses the image of problematic desire, "the Indian maiden, who tempts the being chained by civilization toward the liberation represented by free and open sexuality, not the realm of untamed evil but of unrestrained joy."⁴⁹ This is the overdetermined desire for the Other—male desire for the female Other, such as Gustave Flaubert's now often commented upon libidinous interest in the Egyptian courtesan, Kuchuk Hanem. The most obvious marker of Israeli Jewish and Arab desire would be in mixed marriages, however, Israel only allows Jews to marry non-Jews if one or other partner converts. The intermarriage rate in Israel is around five per cent but most of these marriages are Russian migrants suggesting that the intermarriage rate for Israeli Jews and Arabs is negligible.

Any discussion of sex between Israeli Jews and Arabs is silenced. A sense of how transgressive the idea is can be ascertained from a trawl of the net. The only item I could find was American, a piece in the Duke University online student humor magazine, *Malignant Humor*. The article is entitled "Peace Can Only Be Achieved by Israeli-Palestinian Fucking." The article purports to quote Shimon Peres and Yasser Arafat advocating this solution and has Arafat lusting after Dalia Itzik who was, until November 2002, the Israeli industry and trade minister. The model for the discussion is clearly the American construction of race and the associated American anxieties over interracial sex. The article's humor comes from the shock of the idea of Israeli Jewish and Arab sex, all the more so when apparently sanctioned by leading Israeli and Palestinian politicians—one wonders why Peres was chosen rather than Sharon; perhaps this would have stretched even humorous suspension of disbelief too far.

The article is, of course, American rather than Israeli. An Israeli sensibility, at least that of right-wing settlers, can be found in Goldberg's article. He describes watching an encounter in Hebron. Two Arab girls were walking toward a group of Yeshiva boys. One boy yells out "cunts," another: "Do you let your brothers fuck you?" The comments were made in Arabic. This violent verbal assault, carried out in the language of the indigene, can be read as simultaneously expressing the involvement of the colonizer—the use of the indigene's language—and the assertion of a separation between colonizer and colonized, in the abuse heaped on the Arab girls. The episode suggests a feared incorporation and appropriation. It focuses on the sexuality of the girls. First of all, the shouts highlight the girls' sexual organs using a denigratory term. By this means the girls are reduced to degraded sex objects. Do we have here the Israeli Jewish (male) desire that cannot speak its name? This name-calling is followed by a suggestion that provides an image of transgressive, incestuous desire. This can be read as suggesting the displacement of another transgressive desire, that of these Israeli Jewish boys for these Arab girls. The amount of vitriol in the attack is a cover for the boys' libidinous feelings of which they are no doubt not even aware. In *Orientalism*, and following on from his discussion of Flaubert's description of Kuchuk Hanem, Said muses rhetorically: "Why the Orient seems still to suggest not only fecundity but also sexual promise (and threat), untiring sensuality, unlimited desire, deep generative energies, is something on which one could speculate."⁵⁰ Zionism in its various forms legitimates the construction of the Palestinian male in the trope of violence but absolutely disavows the construction of the Palestinian woman in the trope of the sexualized object of male colonial sexual desire.

The Messianic Wall

There are now around seven thousand Jewish settlers in Kiryat Arba, just northeast of Hebron.⁵¹ A few more live in Hebron itself. The encircling Wall will place Kiryat Arba on the outside—if we think of the Palestinians on the inside. The key to recognizing the messianic quality of the Wall is the realization of the extent to which Zionism has been experienced as a secular version of Jewish messianism. Gershom Scholem has argued that, in contrast to Christianity, Judaism,

in all its forms and manifestations, has always maintained a concept of redemption as an event which takes place publicly, on the stage of history and within the community. It is an occurrence which takes place in the visible world and which cannot be conceived apart from such a visible appearance.⁵²

A crucial element in this public and historical redemption has been the return of the Jews to the land covenanted to them by God. In

this formulation the land takes on a spiritually charged quality and is understood as Eretz Israel, the Land of Israel.

Scholem goes on to explain that:

When the Messianic idea appears as a living force in the world of Judaism... it always occurs in the closest connection with apocalypticism. In these instances the Messianic idea constitutes both a content of religious faith and also living, acute anticipation.⁵³

In this context we need to remember that the movement of which Herzl is placed at the head did not start with him. The Hovevei Zion, Lovers of Zion, movement had begun in 1881 in Russia as a reaction to the increasing numbers of pogroms and general persecution. Leo Pinsker published his pamphlet, "Auto-emancipation," in 1882. Pinsker advocated migration from Russia. Nathan Birnbaum, in Vienna, coined the term "Zionism" in 1885. Like the Hovevei Zion movement, Birnbaum wanted a return to the Land of Israel. Herzl's publication of *Der Judenstaat* in 1896 came relatively late. Herzl, the secularist advocating a political solution, was prepared to countenance settling Jews on available land in Argentina or Uganda.

Herzl convened the First Zionist Congress in 1897. His aim was to bring together the various groups pushing for migration as a solution to the Jewish situation in Europe. Herzl died in 1904 and at the Seventh Zionist Congress in 1905 a motion was passed that nowhere except Palestine would be considered for a Jewish national homeland. Zangwill, true to Herzl's ideas, left the Congress and formed the Jewish Territorial Association. While Zionism owes a great deal to Herzl's political and organizational skills it is clear that, after his death, the Zionist movement was reconstructed as a more or less secular version of a Jewish messianic movement, a movement which, ironically, took the now dead Herzl as its "Messiah." When David Ben-Gurion proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel in 1949 he had a picture of Herzl hanging above his head.⁵⁴ This acknowledgement brought together Herzl the secular Zionist leader and the role the dead Herzl was given as messianic redeemer.

One exemplification of secular Zionist messianism is in the Zionist attitude to the Balfour Declaration. Balfour's letter to Lord Rothschild on November 17, 1917, in which Balfour writes that: "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people," has become constructed in Zionism as the modern, nationalist version of the biblical Covenant. Where, in Genesis 17:8, God says to Abram, who he renames Abraham: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God," now the British Foreign Secretary stands in for God. Better, Balfour is thought of as God's representative, and Britain, and subsequently the United States, gets positioned as the state equivalent of God, the great power which guarantees Israel's right to existence in Palestine.

Baruch Kimmerling discusses the messianic aspect of Zionism in a book review for salon.com:

It's true that Israel was envisioned and created by secular socialists and liberals. At the same time, the Zionist movement was essentially a religious-messianic one. This is why it aroused the antagonism of European Jewish Orthodoxy prior to the Holocaust and World War II. It was not incidental that the founders of the state chose the Holy Land, nor is it by chance that the major symbols of the state were selectively borrowed from the Jewish religion. The Bible was always perceived by both Jews—even the atheist ones—and many non-Jews as the “charter” of the Jewish people, justifying their claims over a land already populated by a native people.⁵⁵

Making a similar point, Yael Zerubavel writes that:

Hebrew culture from the prestate period suggests that this shift from the religious to the national was pervasive. This was clearly manifested in the transformation of biblical or traditional allusions to God into a reference to the people of Israel!⁵⁶

Zerubavel wants to describe the secularization of Judaic imagery as a contribution to the establishment of a Jewish state. However, what we can read from her description is how the Jewish state itself, for all its claimed secularism, became invested with the spiritual charge of messianic apocalypticism.

As an apocalyptic manifestation it is, then, no wonder that Israel has never formally identified its borders. Nor should it be surprising that it has never made peace with the Palestinians even though, as I have already quoted Žižek remarking, “everybody knows the only viable solution.” Segev quotes A. G. Yehoshua, his old teacher, from a book Yehoshua published in 1980: “When peace comes and the normative framework of the State of Israel wins the final recognition of the community of nations, and especially of the people of the region in which we live, we will know that normality is not pejorative.”⁵⁷ Why might normality be thought to be pejorative? Because the normal state is not invested with the apocalyptic charge. From within the apocalyptic experience the normal, the everyday, is felt as lacking. Segev quotes Aliza Badmor who had been a member of the secular Greater Israel movement which was founded in 1967 after the war. She describes how they used to go on hikes: “We internalized the land as a total experience.”⁵⁸ Badmor describes how this gave way later to “coping with life itself, and coping with life itself is, among other things, discerning shades, complexities, and perhaps more than that,”⁵⁹ in other words dealing with the everyday, the normal. While “war” as the opposite of peace, exists with the Palestinians, Israel can be said to be still in the process of coming into being, Zionism still has its

apocalyptic cause. Peace would strip Israel, and Zionism, of its apocalyptic meaning. From this point of view the messianic settlements on the West Bank are simply the extreme end of a spectrum which includes labor Zionism, and post-Zionism can be understood as the non-apocalyptic, normalizing, manifestation of the Israeli imagined community—rather than of the Jewish state.

But what of the Wall? In his discussion of the importance of apocalypse in America literature, *American Apocalypses*, Douglas Robinson writes that:

In theological studies of the apocalypse, a distinction is normally made between the broad category of *eschatology*, or doctrines about the last things, and the narrower category of the *apocalyptic*, a branch of eschatology that stands alongside the ethical eschatology of Old Testament prophecy, definitively seeking to explore the unveiling of the future in the present, the encroachment of a radically new order into a historical situation that has descended into chaos.⁶⁰

Robinson goes on to tell us that: “The root meaning of the *eschaton*, however, is not in fact the last things but the ‘furthestmost boundary,’ the ‘ultimate edge’ in time *or* space.”⁶¹ In an Israeli discourse where the state is an apocalyptic manifestation, the Wall marks the limits of that manifestation in both time and space. Beyond the Wall lies the chaos of the ordinary, that is, in Yehoshua’s word the normal, world. It is the world of the Palestinians, full, in Israeli discourse, of murderers, robbers and even, possibly, incestuous siblings—that is, a world without patriarchal Law, without society. In secular terms this is the Hobbesian presocial contract world of the war of all against all, the world where there is no effective authority, no state. On the Israeli side of the Wall is the Israeli state, still coming into being according to Zionist rhetoric, a haven for all the Jews of the world and according to the messianic settlers who live on the land protected by the Wall, existing on Eretz Israel. In Judaic terms, this is the Land God the patriarch gave to the Jews, the Land where God’s patriarchal Law should order all things.

The Palestinian wall is thoroughly overdetermined. I have discussed here some of the most important aspects of that overdetermination but there are others. That the most potent Jewish relic is a wall, the Western Wall of the Second Temple, should not be forgotten. More, Segev writes that: “A few months after the British conquered Palestine, the Zionist movement made an attempt to buy the Western Wall from its Arab owners.”⁶² Michel de Certeau reminds us of a Midrash: “Praying is speaking to the wall.”⁶³ The Western Wall has a sacred quality and it has always been at the political heart of Israeli nationalism. In another place, discussing Jewish religious resistance to Zionism, Segev mentions, “the Talmudic injunction not to ‘mount the wall’—which was taken to mean a prohibition against organizing mass immigration to the Holy Land.”⁶⁴ The wall is a central trope in Jewish thought. Here, I have discussed three of the more powerful

contributions to the ideology of the Palestinian wall. Walls separate but they also mark an end. The Palestinian wall makes apparent many of the assumptions and anxieties that have driven Zionist practice. The Wall marks the limit, perhaps the end of that world. It is to be hoped that, the destruction of the Wall will mark the beginning of another, non-Zionist, non-colonialist, non-apocalyptic, world.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Banality of Representation: Generation, Holocaust, Signification, and Empire of the Senseless

For the last two years or so I have been fascinated by one of Kathy Acker's later novels, *Empire of the Senseless*. Usually celebrated for its allusive use of pastiche, its preoccupation with post-Oedipal desire and its unsettling of realist continuity, all features that entitle it to the label "postmodern" and place it within a tradition led by such figures as William Burroughs, I have been reading the text otherwise. For me, in what many might regard as an aberrant, if not obsessive, reading, the book is in part, but crucially, a Jewish text. Underlying, and informing, its postmodern qualities is the problem of the ambiguously positioned outsider, the outsider who is at once a part of and not a part of the culture within which they live, and of the event which determines and, in crucial part, defines them but which remains unnamed and, most importantly, unrepresented. I want to effect a partial, Jewish reading of *Empire of the Senseless*, a reading that uses the book as a pretext for a meditation on the problem of representability in particular relation to the Holocaust.¹

The dates given for Acker's birth vary but she was in her early fifties when she died of cancer in 1997. Born in 1945 or slightly later, she came from a rich, assimilated, German-Jewish background. In an interview with the online magazine *Tattoo Jew*, Acker answered a question about whether she had been running away from her Jewish cultural identity by saying:

No. Being Jewish has two aspects: One the religious—it means nothing to me. I don't run away from it, it just means nothing. The Jewish cultural thing is complicated. As we say, there are Jews and Jews. My parents were high-German Jews, and I was trained to run away from Polish Jews. Culturally. And I have that childhood inside me. It's a kind of knee-jerk reaction.²

It seems that, in common with very many American Jews, Acker understood herself to be culturally Jewish but not religiously so. Acker's grandparents, she tells us, went to the United States before World War I. This history is echoed in the background of Abhor, the main character of *Empire*. Abhor's grandmother on her father's side, we are told, "came out of a German-Jewish family which was real wealthy."³ Abhor's grandmother's family left Germany for Paris:

when she was still a kid, cause of all the pre-Nazi nationalistic shit murkiness in Germany, you know about that one, her family had to leave Germany. Not exactly political exile. Voluntary . . . political exile.⁴

To draw the parallel, where Acker's grandparents left, in fact, Alsace-Lorraine for the United States before World War I, Abhor's grandmother, with her family, left Germany for Paris before World War II. Acker describes her grandparents as "first generation French-German Jews."⁵ This suggests that her family weren't established German Jews but rather had come to Germany as part of the exodus of Jews from the Pale around the turn of the century. Nevertheless, from what Acker says, they seem to have rapidly acquired the assimilated German-Jewish prejudice against the traditional Yiddish-speaking Jews. Where Acker's grandparents probably left Germany more to better themselves in the United States, along with millions of other Jews of Polish background, than because of German anti-Semitism, the effect on the reader of Abhor's great-grandparents leaving Germany is to call to mind the steps taken against Jews by the Nazis as a lead-up to the Holocaust.

Empire identifies the turmoil in Germany in nationalist terms and leaves implicit the connection between this and Abhor's great-grandparents being Jewish, and their flight to Parisian sanctuary. The increasing discrimination and violence against Jews before World War II in Germany is left unstated as, indeed, as we shall see, is the Holocaust itself. Importantly, the narrative of *Empire* unfolds with an apparent continuity of Abhor's family in Paris and no mention of the Nazi occupation and the deportation of French Jews to the concentration and death camps.

The extent to which Abhor is formally Jewish is unclear. Halachically, being a Jew descends through the female line so, regardless of whether or not the "rich man who owned part of the garment district,"⁶ whom her grandmother married, was Jewish, Abhor's father would have been Jewish. The text offers no hint as to the background of Abhor's mother and, as the narrative proceeds, quite who was Abhor's mother becomes uncertain. It would seem, then, that Abhor herself is technically not Jewish and, confirming this, Thivai, her partner, describes her only as "part robot, and part black."⁷ Yet, we need to remember that an important decision by the American rabbinical leadership has decreed that Jewish descent can also now be through the male line. Applied retrospectively,

and in another country, but to a text which is a part of the (post)modern American literary tradition, Abhor would count as Jewish. Moreover, according to Nazi racial law, Abhor would have been treated as Jewish because of her father's status as a Jew. As early as April 11, 1933, the Nazi revision of the Law Regarding the Restoration of Professional Service read, in part:

A person is to be regarded as non-Aryan, who is descended from non-Aryan, especially Jewish parents or grandparents. This holds true even if only one parent or grandparent is of non-Aryan descent. This premise especially obtains if one parent or grandparent was of Jewish faith.⁸

This would have been about the time that Abhor's great-grandparents left Germany.

The purpose of this lengthy discussion of Abhor's Jewishness is to develop a sense of the assimilatory complexity of Abhor's status.⁹ While not wanting to suggest any intentional authorial comparison with Acker's own assimilated position within the United States, Abhor's ambiguous Jewishness gives a very particular force to her outsider status within the novel. Moreover, this Jewishness, here expressed in the pseudo-racial terms of descent, and elided as it is in the person of Abhor, literalizes the Jewish cultural preoccupations, the most important of these being the Holocaust, which articulate in crucial part the narrative of the text.

Over the last twenty or so years it has become a commonplace to note the extent to which, for good or bad, secular Jewish identity has become bound up with a memorializing of the Holocaust. When asked whether she had lost family in the Holocaust, Acker had this to say:

They had no relation to the Holocaust. That's why I drew a cultural difference. I grew up basically not knowing about the Holocaust. I didn't get it. It was foreign to me in a funny way, and my mother was very desperate to deny her Jewish [*sic*] and to fit in and be part of [American] [*sic*] society.¹⁰

The cultural difference of which Acker speaks is that between German Jews, most of whom had migrated to the US in the early to mid-nineteenth century, and the Polish Jews who had arrived a generation or more later. Acker's point is that, unlike Polish Jews, she did not grow up with the trauma of the Holocaust imbricated in her familial life. Nevertheless, Acker is of the first post-Holocaust generation. She lived through the historical, discursive reconstruction of the attempted elimination of European Jewry from being conceptualized in the terms of "concentration camps" to "genocide" and the "Holocaust," with all the moral and identitarian freight now associated with this term.

Published in 1988, *Empire of the Senseless* is a post-Holocaust novel. Following Gerd Korman, James Young writes that:

it was not until sometime between 1957 and 1959 that the English term “holocaust” came to refer specifically to the murder of European Jews. And even then, this particular usage depended upon the community of users, with non-Jews hesitating to distinguish between kinds of victims...¹¹

It was after the Six Day War of 1967, during the 1970s, that the term Holocaust, with its capitalized “H” signifying its exceptional status, came into common usage in the United States, and the English-speaking world more generally.¹² In common with her generation, Acker grew into knowledge of the Holocaust as she grew older, as the discourse that identifies what the Nazis did as the Holocaust, evolved. In 1978, the American television network, NBC, broadcast the miniseries, *Holocaust: The Story of the Family Weiss*. This was a key moment in the establishment of the “Holocaust” in the cultural memory of the United States, and the west more generally. As Jeffrey Shandler has argued, “the response to its broadcast in the United States and abroad arguably proved to be a more noteworthy cultural landmark than the miniseries itself.”¹³ Coming ten years later, and five years before that other great popular cultural representation of the Holocaust, Stephen Spielberg’s film *Schindler’s List*, *Empire of the Senseless* is a text by a second-generation writer which, in its allusive relation to the Holocaust, is very much a part of the debate over Holocaust representation.

Representation and the Holocaust

Michael Rothberg argues that there are “two dramatically different interdisciplinary approaches within Holocaust studies,”¹⁴ one realist and the other antirealist. He goes on:

Although not aligned uniquely with any one discipline, each side of the realist/antirealist divide tends to fall into a broad coalition: historians and social scientists representing the realist side, while the more speculative and theoretical practitioners of philosophy, religion, literary theory, and some versions of psychoanalysis line up on the other.¹⁵

This division has developed along with the discourse of the Holocaust, however, it has a more fundamental origin. Rothberg gives no reason why the divide has occurred. While not suggesting a monocausal explanation, we can discern a link between an empiricist understanding of language as adequate to the task of description and a claim that only survivors are able

to use language in a rhetorical form to produce affective understanding of an event of such inhuman enormity, literal, moral and metaphysical. As is implied in Rothberg's distinction, the realist/antirealist divide maps conceptually onto a fact/fiction distinction. Elie Wiesel takes this position, that is that the Holocaust cannot be represented adequately in realist fiction, when, in his 1989 piece entitled "Trivializing Memory," he criticized what he called, "the recent spate of fictionalized accounts of that tragedy [the Holocaust] in the mass media."¹⁶ Writing that "this is a period of general desanctification of the Holocaust,"¹⁷ he ends by exhorting people to study diaries written during that time, works by historians, to watch documentaries and, finally: "Listen to the survivors and respect their wounded sensibility."¹⁸ The emphasis on testimony as the way to legitimate representation runs deep. Even Spielberg, at the end of *Schindler's List*, brings together his actors and the Schindler survivors as if to suggest a testimonial invocation for his fictionalized narrative.

Nevertheless, in spite of Wiesel's imprecations, the 1990s saw a growing stream of fictionalized accounts of the Holocaust. In the Introduction to her edited collection on *Schindler's List*, Yosefa Loshitzky makes the point that Spielberg's film was released during the time of generational change when the survivors were beginning to die in large numbers and the second generation, the first post-Holocaust generation, was reaching its ascendancy. She writes that: "As an anxiety-induced film motivated by fears of disappearance and denial, *Schindler's List* also marks a shift in Holocaust tropes and generational sensibilities."¹⁹ For one thing, it focuses on survival rather than annihilation. Most importantly though, the reception of *Schindler's List* marks the acceptance by the post-Holocaust generation of fictionalized representations of the Holocaust. As an exemplification of this acceptance we can take the episode of the sitcom *Seinfeld* entitled "The Raincoats," first aired in the United States at the end of April 1994, in which Jerry is caught making out with his new girlfriend while watching *Schindler's List*.

Loshitzky argues that this,

fragile moment of transition in historical consciousness from lived, personal memories to collective, manufactured memory signified the victory of collective memory as transmitted by popular culture over a memory as transmitted by professional historians.²⁰

Implicit in Loshitzky's argument is the claim that collective memory circulates in and through popular culture by way of fictional as much as nonfictional texts, that even if personal memory were always true to experience, which it isn't, then collective memory is culturally mediated and the distinction between fiction and nonfiction problematic. The post-Holocaust generations, both Jewish and non-Jewish, have to find their own ways to come to terms with what happened and seek means to incorporate it into their lives. Loshitzky argues that the taboo on explicitly

imaging the Holocaust and, we could add more generally, representing it, “begins to lose its moral grip as second generation artists appear on the Holocaust scene.”²¹ Acker is writing in the midst of this generational change. The change allows for increasingly direct, and sometimes explicit, explorations of the Holocaust. From this point of view Acker’s book could be understood as conservative in that it does not attempt to represent the Holocaust.

What, then, is at stake in arguments about fictional, realist representations of the Holocaust? The place I want to start is with Saul Friedlander’s Introduction to his highly influential edited collection, *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the “Final Solution.”* Friedlander writes, sensibly, that, “[t]he extermination of the Jews of Europe is as accessible to both representation and interpretation as any other historical event.”²² He goes on to argue that, “[w]hat turns the ‘Final Solution’ into an event at the limits is the very fact that it is the most radical form of genocide encountered in history.”²³ “Genocide” was a neologism invented by the expatriate Polish-Jewish lawyer Raphael Lemkin and used by him in his 1944 book, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. What is foundational to the discourse of genocide is the ability to think of a group of people as a totality and identify them as fundamentally different, as so different, so Other, that “they” can be killed by “us” while “we” will not kill ourselves. Lemkin was not, it would seem, thinking of what was being done to the Jews when he started using the term genocide. As Yehuda Bauer writes:

The historical context for Lemkin’s work in early 1943 consisted of the information he possessed as to what was happening to Poles, Czechs, Serbs, Russians, and others. Horrifying information had been received concerning the fate of the Jews, but decent human beings evinced an understandable reluctance to believe that the accounts were literally and completely true.²⁴

Lemkin wrote about nations and national groups. Bauer argues that Lemkin was most likely thinking of what was happening to the Poles when he defined genocide.²⁵ The identification of the destruction of European Jewry as the typifying genocide took place later. Friedlander’s statement raises the important question of whether he is emphasizing the mass murder of large numbers of people identified as belonging to the same group (let us say “race”), or whether what places the Holocaust at the limits of representation is the way the event was, or is, thought about.

Friedlander goes on to quote Jürgen Habermas approvingly when he writes that:

There [in Auschwitz] [*sic*] something happened, that up to now nobody considered as even possible. There one touched on something which represents the deep layer of solidarity among all that wears a human face; notwithstanding all the usual acts of beastliness

of human history, the integrity of this common layer has been taken for granted... Auschwitz has changed the basis for the continuity of the conditions of life within history.²⁶

I have requoted this in the fullness that Friedlander quotes it because its humanism forms the justification for Friedlander's claim that the Holocaust is at the limits of representation. It is this kind of statement which is challenged by those writing about the colonial destruction of the "non-white" peoples outside of Europe since the beginning of modernity, let us say since the "discovery" and exploration of the American New World. In chapter 3 I have made the argument that what was most distinct about the Holocaust was not the attempt to destroy European Jewry but, rather, the carrying out of this act within the generally accepted boundaries of Europe—though, importantly, Germany did not perceive Poland as a part of Europe—and to a people who had been accepted up until the mid-nineteenth century as in some sense "European." My purpose here is not to diminish the awfulness of what was done to the Jews but to place the problem of the limits of representation in a broader context. We might, then, begin to think about how the limits of representation equate with the limits of the modern, European world, and its "white" people.

Representation and the Colonial Other

Friedlander goes on to make the point that bearing witness and recording the Holocaust "implies, quite naturally, the imprecise but no less self-evident notion that this record should not be distorted or banalized by grossly inadequate representations."²⁷ This raises the question of what might be considered a grossly inadequate representation, and how such a thing might be judged. Rothberg argues that, "[t]he problematics of representing and coming to terms with an extreme historical event push the realist project—based, as it tends to be, on the depiction of modern, everyday life—to its limits."²⁸ Here we have an argument that the more extreme the event, and we will have to define what we mean by extreme, the greater the difficulty realism as a genre has in depicting it. Coupled with Friedlander's concern we can appreciate that, the more an event is understood as extreme, the more likely it is that representations of it will be (thought of as) inadequate. To shed light on this idea of the link between inadequacy and extremity we can turn for a moment to Michael Taussig's book, *Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing*. Taussig's work was centered on what was done to the Putumayo people during the rubber boom of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century, and the aftermath. The Putumayo live in an area that borders Colombia and Peru. Taussig gives many examples of the great violence inflicted on the Putumayo by the rubber traders who

used the indigenous people to gather wild rubber from the jungle. After quoting one such account published in a local newspaper in 1908, Taussig writes; "There is an uncanny, overblown tone to all this, I think, which breeds skepticism no less than fear and revulsion."²⁹ He quotes David Cazes, who had been the British vice-consul in Iquitos, the main town in the rubber boom area, from 1902 to 1911, replying to questions put to him in 1912 by the British House of Commons Select Committee:

I started taking the first two numbers [of *La Felpa* and *La Sanción*], I think, but I thought they were rather fantastic in the horrors they depicted. Such a horrible state of affairs seemed to me incredible, and I did not have them brought up to the house anymore. My wife was with me, and they had a rather strong effect on her, I think.... I suppose now that I know things better I think I should probably have given them much more credence, but I really thought at that time that they were in a way fabricated.³⁰

This offers us a way of thinking about Friedlander's idea of grossly inadequate representations. For David Cazes, rather more than for his wife, the depiction of the great violence inflicted on the Putumayo seems fantastic; detailed description gives him the impression of being fabricated. The problem here, as illuminated by Cazes' reaction, is one of believability. Believability in this case, though, is not an effect of realistic portrayal. Rather, the greater the realism the more Cazes considers the reports fabricated. We can refer here to Dominick LaCapra's suggestion that:

Extremely traumatic series of events beggar the imagination, and such events often involve the literalization of metaphor as one's wildest dreams or most hellish nightmares seem to be realized or even exceeded by brute facts. Such facts go beyond the imagination's powers of representation.³¹

For Cazes, the problem had lain in the literally unbelievable violence that was depicted. Here we have an exemplification of Rothberg's claim that realism, as a genre, has difficulty representing extreme events, to which we need to add that the difficulty lies in making an audience believe in the events. It would seem, also, that it is extreme violence that permeates extreme events and makes it possible to define them as extreme.

Friedlander has discussed historical writing on the Holocaust. He comments on an example of such writing that:

Here the unreality springs from an absolute disparity between the two halves of the phrases. The first half implies an ordinary administrative measure, and is put into totally normal speech; the second half accounts for the natural consequence, except that here, suddenly, the second half describes murder.³²

The style of historical writing, as Friedlander goes on to say, “neutralizes the whole discussion.” His point is that the problem here lies not with the genre of history writing—though some might think otherwise—but that “[t]he events described are what is unusual, not the historian’s work.”³³ The modern genre of history writing, with its use of realistic convention, makes events ordinary. As with realist fiction, when what is thought of as extraordinary, as extreme, is being described, a problem of believability arises which is only resolved to the extent that the reader accepts the reliability of the historian. This, I would argue, points to the representational limits of even history writing.

Roger Casement worked for the British Foreign Office before being hanged for treason on a British gallows in London in 1916. Commenting on Casement’s reports on what was happening to the Putumayo, published by the House of Commons in 1913, Taussig writes: “The unreal atmosphere of ordinariness evoked in the reports—of the ordinariness of the extraordinary—makes the atrocities less startling than uncanny, like watching a sunken world underwater.”³⁴ Taussig could just as well be commenting on descriptions of life in the concentration and death camps of the Holocaust. Realism, we might say, makes things ordinary. A way of thinking about the limits of representation is that the limit is reached when the divergence between the effect of making things ordinary, a consequence of realist description, and the extraordinary that is being depicted, is experienced by the reader as making the realism unbelievable. This applies to both factual and fictional work. Realism is, after all, an effect, in the celebrated French term, of *vraisemblance*, true-seemingness.³⁵ In this thinking, the limits of representation have been reached when the generic project of realist representation fails to naturalize the event depicted for the normative—itsself, of course, a problematic idea—reader within the culture.

What, then, can we say about the relation between the realist project and modern, everyday life? Let us begin by discussing what Henri Lefebvre argues. Commenting on everyday life in modernity, he writes of it in terms of a terrorist society: “[A terrorist society] is based on the organization of everyday life (which is also its objective) of which terror is the outcome.”³⁶ Terror, Lefebvre is suggesting, is a key element in the production, and experience, of everyday life. He writes that, “[i]n a terrorist society terror is diffuse, violence is always latent, pressure is exerted from all sides on its members, who can only avoid it and shift its weight by a super-human effort.”³⁷ In the modern world, the modern state, violence is held in reserve. The members of the society live in a naturalized circumstance of terror that is experienced as normal. This is the modern, disciplinary society that Michel Foucault was to write about some years later in *Discipline and Punish*.³⁸ The ordinary in the modern world, then, can be thought of as a consequence of naturalized terror.

But what of realism, the genre suited best to the depiction of the ordinary? Or, more generally, and more fundamentally, what of representation?

Realism, as a modern genre, can be understood as itself implicated in, indeed a product of, the naturalization of a terror which holds unlimited violence in reserve. Writing about representation, Alice Jardine offers this outline of the Lacanian Real: "In Lacanian literature, the 'Real' designates that which is categorically unrepresentable, non-human, at the limits of the known; it is emptiness, the scream, the zero point of death, the proximity of *jouissance*."³⁹ Setting aside the distinctly modern sense of universalism here, we can ask how, in the modern world, something gets to be unrepresentable; to put it another way, what underlies and guarantees the modern quality of representation. Jardine writes that: "In all cases, the new philosophies were to conclude that this 'unrepresentable factor' can perhaps be formulated, but not represented, for it is the space of non-resemblance between the signifier and the signified."⁴⁰ Jardine is writing of the post-Holocaust French philosophers, forced to confront the limits of modernity. In the modern world representation was conjured in the naturalization of the relation between signifier and signified. That which was done to Others on the geographical limits of the modern world was unrepresentable.

Taussig writes of what he calls the "space of death." This space "is important in the creation of meaning and consciousness, nowhere more so than in societies where torture is endemic and the culture of terror flourishes."⁴¹ He goes on:

With European conquest and colonization, [the] spaces of death blend into a common pool of key signifiers binding the transforming culture of the conqueror with that of the conquered. But the signifiers are strategically out of joint with what they signify, "If confusion is the sign of the times," wrote Artaud, "I see at the root of this confusion a rupture between things and words, between things and the ideas and signs that are their representation."⁴²

As may be apparent, Taussig universalizes the space of death, arguing for its presence in all societies and, indeed, arguing that in colonial conquest, European and indigenous spaces of death merge. I wish to be more circumspect. The space of death is, at least in a crucial inflection, a product that characterizes European modernity. It can be understood, as Artaud intuits, as the space between signifier and signified. The space of death is literalized at the limit of representation. It has been present in the moment of colonial conquest. It is also the space of the Holocaust camps. We should remind ourselves of what else Taussig writes about this space, that: "We may think of the space of death as a threshold that allows for illumination as well as extinction."⁴³ But at what price? I shall come back to this.

Joseph Conrad, the Pole from the uncertain eastern frontier of Europe who became one of the greatest novelists in what was not even his second language, English, had met Roger Casement in the Congo in 1890. While Casement and Edmund Morel campaigned to stop the exploitation of the

Congo people in the rubber boom through the Congo Reform Society, Conrad felt unable to assist describing himself as a “wretched novelist inventing wretched stories and not even up to that miserable game.”⁴⁴ Instead, Conrad wrote *Heart of Darkness*. First published in installments in *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1899, it is a strange book, a text which struggles not to portray precisely that with which it is most concerned, the Africans and their fate at King Leopold II's hands. It is a text attentive to the incorporating power of Western representation, and the reductive force of realism. Taussig quotes the critic Frederick Karl who wrote that Conrad “attempted to penetrate the veil and yet was anxious to retain its hallucinatory quality.”⁴⁵ What the text seeks to avoid is the violence of representation. And yet, of course, it can't, and so, finally, we are offered an attempt at a proud, free African woman, a woman not appropriated and despoiled by the ivory and rubber pillagers:

She walked with measured steps, draped in striped and fringed cloths, treading the earth proudly, with a slight jingle and flash of barbarous ornaments. She carried her head high, her hair was done in the shape of a helmet, she had brass leggings to the knee, brass wire gauntlets to the elbow, a crimson spot on her tawny cheek...⁴⁶

And so on. This description, inevitably of course, appropriates and reduces the fictional African it depicts, forming her within the only discourse available to Conrad, the colonial exotic. Taussig asks rhetorically: “Is not horror made beautiful and primitivism exoticized throughout this book?”⁴⁷ The answer is yes, but how could it have been otherwise? What is most remarkable about the book, though, is its struggle with the limits of representation.

What yokes together signifier and signified is terror, terror of the violence held in reserve in modernity and practiced on the periphery, at the limit of representation. It is this violence which gets constructed as extraordinary in the problematics of realism because it unsettles the apparent naturalness of the, albeit arbitrary, relation between signifier and signified. Taussig has insightfully described as uncanny the experience of reading the detailed accounts of extreme violence among the Putumayo.⁴⁸ In Sigmund Freud's investigation of the uncanny he suggests that one source of the feeling is “something which is secretly familiar, which has undergone repression and then returned from it.”⁴⁹ We may understand Taussig's feeling of the uncanny, as we can understand our own when reading these accounts of colonial violence, as the return of the repressed knowledge of the violence underlying the terror of modern society. In the same vein, we may think of representations of the Holocaust as being, by virtue of their expression of the same extreme violence, uncanny. Geoffrey Hartman notes that, for Jean-Francois Lyotard in *The Postmodern Condition*: “The postmodern differs from the modern not essentially but by projecting ‘the unrepresentable in presentation itself...[it] searches for

new presentations, not in order to enjoy them but in order to impart a stronger sense of the unrepresentable.’”⁵⁰ Lyotard is here writing about art, however, it is a point to be taken more generally. A way of thinking about the postmodern is that, post-Holocaust, the unrepresentable, the violence that in threat produces the terror that pervades the ordinary and guarantees realism, is always present. No longer on the colonial periphery, the awareness of it unsettles the system of representation itself.

The Holocaust of *Empire of the Senseless*

As I have remarked, *Empire of the Senseless* is not a realist text in the classic generic understanding. Nevertheless, the text still invokes the code of realism as it undermines that code. Equally, the text does not directly engage with the Holocaust. Rather, *Empire* can be read with the Holocaust, absent, working through it. In this way the text is post-modern in the way that I have defined that term above. Perhaps the most immediate experience of the Holocaust's determining absence is the sense of a loss of moral bearings in the book. Following Max Weber's typology, Zygmunt Bauman suggests that the Holocaust marks the triumph of instrumental rationality, that the eradication from the modern world of divinely claimed moral absolutes had the unforeseen consequence of allowing the possibility of an action such as the Holocaust.⁵¹ A key element of the discursive construction of the Holocaust has been its acceptance as a moral benchmark. In this way, then, the parade of sexual violation, incest, torture, violence, murder in *Empire* implies a loss of moral premises, a loss also implied in the post-Holocaust recognition of the consequences for an accepted, shared morality of the Nazi decision that European Jewry had to be destroyed.

The title of Acker's book echoes the French title of Nagisa Oshima's notorious Japanese film, released in 1976, called *Ai No Corrida*, translated into English from its French version as *Empire of the Senses*.⁵² Based on a true story, the film depicts the consuming sexual obsession that develops between a man and one of his servants, Sata, an obsession that leads to the infliction of great physical pain as a way of heightening pleasure, and finally the death of the master at the loving hands of Sata. In an online interview Slavoj Žižek has described this film as, “at the level of sex, the archetypal film of the twentieth century.” For Žižek the film shows: “the idea . . . that you become truly radical, and go to the end in a sexual encounter, when you practically torture each other to death. There must be extreme violence for that encounter to be authentic.”⁵³ Žižek uses *Empire of the Senses* as an illustration of his claim that what defines the twentieth century is a “passion for the real.” He expands on this:

That is to say, precisely because the universe in which we live is somehow a universe of dead conventions and artificiality, the only

authentic real experience must be some extremely violent, shattering experience. And this we experience as a sense that now we are back in real life.

These dead conventions include the established moral order undermined by instrumental rationality. In Žižek's formulation, extreme violence has become a way to achieve personal authentic experience. The way he outlines this argument suggests that, for him, what marks the twentieth century is that trauma has become the measure of the authentic for the subject—an implicitly Lacanian position. The question that this chapter will address later is whether the violence of *Empire of the Senseless* can, indeed, be understood as extreme, or whether it is merely transgressive. At this time, we can rework Žižek's argument for the insight that the Holocaust has become accepted as not only the benchmark of the moral but also the traumatic cultural marker of reality in a postmodern, post-Holocaust world where even the cultural understanding of what is real has become unsettled.

Acker has entitled the first section of the book, "Elegy for the World of the Fathers," a heading that can be read in the terms of Freud's understanding of the familial drama that he named the Oedipus complex. Reinforcing this reading, Thivai's name is what Thebes was called after its days of glory. In the Greek myth, Jocasta was queen of Thebes when she unknowingly married her son, Oedipus. Oedipus had, himself, murdered his father. These actions brought destruction upon Thebes. However, the subtitle also echoes the title of a well-known book by Irving Howe on life in the United States for the Jewish migrants from the Pale around the turn of the twentieth century, *World of Our Fathers*.⁵⁴ The blurb on the back of *Empire* makes this resonance even clearer. There we are told that: "Together and apart, [Abhor and Thivai] undertake an odyssey of carnage, a holocaust of the erotic, 'An elegy for the world of our fathers,' as Kathy Acker calls it." In both the Greek myth and the Holocaust, the murder of the father(s) destroyed a coherent and ordered world, a patriarchal world of moral certainty. Like Abhor, we should note that Thivai also has a Jewish heritage. He tells us, with one presumes Acker's humor, that: "My mom, cause she had been part Jewish, and cause I wasn't a girl so I couldn't marry a rich man, had wanted me to be a doctor."⁵⁵ That part-Jewishness would have been enough for Thivai too to have been murdered by the Nazis. When is this "world of the/our fathers," though? For Howe, it was, as I have mentioned, the pre-Holocaust world of Jewish migration to the United States. Much of his book examines the social life of these migrants during the first quarter of the twentieth century based on memoirs, newspapers, biographies and other sources. For Abhor and Thivai, though, the world of their fathers, as far as one can tell, would have been that of the Holocaust. From the beginning, then, *Empire* suggests the Holocaust as its unrepresented, indeed unspoken, reference.

Rothberg develops his theory of traumatic realism in relation to testimonial texts but claims a broader sweep for it. He writes:

This correlation between the demands and modalities of representation ["efforts of victims, bystanders, and those born after the Holocaust to engage with the legacy of specific historical events" plus "the crucial sour-aesthetic categories of realism, modernism and postmodernism"] arises from extensive engagement with all kinds of Holocaust-related texts including historical works, literary testimonies, philosophies, speculations, films, novels, museums, and television broadcasts.⁵⁶

At the heart of this theory of traumatic realism is indexicality. Rothberg argues that while some events, such as the Holocaust, are so extraordinary that they are not available for meaningful realist representation—events experienced as traumatic are the model here as the theory's name suggests—they can be referenced indexically. Thus, for example, Rothberg writes of the objects, such as the pile of victim's shoes, in the United States Holocaust Museum in Washington that: "The incompleteness of these objects is the point; they all gesture toward the absent and unrecoverable bodies of the dead."⁵⁷

How could such indexicality work in a fictional text, and one as violently confronting as *Empire of the Senseless*? Why, indeed, does this text, which is so thoroughly transgressive in a conventional sense, that is, in its depictions of acts generally considered transgressive, avoid narrativizing the Holocaust? We can begin by noting the theory of language adumbrated by the text's narrator. The section begins by critiquing the idea that "[n]onsense would attack the empire-making (empirical) empire of language, the prisons of meaning."⁵⁸ The reference in the final phrase is to Frederic Jameson's celebrated 1972 book, *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism*, which offered a Marxian account of Formalist and Structuralist approaches to literary theory.⁵⁹ The reference to empire not only suggests connections between colonialism and the modern practice of language, but also brings to mind the title of Acker's book. The senseless empire is the empire in which sense, and most importantly linguistic sense, and more generally the sense of modernity, is found to be lacking. The reference to Jameson's book suggests the connection between systematizing understandings of language in which meanings are founded on exclusion and the totalizing project of empires. The narrator goes on to offer a more Lacanian position asking: "What is the language of the 'unconscious'?" a question that reworks Lacan's well-known dictum that the unconscious is structured like a language. The text offers the answer:

Its primary language must be taboo, all that is forbidden . . . Language, on one level, constitutes a set of codes and social and historical

agreements. Nonsense doesn't *per se* break down the codes; speaking precisely that which the codes forbid breaks the codes.⁶⁰

Here we have a way of reading *Empire*, as a text that wishes to rupture certain existing codes by their relentless linguistic transgression. The code, we might say the discourse, of the Holocaust is not one of those that the text looks to disrupt. It is, rather, one on which the affect of the book is built, as indeed is the book's preoccupation with representation. The Holocaust remains, then, a site offering a purchase for moral critique. In this sense *Empire* works within the same problematic of representation as *Heart of Darkness*. What I am suggesting, then, is that, in the narrator's terms, while the intention may be to break open the codes, the transgression realized in the text only challenges the codes and makes "us," the readers, more aware of them. No bad thing, but not the way to an apocalyptic transformation.

Rothberg writes about a Grace Paley short story that centers on a survivor's concentration camp tattoo. He describes the tattoo as "the material trace of suffering that the survivor carries into the postwar world of the everyday, but it is not the suffering itself."⁶¹ He goes on: "The bearing of the tattoo, even as artefact of the Holocaust, is an example of the kind of indirect reference...whereby material objects stand in for the forceful absence of physical violence."⁶² Here, we are returned to violence as the marker of the extraordinary. Where, in Rothberg's argument, it is the violence of the Holocaust which is indexed by material objects, in *Empire* it is the Holocaust itself, with its extraordinary fracturing of modern life, which is indexed by the narrated, and in this sense banalized, transgressive violence of the text. At the same time, it is the unrepresented and, as we can now understand in a very specific sense unrepresentable, Holocaust that gives emotional and moral force to the violence represented in the text.

While the Holocaust pervades and underwrites *Empire*, it can be most clearly sensed in the section titled "Let the Algerians Take Over Paris." From the discussion of the CIA's MK-ULTRA drug and mind control program later in *Empire*, the Algerian takeover of Paris would have happened in the 1950s and 1960s.⁶³ This would have been some ten years or so after the Nazi takeover of Paris that, as I have mentioned earlier, is not acknowledged in *Empire*'s history. Within "Let the Algerians," however, we are told that Mackandal the leader of the revolution, built up his organization between 1981 and 1985 which is a generation after the Nazi occupation. Either way, the absent Holocaust inflects the meaning of this section.

In "Let the Algerians Take Over Paris" the unrepresented Holocaust, where the Nazis brought the excessive violence of the colonial order to Europe, is supplanted by the colonized themselves bringing colonial violence to modern Europe. This supplanting is also a return of the repressed. Imprisoned by the Vichy government and later by the

Germans, the former prime minister of France, Edouard Daladier, wrote that the Germans “would prefer a policy of ‘collaboration,’ to use a term in vogue in the French press,” because “this would guarantee Germany control over our principal industries...and reduce France to the state of a colony or a protectorate.”⁶⁴ After the 1940 Franco–German armistice the French government at Vichy notionally had sovereignty over both occupied and unoccupied France but governed only the unoccupied part. Collaborationist, the Vichy government fitted Daladier’s description and, after the war, left an unacknowledged feeling of anxiety in France about its status as a colonial power.

Jodey Castricano suggests that *Empire* can be classed in “postcolonial gothic,” a genre which “violently ruptures the ethos of Othering implicit in gothic fiction.”⁶⁵ He suggests that “*Empire of the Senseless* takes up the question of imperialism and colonialism where Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* leaves off.”⁶⁶ He adds:

A chapter entitled “Let the Algerians Take Over Paris” resonates with Kurtz’s mandate to “[e]xterminate the brutes” when Abhor recalls how the atrocities once perpetrated by the French in North Africa were continued in Paris by the Parisian and French governments, who, she says, “desired simply to exterminate the Algerian trash, the terrorists, the gypsies.”⁶⁷

Mackandal was an eighteenth-century revolutionary in San Domingue, now Haiti. Coming from a slave background, his partially successful plan was to poison the white French slave-owners. In *Empire*, mirroring the practices of the colonizers, extermination is a tactic used by Acker’s Mackandal who, now transferred to the colonizers’ capital and made leader of the Algerian uprising, one day, “arranged for the poisoning of every upper-middle and upper-class apartment in Paris.”⁶⁸

This depiction of the takeover by the colonized of the colonizer’s capital literalizes an idea of Jean-Paul Sartre in his Preface to Frantz Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth*, published in French in 1961 during the Algerian war for independence. Sartre writes that:

The union of the Algerian people causes the disunion of the French people; throughout the whole territory of the ex-mother-country, the tribes are dancing their war-dances. The terror has left Africa, and is settling here; for quite obviously there are certain furious beings who want to make us pay with our own blood for the shame of having been beaten by the native.⁶⁹

Here, Sartre’s concern is with the terrorist violence inflicted by the French neo-fascist OAS, Organisation Armée Secrète, within France. The OAS was committed to Algeria remaining under French authority. Sartre writes of this violence within metropolitan France as a transferral of the

violence that had been taking place since 1954 in Algeria. With the spread of this violence, Sartre goes on:

It's our turn to tread the path, step by step, which leads down to native level. But to become natives altogether, our soil must be occupied by a formerly colonized people and we must starve of hunger. This won't happen; for it's a discredited colonialism which is taking hold on us; this is the senile, arrogant master who will straddle us; here he comes, our mumbo-jumbo.⁷⁰

Sartre understands the violence in France as evidence of a decline in the quality of French humanist civilization. He imagines the French becoming "native," indigenous people occupied by a previously colonized power. Sartre's image is of a dialectical inversion; the colonized become colonizer and vice versa. However, this will not happen. Rather, France will be held in thrall by an old-fashioned and out-of-date colonialism, a nostalgic attempt to reprise the past in the present. In "Let the Algerians Take Over Paris," Sartre's transgressive fantasy, the taboo fear of colonial Europe, gets played out.

Where Acker, following Sartre, makes her point in an apocalyptic tone, we should recognize that there is an increasing presence of people from the old colonized countries in the European heartland of the west. As Jonathan Boyarin notes: "The colonized occupy the metropole as *Gastarbeiter* (guest workers) who sometimes overstay their welcome . . . and the ideology of the unified, mono-cultural nation-state begins to crack."⁷¹ There are other ways the colonized appear in the metropole, as migrants, and as asylum seekers, for example. Anyway, the effect is the same.

Earlier, I commented on Jardine's point that one thing which characterized the new French philosophies was the sense that the unrepresentable existed in the space between signifier and signified. I related this to a post-Holocaust unsettling of modern certainty, a certainty that had been based on systemic exclusion. Now, I can add that, in ideas, Algeria, or at least the left-radical *pieds-noirs*, can indeed be considered to have taken over Paris. For we can note that among those who were either raised in Algeria or worked there for a period of time, we can count Albert Camus, Louis Althusser, Jacques Derrida, Hélène Cixous, Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Francois Lyotard.⁷² Derrida and Cixous are also European-Jewish (as opposed, say, to Arab-Jewish) in ancestry.⁷³ It has been these thinkers who have pioneered the theoretical disruption of the modern order.

Absolute Violence and the Holocaust

In this book I have suggested that, for one, partial perspective on the Holocaust it should be understood in the frame of colonialism. In *The Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon, implicitly following Aimé Césaire,

writes: "Deportations, massacres, forced labor and slavery have been the main methods used by capitalism to increase its wealth, its gold or diamond reserves, and to establish its power. Not long ago Nazism transformed the whole of Europe into a veritable colony."⁷⁴ For Fanon it would seem, as for Césaire in *Discourse on Colonialism*,⁷⁵ the Nazi extermination of European Jewry, along with the treatment of Poles, Slavs, and other "inferior peoples," could be placed within a history of modern colonialism, indeed of colonial violence. I would suggest that the same understanding of the Holocaust as, at least partially, a colonial event marked by the extraordinary violence of colonial practice, informs *Empire*.

On Samira Kawash's reading, Fanon can be understood as distinguishing between two different kinds of violence. As she puts it: "instrumental violence and absolute violence are two ways in which violence emerges into and operates on a reality that is always constituted and conceived discursively."⁷⁶ Instrumental violence in Fanon's text, Kawash tells us, "is the violence of revolt and reversal, the violence whereby the colonized challenge and attempt to upend the domination that has oppressed them."⁷⁷ This is matched by, and indeed produced by, the everyday violence of the colonizer. Here, we see the exercise of violence, and terror, as a means of preserving the domination, in particular the hierarchical order of colonizer and colonized, which has been naturalized in European, modern society. Instrumental violence, for all its exercise of torture, assassination and so forth, is a violence of the everyday. It was the violence of the Algerian war of independence. It is not, for example, of the order of violence, what I earlier called extreme violence, that Taussig describes among the Putumayo, nor is it, for that matter, the violence of the Holocaust.

Absolute violence is:

the world-shattering violence of decolonization. Decolonization destroys both colonizer and colonized; in its wake, something altogether different and unknown, a "new humanity", will rise up . . . this violence shatters the very world that has determined the value and distinction of means and ends.⁷⁸

Absolute violence sweeps away the old order completely. It is not the violence that gains independence for the colonized while leaving the people in a reorganized, neo-colonial order. Unlike the reciprocal system of instrumental violence which exists within the modern order of representation, absolute violence, "is outside agency or representation . . . it interrupts and erupts into history and wrests history open to the possibility of a justice radically foreclosed by the colonial order of reality."⁷⁹ Representation needs to be understood here as a discursive construct founded in the modern project. Absolute violence would blast apart the modern, dialectical structure expressed in representation. Indeed, absolute violence, which may not even be violence as we (post)moderns, understand it, exists at the limit of realist representation.

Fanon, read through Kawash, is looking toward the future. I want to suggest that it is an equally unrepresentable violence that produces the colonized in the first place. This is the violence imposed on those outside the modern world, the violence, both literal and discursive, that produces them, or those who remain, as Other. This is the violence that decimated the peoples of the "New World," of the Congo and other places in Africa, the violence that reduced those named the "Aborigines" of Australia, and the violence of the Holocaust. This is the extreme violence that, in bringing peoples within representation produces the Other, and produces that Other as colonized. It is the violence that, through its consequence, terror, sutures signifier and signified, and produces the space of death. In doing so it is the violence that underlies and guarantees what we call modernity. It is also, though, as we can now understand, the absolute violence that, unrepresentable, can finish this dialectical system, finish the (post)modern order.

The modern understanding of apocalypse functions in terms of absolute violence. The imagining of apocalypse is through ontologizing violence. LaCapra makes a similar point in respect of Walter Benjamin's idea of divine violence: "Benjamin's later comment on the aestheticization of politics could be read as in part a self-critique, although it was not made to apply to the redemptive, politically sublime side of one variety of Marxism."⁸⁰ In modernity, the discourse of violence is basic to our understanding of fundamental social transformation whether that be religious or secular, Marxist. In this apocalyptic time, beyond modern rationality, beyond the problematic of representation, absolute violence is socially illuminating, revelatory.⁸¹ When absolute violence comes as an ending to the modern order based on terror, it offers a possibility for a new form of society, one beyond the discursive possibility of Otherness, of colonial genocide, of another Holocaust—of representation. At the end of the described, transgressive awfulness of *Empire*, Abhor tells us:

I now fully knew what I didn't want and what and whom I hated.
That was something.

And then I thought that, one day, maybe, there'd be a human society in a world which is beautiful, a society that wasn't just disgust.⁸²

Ultimately, the postrealism of *Empire* is limited by the determination of representation, the force of banalization in depiction. Like *Heart of Darkness*, *Empire* inevitably fails. Nevertheless, *Empire* offers us a text which makes "us" aware of the codes, the Law which instates the ordinary, the everyday and which gives *Empire* itself meaning. It realizes the post-Holocaust awareness of the pervasive extreme violence that enables representation, and underlies and defines what we call modernity, but it cannot, of course, show it.

CHAPTER SIX

Trauma and Memory in the Post-Holocaust West

“The disaster always takes place after having taken place”

Maurice Blanchot,
The Writing of the Disaster.

How to think about how the “West” has thought about itself? The production of “Europe” in its specificity, in its foundational production of its historical claim to difference from the Rest, from that which exists outside of its geographic/conceptual parameters, produces the conditions for the coming into existence of a discourse; the discourse that has come to be called trauma. The cultural experience that we call modernity, to be precise “Europe” as it comes into existence as the site of the modern world, frames the production of the experience that, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, was given that name “trauma.” We may think of trauma as palimpsest and epitome of modern understanding, the modern discourse that gives special meaning and limits to life in modernity. The category of trauma offers a way of thinking that which we cannot speak, either as individuals in their/our modern formation, or as a culture. In his meditation on the specter about which Karl Marx writes in *The Communist Manifesto* (“a specter is haunting Europe”) Jacques Derrida comments that:

...haunting is historical, but it is not *dated*, it is never docilely given a date in the chain of presents, day after day, according to the instituted order of a calendar. Ultimately, it does not come to, it does not happen to, it does not befall, one day, Europe, as if the latter, at a certain moment of history, had begun to suffer from a certain evil, to let itself be *inhabited* from the inside, that is, haunted by a foreign guest. Not that that guest is any less a stranger for always having occupied the domesticity of Europe. But there was no inside, there was nothing inside before it. The ghostly would displace itself like the movement of this history. Haunting would mark the very existence of Europe. It would open the space and relation to self of what is called by that name, at least since the Middle Ages.¹

The production of Europe opens a space and, in that opening, it produces a new discourse, a new experience, one that is silenced through a suturing; a denial, and for that matter a displacement onto the Rest, the Other, by way of the intellectual claims of the Enlightenment, of “progress,” of “scientific Truth,” of universal validity. It is in that denial that we find the haunting about which I am writing.

Derrida thinks of the specter as a revenant. The translator of *Specters of Marx*, Peggy Kamuf, notes: “A common term for ghost or specter, the *revenant* is literally that which comes back.”² Reading the specter of *The Communist Manifesto* against the ghost in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, Derrida argues that, “Everything begins in the imminence of a *reapparition*, but a *reapparition* of the specter as *apparition* for the first time in the play.”³ More generally, he remarks that: “A question of repetition, a specter is always a *revenant*. One cannot control its comings and goings because it *begins by coming back*.”⁴

If what we call trauma haunts the existence of Europe, an aspect of that is the sense of a constant return, a repetition of the unspeakable which is central to the identification of trauma. These repetitions are uncontrollable. It is not that trauma began to haunt that new construction, “Europe,” but that, with that new construction, the elements that we call “trauma” cohered together. The unspeakable itself underlies that construction and is known by its uncontrollable repetitions.

There is another, more specific way of thinking about Derrida’s revenant. For Georg Simmel, in his essay “The Stranger,” first published in German in 1908, as for Zygmunt Bauman in his discussion of the situation of the stranger in the modern nation-state in *Modernity and Ambivalence* (1991), the archetypal stranger is the Jew. Derrida’s revenant, the stranger who haunts Europe, has this same Jewish quality. Expelled, as we have seen, during the formation of “Europe,” the Jew is allowed to return but remains, always, a stranger in the ideally homogeneous European nation-states. In this reading of Derrida’s formulation, then, the Jew becomes the defining moment of the production of modernity—defining in the first instance at the time of Jewish expulsion but, then, defining when the Jew is allowed to return not, though, as a member of the European community of national citizens but as a stranger, tolerated but not thought of as really European. We have, then, already a connection between the Jew and trauma in European modernity.

Jacques Lacan places what has come to be called trauma at the heart of the human experience of the world. He writes that: “The function of the *tuché*, of the real as encounter—the encounter in so far as it may be missed, in so far as it is essentially the missed encounter—first presented itself in the history of psycho-analysis in a form that was in itself already enough to arouse our attention, that of the trauma.”⁵ Lacan is very precise here. He does not talk about trauma *per se*. Rather, he asserts that the encounter with the real was first understood in psychoanalysis in the terms of trauma; that is, that “trauma” identified the constellation of characteristics

that are the effect of the person's encounter with the real. He goes on rhetorically to ask: "Is it not remarkable that, at the origin of the analytic experience, the real should have presented itself in the form of that which is *unassimilable* in it—in the form of the trauma, determining all that follows, and imposing on it an apparently accidental origin?"⁶ The encounter is accidental because it is experienced as happening by chance and cannot be incorporated into the person's self-understanding.

It is this very unassimilability—expressed in unspeakability—which produces repetition. If Jews were expelled from Europe as/at the beginning of modernity, the destruction of these people claimed to be unassimilable repeats that expulsion and marks the end of modernity. Lacan locates repetition in "the very split that occurs in the subject in relation to the encounter,"⁷ between "the return to the real...and the consciousness reweaving itself."⁸ More profoundly, he says, repetition articulates the split between the person's subjectifying concern and "the solicitation of the gaze."⁹ This universalist understanding can be reworked as the experience of modern, individualist self-consciousness. As such, we find in Lacan's work the claim that, at the core of the modern experience lies what modernity came to identify as trauma. More, where Lacan makes the unassimilable encounter with the real the driving, traumatic moment of human existence, we can now acknowledge that the possibility of the production of this encounter lies in the historical formation of Europe, and the experience of this, that which underlies modernity.

It is not coincidental that trauma is named at the high point of modern self-confidence. Naming trauma began a process of seemingly domesticating it in its personal form as modern, individual experience. However, for reasons that should be becoming clear, trauma has always, ultimately, eluded theoretical resolution. The naming takes place in the latter part of the nineteenth century, in the period when doubts begin to emerge about the modern project, questions about slavery, about the impoverishment caused by industrial capitalism, about women's rights; about, that is, the triplet on which modern identity has been conventionally considered to be formed, race, class, and gender. Trauma, though, is a twentieth-century preoccupation. As Cathy Caruth writes: "The centrality and complexity of trauma in our century was first most profoundly addressed in two important and controversial works by Freud, who was, of course, Jewish, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* and *Moses and Monotheism*."¹⁰ This was less than a generation before the event that has now come to be thought of by philosophers such as Jean-Francois Lyotard as defining the end of that modern project. Trauma has become the master-trope for understanding the experience of that event, the Holocaust—the event that, as I have argued in chapter 3, brings the traumatically overdetermined practices of the colonial perimeter, the psychological borderlands of "Europe," within that literal, and moral, space. Freud's four sisters were murdered in the Holocaust, two

in Treblinka, one in Theresienstadt and one in Auschwitz. Indeed, as we shall see, not only is the experience of those who lived through the Holocaust identified in terms of trauma but so also is the European, and perhaps more generally Western, society of the post-Holocaust period. This does not make the unspeakable speakable. Rather, while certain events understood to be unspeakable become culturally speakable over generational distance, the Holocaust, again, is the emblematic example, the unspeakable returns, repeats, reappears, in other places. We are, though, now always aware of trauma's presence—at the very least in the everyday traumas of ordinary people. It is in this context, as the return, repetition, of the defining traumatizing moment, that the Holocaust, itself the European discursive construction of the unspeakable, has become a defining historical moment.

Witnessing

The discourse of the Holocaust emerged in the 1960s and, especially, the 1970s.¹¹ As Dominick LaCapra writes:

The traumatic event is repressed or denied and registers only belatedly (*nachträglich*) after the passage of a certain period of latency. This effect of belatedness has of course been a manifest aspect of the Holocaust as it impinged not only on Germany and Germans but also on other nations and groups.¹²

Its uniqueness lies in its exemplary acting out within the space of European modernity of the trauma that haunts that space. From this point of view the awfulness of the Holocaust lies in its production as an unassimilable, unspeakable event. It was during the period of the discursive construction of the Holocaust that there also evolved the emphasis on “witnessing” as the preferred way of transferring into cultural circulation the knowledge of the events that, grouped together, came to be defined by “the Holocaust.” LaCapra has commented on this development:

Testimonial witnessing typically takes place in a belated manner often after the passage of many years, and it provides insight into lived experience and its transmission in language and gesture. So great has been the preoccupation with testimony and witnessing [about the Holocaust] that they have in some quarters almost displaced or been equated with history itself.¹³

At the level of the personal, witnessing is deeply imbricated with the discourse of trauma. Shoshana Felman has asked: “*Why has testimony in effect become at once so central and so omnipresent in our recent cultural accounts of ourselves?*”¹⁴ Her answer is that there is “a crisis of truth which, in

proceeding from contemporary trauma, has brought the discourse of the testimony to the fore of the contemporary cultural narrative."¹⁵ Felman attributes a special quality to testimony. She writes that:

To testify—to *vow to tell*, to *promise* and *produce* one's own speech as material evidence for truth—is to accomplish a *speech act*, rather than to simply formulate a statement. As a performative speech act, testimony in effect addresses what in history is *action* that exceeds any substantialized significance, and what in happenings is *impact* that dynamically explodes any conceptual reifications and any constative delimitations.¹⁶

Transcending narrative, the performative becomes a kind of repetition of the trauma. In this way, the excessiveness of performative testimony expresses the excessiveness, the unspeakability, of the trauma, in particular for Felman the Holocaust. Testimony operates as a kind of representational recuperation, offering truth through the breakdown not only of narrative but of the conventionalized meanings of words themselves. Now that trauma is experienced consciously as the pervasive cultural psycho-social form, testimony has become the only way of truthful reproduction—or so Felman would have it.

Writing in response to the release of Stephen Spielberg's *Schindler's List* in 1994, Yosefa Loshitzky argues that: "Today, the desire to represent... the Holocaust is motivated by a deep anxiety nurtured by the gradual disappearance of Holocaust survivors—the last eyewitnesses to a catastrophe—from the land of the living."¹⁷ Loshitzky argues that Spielberg's film "may thus be seen as the great locus of this angst." The film evinces a restructuring of the nexus between memory, history, fiction and the Holocaust at a time when all three signature terms are themselves being questioned. Here, then, is the reason for Felman's sense of urgency: how to hand on the trauma of the Holocaust to the next generation. As Walter Benn Michaels puts it in his commentary on Felman's argument:

The point of the performative, then, is that, itself an event, it "transmits" rather than represents the events to which it testifies.... And just as the transformation of history into memory made it possible for people who did not live through slavery to remember it, so the transformation of texts that "make sense" of the Holocaust into events that "enact" it makes it possible for people who did not live through the Holocaust to survive it.¹⁸

Or so the theory goes.

For Loshitzky, *Schindler's List* marks a critical moment in the transference of responsibility for remembrance of the Holocaust from the generation who lived through it to the "second generation." I put this term in scare quotes because it, too, is being reified. From a seemingly straightforward

definition derived in some measure from the therapeutic community where it means the children of survivors, of those who had some direct relation to the events of the Holocaust such as having been concentration camp inmates, the term has begun to take on more epochal overtones. These associate “second generation” with a recognition that the second and, of course, subsequent generations will not have been, themselves, witnesses to the Holocaust, that by the second generation, the Holocaust, having emerged as a powerful discourse not only describing the Nazi Judeocide but also bearing absolutist moral concerns, has become an aspect of a collective Western memory. Thus, who is “second generation” or, now, “third generation” is increasingly problematic. Indeed, more recently, Loshitzky has suggested that:

If we expand the narrow, psychological definition of who is entitled to inclusion within the category of the second generation, then we may as well talk about a second generation “sensibility” that transcends the empirical status of the “real” children of Holocaust survivors and refugees.¹⁹

This is not to say that the children, and grandchildren, of survivors do not have their own quite identifiable problems. Rather, it is to recognize that members of the post-Holocaust generation(s) of Jews have certain things in common. We need to acknowledge also a complex interaction between personal experience within the family and other memories/knowledge derived from a multitude of sources that circulate and are inflected within the nation and, more generally, within the West. As James Young writes, in connection with artists, but the point is a more general one:

It is a generation no longer willing, or able, to recall the Holocaust separately from the ways it has been passed down: “What happens to the memory of history when it ceases to be testimony?” asks Alice Yeager Kaplan. It becomes memory of the witness’s memory, a vicarious past.²⁰

If second generation artists feel unable to approach the Holocaust without also tackling the means by which they came to knowledge of it, it is the case that, for the generations born after the Holocaust, all knowledge of that event, including its construction as the “Holocaust,” or “Shoah,” must be mediated through established cultural understandings.

I would suggest that, in this post-Holocaust era, one of the defining features of membership of the West is a knowledge of, and a sense of a special relationship to, the Holocaust. Indeed, if we are able to describe the post-Holocaust era as post-traumatic society, a description that I will discuss in more detail below, then we have to recognize that, in some sense, all those, not just Jews, who have grown up in the West after what we now call the Holocaust are members of post-Holocaust generations.

The question then is, should the sense of being descended from survivors be limited to Jews? After all, it was the Jews that the Nazis attempted to exterminate.

At a national level the second and third generation relationship to this new, but now naturalized discourse of the Holocaust varies greatly. For example, writing from a psychoanalytic viewpoint, Eric Santner argues that, in Germany, "the second generation [of post-Holocaust Germans] inherited not only the unmourned traumas of the parents but also the psychic structures that impeded mourning in the older generation in the first place."²¹ Such a point of view presupposes an obligation, perhaps better a necessity, on the part of Germans to mourn. This, itself, is a consequence of a view of the Nazi Judeocide imposed by the Allied victors of World War II, and a view deeply foundational in the discourse of the Holocaust. After all, the Nazi position was fundamentally the opposite.²² For example, in his notorious speech at Posen in 1943, Heinrich Himmler said of the Jews that: "We had the moral right, we had the duty to our own people, to kill this people which wanted to kill us." The Allied claim that genocide perpetrated by the Germans is morally unjustifiable, in turn legitimates the conventional, Enlightenment understanding of the modern project in terms such as "progress" and "development."

In the United States the use of the Holocaust as a moral touchstone has been linked with the construction of Jews as Holocaust victims. Peter Novick argues that as groups in the U.S. started to identify ethnically and racially from the 1960s on, they did so in terms of victim-hood. He writes that it was, "in this cultural climate that virtually celebrated victim-hood, that efforts to firm up faltering Jewish identity were mounted."²³ Novick goes on to explain that:

The "culture of victimization" didn't *cause* Jews to embrace a victim identity based on the Holocaust; it *allowed* this sort of identity to become dominant, because it was, after all, virtually the only one that could encompass those Jews whose faltering Jewish identity produced so much anxiety [within the American Jewish community] about Jewish survival.²⁴

Such a usage of the Holocaust was only possible because of the popular circulation and naturalization of the Holocaust discourse.

The move from a rhetoric of the victim to the survivor is fundamentally related to the acceptance within the Jewish community, but also more generally, of the discourse of the Holocaust. Novick describes how: "The decision by Jewish agencies in the 1970s to initiate Holocaust programming seems to have been taken without much input from survivors."²⁵ However, Novick also explains that in the late 1960s a change began to take place, from a "shift in the popular archetype of Holocaust victim from Anne Frank (assimilated, universalist in orientation, sheltered by Gentiles) to Elie Wiesel (of Hasidic background, Zionist and particularist

in orientation, abandoned by Gentiles).”²⁶ This shift is, most importantly, from the victim—Frank was killed—to the survivor—Weisel was not. Jeffrey Shandler writes that: “Beginning in the mid-1970s, the community of Holocaust survivors attracted new interest on the part of the American public. Terrance des Pres’s *The Survivor: An Anatomy of Life in the Death Camps* and Dorothy Rabinowitz’s *New Lives: Survivors of the Holocaust Living in America*, both published in 1976, offered portraits of survivors that stress their special tenacity in the face of persecution and the success of their efforts to create new families and communities in the postwar period.”²⁷ The survivor could be privileged because there was developing a clear sense of what had been survived—the Holocaust. Being thought of as surviving concentration camps when what had transpired was understood as simply another, if huge, pogrom was not special. Surviving could become special when what had been survived was the more or less unique, more or less unrepresentable, genocidal destruction of a people. No wonder then, that Novick suggests that: “It was the *symbol* of the survivor—the survivor as emblematic of Jewish suffering, Jewish memory, Jewish endurance—rather than the highly diverse reality of survivors, that made the greatest contribution to Holocaust commemoration.”²⁸ The qualities ascribed to the Holocaust are mirrored in those given to “the survivor.”

If *Schindler’s List* marks a public, Western transition to second generation concerns, the public naturalization of the Holocaust discourse can be heuristically identified with the screening of the American television miniseries, *Holocaust*, in 1978. Shandler writes that:

Discussions of the *Holocaust* miniseries in the American public forum was renewed the following year [1979] with reports on its broadcast in Israel, South Africa, and several West European countries: England, France, Austria, Italy, Spain, and especially West Germany . . . (International broadcasts of the miniseries played a leading role in popularising the use of the term “Holocaust” for the Nazi persecution of European Jewry in other languages—French *le holocauste*, German *der Holocaust*, Spanish *el holocausto* and so on.)²⁹

It was, as Shandler notes, in the wake of the screening of *Holocaust* that there was an efflorescence in “the recording of hundreds of testimonies by survivors and other witnesses to the Holocaust on videotape.”³⁰ The context, here, was the discursive construction of the Holocaust, as compared, for example, to thinking of what happened in terms of pogroms, and the association of the Holocaust with the murder of an entire people, with what come to be called genocide. Shandler identifies the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale University that began videotaping survivors in the late 1970s and had some 1,600 testimonies on tape by 1990. By 2002, this number had increased to 4,200 video testimonies. As is well-known, Spielberg ploughed back profits from *Schindler’s List* into the Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation, started

in 1994, a foundation devoted to the videotaping of Holocaust survivors wherever in the world they could be found. To date, it has videoed over 51,000 survivor testimonies. Alan Mintz notes that, as of the summer of 1999, the Shoah Foundation had collected 116,593 hours of testimony: "If a viewer watched eight hours a day five days a week, it would take fifty-six years to view the entire archive."³¹ Shandler implies that the *Holocaust* miniseries provided a stimulus for the taping of testimonies because of the negative reception of the fictional account and a desire to set the record straight. Rather, I would suggest, the massive increase in testimonial witnessing was made possible because of the new public acceptance of Holocaust discourse that offered a site to bring together the multitude of varied events and experiences that are now understood to make up the Holocaust. Moreover, once this discourse was allied to that of trauma, in the 1980s, witnessing became a way of validating the behaviors of survivors as traumatic. In other words, the acceptance of the discursive construction of the Holocaust provided a space in which those who lived through the events subsumed in the discourse could speak about their experiences. At the same time, the angst over the natural attrition of the survivors, identified by Loshitzky and reflected in Felman's ideas, has reinforced the attempt to expand, and make as complete as possible, the archive of recorded testamentary memory.

How to read this archive of memory? Lawrence Langer ends his influential discussion of the videotaped interviews in the Fortunoff Archive by suggesting that: "For the former victims, the Holocaust is a communal wound that cannot heal. This is the wailing subtext of their testimonies, wailing beneath their surface lives."³² The testimonies express a communal wound for the Jewish generation retrospectively identified as that of the Holocaust and, we might add, for later generations defined by the Holocaust. From this perspective, the archive is experienced as a phantom, a revenant—or, at least, is composed of interviews with a generation of witnesses increasingly deceased who, in their taped form, appear as revenants. Commenting on Tasso's story of Tancred unwittingly killing his beloved Clorinda, a story retold by Freud in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Caruth writes: "As Tasso's story dramatizes it, the repetition at the heart of catastrophe—the experience that Freud will call 'traumatic neuroses'—emerges as the unwitting re-enactment of an event that one cannot simply leave behind."³³ For Felman, reenactment is a deliberate way of ensuring that the trauma of the Holocaust is repeated in the next generation. The Holocaust, as Langer sees it, is experienced by the generation of witnesses as an unhealable wound in the Jewish community. However, the catastrophe is increasingly constructed as something more general, as an irreparable gash in the seamless speakability that is rational European modernity and its philosophical expression, the Enlightenment: a marker—the marker—of a semiotic crisis located in the Holocaust as the epochal repetition of a foundational trauma. Thus, the Holocaust has become the defining communal wound of the West.

Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok, psychologists who were themselves, as Elizabeth Bellamy tells us, Holocaust survivors:³⁴

[reconfigure] the Freudian unconscious as a psychic “crypt,” a kind of tomb or vault harboring the not fully confronted “phantoms” or secrets of the analysand’s earlier family history. For Abraham and Torok, traumatic symptoms arise not because of the repressive demands of the Oedipus Complex, but because of unspeakable secrets inherited from an earlier generation—secrets the analysands cannot fully repress, but cannot fully confront either.³⁵

Bellamy describes this crypt as marking, “the trace of the ghost, or ‘ghost-effect’ within the unconscious where trauma and memory converge.”³⁶ She suggests a connection between these Holocaust survivors’ theoretical elaboration of the crypt and the silencing of the survivors in the decades immediately following the Holocaust. Abraham and Torok associate the handing on of trauma with unquiet death—tombs harboring phantoms. As Nicholas Rand notes:

the psychoanalytic idea of the phantom concurs, on the level of description, with Roman, Old-Norse, Germanic, and other lore, according to which only certain categories of the dead return to torment the living: those who were denied the rite of burial or died an unnatural, abnormal death, were criminals or outcasts, or suffered injustice in their lifetime.³⁷

In Western thought, revenants such as Hamlet’s father’s ghost can be the consequence of murder. They witness to an immoral act that requires justice, moral resolution. This is the injunction that Hamlet’s father’s revenant gives his son. It should not surprise that Abraham published a paper in which he recast the end of Shakespeare’s play—though his recasting has the revenant as having deceived his son.³⁸ European modernity also passed unspeakable secrets down the generations, revenants that never came into the light until the acting out that has become known as the Holocaust.

In the archives of videotaped interviews, the experience of the revenant is repeated. Abraham has written of transgenerational haunting. He describes how:

The phantom is a formation of the unconscious that has never been conscious—for good reason. It passes—in a way yet to be determined—from the parent’s unconscious into the child’s... The phantom’s periodic and compulsive return lies beyond the scope of symptom-formation in the sense of a return of the repressed; it works like a ventriloquist, like a stranger within the subject’s own mental topography.³⁹

In these videotapes those who were silent for so long get to speak. The archive fixes a compulsive return of generational memory, a testimonial haunting of the Jews but also, and definitionally, of those who understand themselves as “European,” as (post)modern now understood as post-Holocaust, that will continue for as long as these archives exist.

There is, then, a haunting *by* the dead Jews for whom the survivors stand in their testimonies. Bellamy thinks through Lyotard’s philo-Semitism. Discussing *Heidegger and “the jews”* she writes that:

What we discover, then, is that Lyotard’s insistence on “the jews” as the “unrepresentable” may have less to do with a “mourning” for Western anti-Semitism than with his ongoing celebration of the sublime as that which refuses to let itself be inscribed in the “aesthetic memory” of the West. As an “unform,” as an “absence” of form, “the jews” have all along been pointing to “the aesthetics of shock” that constitute Lyotard’s sublime.⁴⁰

She argues that,

it is important to observe that in the midst of his philo-Semitic and affective expressions of sympathy for the suffering of the young [Elie] Wiesel in Auschwitz and Buchenwald, Lyotard’s discourse of “the jews”—who are now (despite his earlier insistence that “the jews” are not a “nation,” a “politics,” or a “religion”) synonymous with the real, historical Jews of the Holocaust—ends up recapitulating a neo-Hegelian aesthetics that has encrypted within it an exclusion of the Jew.⁴¹

Where, through modernity, the Jews were so long excluded from Western history, from Hegel’s dialectic of progress, the dead Jews of the Holocaust enter that history to haunt the post-Holocaust West and deconstruct its exclusive certainties. It is in this way that “the jews” and the Jews become, together, the Jewish foundation of the Western postmodern.

The Discourse of Trauma

The discourse of trauma is fundamentally, and inevitably from what I have been arguing, modern. It emerges in the second half of the nineteenth century. For one thing trauma, as a description of a psychological state, requires an understanding of the subject that is to some degree Cartesian; as having a “mind” and a “body.” We shall return to this. As Ruth Leys tells us, “trauma” “was originally the term for a surgical wound conceived on the model of a rupture of the skin or protective envelope of the body resulting in a catastrophic global reaction in the entire organism.”⁴² More, as Leys notes, and this is typical of understandings of modern, scientific

knowledge, experts in Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) think of it “as a timeless diagnosis, the culmination of a lineage that is seen to run from the past to the present in an interrupted yet continuous way.”⁴³ What I am arguing is the reverse. That trauma is a modern discourse that offers a way of understanding the formation of modern and postmodern, where this may be defined as post-Holocaust and, indeed, post-traumatic, European society and, also, how modern and postmodern individuals experience events that rend their identities.

The founding site for the beginnings of an understanding of a psychological state to which the term “trauma” has come to be applied is traditionally the work of the British physician John Erichsen. During the 1860s, Erichsen “identified the trauma syndrome in victims suffering from the fright of railway accidents and attributed the distress to shock or concussion of the spine.”⁴⁴ In this formulation, the collection of mental symptoms linked to the idea of trauma was thought of as the effect of a particular kind of physical damage. Ian Hacking tells us that the injury that used to be called “railway spine” is what we now call “whiplash.”⁴⁵ The suggestion was that a specific sort of intense and unexpected physical shock would affect the nervous system of the individual producing a syndrome of mental and physical effects. Such was the association with railway accidents that not only did Erichsen write a book called *On Railway and Other Injuries to the Nervous System*, published in 1866, but, a year later, Edwin Morris published *A Practical Treatise on Shock after Surgical Operations and Injuries, with Special Reference to Shock Caused by Railway Accidents*. By the 1860s, the railway had become a common, and most of all fast, means of mechanical transportation. From its discursive origin, then, trauma was associated with the distinctive practices of modernity. Later, trains would come to figure as one of the abiding images of the Holocaust, a signifier of the industrialization of a people’s extermination.

There is a further connection with railways. Hacking makes the point that: “The railroad created the accident.”⁴⁶ What he means is that, with the development of the railway, there was the possibility for new, massive disasters because of the engineering that was required, cuttings collapsing, boilers exploding, and the like. Consequently, “accident” took on a new, pejorative meaning of “something sudden, *bad*, harmful, and destructive.”⁴⁷ With this in mind, Lacan’s remark that personal trauma originates in an accidental encounter with the Real is given an historical context.

Lays writes that it was the Berlin neurologist Paul Oppenheim who, subsequent to Erichsen’s work, described the traumatic syndrome as a distinct entity. He “gave it the name ‘traumatic neurosis’ and ascribed the symptoms to undetectable organic changes in the brain.”⁴⁸ Hacking offers examples of cases from the 1870s in France where terror or revulsion were understood to have caused a variety of mental problems including amnesia. These cases were described in terms of “moral trauma.”⁴⁹ What is interesting about this identification for our purposes here is the perception of trauma being produced in an individual as the result of an extreme

disturbance of the moral order. Around the turn of the century a number of researchers including Charcot, Janet, Binet, Prince, Breuer, and Freud increasingly used trauma:

to describe the wounding of the *mind* [*sic*] brought about by sudden, unexpected, emotional shock. The emphasis began to fall on the hysterical shattering of the personality consequent on a situation of extreme terror or fright.⁵⁰

As Leys goes on to write: "Hypnotic catharsis thus emerged as a technique for solving a 'memory crisis' that disturbed the integrity of the individual under the stresses of modernity."⁵¹ We should remember that the idea of the individual is itself a modern construction. Freud's work not only placed trauma at the basis of mental disturbance, it also feminized, domesticated and internalized trauma. Where Freud's early seduction theory gave trauma a place as an effect of what we would call sexual abuse, his later psychologization of these claims in his formulation of the Oedipus Complex helped to emphasize the importance of the mental component in the construal of trauma. This is part of a movement that, in Leys' phrase, interiorizes trauma.⁵² As Freud and Breuer wrote, in 1895 in *Studies on Hysteria* in what became a most celebrated phrase: "hysterics suffer mainly from reminiscences."

World War I was a watershed in modernity. While, perhaps, the Russo-Japanese war can be called the first industrialized war, World War I was the first industrialized war to be fought on European soil. Eric Leed argues that: "Neurosis was a psychic effect not of war in general but of industrialized war in particular."⁵³ As early as 1916 a British neurophysician, M. D. Eder, wrote that: "From the combatant's point of view this has been described as industrial warfare, from the medical point of view it might be described as nerve warfare."⁵⁴ World War I produced a quantum leap in the quantity of neurosis. As Hacking writes: "Studies of shell shock (Britain) and traumatic neurosis (Germany) became critical during the 1914–1918 war, but of course such effects were well-known before then."⁵⁵ Omer Bartov argues that:

The trauma of World War I had a profound effect on European conceptualizations of history and memory; visions of the future were permeated by images of the past, some lamentably lost in time, others etched in the mind as moments of horror and destruction, marking an irreparable break that inevitably diminished trust in progress.⁵⁶

World War I may have been culturally traumatizing and we have to recognize that it functioned to transform modern cultural understandings of the past and its relationship to the present. It also produced in large numbers of participants a variety of symptoms that many, including Freud, felt were best thought about in the terms of trauma.

In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, published in 1920, Freud rethought his metapsychology to include trauma. Indeed, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, with its introduction of the death drive, is not only, as is often said, Freud's revision of his metapsychology in light of the tremendous loss of human life in World War I, it is also a meditation on trauma. Freud gets to his discussion by outlining the pleasure principle and then enjoining his readers: "let us go a step further."⁵⁷ He then begins by outlining the traumatic: "We describe as 'traumatic' any excitations from outside which are powerful enough to break through the protective shield."⁵⁸ Two pages later he paraphrases this definition and goes on: "This would seem to reinstate the old, naive theory of shock, in apparent contrast to the later and psychologically more ambitious theory which attributes aetiological importance not to the effects of mechanical violence but to fright and the threat to life."⁵⁹ Freud goes on to explain that these two views can be reconciled. At the basis of this reconciliation is fright. This new understanding of trauma gives it back its quality as the effect of external stimuli.

It is in the context of Freud's new elaboration of trauma as a possible experience in everyday life in modernity that he outlines his theory of the compulsion to repeat. Freud had already discussed repetition as one of the sites of the experience of the uncanny and, in "The Uncanny," had referred readers to another work in which he discusses the compulsion to repeat in detail. This work was *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, published a year later. In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Freud discusses dreams that, rather than being in some way allied to the pleasure principle, are connected with traumatic neuroses. They arise, Freud tells us, "in obedience to the compulsion to repeat."⁶⁰ For Freud this compulsion is linked to the idea that, more fundamental than the pleasure principle, "*an instinct is an urge inherent in organic life to restore an earlier state of things.*"⁶¹ Freud also restates the point he had made in *Psycho-Analysis and War Neuroses* (1919), that "'war neuroses' . . . may well be traumatic neuroses which have been facilitated by a conflict of the ego."⁶² Without letting go of his established psycho-sexual system, in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* Freud gives a new status to trauma. He achieves this by linking it on the one hand with a regressive drive more basic than the libido, the so-called death drive, and, on the other, with the syndromes experienced by soldiers in World War I. It is Freud's universalist formulation of repetition in the death drive, a drive more fundamental than the pleasure principle, which, of course, formed the basis for Lacan's later reworking that I have already discussed. Revising Freud, we could say that what he appreciated was the centrality of repetition, and of the unassimilable, to the modern world. Abraham remarks that, "the work of the phantom coincides in every respect with Freud's description of the death instinct."⁶³ The onto-social status that Freud gives to repetition should also remind us of trauma, the prefigurative modern experience, as itself the revenant that, embodied in the Jews, haunts Europe.

Traumatic Fracture and the Holocaust

The formal medical acceptance of the syndrome of trauma finally took place after the Vietnam War. Leys writes that:

it was largely as a result of an essentially political struggle by psychiatrists, social workers, activists and others to acknowledge the post-war sufferings of the Vietnam War veteran that the third edition of the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (1980) accorded the traumatic syndrome, or PTSD, official recognition for the first time.⁶⁴

While this connection is not to be doubted, we should remember that, in the United States especially, a social shift toward a politics of victimhood had been taking place over the previous ten to twenty years. The recognition of PTSD enabled a claim to be made for present mental disorder based on a much earlier traumatic experience. Equally, when understood socially, PTSD gave particular groups a legitimation for the present generation's circumstances based on a previous generation's traumatizing treatment.

Leys makes the important point that trauma was accepted medically, and for that matter socially, in relation to Vietnam War veterans rather than Holocaust survivors.⁶⁵ I have now suggested one reason why this might have been the case. Leys goes on to write that:

...the process of viewing the literature of the Holocaust through the lens of Vietnam and P.T.S.D. has produced a simplification that works to the benefit of the former, in the sense that it can now be seen to have contributed directly to the development of current research on P.T.S.D. For these reasons, the Holocaust now appears, retroactively so to speak, not only to have been *the* [*sic*] crucial trauma of the century but also the one that can be fully understood only in the light of our knowledge of P.T.S.D.⁶⁶

In the aftermath of World War II the Jewish survivors of the concentration and death camps found themselves in a situation where they were unable to speak, or, perhaps better, were unable to make themselves heard. Those who sought psychological help were treated in terms of their individual experiences. However, as this quotation shows, the Holocaust, newly emerging as a discourse during this period, has come to haunt the cultural acceptance of trauma. To put it in individual terms, the Holocaust survivor has become the archetype of the traumatized individual.

Trauma is deeply imbricated in Holocaust thought both in terms of individual experience and as a chiasmic social moment. One of the discursive developments that made this complex imbrication possible was

the connection between the idea of trauma and death, a connection that has always been implicit in definitions of trauma but which, as we have seen, Freud theorized in a way which opened the possibility of a social application of trauma to describe a kairotic moment, a disjuncture in societal history. Freud, indeed, prefigured this development in his description of the founding of society out of the primal horde in *Totem and Taboo*, first published in 1912/13. Here, the act that marks the transition into society, the killing of the horde's patriarch by his sons, is experienced by them as a traumatizing and guilt-ridden exercise. As Freud writes:

The patriarchal horde was replaced in the first instance by the fraternal clan, whose existence was assured by the blood tie. Society was now based on the sense of guilt and the remorse attaching to it; while morality was based partly on the exigencies of this society and partly on the penance demanded by the sense of guilt.⁶⁷

In Freud's understanding, not only is society founded on a traumatizing murder but the guilt for this murder is repeated down the generations. Where the sons eat their murdered father in a totemic feast that, Freud argues, was itself "a repetition and a commemoration of this memorable and criminal deed,"⁶⁸ he goes on to explain that:

Robertson Smith [the Biblical scholar] has shown us that the ancient totem meal recurs in the original form of sacrifice. The meaning of the act is the same: sanctification through participation in a common meal. The sense of guilt, which can only be allayed by the solidarity of all the participants, also persists.⁶⁹

Freud writes that religion itself is founded on the persistence of guilt, handed down from generation to generation, over that originating murder. Thus, if murder marks the origin of society as based in exogamy then the trauma of that action is acted out repetitively and underpins the continuity of social order. I have remarked elsewhere that Freud's universalistic story can be understood as a particular description of the experience of the modern state.⁷⁰ In its preoccupation with murder, death, guilt, repression and commemoration, and repetition, elements that include those central to the constellation identified as trauma, Freud is also mythically invoking the origins of the European experience—or, to invest one of the central metaphors of this piece, Freud's narrative is haunted by Europe's foundation. The mythic murder at the beginning of society, of Europe, which in actuality can be read as the destruction of Europe's Jewish communities, lends affective charge to the traumatizing (attempted) murder of an entire people, at least within that Europe, that is understood in the Holocaust construed as genocide—a mirroring which bookends modernity thought of as an Enlightenment project.

In their Introduction to *Tense Past* Paul Antze and Michael Lambek argue that we think of our lives as narratives and that those narratives are ordered by cultural conventions. They suggest that "traumas offer a way of inserting a radical, often transformative break in the flow of a life narrative."⁷¹ Similarly, the narrativization of late-nineteenth- and twentieth-century Western history increasingly makes use of trauma as a way of thinking through what is claimed as a fundamental transformation in social experience. Moreover, the claim is not just that there has been a trauma, such as World War I, which marks a caesura between periods but, in concert with the much more epistemic argument that there has been a transition from the modern to the postmodern, from modernity to postmodernity, so it is now increasingly claimed that we live in a traumatized world. Thus, for example, in "Wound Culture," Mark Seltzer uses a quotation from J. G. Ballard's Introduction to his novel *Crash* as the basis for his own argument:

"In the past we have always assumed that the *external* world around us has *represented* reality, and that the *inner* worlds of our minds, its dreams, hopes, ambitions, *represented* the world of fantasy and imagination. These roles, it seems to me have been reversed." This reversal of the real, along the axis of representation, is . . . one way of describing the switching between inside and outside that is called trauma: the subject in a state of shock who appears, at the same time, as the subject shot through by the social.⁷²

Here the discourse of trauma operates as a defining model for understanding what has become a general experience, the loss of that modern distinction between the public and the private which, experientially understood, is the loss of a self-conscious distinction between the subject and the social—the modern site of the production of identity. Indeed, a little further on Seltzer quotes Mary Ann Doane commenting on "the theorization of modernity as trauma or shock."⁷³ Here, the modern as traumatic bleeds into the postmodern.

In this kind of thinking, the Holocaust has become an ontological marker. Thus, for example, Lawrence Langer has written that:

before 1939 imagination was always in advance of reality, but after 1945 reality had outdistanced the imagination so that nothing the artist conjured could equal in intensity or scope the improbability of *l'univers concentrationnaire*.⁷⁴

Here, as early as 1975, the Holocaust, invoked by way of the title of David Rousset's 1946 book, is imaged as something beyond artistic imagination. We have, then, a version of Ballard's more generally couched concern, that fantasy and the external world have somehow become reversed. However, Langer is not making a direct connection between the Holocaust/concentration camp and trauma.

Narcissism and the Holocaust

Andreas Huyssen, writing in a book concerned with Holocaust memorials, starts from a different position, the anxiety over memory, and in particular forgetting, or the loss of a sense of the past, which is argued to be a characteristic of postmodernity. We will return to this argument about memory later. Here, my concern is with the way the Holocaust gets reified and constructed as a transformative moment. Huyssen writes:

the postmodern debate about amnesia locks in with the memory of the Holocaust. The French philosopher Jean-Francois Lyotard has gone so far as to equate the post-war Germans' amnesia and repression vis-à-vis the Holocaust with the failure of Western civilization, in general, to practice anamnesis, to reflect on its constitutive inability to accept difference, otherness, and to draw the consequences from the insidious relationship between enlightenment modernity and Auschwitz.⁷⁵

In this argument the Holocaust, which, preserving its discursive history, Lyotard has synecdochally described as "Auschwitz," is the climactic moment in the dark side of modernity, the West's obsession with homogeneity, with sameness. Huyssen's primary concern here is with the Germans', and the West's more general, lack of anamnesis.

In the article of Lyotard's to which Huyssen refers, "Ticket to a New Decor," Lyotard connects anamnesis to mourning. He writes that Germans:

imposed on their children a forty-year silence about the "Nazi interlude." This interdiction against anamnesis stands as a symbol for the entire Western world. Can there be progress without anamnesis? Anamnesis constitutes a painful process of working through, a work of mourning the attachments and conflicting emotions, loves and terrors, associated with those names.⁷⁶

Lyotard goes on to suggest that: "We have only gotten as far as a vague, apparently inexplicable, end-of-the-century melancholy."⁷⁷ Interestingly, this article is a rare example in Lyotard's work of an acknowledgement of the power of working through trauma as a way of not repeating the act that produced the trauma in the first place. What should the Germans, and the West, mourn? Lyotard's coupling of mourning and melancholy is an obvious reference to Freud's distinction between the two psychological processes in "Mourning and Melancholia." Freud describes mourning, and its pathological alternate, as "the reaction to the loss of a loved person, or to the loss of some abstraction which has taken the place of one, such as one's country, liberty, an ideal, and so on."⁷⁸ In fact, in "Ticket to a New Decor," Lyotard doesn't mention either "Auschwitz" or the Holocaust.

Rather, he is arguing that the Nazis destroyed, or at least through their practices, undermined the ideals of the "modern project." For Huyssen, "the Holocaust" is the event that has come to symbolize this loss.

It is as Huyssen acknowledges, Eric Santner's thoughtful and insightful discussion in the first chapter of *Stranded Objects* that mediates Lyotard's work for him. Santner reads Lyotard's remarks through the prism of the Holocaust. Reading the idea of the Holocaust as a chiasmic break into Lyotard's remarks, Santner claims that, "readers are being asked to think the 'post-war' under the double sign of the postmodern and the post-Holocaust."⁷⁹ If Lyotard was suggesting a West disillusioned by the Nazi interlude, Santner is suggesting a West transformed into melancholic gloom. He reaches this position by a much more detailed discussion of postwar Germany as being in denial and therefore being in an ongoing state of melancholy. Santner then elaborates Freud's idea of melancholy as being fundamentally narcissistic, a mode of being which is an effect of an overidentification with the object of affection. Santner describes how: "The melancholic grieves not so much for the loss of the other as for the fact of otherness and all that that entails."⁸⁰ Freud writes that:

If the love for the object—a love which cannot be given up though the object itself is given up—takes refuge in narcissistic identification, then the hate comes into operation on this substitutive object, abusing it, debasing it, making it suffer and deriving sadistic satisfaction from its suffering.⁸¹

We can pause here and think through a psychoanalytic understanding of modernity in terms of the historical production of Europe and its Others, the West and the Rest or, in phenomenological terms, the Same and the Other. Enrique Dussel has described this modern process: "The same violently reduces the Other to itself through the violent process of conquest. The Other, in his or her distinction, is denied as Other and is obliged, subsumed, alienated, and incorporated into the dominating totality like a thing or an instrument."⁸²

However, as I discuss in chapter 5, the level of violence involved has, throughout modernity, been excessive and seemingly gratuitous. In "On Narcissism," Freud postulates a primary narcissism, founded on the idea that, "a human being has originally two sexual objects—himself and the woman who nurses him."⁸³ He argues that, in narcissistic identification: "The ego wants to incorporate [the] object into itself, and, in accordance with the oral or cannibalistic phase of libidinal development in which it is, it wants to do so by devouring it."⁸⁴ We can easily see how closely this accords with Dussel's description of the reduction of the Other. Moreover, we should be reminded of Freud's own discussion of the totemic, cannibalistic feast that he places at the origin of society. Following Dussel's description we need to think about how that which becomes Other gets Othered, and Santner's suggestion that the melancholic grieves for the fact

of Otherness. We can understand this in the terms of primary narcissism. The narcissist overlays himself on the Othered, but, being Othered, this Other always, in some sense refuses this narcissistic love. This produces, as we have already quoted Freud writing, hate, a hate that in this case is acted out in excessive, and often sexualized, violence on the non-European being Othered.

Here, then, I am arguing for a pathological understanding of modernity. Santner argues similarly. He writes that:

Postmodernism... may thus be understood as a collection of theoretical and aesthetic strategies dedicated, some directly, some rather more indirectly, to undoing a certain repetition compulsion of modern European history. This compulsion may be seen to have found its ultimate staging in Auschwitz, which can be seen as a sort of modern industrial apparatus for the elimination of difference.⁸⁵

For Santner, the politics of poststructuralist theory lie in an attempt to undo the epistemological organization that is a consequence of melancholy. He reads the history of European modernity as a repetition compulsion determined to instate homogeneous Sameness. Here, "Auschwitz," the Holocaust, gets read as the culmination of a calamitous modernity, an event that, in finally undoing the blind self-satisfaction of the Enlightenment project, has forced an attempt to confront modernity's underlying narcissistic structure. Abraham writes that:

The phantom counteracts libidinal introjection, that is, it obstructs our perception of words as implicitly referring to their unconscious portion. In point of fact, the words used by the phantom to carry out its return... do not refer to a source of speech in the parent. Instead, they point to a gap, they refer to the unspeakable.⁸⁶

If the survivors' testimony refers to the dead Jews, the Judeocide of the Holocaust, then what is it to which the dead Jews of the Holocaust refer? These revenants who now haunt the West in the constant references to the Holocaust identify an originary unspeakable, a site that cannot be represented in its fullness. While, as we have seen, describing the compulsion to repeat as evidence of the death drive, that which is beyond, more primitive than, the pleasure principle, this compulsion is also an effect of the subject's experience of trauma. In this thinking, the Holocaust gets constructed as the transcending repetition of what we can now understand as a primal trauma that we might think of as the originary production of a distinction between Same and Other, Europe and the Rest—psychoanalytically speaking, the founding modern moment, a moment, we could say, of narcissistic trauma.

Here it is important to distinguish types of modern, social trauma. For example, in the United States, African slavery is a national trauma. One

aspect of this trauma was a consequence of the historical transformation of the United States from a peripheral, colonial society where racialized slavery was acceptable to a nation-state that is within the core of modernity which lays claim to uphold Enlightenment morality. World War I was a social trauma for the modern Euro-American world, but one that was produced contingently, as an effect of the industrializing of war. In terms of this differentiation, what makes the Holocaust so central to modernity is its foundation in the socio-psychological organization of the modern world. The genocide of the Jews brought within the geographic bounds of Europe the practice of extreme violence validated by the state that, until then, had been repressed to the periphery. Where the treatment of "Blacks" in the United States was legitimated by their status as always already Other, imported from the colonial periphery, the position of the Jews, and the other groups racialized and identified as "inferior" by the Nazis, was much more ambiguous. Perceived within the rest of Europe as in some degree "white" and European, the destruction of these groups, especially the Jews, brought to cultural consciousness the violence—the sexualized violence—which founded the modern experience by applying that violence *within* the conceptual, as well as geographic, limits of Europe itself.

European Memory

As Huyssen notes, the discussion over remembering the Holocaust is one element in a more general debate over what is often perceived as an increasing tendency to forget, to lose remembrance of that which is past, a tendency often considered characteristic of postmodernity. It is equally the case that memory, and particularly forgetting—or an inability to remember—is central to the discursive formulation of trauma. We can refer this to Lyotard's concern with anamnesis in connection with the Nazi era and acknowledge its relation by way of mourning through to trauma. In order to understand what is going on here we need to think through the construction of the modern subject. Hacking argues that: "From [John] Locke's exceptional point of view [in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1700)], the person is constituted not by a biography but by a remembered biography."⁸⁷ This "person," Hacking writes, was associated "with memory and responsibility"⁸⁸ and "arose from evolving practices of law, property and trade."⁸⁹ Locke's person, with their identity founded on, and given continuity by, individual memory was the modern, bourgeois subject. Personal remembering, the practice of anamnesis, underpinned the "individual."

Hacking argues that the science of memory developed during the nineteenth century and, along with it, a new preoccupation with forgetting; the problem, that is, of individual forgetting. He concludes that: "These sciences had as their aim the takeover of the soul, the last refuge of a person from all prior science."⁹⁰ Hacking discusses the work of

the French memory scientist Théodule Ribot, the writer of *Les Maladies de la Mémoire*, arguing that, “whereas for Locke it was positive memory that constituted the idea of a person, in the time of Ribot one understood the memory that would teach us about the unhappy soul in terms of forgetting.”⁹¹ It was within this new context of a science of memory that the discourse of trauma began to emerge, a discourse in which both remembering and forgetting, the very practice of recollection, was to become problematic.

Why was there a transformation in the way memory was thought of in the latter part of the nineteenth century? To answer this we can go to the work of Pierre Nora. Nora argues that, toward the end of the nineteenth century, a fundamental shift took place in the relation between collective memory and history. Nora points to the ending of a traditional world in particular the disintegration of the rural world⁹²—he writes,

in which there was an irrecoverable break marked by the disappearance of peasant culture, that quintessential repository of collective memory whose recent vogue as an object of historical study coincided with the apogee of industrial growth.⁹³

History, he writes, “is how our hopelessly forgetful modern societies, propelled by change, organise the past.”⁹⁴

Nora argues that there have been two developments as a consequence of the loss of collective memory and the instatement of history. One of these directly connects with Hacking’s argument. Nora writes that, at the end of the nineteenth century, “memory appeared at the center of philosophical thought with Bergson, at the core of psychological personality with Freud, at the heart of literary autobiography, with Proust.”⁹⁵ His claim is that, with the disintegration of collective memory, there arose a new preoccupation with individual memory, and the role of individual memory in the construction and persistence of individual, and indeed group, identity.

Collective memory has been of critical importance in the historical preservation of the Jews. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi writes that:

the Hebrew Bible seems to have no hesitations in commanding memory. Its injunctions to remember are unconditional, and even when not commanded, remembrance is always pivotal. Altogether the verb *zakhar* appears in its various declensions in the Bible no less than one hundred and sixty-nine times, usually with either Israel or God as the subject, for memory is incumbent upon both. The verb is complemented by its obverse—forgetting. As Israel is enjoined to remember, so is it adjured not to forget.⁹⁶

At this point in the disintegration of collective memory structures it is not surprising, then, that all three of the men identified by Nora as being

crucial to the new concern with memory should be Jewish—nor, we might add, that it should be a Jew, one of that group who were the internal Other of modern Europe, who should identify trauma at the foundation of society; whose work should so closely precurse the Judeocide. As Nora writes: “The less memory is experienced collectively, the more it will require individuals to undertake to become themselves memory-individuals, as if an inner voice were to tell each Corsican ‘You must be Corsican’ and each Breton ‘You must be Breton.’”⁹⁷ Indeed, Nora goes on to give the example of Jewish memory. He concludes this section: “The psychologization of memory has thus given every individual the sense that his or her salvation ultimately depends on the repayment of an impossible debt.”⁹⁸ The debt to be repaid is that, in the time of collective memory, individual identity, and recollection, functioned through collective memory. Now, however, and this is the anxiety behind Bergson, Freud and Proust’s preoccupation, individual memory must bear the burden of remembering not just for themselves, but as Corsicans, Bretons and Jews, as the foundations for the very existential existence of their communities.

The second development Nora identifies is the novel production of *lieux de mémoire*, sites of memory. *Lieux de mémoire* serve as mnemonic moments, offering to a group the opportunity to recall some aspect of their past that would previously have been embedded in the ongoing system of collective memory. Nora argues that in any *lieu de mémoire*, three elements coexist: the material, that is, for example, the monument; the functional, that a material site may also be utilized for a ritual; and the symbolic that some meaning is associated with the site so that “it can serve as a concentrated appeal to memory.”⁹⁹ Nora argues that: “Modern memory is archival. It relies entirely on the materiality of the trace, the immediacy of the recording, the visibility of the image.”¹⁰⁰

Now is the time to recall that post-1970s preoccupation with videotaping Holocaust survivors, the production of (a) Jewish archive(s) that serve as a supplement to the increasingly ephemeral Jewish collective memory. But of what does this archive remind us? This archive that, as a revenant, serves as a mechanical anamnesis. It is, of course, of that new discursive construction, “the Holocaust.” From this point of view, the Holocaust functions as a *lieu de mémoire* not only for Jews, for Jewish identity, but, traumatically, for the West in general. The Holocaust acts as a *lieu de mémoire* for a postmodern West, a West after the disillusion of the Enlightenment project that drove modernity, a West traumatized, and recognizing its own narcissistic denial of the trauma(s) on which the modern project was founded.

In a reading of Freud’s *Moses and Monotheism*, Cathy Caruth argues that:

By appearing only belatedly, then, the historical effect of trauma, in Freud’s text, is ultimately its inscription of the Jews in a history always bound to the history of the Christians . . . It is therefore, I would like

to suggest, precisely in the very constitutive function of latency, in history, that Freud discovers the indissoluble, political bond to other histories. To put it somewhat differently, we could say that the traumatic nature of history means that events are only historical to the extent that they implicate others. And it is thus that Jewish history has also been the suffering of others' traumas.¹⁰¹

We can reread this as a commentary on the Jewish, and European post-Holocaust experience, an era that Michael Rothberg writes about as "posttraumatic culture."¹⁰² The emergence of the discourse of the Holocaust, and its imbrication with the discourse of trauma retrospectively produces post-Holocaust history as traumatized. The unexpected consequence is that the Jews, that internal Other of European modernity, are now united with Europeans through a shared post-Holocaust, traumatic memory, in which the dead Jews of the Holocaust act as revenants, a memory which (re)produces the Holocaust as a *lieu de mémoire*. Although the West now defines itself by the Holocaust, the effects of trauma give structure and meaning to post-Holocaust Western history. This recognition of the cultural centrality of trauma also enables a revision of modernity and the formation of Europe, and allows a new centering of the ways Europeans have treated, and are treating, those they have Othered.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Before Holocaust Memory: Making Sense of Trauma between Postmemory and Cultural Memory

My mother has Alzheimer's. She was diagnosed in the early 1990s. Over the years her ability to remember recent events has got steadily worse. In time my phone calls with her—she in Bexhill-on-Sea on the south coast of England and I in Perth, Australia—got circular; and the circle became steadily smaller. She had a routine of questions she would ask. As the disease progressed the time it took my mother to forget the answers that I had given to her questions, and then to forget that she had asked the questions, got shorter. She would ask the question again, and again.

Through this period, until his death in February 2002, my father, her husband, remained her principal carer. In 1998 I visited them, a trip I made every three years or so. My father opened the door of their flat and we went into the lounge room where my mother was sitting. After a few moments of small talk my father went to the kitchen to make us all a cup of tea. A very English ritual! As my mother started to ask me questions about my trip and my presence in the flat a feeling of uneasiness and disorientation crept over me. She began by asking me how the journey had been. Then she started suggesting that I must have had considerable difficulties. She said how pleased she was that I was staying—speaking as if I was a visitor rather than her son. And then she started referring to Germany. I started feeling uncanny. I hadn't been to Germany on this trip. In fact I have only been there twice. By this point I was thoroughly confused. Luckily my father came back into the room. My parents married in October 1940, a year after the outbreak of war. My father recognized the memory my mother was calling up.

As I have discussed elsewhere, my mother is Jewish, a Jew who married out and has spent her life determinedly assimilating; wanting to be a

middle-class English woman.¹ Such an ambition was understandable in the context of the time. Ari Sherman reminds us that:

The [prewar] refugee crisis brought painfully into consciousness the ambiguities of assimilation, especially in a country as relatively insular and monochromatic culturally as Great Britain in the pre-war period; and the anxiety over the numbers and conspicuousness of the refugees, their sheer foreignness, the likelihood that they would stir not only anti-Semitism but anti-German feeling still latent from the First World War, was shared by government officials as well as Jewish communal leaders.²

Louise London has commented on the pressures in England to assimilate that “made [Anglo-Jewish leaders] distinguish between different groups of refugees.”³ Victor Jeleniewski Seidler was born in England in 1945, the child of a Polish Jewish refugee family which, as he puts it, “had escaped from continental Europe just before the war.”⁴ Seidler writes how “becoming English” was important because:

to be English was to be “safe.” It was this safety that parents were ready to sacrifice for, and it was part of their deep and unquestioned gratitude to England that they also tried to pass on to their children.⁵

He adds that: “Our [refugee] parents, scarred by the horrors of Nazi rule looked forward to their children ‘becoming English.’”⁶ My mother was not a refugee but she understood the importance of assimilation as a means to at least provisional safety in England, and wanted it both for herself and her children.

Through the 1930s some German-Jewish refugees managed to leave Germany and made their way to England. London writes that: “The bulk of the emigration occurred in the nine months preceding World War II, when over 40,000 Jewish refugees entered Britain, only 11,000 or so came before November 1938.”⁷ In 1933, Anglo-Jewish leaders “promised the government that the community would shoulder the burden of this new influx.”⁸ London writes about the pleas for financial help that appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle*. After *Kristallnacht*, in November 1938, a high-ranking deputation from the Council for German Jewry made representations to the prime minister, Neville Chamberlain, to facilitate the temporary admission of young people under seventeen for training and education.⁹ The result has become known as the *Kindertransport*, an operation which brought around 10,000 unaccompanied children, almost all Jewish, from Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland to Britain. Walter was one of these children. He arrived in England in March 1939, aged eleven and was picked up from the train station by my mother and one of her sisters. Walter came from Berlin. He was seven when the Nazis

passed the Nuremberg anti-Jewish racial purity laws and he lived through *Kristallnacht*. Up until I came to write this chapter I knew only that he was a refugee who had stayed with my mother's family.¹⁰ Walter was one of the "perhaps 40,000 Jewish refugees" that the Home Office grudgingly accepted into the British population after the war.¹¹ Subsequently, he went to the United States. What happened to Walter, though, is not the point of my story.

As the effect of the Alzheimer's deepened, my mother had started mapping events from her past onto the present as a way of making sense of her here and now. For her, this man who had come to visit, this unrecognized stranger, was the Holocaust survivor whom her family had taken in. But it is much more complicated than this. In the late 1930s there was no Holocaust—the Holocaust, as we shall see, was a discursive construction of the 1960s and 1970s. Indeed, in the late 1930s the crucial, exterminating events of the Judeocide were still yet to happen. For my mother and her family, as for other English Jews, Walter and the rest of the German-Jewish refugees were escapees from the largest pogrom ever conducted against European Jews.

In my mother's mind Walter and I doubled. I, her son born in 1950, became the young refugee who had brought home to her, literally, the horror of what was unfolding across the English Channel. In conversations with my sister, the early child of the marriage, it seems she was treated with similar emotional brutality to me. It was as if our mother was constantly trying to distance herself, as if she was frightened of us, or as if we brought up for her a nameless terror that she could not face—that respectable, middle-class English women did not have—as if, perhaps, in the end, she was frightened for us.

Growing up in a Jewish refugee family, Seidler writes, "was to grow up in the shadows of the Holocaust—the Shoah."¹² Seidler tells us that:

in our families we were to be protected from the cruelties of the past. As children we were to represent hope and the future and we were to live without the stains and injuries of the past. This was to protect us as children, but this was also to make things easier for our parents who often found it difficult to speak about what had happened to them.¹³

I have already remarked that my mother was not a refugee, nor was her family. However, turning twenty in 1935, she learnt to fear the Nazis as her ancestors in the Pale had feared the Cossacks and, later, the Polish and Russian pogroms. She lived in the certain knowledge that, were circumstances in England to change, she would not be able to protect her children; she would not be able to protect herself. At the same time, after 1945 this was the past, unless, indeed, circumstances changed radically.

My mother's reaction to the Judeocide, as she came to understand what was happening, and what had happened, was her determined, perhaps

pathological assimilation. For her, assimilation seems also to have been the best way she could protect her children. She gradually lost touch with her family. I went to my last Jewish familial gathering when I was about eleven. Seidler remarks that: "As children we learnt about the war and we were told about the Nazis but often this was in generalized terms, sometimes as an early warning against thinking we could marry anyone who was not Jewish."¹⁴ Implicit here is the demand that Jewish tradition be preserved. My mother would have been pleased for me to marry out, it would increase my assimilation. It would, she would have thought, increase my safety in this threatening world. Similarly, there was no talk in my family about the Nazis, or about the war. For my father, Gentile that he was, there was little to discuss about the war by the 1950s and 1960s. This helped my mother to keep silent about the Judeocide and, indeed, helped to produce an environment inimical to its discussion. Such silence may well have been a part of my mother's protection, keeping her children safe from the knowledge of such awfulness. In the nonlogic of everyday life she may well have had some thought that if my sister and I did not know about the Judeocide—and, as I will go on to discuss, in the 1950s and 1960s this was not accepted public knowledge—then we could more easily assimilate into that dominant culture where it was also not generally known about.

In my mother's mind, Walter and I, two strangers who had come to stay in the family, had merged, conjoined across approximately sixty years by her anxieties in relation to the Judeocide. Sigmund Freud comments on the double that: "From having been an assurance of immortality, it becomes the uncanny harbinger of death."¹⁵ In this case the relationship between those doubled was articulated by the death of six million of my mother's, and my people. My unease at being misrecognised as a German-Jewish refugee was compounded by my greater unease founded in my mother's bequeathal to me of her unimaginable terror in the face of the Nazi Judeocide.

In this chapter I will explore the relationship between personal knowledge and public knowledge, between the constructions of personal knowledge, as mediated by narrative memory and postmemory, and collective memory, which is now usually thought about by way of a distinction between social memory and cultural memory. I want to discuss these intersections with reference to the Holocaust. More specifically, I want to discuss the complexities of growing personal awareness as this took place in conjunction with the historical formation and public acceptance of the discourse of the Holocaust, a discourse the establishment of which coincided with what Saul Friedlander described in his 1982 book *Reflets du Nazisme* (translated as *Reflections of Nazism*) as a "new discourse" of Nazism.¹⁶ This involved the return of Nazism by way of films, novels and even popular music—before Sid Vicious' 1976 punk song recorded by the Sex Pistols, "Belsen Was a Gas," Serge Gainsbourg, the notorious French-Jewish *chanteur* released an album in 1975 entitled *Rock around the Bunker* which included tracks called

“Nazi Rock,” “Yellow Star” and “S.S. in Uruguay.” Freidlander identifies this upsurge, in the words of his book’s subtitle, as a preoccupation with “kitsch and death.”¹⁷ It also involved a more or less pornographic working over of the mechanics of the Judeocide.

My coming to terms with my relation to the Judeocide coincided with, and was inevitably influenced by, these two developments in cultural memory. Indeed, as a secular Jew with no formal Jewish cultural capital my growing awareness of what it means to be Jewish was inevitably tracked on my increasing understanding of what happened to European Jewry, and this as the Judeocide was getting constructed as genocide, itself a new term, and as the Holocaust. In this chapter, then, I shall also write about what I shall call, coining a neologism, the *traumascape* of my life. Writing about my own *traumascape* places it within the context of personal myth that Kali Tal defines as “the particular set of explanations and expectations generated by an individual to account for his or her circumstances and actions.”¹⁸ Here, *traumascape* refers to those events which, in retrospect, I can construct into a personal narrative influenced by transgenerational haunting and postmemory, a narrative about coming to terms with trauma—trauma in this case handed on from my mother as affect.

Cultural Memory and the Discourse of the Holocaust

In his discussion of the generic technique he calls traumatic realism, Michael Rothberg remarks that, “traumatic realism is an attempt to produce the traumatic event as an object of knowledge and to program and thus transform its readers so that they are forced to acknowledge their relationship to posttraumatic culture.”¹⁹ The traumatic event to which Rothberg is referring is the Holocaust. But when and how did the Judeocide become culturally traumatic, and for whom? Writing about individual experiences, Ernst van Alphen argues that:

experience of an event or history is dependent on the terms the symbolic order offers. It needs these terms to transform living through the event into an experience of the event.²⁰

His point is that sometimes, as with Holocaust survivors, it is not necessarily the horror of what has happened which makes it impossible to talk about, to narrativize, but rather that there is no appropriate discourse to transform what has occurred into experience. “[T]he problem for Holocaust survivors,” he writes, “is precisely that the lived events could not be experienced because language did not provide the terms and positions in which to experience them, thus they are defined as *traumatic*.”²¹ The sense might be clearer here if we substitute “traumatizing” for “traumatic.” The events were not in themselves traumatic but they were traumatizing.

When applying the model of trauma to the Western experience of the Judeocide it is usual to anthropomorphize and think of the period between the end of World War II and the 1970s in terms of Freud's idea of *Nachträglichkeit*, delayed action, the time between the traumatizing event and the person's ability to narrativize that event as experience. The first problem here is whether culture as such can be traumatized. If trauma can be defined as referring to the effect of a shock that breaks through a person's narrativized identity, can this process be applied to a culture, indeed to Western culture? If it can, then this would suggest that Western culture after the Judeocide could be post-traumatic. However, while those caught up in the Judeocide found the events traumatizing, to suggest that Western culture was itself traumatized implies a degree of self-consciousness not applicable to culture. Thus, it is not until the Judeocide gets constructed as the Holocaust, with all the absolutist moral freight attached to that term, and with the discursive understanding that the Holocaust was culturally traumatic, that we can think of Western culture as post-traumatic. More, it is only when the Judeocide becomes discursively constructed as the Holocaust, and as traumatic, that there is a public space in which the traumas of Holocaust survivors make sense, not just as individual trauma but as experiences within a greater, cultural trauma.²² Only at this time can the individual narratives of survivors become valued as testimonies in the witnessing to a cultural experience of trauma. One of the implications of this argument is that, for around thirty years, there was no fit between individual trauma related to the Judeocide and cultural understanding. Moreover, thirty years is roughly a generation. It is worth considering whether what we are actually identifying is a generational trauma—that of the first European post-Holocaust generation.

At this point it is useful to begin to think about the concept of cultural memory. The idea derives from Maurice Halbwachs' work on collective memory. In "The Social Frameworks of Memory," Halbwachs commented that: "One is rather astonished when reading psychological treatises that deal with memory to find that people are considered there as isolated beings."²³ He argues that, to the contrary: "it is in society that people normally acquire their memories. It is also in society that they recall, recognize and localize their memories."²⁴

Individual memory is constructed in a dynamic relation with society. More specifically, individual memory is formed in relation to the society's collective memory. For Halbwachs:

It is in this sense that there exists a collective memory and social frameworks for memory; it is to the degree that our individual thought places itself in these frameworks and participates in this memory that it is capable of the act of recollection.²⁵

Memory might appear to be a personal matter, born out of one's own individual experience but it is located in the ways the society as a whole

remembers, and makes sense of things. This, of course, changes over time and, with it, not only how we, as individuals, make sense of the world but also how we remember our experiences in the world.

Halbwachs had a Catholic background. However, his main influences, first Henri Bergson and then Emile Durkheim, were both Jewish, the one concerned with memory and time, the other with collective representations. This at a time when Jewish identity was under threat from the disintegration of Jewish communal memory—or, as Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi puts it, using Halbwachs' own concept:

The collective memories of the Jewish people were a function of the shared faith, cohesiveness, and the will of the group itself, transmitting and recreating its past through an entire complex of interlocking social and religious institutions that functioned organically to achieve this. The decline of Jewish collective memory in modern times is only a symptom of the unravelling of that common network of belief and praxis through whose mechanisms... the past was once made present.²⁶

Omer Bartov argues that Halbwachs' interest in collective memory was not surprising. It grew out of "a France haunted by the proximity of total war and devastation, and by the abyss that 1914–18 had torn between the present and the pre-war past, transformed in a series of brutal, bloody battles into a dim, far-off, sentimental memory of a lost world."²⁷ Bartov goes on:

Nor is it mere coincidence that both the sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, who had coined and analysed this concept, and the historian Marc Bloch, who had pioneered the study of collective mentalities and the role of fraud and error in history, became victims of a historical moment in which a regime determined to "correct" the memory of the past had occupied a nation unable to be reconciled with its own memories of that same event.²⁸

Halbwachs was born in Reims, whence his parents had moved six years before, having left Alsace when it became German after the Franco-Prussian war. That is to say, Halbwachs' background was a geographical area that had competing national memories attempting to legitimate ownership. Both national and communal memory anxieties, exacerbated by the effects of the devastation of World War I, influenced Halbwachs. Bloch, a Jew, joined the Resistance and was tortured and shot by the Nazis in 1944. Halbwachs, married to a Jew, was sent to the Buchenwald concentration camp where he died, after he travelled to Lyons to complain about the murder of his eighty-year-old in-laws, both killed by either the Vichy militia or the Gestapo.²⁹

Where Halbwachs wrote about social memory, emphasizing the extent to which individual memory was imbricated with, for example, family memory, since the 1980s there has been a conceptual shift to the idea of

cultural memory. In the important *Acts of Memory* collection Mieke Bal writes on behalf of the contributors that: "We... view cultural memorization as an activity occurring in the present, in which the past is continuously modified and redescribed even as it continues to shape the future."³⁰ Using the notion of cultural memory is a way of thinking outside of the roles played by particular social institutions in the formation of memory. Cultural memory recognizes that cultures reproduce and reform themselves and that, in this process, understandings of the past are transformed. Furthermore, as Bal goes on to write: "The interaction between present and past that is the stuff of cultural memory is... the product of collective agency rather than the result of psychic and historical accident."³¹ The past makes sense on the terms of the present and, moreover, individual understanding of the present is mediated by cultural memory. The discourse of the Holocaust not only gives us a way of understanding certain past events, it is a means of remembering those events and, more, a way of understanding individual trauma that is removed from those events—trauma, we might say, as transgenerational haunting.

However, before we go there, we must first briefly examine the historicity of the discourse of the Holocaust. In his overview of the evolution of the discourse, Tim Cole asserts that: "While the Holocaust was perpetrated in Europe during 1941–45, it was not really until the early 1960s that anything like widespread awareness of the 'Holocaust' began to emerge."³² At this time, as Cole indicates, the Judeocide was not yet known as the Holocaust. What is often argued, and Cole repeats the claim, is that it was the Israeli trial of Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem, in 1961, which brought widespread public knowledge of the Judeocide. As Cole writes: "It was a trial concerned with the *Shoah*, and was a self-conscious attempt to bring awareness of the massacre of six million European Jews to both native-born Israeli youth and the wider world."³³ Within Israel a divide had evolved between the survivors of the Judeocide and the Israeli-born young people. The survivors were silenced and looked down on by an Israeli generation that had been brought up to fight for its land.

Ben-Gurion's intention was to use the trial as a way of uniting Israel. For the first time the survivors were able to tell their stories in a public forum. Cole writes:

The speaking out of these survivors in the Jerusalem courthouse became the signal for a more general speaking out of survivors across the country. The silence was broken both within and outside of the courthouse.³⁴

Nevertheless, at this time there was still no possibility of understanding what had happened in a unifying form, and understanding it as something either unique or new, or both.

Throughout this period the Judeocide was still thought of within a continuity with previous events. Gerd Korman notes the great Jewish

historian Salo Baron talking in 1950 of the need to examine the “dissimilarities as well as the similarities between the great tragedy and the many lesser tragedies which preceded it.”³⁵ Korman writes that,

in 1949, there was no “Holocaust” in the English language in the way that the term is used today [1972]. Scholars and writers had used “permanent pogrom” . . . or the “recent catastrophe,” or “disaster,” or “the disaster.”³⁶

At the Nuremberg trial of Nazis accused of war crimes, which ran from November 1945 to October 1946: “On numerous occasions, [Robert H. Jackson, the chief counsel for the United States] and other prosecutors used the term *pogrom* to describe Nazi persecutions [of the Jews].”³⁷ Generally speaking, the rhetoric of “concentration camps” was used as the key figure for the events of the Judeocide.

Hannah Arendt, Korman tells us, looked for what was new and unprecedented in the concentration camps in their connection to totalitarianism³⁸ Arendt was certainly arguing strongly for the novelty of what had taken place. In her book on the Eichmann trial published in 1963 as a compilation of reports she had written at the trial itself which had been published in *The New Yorker*, she wrote about:

[H]ow little Israel, like the Jewish people in general, was prepared to recognize, in the crimes that Eichmann was accused of, an unprecedented crime, and precisely how difficult such a recognition must have been for the Jewish people. In the eyes of the Jews, thinking exclusively in terms of their own history, the catastrophe that had befallen them under Hitler, in which a third of the people perished, appeared not as the most recent of crimes, the unprecedented crime of genocide, but, on the contrary, as the oldest crime they knew and remembered . . . None of the participants ever arrived at a clear understanding of the actual horror of Auschwitz, which is of a different nature from all the atrocities of the past, because it appeared to prosecution and judges alike as not much more than the most horrible pogrom in Jewish history.³⁹

While the Eichmann trial increased awareness of the Judeocide it did not do so in terms that would make it culturally understandable as a traumatic episode. Rather, what had happened was placed within a normalizing historical narrative, and this in both Jewish and dominant Western perspectives.

In the United States Paul Breines argues that it was the 1967 Six Day Arab–Israeli War which marked the turning point in Jewish public awareness of the Judeocide. Breines writes:

It is really only *after* the June 1967 war that we see the proliferation of scholarly studies, films, courses, lectures, conferences, tough

Jewish fiction, and intense popular discussion. Among American Jews, Israel's victory in June 1967 expanded and escalated what had previously been a limited relationship to the Holocaust.⁴⁰

Breines' argument, in his words, is that: "The Israeli triumph in the Six Day War provided American Jews with the imagery of Jewish toughness and politico-military self-assertion which enabled them to rethink the Holocaust as something more than simply Jewish passivity and victimization."⁴¹

It needs to be remembered that Breines is writing about Jews, and specifically American Jews. In general, there was an increased awareness among Jews of the circumstances of the Judeocide during the decade of the 1960s. For Jews as a community, there began to be established a cultural memory of the Judeocide which understood it in terms of disaster or catastrophe and placed it within a narrative of such events. The Yiddish term *khurban* carries this kind of understanding. For Jews outside of the community, I think for example of myself here, and for the general population, there was still little cultural knowledge of the Judeocide. It was an event in World War II, and a minor one in the context of a narrative about Allied victory over the Axis forces.

When the Judeocide was thought about it was in the particularized, piecemeal, terms of concentration camps, and the treatment of inmates within these camps. This was in part a consequence of the screenings of film footage taken by the Allied forces when they liberated the concentration camps. Bergen-Belsen was the first camp entered by British troops and, as Cole writes: "The harrowing film footage of piles of corpses was shown in British cinemas shortly after liberation on 15 April 1945, and ensured that 'Belsen' became a synonym for Hitlerian atrocities."⁴² By the 1960s this footage was rarely shown. In my own experience, at the age of twelve or thirteen I had much greater access to literature, mostly war novels, about Japanese atrocities on allied servicemen in Prisoner of War (POW) camps. At that time I had no clear understanding of the difference between POW camps and concentration camps so it was easy to imagine what I read happening in these POW camps as the horror of concentration camps. This Japanese POW camp literature worked within the dominant narrative of World War II. It functioned by way of a binary of British/European civilization and Asian savagery. In the process it served to occlude the Judeocide and reinstate the values of colonial modernity.

What transformed knowledge of the Judeocide and established it in cultural memory as a defining moment in modern, Western history was the discourse of the Holocaust. It seems that there are rare cases of the use of "Holocaust" to describe the destruction of European Jewry during World War II. However, the Israeli memorial of remembrance, Yad Vashem, founded in 1953, was still translating *shoah* as "Disaster" in 1955.⁴³ Korman dates the new usage of Holocaust to between 1957 and 1959. It was used at the Second World Congress of Jewish Studies held in

Jerusalem in 1957. After 1959 Yad Vashem gave “Holocaust” its official imprimatur, switching from translating *shoah* as Disaster to Holocaust. We find here also the origin of the capitalization of Holocaust. This practice, following the capitalization of Disaster, suggests the special, transcendent, quality of the events being named. Raul Hilberg’s magisterial *The Destruction of the European Jews*, published in 1961, still did not use Holocaust.⁴⁴ Peter Novick writes that, at the time that Hilberg was writing his doctoral thesis at Columbia:

The Holocaust had not, at this point, become as sacralized as it was subsequently to become. But there was already a great deal of visceral resistance to its being discussed in terms other than the confrontation of pure evil and pure virtue.⁴⁵

The word, and the discourse associated with it, was not yet fully established. However, Breines tells us that: “By 1967 *Holocaust*, with its immense and eventually mind-numbing resonance, was becoming the central term of Jewish American discussion and identity.”⁴⁶ Korman notes that by 1968 there were so many books making use of the term that in that year the Library of Congress Catalogue Division established a new category for “Holocaust-Jewish, 1939–1945.”⁴⁷

However, Holocaust was still used more in the United States and still predominantly within the Jewish community. It was, without a doubt, the NBC miniseries *Holocaust*, shown in the United States in 1978 and subsequently around Europe to massive television audiences, that got the word Holocaust general acceptance.⁴⁸ The point here, though, is not just about the take-up of a word, it is about the discourse expressed through that word. The immense popularity of the miniseries suggests that the Judeocide was already becoming a part of a general, non-Jewish cultural memory. The utility of the discourse of the Holocaust has been that it not only unified the disparate events of the Judeocide such as *Kristallnacht*, the race laws, the concentration camps, the ghettos, and so on, it has also provided the site of meaning for the Judeocide. Lawrence Langer has argued that: “In one sense, all writing about the Holocaust represents a retrospective effort to give meaningless history a context of meaning.”⁴⁹ Identifying the Judeocide as the Holocaust has the same result.

The miniseries helped to establish the Holocaust as having a Western universal, that is no longer specifically Jewish, theme. The Western world could now think of the events of the Judeocide as the Holocaust, as a morality story about Good and Evil. At the same time, in its new discursive form the Judeocide could be thought of as a total entity rather than in terms of concentration camps, massacres, ghettos and so on. More, the discourse satisfied Arendt’s concerns, the Holocaust was thought of as unique and unprecedented—at least in part no doubt a consequence of the championing of the term in the 1960s by writers such as Elie Wiesel. The Holocaust also embraced another of Arendt’s preoccupations, that the

Judeocide be thought of as genocide. Genocide now became the key for understanding the horror of the Holocaust—that the Nazis had aimed for the destruction of an entire people. However, as I have remarked, the general construction of cultural memory in terms of Holocaust discourse did not take place until the time of the television miniseries. In England in the 1970s people could still remark that an exceptionally thin person “looked like something out of Belsen” (note the distancing objectification here), and, as I have mentioned, Sid Vicious could write “Belsen Was a Gas” for his band Flowers of Romance in 1976, a song subsequently recorded by the archetypal punk band the Sex Pistols with Ronnie Biggs, the Great Train Robber, in 1977.⁵⁰

Trauma and Postmemory

What was it like to grow up in this environment in England in the 1950s and 1960s, the son of a fearful assimilating Jew who had no way of talking about her own fears brought about by what the Nazis had done and, indeed, no discourse in which to conceptualize what had happened? Most importantly, I think, my mother, like many thousands, possibly tens of thousands, of others, had no way of understanding her relationship to what had taken place as traumatizing. Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) was formally accepted as a medical diagnosis in 1980 in the wake of the Vietnam War when it was included in the third edition of the American Psychiatric Association’s *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*.⁵¹ Trauma only became a publicly recognized way of thinking about the effects of certain events on individuals in the 1980s. Even then it has only been applied to those directly affected by events happening to them personally, such as sexual abuse, or being caught up in events such as the Vietnam War and, retrospectively, the Holocaust. Given her situation in post-World War II England, my mother’s, most probably unconsidered, solution was silence. How could my mother even consider it worth contemplating to talk about, for example, how she felt when Walter came into her apparently safe, middle-class Anglo-Jewish family life with his tales of the persecution of people just like her in Germany? How could she think it important to work through—to use a Freudian term now much in vogue with therapists, but a term, and a way of thinking that would have been completely unknown to her—her reactions to her growing knowledge that the Jews who had at first been persecuted and ill-treated across that short distance of the English Channel were later actually being rounded up for extermination? And this when the Nazis had occupied the Channel Islands in 1940 and looked set to invade England. After the war my mother would have had no language to discuss her reactions to the film footage from the concentration camps and her anxieties for the future that her children were being born into, and in any case, nobody with whom she could talk about these things

who could understand what they meant to her. Certainly not my father, the man she had married for, among other things, his Englishness, his situatedness as English within England, his certainty of his place.

Elsewhere I have recounted the only two times during my childhood that I remember my mother acknowledging the events that had not yet come to be thought of as the Holocaust. Once was a disconcertingly lighthearted reference to “the Germans killing all our relatives over there”—as close a paraphrase as I can recall. The other was her rage when she discovered that the birthday present I had given her had been made in Germany.⁵² I knew, even then, that her anger was disproportionate, indeed inappropriate, to what she saw as the offence I had committed. Looking back I can suggest the connection between her anger and her fear, emotions born of her reactions to events that she had no way of expressing and no context for understanding.

How has all this, my mother’s unrecognized trauma, manifested in my life? One way of thinking about this is through Nicolas Abraham’s idea of transgenerational haunting discussed in chapter 6. We can complement this idea with Marianne Hirsch’s notion of postmemory which she explicitly ties to trauma. She writes:

I use the term *postmemory* to describe the relationship of children of survivors of cultural or collective trauma to the experiences of their parents, experiences that they “remember” only as stories and images with which they grew up, but that are so powerful, so monumental, as to constitute memories in their own right. The term is meant to convey its temporal and qualitative difference from survivor memory, its secondary or second-generation memory quality, its basis in displacement, its belatedness. Postmemory is a powerful form of memory precisely because its connection to its object or source is mediated not through recollection but through projection, investment and creation.⁵³

My mother is not a survivor in the conventional sense, a sense by the way which has only become conventional since the establishment of the discourse of the Holocaust. My mother, like so very many others, has no stories and images of rapid evacuations or atrocities that she has handed on. Rather, my mother’s trauma was a secondary effect, a trauma brought on by witnessing what others went through, albeit at a mediated remove, and the fear that their fate could become her own, or her children’s. What was passed on was a vague focus—beware of Germans, they do awful things; they murdered Jews during World War II. This was not a phantom, it was evident in the two stories which I have told and it was a constant presence in my mother’s attitude to German people and to, for example, news stories in the paper or on television concerning Germany or Germans; if a German had been killed in an accident she might remark “Good riddance.” It is also not strictly postmemory in that it was a *reaction* that was

passed on, a reaction expressing an emotional complex made up of fear, anger, perhaps sadness and other emotions. All these passed on without realization, a legacy composed of affect.

Hirsch identifies well the expression of postmemory. The manifestation of the next generation's inheritance of the trauma in displacement, its belated repetition acted out, as she writes, in projection, investment and creation. It is these phantasmatic repetitions, retrospectively identified and narrativized, that I am describing as a traumascap. For large numbers of the second generation after the Judeocide, this postmemorial acting out coincided with attempts to find out, and understand, what had happened—and in my case, and doubtless that of many others, to situate myself somehow in relation to this knowledge. In "Projected Memory" Hirsch retells my friend Mitzi Goldman's story, "her strange memories of the Jewish school she attended, where, on rainy days when they could not go outside at lunchtime, the children were shown films about the Holocaust."⁵⁴ I did not go to a Jewish school and I did not have such questionable assistance in finding out what had taken place. Furthermore, finding out was, in itself, complicated, as I now realize, by the changing cultural memory of the Judeocide.

Let me begin to describe some of my own traumascap with a school story of my own. To the best of my knowledge I was the only Jew, certainly in my year—there may have been others in the school but I was so totally, if uncomfortably, assimilated that I didn't seek them out—and, with my very English family name, they didn't come looking for me. I do remember a rather overweight younger boy called Schlomo but I never even thought of him as Jewish. My English teacher was a young, Christian, Cambridge-educated man. Thoughtful and kind, he had an ability to enthuse us, me anyway, with the literature he had us read. During a number of classes when I was, I think, fifteen, he worked through an anthology of modern English verse. Two of the poems in that collection were by Sylvia Plath, "Daddy" and "Lady Lazarus." Plath wrote both these poems in 1962. My memory is that our teacher said little or nothing about the Jewish references in the poems. Rather, he concentrated on the suicide theme in "Lady Lazarus." What is it, the class wanted to know, that the narrator—and is the narrator here indeed the author?—has done again, and does, it seems every ten years? Even then, before the rise in teenage suicides, discussing this with sixteen-year-olds was not easy. Much of the class time was taken up with teasing out the narrator's emotional state. In "Daddy" the discussion, in my recall, centered on the female narrator's relationship with her father. My school was single-sex and most of us were boarders. A poem that explored the relationship between father and daughter from the daughter's point of view was fascinating for boys of our age. It seems extraordinary today to think that these poems could have been talked about in a school class without referring to their take-up of the Judeocide but, again, we must remember that this was a class of non-Jews—how could what happened to the Jews be relevant—and, besides,

what had taken place in the concentration camps was surely too awful for the impressionable minds of fifteen-year-olds.

I was left to ponder these poems on my own. What had they to do with me, to do with me being a Jew? What is the anguish in "Lady Lazarus," I wondered. What has suicide got to do with Jews? I understood Plath to be describing the horror of the concentration camps, a term I knew:

Ash, ash—
 You poke and stir.
 Flesh, bone, there is nothing there—

 A cake of soap.
 A wedding ring.
 A gold filling.

I connected with the affect though I did not know why. I had heard stories of the skin of victims being turned into lampshades, something to which Plath refers in the poem's second stanza. I knew, what I now understand to have been British propaganda, that Nazis had made soap from the Jewish bodies.⁵⁵ I did not know that the Nazis had taken the wedding rings and the gold fillings and made piles of these. The poem wove in and out of my little knowledge. It conjured feelings I had that I could not explain, and that I had no space to talk about and no way to talk about in that classroom with those boys.

"Daddy" was not quite as powerful for me. I related to it more incoherently. The speaker appeared to be the Jewish daughter of a German and a Jew; I was the Jewish son of an Englishman and a Jew. At the same time the poem's attitude to the German father resonated for me with my mother's attitude toward Germans. In particular there was this stanza:

An engine, an engine
 Chuffing me off like a Jew.
 A Jew to Dachau, Auschwitz, Belsen.
 I think I may well be a Jew.

I knew Belsen had been a concentration camp. I had never heard of Dachau.⁵⁶ I identified with the speaker's uncertainty about her Jewishness and empathized with the inevitability, in spite of her uncertainty, of her being sent to a camp. Importantly, the poems spoke to me about this Jewish experience. They broke my mother's silence and I realized that there were people out there who knew and thought and wrote about these things.

What I didn't know then was that Plath was not Jewish, was not herself the daughter of a mixed marriage. I accepted relatively unproblematically that the speaker of "Daddy" was the speaker of "Lady Lazarus" and that she was Plath, the author. James Young has written about Plath's use of the image of the "Holocaust Jew," the victim. He explains that: "The

Holocaust exists for her not as an experience to be retold or described but as an event available to her (as it was to all who came after) only as a figure, an idea, in whose image she has expressed another brutal reality: that of her own internal pain."⁵⁷ For me at fifteen, the emotional pain in the poems connected with the pain that I had inherited and, expressed through the imagery of Jewish suffering in the camps, and at the hands of the Germans, offered me a way of beginning to think about these things and myself as a Jew. My emotional investment in these poems can, I think, be understood as an example of the work of postmemory. In this sense they mediated for me a knowledge, and an affect, which has been handed on to me in the silence of repression.

For a different purpose I have briefly written about the relationship I had with a Jewish woman while in my twenties.⁵⁸ In terms of my traumascapes this needs to be set in a context. During my final year as an undergraduate, a couple of years before I met this woman, I had a shortish relationship with a German exchange student who had come to Bradford University where I was studying. How to make sense of these two relationships symptomatically, closely juxtaposed as they were? My relationships with a German and then a Jewish woman can be read as an acting out of my fraught relationship with my mother and, simultaneously, an attempt to come to terms with my own Jewishness. There was, I think, a certain frisson of transgression for me with my German friend. This was not a relationship I ever told my mother about. There was a sense in which it was a rebellious act, as indeed was my later relationship for my mother had not formed my identity as an Englishman to have me go out with a Jew. However, while this was also a rebellious act, and one linked by the same context, it was of a different order. What could be construed as evidence of my failure to assimilate was different from my sleeping with the enemy.

At the time I met my German friend in the very early 1970s, I still had not thought through what for me was not to become the Holocaust until the late 1970s—though I must say that I felt very relieved when she mentioned (though was this by chance?) that her parents had been in Africa during the war. I had been to Germany once, for a couple of days on a camping holiday with friends when we had driven across Europe to Italy and back. Being in Germany had disturbed me. Today I would say that I felt uncanny. Seidler tells a story about visiting Poland with his partner. On Warsaw station she left him to go and report a robbery. He writes: "Waiting in the station for Anna felt fine at the beginning but then I felt uneasy and nervous."⁵⁹ He goes on: "when Anna returned from a different direction about forty minutes later I knew that I just needed to leave. I could not deal with the insecurities that were emerging and I felt terribly unsafe."⁶⁰

I was much younger than Seidler on my first visit to Germany and much less in touch with my feelings. All I knew was that for some reason I was on edge, that being there made me feel uncomfortable. I didn't connect the feelings with my mother's hatred of all things German or with

her silenced fears over the Judeocide. There was, it seems, a twofold process at work here: my feeling of uncanniness which was the result of my transgenerational haunting and my feeling of unease, anxiety at being in Germany, which was the affect of the phantom that I had inherited.

My German friend went to university in Saarbrücken. I visited her there once. By this time her English had somewhat declined and my German, which I had learnt as a special subject at school—and done worse in than any other subject I had taken—was negligible. My friend took me to meet some friends of hers. This I could understand. Then she took me to meet some more, and more wanted to meet me. I began to think something strange was happening. I tackled my friend about it. She told me that word had got round that I was Jewish. These young people in their early twenties knew that the previous generation, maybe their parents or relatives, had destroyed the Jewish population of Saarbrücken, and of Europe. They themselves had never met a Jew.

I was aghast, not so much at being an exhibit (for me now it has disturbing colonial connotations of being a specimen) as being exhibited as a Jew. Me, totally assimilated, with no knowledge of Judaism, no Jewish cultural knowledge, whatever that might be, was being taken by these people as an example of those no longer present in Germany.⁶¹ The complex, unconscious intertwinings of desire and death which drove my friend's and my relationship—what, after all, was her stake in this?—had been transformed, for me, into a very confrontational moment. While I had felt safe with my friend, helped no doubt by knowing that the French border was so very close, I was now led in a most confrontational way to the knowledge that my mother had repressed and, seemingly, had wanted me to not to know.

Twenty years later Saarbrücken got its own anti-memorial to what, by 1990, was generally known as the Holocaust. Jochen Gerz made his first anti-memorial in 1972, the year of my visit. As James Young writes: "Between 1972 and 1998 [Gerz] has...opened a new generation's eyes to the essential incapacity in conventional public institutions like the museum or the monument to serve as wholly adequate sites for Germany's tortured memory of the Holocaust."⁶² At Saarbrücken, Gerz's students secretly removed cobblestones from the square leading to the Saarbrücken Schloss, engraved their undersides with the names of disused Jewish cemeteries in Germany and replaced them. The Gestapo had occupied the Schloss during Hitler's Reich. The town's Jews had been brought to the square on *Kristallnacht* in 1938 to be publicly humiliated. The remnants of Saarbrücken's Jewish population had been assembled in the square to be deported to Gurs in southern France on October 22, 1940.⁶³ At the time of my visit this kind of information was not public, general knowledge, not a part of local cultural memory.

The autobiographical narrative that I am constructing leads toward a consciousness of the Judeocide, understood in the late 1970s in the terms of the discourse of the Holocaust, and a gradual awareness of my situatedness

as a Jew in relation to the Judeocide. Another important moment in this trajectory came around the time I met my Jewish friend, shortly after I had gone to the University of Essex to study for my Masters. Sometime in 1973 or 1974 somebody at the university showed a print of Vittorio De Sica's 1971 film, *The Garden of the Finzi-Continis*. De Sica's reputation was made in the Italian neorealist movement of the late 1940s and 1950s. After a long, relatively fallow period *The Garden of the Finzi-Continis* was highly acclaimed and won De Sica an Oscar for Best Foreign Language film. These were the things I knew about the film when I went to watch it in one of the university's larger lecture theatres. What I did not know, or chose to ignore, was that this is a film about anti-Semitism and the Holocaust. I had never given much thought to what had happened to the Jews in Mussolini's fascist Italy.

The film asks to be read as an elegiac evocation of a lost era of harmonious community relations before fascism transformed Italy.⁶⁴ The Finzi-Continis are a very wealthy and assimilated Jewish family who live in palatial circumstances with a large, wonderful, peaceful garden protected from the world outside by a high wall. As fascism takes hold the family retreat behind their wall. The film begins in 1938. Much of its narrative concerns Giorgio's doomed love for his childhood friend, Micòl of the Finzi-Continis. Giorgio comes from a middle-class Jewish family that, in spite of the father's attempts to put a positive light on Italian fascism, is increasingly affected by the new laws restricting the lives of Jews. Micòl retreats into her family's private world. Finally, one day in 1943, the fascist police come to the Finzi-Continis' home, identify them in a roll call and take them to an assembly point with the other Jews of Ferrara, prefatory to deportation to a concentration camp.

In the film's narrative the menace increases slowly and subtly. As a viewer I became totally involved. When the police came to take the Finzi-Continis away I found myself on my feet shouting at the screen. What was it that I was feeling—anger at the fascist destruction of these Jews; anger at the Finzi-Continis for their passive acceptance of their fate? I don't know. I think probably both. The Finzi-Continis' behavior must have reminded me of my mother's determined assimilation, and maybe even her apparent refusal to confront what had happened in the Judeocide. Equally, I had, I think, found my anger at what the Nazis had done—an anger which was also my mother's anger transgenerationally haunting me but, as well, a postmemory acted out in a projection onto De Sica's film. I sat down embarrassed and confused. My friends, none of whom were Jewish, didn't mention the incident.

Living in Post-traumatic Society

One marker, at least for me, for the spread of what Friedlander calls the new discourse of Nazism was Lilliana Cavani's 1974 film, *The Night Porter*.

This film stars Dirk Bogarde as Max, an ex-Nazi officer who now, in 1957, works as a night porter in a hotel in Vienna. To this hotel comes Lucia, played by Charlotte Rampling, and her husband. It turns out that Lucia was a young prisoner in the concentration camp where Max was stationed. In the camp Max had forced Lucia into a sexual relationship with him. Now, many years on, the two return to that sadomasochistic relationship within the claustrophobic confines of Max's apartment room. Analytically, we could read this as traumatic repetition. I went to see this film with my Jewish friend when it was released in England and found myself speechless and riven with anxiety. I remember us leaving the cinema, silent and awkward with each other.

As Friedlander documents, through the latter part of the 1970s there was an outpouring of literature and film, fiction and nonfiction, about Hitler and Nazism.⁶⁵ Much of it was taken with the erotic qualities of the Nazis. Cavani's film, with its portrayal of tortured sex intermingling with violence, was the respectable tip of a pornographic iceberg the most notorious filmic example being *Ilsa, She-Wolf of the S.S.*, also released in 1974. *Ilsa* was set in a Nazi slave labor camp—actually the set of the television series *Hogan's Heroes*—in which Ilsa, played by Dyanne Thorne, is the camp commandant. She has two preoccupations, having sex with the male prisoners, castrating those who fail to satisfy her, and experimenting to find out if women can stand more pain than men. A large number of these films are set in concentration camps. These include the Italian-made *Last Orgy of the Third Reich* (1976) and the American *Prisoners of Paradise* (1980). In some, but by no means all of these films, such as *Last Orgy* and *Nazi Love Camp 27* (1977), the women are supposed to be Jewish. My point here is that the concentration camp films were a subgenre within this new representational concern with Nazism, and that these are not, in the first instance, Holocaust pornography. Lucia, in *The Night Porter*, is described as the daughter of a socialist, she is not identified as Jewish although in the flashback to her round-up there are many in the group wearing yellow stars. These films come out of the post-World War II narrative in which what happened to the Jews was simply one aspect of the war.

Friedlander argues that the preoccupation with Nazism offers a way of expressing opposing needs to be found in modern civilization:

*Modern society and the bourgeois order are perceived both as an accomplishment and as an unbearable yoke. Hence this constant coming and going between the need for submission and the reveries of total destruction, between love of harmony and the phantasms of apocalypse, between the enchantment of Good Friday and the twilight of the Gods.*⁶⁶

Embedded in this dichotomy is modernity's preoccupation with sex and male violence as an imbricated unity for which the concentration camp topos became the perfect vehicle. We cannot discuss this in detail here but we can note Slavoj Žižek's comment that concentration camps are

“the ‘perverse’ obverse of twentieth-century civilization.”⁶⁷ As I have argued in chapter 3, concentration camps can be traced back to the eighteenth century and the rise of the modern state. In Freud’s modern story of the origin of society he describes the primal horde and tells how the sons banded together to kill the Father so that they could gain access to the women of the horde whom the Father had kept for himself. Here, we find male desire and male violence intimately linked. This fantastic story is recapitulated in the familial Oedipus complex where the young son’s desire for the mother, to be satisfied by killing the father and taking his place, is thwarted by the son’s fear of castration. Freud comments that: “A considerable amount of aggressiveness must be developed in the child against the authority which prevents him from having his first, but none the less his most important, satisfactions.”⁶⁸ This characterization of the male child’s sexual life in the modern, nuclear, privatized family, with its freight of aggression, returns us to the idea of concentration camps by way of the German author Dieter Duhm who, in *Angst im Kapitalismus* (Fear in Capitalism), published in 1972, described families as “this massive number of private concentration camps.”⁶⁹ However, this is a recapitulation of a more profound modern structure. Concentration camps provide a patrolled space for the extreme violence that had been acted out previously—and continued to be acted out—by the Europeans on the Others identified on the colonial periphery. What the Nazis imported into the concentration and death camps, and into the space of Europe, was the modern, historical production of Same and Other, a production expressed in the distinction between “European” and “non-European” and, by the nineteenth century, “white” and “colored.”⁷⁰ This historical construction of Difference was a founding moment of narcissistic trauma which gets acted out as excessive, sexualized violence on those constructed as Other.

Andrea Dworkin, in her account of pornography as the expression of male sexual violence against women, *Pornography*, argues that the Nazis:

created a kind of sexual degradation that was—and remains—unspeakable. Even Sade did not dare to imagine what the Nazis created and neither did the Cossacks. And so the sexualization of the Jewish woman took on a new dimension. She became the carrier of a new sexual memory, one so brutal and sadistic that its very existence changed the character of the mainstream sexual imagination. The concentration camp woman, a Jew—emaciated with bulging eyes and sagging breasts and bones sticking out all over and shaved head and covered in her own filth and cut up and whipped and stomped on and punched out and starved—became the hidden sexual secret of our time. The barely faded, easily accessible memory of her sexual degradation is at the heart of sadism against all women that is now promoted in mainstream sexual propaganda.⁷¹

I am arguing that, rather than being a new figure, the Jewish concentration camp woman is the expression of what has always been repressed and marginalized—literally, to the colonial periphery—in modernity. From this point of view, the Sadean expression of power through sexual violence is normative rather than deviant. She is, then, not a new sexual memory but an unrepressed one. One element of our post-traumatic society is that the image of the Jewish concentration camp woman has become normalized. Joan Smith has written about William Styron's novel *Sophie's Choice* (published in 1979) that "the secret of the novel's popularity [is that] the juxtaposition of sex and the Holocaust has been dressed up as art, thus sanctioning its passage from the back rooms to the shelves reserved for the literary."⁷² In this book the concentration camp survivor is not Jewish, allowing for a more general identification. Given the normalization of the concentration camp woman as the legitimized expression of male sexual violence against women, it is not surprising that motifs that appear in the concentration camp film genre, such as women being fed to dogs in *Last Orgy*, repeat documented actions carried out with regularity on the colonial frontier.

The corollary is that descriptions of what took place in concentration and death camps and, indeed, the actual images photographed at the time, became pornographic opportunities for sexual arousal—even, perhaps especially, for Jews. Thus, for example, in his autobiography, Alan Kaufman, born in the Bronx to a French survivor and an American-Jewish father, tells how, one day going through the books in the children's section of the public library on Grand Concourse, he found a misshelved book with photos taken in the camps:

There followed photograph after photograph of naked corpses piled up in pits and on wagons and arranged on the ground:

In one such picture I caught the curve of a beautiful breast, looked more closely. There was a matching breast visible, equally voluptuous, the pair belonging to a shapely body spread pinwheeled on the ground, head flung back and mouth agape. The soft, pretty face was not skeletal like the others. I could imagine the woman alive, developed an erection. Eyes closed, envisioned my fingers cupping her breasts, penis grazing her lips... When I opened my eyes, saw that she was dead among others, anonymously, her teeth jutting from her limp jaw, her legs twisted unbecomingly in the open pit, my erection shrivelled instantly.⁷³

Kaufman associates the dead woman with his mother, whose behavior betrays her traumatized connection with her past and with whom he has a relationship of intermingled love and fear. This gives a reason for his particular reading of these images. However, Kaufman's interaction with these images is much more common.⁷⁴ As is indicated in the quotation from Dworkin, these images of naked women, and men,

and the narratives about what was done to them, can all too easily be appropriated as pornography—which I am defining very briefly here as culturally transgressive images that a reader appropriates voyeuristically as sexualized. With these images and descriptions the modern discourses of history and pornography commingle.

This commingling is even more fraught when it comes to reenactments. Discussing *Schindler's List*, Alan Mintz writes that:

Among the Hollywood conventions that Spielberg is least willing to part with, according to his detractors, is the intimate connection between violence and sexuality. Despite the high calling and supreme sensitivity supposedly embodied in the making of the film, *Schindler's List* carries over the same eroticization of female victimhood found in many lesser, exploitative films on the Holocaust and in the general run of Hollywood entertainment.⁷⁵

The most egregious example is usually taken to be the Auschwitz shower scene where the naked women wait fearfully, to be relieved to discover that the jets deliver water not gas. Placing the scene within what I have called the concentration camp genre, Omer Bartov comments that it “would be more appropriate to a soft-porn sadomasochistic film than to its context (and here Spielberg comes dangerously close to such films as Cavani’s *The Night Porter* and Wertmuller’s *Seven Beauties*).”⁷⁶ The debate over whether there is gratuitous nudity in the shower scene—which has a history in a Hollywood soft-porn genre, that of male coming-of-age films such as *Porky's* (1981)—or a legitimate portrayal of what went on in the camps is, ultimately, impossible to resolve because what happened in the camps was, itself, an expression of the extreme sexual violence that haunts modernity.

Bartov writes about a form of literature available to adolescents in pre-1967 Israel. This was:

passed secretly from one youth to another, read at night under a street lamp far from the eyes of adults, hidden under stones in the backyards of tenements, never brought home, hardly ever discussed, a source of illicit excitement and shameful pleasure. These were the so-called Stalags, a type of pornographic literature that circulated in Israel of the time, written by anonymous (but most probably Israeli) writers, replete with perverse sex and sadistic violence. The excitement evoked in young readers by such pulp fiction stemmed both from the encounter with forms of human activity kept tightly sealed from them by the puritanical nature of pre-1967 Israeli society and from the fact that the central sites for these actions were the concentration camps. Nothing could be a greater taboo than deriving sexual pleasure from pornography in the context of the Holocaust; hence nothing could be as exciting.⁷⁷

While the specificity is particularly worrying here, that young Israeli Jews—predominantly male, one would think—should learn about sex and sexual relationships by way of Holocaust pornography, such pornography utilizing concentration camps became relatively common in the West, as the concentration camp film genre makes clear. What the topos of the camp has offered has been the opportunity to portray the most extreme forms of sexual violence available to the modern imagination within a historically validated legitimating context.

Where Žižek implies that the concentration camp remains distinct from post-Holocaust society, Ka-Tzetnik, the concentration camp survivor and author of the *Salamandra* sextet about life in Auschwitz in which he novelized the fate of his family and himself, argues that, “if Auschwitz is another planet, then we are still living on that planet today.”⁷⁸ In this post-Holocaust society, the excessive aggression and sexual violence that underlies modern society, and which was brought home to Europe and played out in the concentration and death camps, has been accepted into the everyday where it is traumatically repeated in representations and acted out in everyday life.

The new discourse of Nazism, really a newly overt preoccupation, coming in the 1970s, approximately thirty years after the end of World War II, was a product, more or less, of that generation that came of age after the war, the postwar generations. This discourse was an appropriation and working over in many forms of the Nazi legacy. When English punks used the swastika as a part of their fashion bricolage, it was from within this new awareness of, and coming to terms with, Nazism by the following generations.⁷⁹ In 1978, when the punk band Joy Division named themselves after slang for a concentration camp barracks where forced prostitutes were kept—taken, indeed, from the second of Ka-Tzetnik’s sextet, *The House of Dolls*, the fictionalized account published in 1956 of what had happened to his sister, and a book that Bartov describes as sharing some of the characteristics of Stalag pulp fiction⁸⁰—the transgression was in response to the terms of the discourse of Nazism not of the Holocaust.⁸¹

However, the discourse of the Holocaust was becoming established and the two discourses were beginning to overlap, especially after the watershed of the British showing of *Holocaust* in 1978. These two discourses, individually and in complex combination, reconstituted cultural memory in Britain and in the West generally. The discourse of Nazism opened a space in which the war and the Nazi Reich could be discussed and worked over in popular culture. The discourse of the Holocaust, as I have already explained, enabled the various events of the Judeocide to be understood as a totality and for there to be debates about its unprecedentedness, its uniqueness, and its unrepresentability. The discourse also enabled the Judeocide to be understood as a cultural trauma.

Hirsh writes that:

postmemory is not an identity position, but a space of remembrance, more broadly available through cultural and public, and not merely

individual and personal, acts of remembrance, identification, and projection. It is a question of adopting the traumatic experiences—and thus also the memories—of others as one's own, or, more precisely, as experiences one might oneself have had, and of inscribing them into one's own life-story.⁸²

In the late 1970s and early 1980s there developed a space in which the inherited trauma of the Holocaust could be publicly understood and legitimized, where personal trauma could be made sense of in relation to a cultural memory of the Judeocide as the culturally traumatizing event of the Holocaust. At this point my own knowledge of what had transpired coupled with my traumascapes, my repeated actings out of my inherited fears and confusions related to the Judeocide, meshed with the new cultural memory of the Holocaust in what now could be identified as post-traumatic society. This was the time that I could begin my own journey to understand the impact on me of my mother's traumatic relation to the Judeocide and its haunting of my psyche.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Why Were the Sixties So Jewish?

Einstein, disguised as Robin Hood
With his memories in a trunk
Passed this way an hour ago
With his friend, a jealous monk

Bob Dylan, "Desolation Row."

I need to start with a caveat. This is not a historical trainspotting chapter about who was Jewish in the American counterculture of the sixties. As we shall see, a high proportion of identifying Jewish college students was engaged in radical political activity. More, a remarkably high percentage of Jews, as compared to their presence within the general population, were leaders in the political and sociopolitical arena.¹ Indeed, Jews were central to areas of activism as diverse as Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Weathermen, the Diggers, the Yippies, the second-wave feminist movement, the protest movement in folk-rock music.

Jews also played a very important role in the civil rights movement. Indeed, as Jonathan Kaufman notes, "[b]y the mid-1960s, Jewish contributors made up three-quarters of the money raised by SNCC [Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee], CORE [Congress of Racial Equality], and SCLC [Southern Christian Leadership Conference]."² However, in a crucial development, not only for its practical consequences but for what it suggests about the changing discursive context in which African-Americans and Jews related to each other, an SNCC staff meeting in December 1966, with Stokely Carmichael as chairman, voted to exclude all Whites, which included Jews, from the organization.³ This marks an important watershed, and one I will discuss in more detail because it signals the repositioning of Jews in American society; a repositioning that, as we shall see, was central to Jewish involvement in the counterculture and, to some extent, to the existence of the counterculture itself.

In this chapter, then, I am not interested in the role of individuals as such: Al Haber, Bob Ross, Todd Gitlin, for example, in SDS; Peter Berg and Peter Coyote in the Diggers; Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin in the

Yippies; Betty Friedan (a little older), Robin Morgan, Gloria Steinem, Kim Chernin, Marge Piercy to name a very few in the women's movement; Phil Ochs, Bob Dylan, Paul Simon, and Art Garfunkel in folk music. All these people, and more, will appear in this chapter. Many, many more won't. It will be easy to list Jews in the counterculture that I don't mention. That is not the point. This is not a history of the roles that Jews played in the events that are now thought of as making up "the Sixties" in the United States. Rather, my concern is with why, proportionally, so many Jews in the United States were involved in the counterculture and, to some extent, how their Jewish interests, not necessarily consciously, came to shape the preoccupations, and style, of the counterculture.

So Many Jews

Let us be more specific. Arthur Liebman, in his history of Jewish involvement in the American Left, *Jews and the Left*, writes that during the 1960s "the number of Jews among American college students averaged about 325,000 a year."⁴ SDS, the major campus radical-left organization of the 1960s, evolved out of the student wing of the League for Industrial Democracy (LID). LID had been set up in the early part of the century as a socialist, and indeed anticommunist, group allied to the Socialist Party. By the late 1950s it, and its student adjunct, were more or less moribund.⁵ Liebman tells us that: "In the early to mid-1960s, during which time membership of SDS rose from 250 to more than 30,000, the percentage of Jews within it was considerable, ranging from 30 to 50 percent."⁶ In the second half of the 1960s, SDS membership neared 100,000 but, Liebman writes, "the percentage of Jews declined."⁷ This relative decline in Jewish involvement is, I would suggest, easily explained by reference to the total number of Jews on the campuses. The high proportion of this number involved seems to have remained pretty constant. Perhaps the more telling point is that: "Jews were . . . almost always a significant proportion of the leaders and activists within SDS. At the 1966 SDS convention 46 percent of the delegates who identified themselves as having a particular religious background were Jewish."⁸

Of the Weathermen, the radical-left terrorist group that grew out of the implosion of SDS, Liebman writes that one-third of those arrested by the police were Jewish.⁹ Peter Collier and David Horowitz, in their right-wing critique of the sixties' generation, *Destructive Generation*, comment that WASPs (White Anglo-Saxon Protestants) were:

attracted to the Jewish drama of the new group and to "struggle sessions" during which Rudd, Robbins, and J. J. histrionically argued their positions. (Typical of the hard style she was developing, Bernadine [Dohrn] now called herself an "Oven Jew" explaining that she only identified with her Jewish side through the knowledge that

when the inevitable new genocide began, her Jewish blood would mark her as a victim.)¹⁰

Dohrn was Jewish on her father's side. Her preoccupation with what, in the 1970s, would become conventionally known as the Holocaust, was by no means unusual for these radical Jews and is a theme to which we shall return.

At the Berkeley campus of the University of California, the first spark that ignited the Free Speech Movement (FSM) was the protest at the House of Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) sitting in San Francisco's City Hall on May 13, 1960.¹¹ The fire really started on the Berkeley campus itself in 1964 when the university administration restricted left-wing political activity on the campus. Liebman writes that: "[a] majority of the FSM's leadership (Steering Committee) was Jewish"¹² and that, in 1964, "about one-third of the Free Speech Movement demonstrators were Jews."¹³ More generally, Liebman explains that "ninety percent of Jewish students attending schools at which there were demonstrations claim to have participated"¹⁴ and that, "Overall, in the course of the decade, it has been estimated that from one-third to one-half of the most committed activists at the most volatile schools were Jews."¹⁵

For Liebman, the Jews of the New Left were carrying on a family tradition. He argues that, regardless of their middle-class background, in left-wing schools, summer camps and resorts, institutions set up by the Jewish community, "young Jewish boys and girls were either politically socialized in conformity with the attitudes and values of their parents, or they were provided with exposure to a political perspective that reinforced that of their parents."¹⁶ While such institutions played a part, I will argue that, far more important, was the ambiguous social position in which Jews of the third generation since migration from the Pale found themselves during the 1950s and 1960s. Finally accepted as "White," they nevertheless still experienced discrimination in a multitude of mostly subtle ways. Moreover, while their parents had in the main joined the liberal middle class, the effect of discrimination, coupled with a still almost unspoken, folk knowledge of the events of the Holocaust, meant that these Jews, in spite of their assimilation into the culture, and values, of Anglo-American, "White" life, held themselves apart. At the same time, these third-generation Jews felt a disillusionment with an American life that, with its ideology of individualism and egalitarianism, failed to deliver. This was particularly shocking, consciously or not, for children of religious, or for that matter secular, Jewish families which, in one form or another, the *mitzvah* of *tzedekah*, which we might translate here as "righteous acts," was a part of life. What I am suggesting is that, for Jews, with their religio-cultural concern with an ethics of social practice, a society in which the ideological promise so clearly outstripped the way life that was led was a society in need of social transformation.

I want to begin unpacking this argument by looking at the problem of generations. These Jews of the sixties were, in the way they experienced America if not in actuality, third generation, the grandchildren of those Yiddish-speaking Jews who migrated from the Pale to the United States around the turn of the century. As Arnold Eisen writes,

That a Jew coming to maturity in 1930 could...be called "second generation" is a function of the massive immigration of Jews from Eastern Europe between 1880 and 1924 which raised the Jewish population of the United States from about a quarter million in 1880 to 4.2 million in 1927.¹⁷

One aspect of Jewish transformation over these three generations was the assimilatory, syncretic accommodation with American ideology.

In one respect Jews found a remarkable overlap between that ideology and their own religio-cultural thinking:

In choosing America the Jews had adopted a nation which, thanks to a Puritan legacy deriving from the Hebrew Bible, has traditionally regarded itself as a chosen people and its bountiful country as a chosen land. Americans, Jews discovered, saw themselves as a people destined to build a "city on a hill" after traversing a great wilderness.¹⁸

This enabled Jewish accommodation to be far-reaching. Reform Judaism, the most important sect for the second generation, began in France and Germany in the early nineteenth century as an accommodation to the needs of modern society. Imported to the United States by migrating German-Jews, it was formalized in the Pittsburgh Platform of 1885. Underpinning the Jewish-American turn to Reform Judaism was a perception of fundamental similarities between Judaism and secular American ideology. This claim to similarity, if not homology, is exemplified in the 1937 revision of Reform known as the Columbus Platform that also showed the influence of the more traditional Jews of the first generation in its return to many long-established Jewish practices. Nevertheless, the primary emphasis in Reform is on ethics. In 1952, in a speech before the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the organized rabbinate of Reform, Nelson Glueck, soon to become president of the Hebrew Union College, said:

Here, in the New Jerusalem of America planned as a spiritual Zion by its founding fathers and brought into being by revolutionary patriots imbued with the God-inspired liberalism of the prophets of Israel, the concept of this country as a citadel of social justice and warm-hearted humanitarianism was a natural one.¹⁹

As Eisen points out, Glueck was clear that Reform Judaism equated with American liberalism, indeed with American democracy. Specifically, in

this quotation we find an assertion of the similitude of American and Jewish understandings of social justice.

Social Justice

It is necessary, here, to say something about this idea of social justice. Earlier, I mentioned that the *mitzvah* of *tzedekah* could be translated as “righteous acts.” The idea derives from Deuteronomy 16:20 “Justice, justice thou shall follow.” As a divinely ordained imperative, *tzedekah* is often translated as “charity” and thought of in those modern, western terms, as the obligation to give of one’s bounty to help other Jews, and others in general, who are in more straitened circumstances. Over the first two generations in the United States, this understanding was transformed. Deborah Dash Moore has described how, in the nineteenth century, the concept of charity was parlayed into the idea of philanthropy by way of the Protestant notion of stewardship.²⁰ As Jews syncretically reworked the imperative of *tzedekah* with the idea of philanthropy so:

From a social activity of wealthy individuals, philanthropy became a communal endeavor. As a collective enterprise, Jewish philanthropy tried to reach across class lines to unite Jews into a non-sectarian community of interests with moral dimensions.²¹

At the same time the second generation synthesized American and Jewish worldviews. As Moore writes:

Standing between the immigrants and future American generations of Jews, the second generation created a communal framework for its children. They constructed a moral community with supports borrowed from American culture, middle-class values, urban lifestyles, as well as from their immigrant Jewish heritage. In fact, so successful were they in binding middle-class norms to visions of Jewish fulfillment, that their children could often not disentangle the two.²²

Exactly. Thus, for the third generation, *tzedekah* was understood in a secular context. Where the second generation saw it as a moral force binding the community, the third generation grew up to understand it in universalist terms, the terms of the Enlightenment on which Anglo-American national ideology was founded, as “social justice.”

Here we can return to Glueck’s typically second-generation understanding of the United States as a morally just society. It was their disillusionment with this perception, based on a variety of realizations that initiated the radicalism of the third generation. We may start contextualising this

by turning to Dominick Cavallo's discussion of "White" involvement in the civil rights movement. Cavallo writes that:

Most Whites who joined SNCC or participated in the sit-ins, boycotts, freedom rides and voter-registration drives of the early sixties, were children of liberal, middle-class parents. Whatever their family backgrounds (not all of them were offspring of middle-class or liberal parents), these young people were inspired by moral outrage. The injustice and inhumanity of racism inspired them to go to the South and "put their bodies on the line."²³

Cavallo's book is remarkably race-blind. Liebman tells us that:

In the summer of 1961 Jews made up two-thirds of the White Freedom Riders that travelled into the South to desegregate interstate transportation. Three years later Jews comprised from one-third to one-half of the Mississippi Summer volunteers.²⁴

I have already referred to the very high proportion of the funding of civil rights organizations that came from Jewish sources. This, we can now understand as a more conventional form of *tzedekah*.

Disillusionment started at home. Here, for example, is the civil rights worker and feminist Melanie Kaye/Kantrowitz writing about her Jewish family:

Every day I watched my parents leave our Brooklyn apartment to take the subway to work and return home drained, and I, with my seventeen-year-old energy, vowed to live differently. I believed I was confronting my parents' hypocrisy; in truth, I was also punishing them. These were their values? Then I would live these values, scorn their inability to do the same.²⁵

Kaye/Kantrowitz expresses her disgust, her moral outrage, at her parents' failure to live up to their own values in a society that was also failing to live up to the values it claimed. The basis of this relation is the assumed homology of values of Jews/Judaism and American ideology exemplified for the second generation in Glueck's assertion.

Abbie Hoffman, the activist and co-founder of the Yippies tells a similar story in his autobiography, *Soon to Be a Major Motion Picture*: "Deep down I'm sure we felt our parents' generation was a bunch of cop-outs. Six million dead and except for the Warsaw ghetto hardly a bullet fired in resistance!"²⁶

Hoffman tells a story of being very young and practice-reading the hotel brochure on the drive to the hotel for the family holiday. He asks: "Hey everybody, what does 'Christian Clientele Only' mean?" The upshot is that, rather than confronting the hotelier, Hoffman's father drives to another hotel. Hoffman retrospectively places this episode in the context

of the Holocaust and the claim of Jewish passivity in the face of extermination. However, his disgust at his father's failure to confront anti-Semitic discrimination is founded on an assumption of egalitarian social justice the moral correctness of which pervaded Hoffman's later activism, first in the civil rights movement and later in various fields including the anti-Vietnam War movement and the Yippies.

Jerry Rubin, who was an anti-Vietnam War activist and subsequently co-founder of the Yippies with Hoffman, cut his radical teeth on the Berkeley FSM. Jonah Raskin writes: "Born in 1938 to a Jewish working-class family in Cincinnati, Rubin grew up an all-American kid."²⁷ Cavallo tells us that Rubin was: "fascinated by the image of the loner cowboy dispensing justice in an anarchic West. He once remarked (tongue only slightly in cheek) that his radical ideas were 'more influenced' by 'the *Lone Ranger* [television series] than by Mao or Lenin."²⁸

Here we can see well the third generation's cultural starting-point in an assimilatory melding of secularized Jewish values and American ideology. Riv-Ellen Prell discusses the results of Marshall Sklare's 1957 sociological study of Jewish identity in a Chicago suburb. Ranking first out of twenty-two proffered statements in what respondents felt made a "Good Jew" was "to lead an ethical and moral life," third was "to promote civic betterment and improvement in the community."²⁹

The most important place where we can find this confluence of secularized Jewish and American values, and the third generation's reassertion of these from a disillusioned and left-radical position, is in the now-legendary Port Huron Statement of 1962. This statement was intended as the manifesto of the SDS. James Miller describes it as "one of the pivotal documents in post-war American history."³⁰ The Statement was drafted by Tom Hayden, perhaps the most significant of the founding members of Students for a Democratic Society. Hayden was born in 1939 in Royal Oak, Michigan, about twelve miles outside of Detroit. His Catholic parents were of Irish descent.³¹ Later, I will discuss the similarities, and divergences, in the American ambiguous racialization of the Irish and the Jews. Here, we can note that Hayden was not the only male of Irish-Catholic background prominent in the early formation of SDS. Michael Harrington, twelve years older than Hayden, was the link between LID and its student wing. As Todd Gitlin writes:

[a]mong the older, largely Jewish trade unionists, [Harrington] was the LID's one younger hope... He was close to Hayden, had drunk and travelled with him, had gone to his wedding—they were both fluent-tongued, fervent, middle-class Irish Catholic boys from the mid-West.³²

It is worth mentioning here that, in San Francisco's Digger movement, about which more will be said presently, the prime movers were predominantly Jewish and Irish-American. Hayden's draft Statement was discussed over three days by the fifty-nine delegates at the Port Huron conference,

many of whom were Jewish, and subsequently redrafted by Hayden along with Al Haber and Bob Ross, both Jews.

Here are two sentences, subsequently considerably revised and shortened, from a paragraph of a declaration presented to the Central Conference of American Rabbis in 1936. Rewritten, it became part of the Columbus Platform: "The mission of Israel expresses our undying will to live a life of ethical and religious creativeness. Israel will endure as long as its destiny will be bound up with the destiny of faith, brotherhood, freedom, justice, love, truth, and peace."³³ Near the beginning of the Port Huron Statement there is a section entitled "Values." Here we find: "Unlike youth in other countries we are used to moral leadership being exercised by our elders. But today, for us, not even the liberal and socialist preachments of the past seem adequate to the forms of the present."³⁴

We can see, as Moore suggested happened, the seamless synthesis of Jewish and American values. This critique is, simultaneously, third-generation disillusion—note the similarity in disappointment with that expressed by Kaye/Kantrowitz and Hoffman in their parents—and more universally American. Similarly, the left genealogy suggested by the allusion to "liberal and socialist preachments" refers to the history of the American left but at the same time refers to the trajectory of very large numbers of Jewish families in which the first generation's European socialism gave way, under the impact of assimilation and upward social mobility, to the second generation's American liberalism. Allegiance to this liberalism is now being associated with the moral failure of American/Jewish-American society.

Thus, for Jews, the moral assertion set out in the Columbus Platform draft is here read by the subsequent generation in terms of the second generation's failure to live up to its promise. The Port Huron Statement goes on:

We regard *men* [sic] as infinitely precious and possessed of unfulfilled capacities for reason, freedom and love... Men have unrealized potential for self-cultivation, self-direction, self-understanding and creativity... *Human relationships* [sic] should involve fraternity and honesty.³⁵

Here are reproduced almost all the moral values identified as being central to an ethical life in the Columbus Platform draft: creativity, freedom, love, brotherhood/fraternity, honesty/truth. The very success of the second generation in synthesizing Jewish and American values here becomes the basis for a critique of American society, and implicitly of the Jewish-American community, for not living up to those values.

The concept that knitted up this skein of values for both the Americanized Judaism of the second generation and the SDS radicals was democracy. As Eisen writes:

In America... the primary effort at harmonization was not made in terms of universalism, or even of the "Judeo-Christian heritage," but

in terms of democracy, a parallel harmonization which rendered the others, more useful in the past, somewhat dispensable.³⁶

For the second-generation Jews, democracy encoded a pluralism that allowed for their existence as a community within American society. The third generation radicalized the idea of democracy, calling for “participatory democracy.” Cavallo describes it as “one of the most frequently mouthed shibboleths of the decade, though it seemed to have different meanings to each person who used it, including those in SDS.”³⁷ Running their Jewish values as universal, American values, it would seem that, unlike the second generation’s attempt to make space for Jews within American, representative democracy,³⁸ the radicals of the third generation were looking to a form of democracy that celebrated the worth of each individual equally and saw this as the basis for promoting an ethical society.

Miller argues that Hayden’s understanding of participatory democracy derived from an article by one of his lecturers at the University of Michigan, the Jewish Arnold Kaufman who, in 1960, had published “Human Nature and Participatory Democracy.”³⁹ Kaufman’s argument is fundamentally ethical, concerned with how each individual might reach the limit of their human potential. As he writes: “A democracy of participation may have many beneficial consequences, but its main justifying function is and always has been, not the extent to which it protects or stabilizes a community, but the contribution it can make to the development of human powers of thought, feeling, and action.”⁴⁰ The idea of participatory democracy enabled the third generation, and their fellow radicals, simultaneously to take a step further on the assimilatory road and embrace American individualism while using that very individualism as the basis for radical action against the perceived immorality of American society and to attempt to create a new, American community—a classically American quest which, as Cavallo explains, can be traced back to the end of the eighteenth century.⁴¹

So far I have discussed the third generation’s radicalism, indeed their desire to reconstruct American society along more moral lines, in terms of their disillusionment with the second generation’s hopeful acceptance of American values. We must now contextualize that disillusionment and the disappointment on which it was founded. Matthew Frye Jacobson, in *Whiteness of a Different Color*, recounts how:

The period of mass European immigration, from the 1840s to the restrictive legislation of 1924, witnessed a fracturing of whiteness into a hierarchy of plural and scientifically determined White races...Finally, in the 1920s and after, partly because the crisis of over-inclusive whiteness had been solved by restrictive legislation and partly in response to a new racial alchemy generated by African-American migrations to the North and West, whiteness was reconsolidated.⁴²

Jacobson argues that, having been racialized out of whiteness in the second half of the nineteenth century, Jews were reincorporated from the 1920s onward. Karen Brodtkin asserts that: "The U.S. 'discovery' that Europe was divided into inferior and superior races began with the racialization of the Irish in the mid-nineteenth century."⁴³

While Jacobson focuses on the massive influx of migrants, Brodtkin examines the way American society constructed a racial hierarchy that related to what were considered appropriate jobs for each racial group. In this argument, the racialization of the Jews, along with national groups such as the Italians, had to do with job protection as well, of course, as the protection of Anglo-American culture and, indeed the "White" race itself. The early 1920s saw the popularity of Madison Grant's *The Passing of the Great Race*, published in 1916, in which he warned against accepting the migrant Jews as White, "the Polish Jew, whose dwarf stature, peculiar mentality, and ruthless concentration on self-interest are being engrafted upon the stock of the nation."⁴⁴

Very many of the Jewish migrants arrived as committed socialists. In fact, John Murray Cuddihy, for one, argues that socialism was developed in Europe, in the first instance, by Jews attempting to address in universalist rhetoric the so-called "Jewish question."⁴⁵ For the first generation, as Brodtkin writes, in the United States, as it had been in the Pale, Jewish socialism was a way in which Jews confronted their racialized oppression in a capitalist sociality:

Jewish socialism shared a broad set of principles with the rest of the community: that everyday Jews were members of the working class and were exploited as workers; that Jews were stigmatized and discriminated against as a race; that Jewish workers had to organize and fight the bosses and the state for their dues; that the goal of the international working-class struggle was to build a society based on reciprocal principles that fed the mind and spirit⁴⁶

Presented as a universalist ideology, socialism functioned as a secular complement to Judaism as a means of building and preserving community. In addition, it provided a basis for communal action against a racially structured economic environment read in terms of class.

Whitening the Irish and Jews

In *Broken Alliance*, Jonathan Kaufman discusses the reasons for the Jewish involvement in African-American struggles for civil rights. Kaufman explains that, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, American Jews were little concerned with Black rights. Indeed, many Jews supported the institution of slavery.⁴⁷ For Kaufman, the turning point was the Americanization of Judaism as expressed in the Reform's Pittsburgh

Platform. As we have seen, it was this Platform that first formalized the American Jewish concern with social justice. Complementing this development in the established community, Kaufman argues for the importance of the socialism of the new migrants:

The catechism of socialism impelled an alliance with Blacks. The brotherhood of the workers would overthrow the bosses and banish racism, anti-Semitism, war, and exploitation. Even more, socialism gave Jews an opportunity few could dream of in Poland or Russia—the chance to help people less fortunate than themselves.⁴⁸

The result is well known, from the key roles played by Joel and Arthur Spingarn in the formation of the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) to Samuel Leibowitz's defense of the nine "Scottsboro boys" in 1931, to the Jewish involvement, already noted, in the civil rights movement of the 1960s.

What is left out of this equation is the importance of the racialization of the Jews. Socialism enabled Jews to make common cause with Blacks because, as we have seen, it was an ideology that came out of the European racialized oppression of the Jews. As importantly, Blacks could make common cause with Jews because they understood that Jews were racialized and discriminated against. The Ku Klux Klan was anti-Semitic for the same reason it was anti-Black: both races were considered to be inferior. When Leibowitz travelled to Scottsboro from the relative safety of New York it was less than twenty years after Leo Frank had been lynched in 1913 for, it was claimed, murdering (and possibly raping) a White girl. When three civil rights workers were murdered in Mississippi in 1964, Mickey Schwerner, Andy Goodman and Jim Chaney, were publicly identified as two Whites and a Black. However, it seems too coincidental that, at a time when Jews were supposedly thought of as "White," the only two White civil rights workers to be murdered, rather than beaten up, happened to be Jewish. Yet, and this is important for thinking about the sixties as Jewish, when Whites were asked to leave the SNCC in 1966, it began a rapid disentangling of Jewish involvement in African-American civil rights.

By the 1960s public rhetoric described Jews as White. For nearly two decades Jews had been increasingly accepted in "White" society as White. They could no longer stand as racialized not-quite-Whites with Blacks, working in an advocacy role for an even more racialized minority. While the rise of Black Power and African-American consciousness were instrumental in the exclusion of Whites from Black organizations, the change in racial status of Jews also played a significant part.

I have noted Brodtkin arguing that the racialization of the Irish pre-cursed that of the Jews in the mid-nineteenth century. In this she follows, as I will also, the foundational work of Noel Ignatiev in *How the Irish Became White*, a book the importance of which is signaled in

its echo in the title of Brodtkin's own book, itself groundbreaking. Spurred by the Great Famine of 1846–50, around 1.8 million Irish migrated to the United States between 1845 and 1855, almost a generation before the period of most significant Jewish migration. These Irish were predominantly poorer, Gaelic speakers and Catholic, as compared to earlier migrants from Ireland. In England, the colonizing power, the Irish were increasingly racialized through the nineteenth century. Mostly, this took the form of associating their features with those of Black Africans, and, with the acceptance of evolutionary theory that allowed for scientific claims to be made for a racial hierarchy, with apes. Physiognomy, a science in its own right, enabled commentators to focus on perceptions of the physical features of the Irish rather than their whiteness. As L. Perry Curtis jr. puts it: "Whether seen from a scientific, social, or cultural perspective, the Victorian images of the Irish as 'White Negro' and simian Celt, or a combination of the two, derived much of its force and inspiration from physiognomical beliefs."⁴⁹ In the United States, where, unlike England, there was a large population of enslaved and free Black Africans, this understanding of the Catholic Irish as Negroid was acted out. Ignatiev writes that: "On their arrival in America, the Irish were thrown together with Black people on jobs and in neighborhoods."⁵⁰ He notes that this led not only to sexual relationships and children but also to a more general, dense web of everyday relations including shared participation in theft and an intermixing in church matters.⁵¹

Ignatiev sums up this positioning of the Irish, writing that: "Strong tendencies existed in antebellum America to consign the Irish, if not to the Black race, then to an intermediate race located socially between Black and White."⁵² Ignatiev argues that we cannot understand the whitening of the Irish without acknowledging that:

White supremacy was not a flaw in American democracy but part of its definition, and the development of democracy in the Jacksonian period cannot be understood without reference to supremacy. As it became the pillar of the Democratic party, Jeffersonian reservations over slavery and willingness to entertain notions of natural human equality (expressed in his *Notes on Virginia*) gave way to militant racial ideology.⁵³

We can, by the by, place the Jewish second generation's championing of American democracy, something central to Reform Judaism, in this context. Elsewhere I have discussed Horace Kallen's—the main ideologue of cultural pluralism between the two World Wars—complete lack of interest in the place of Blacks in American society.⁵⁴ Jewish involvement in the civil rights movement, with its faith in the American democratic process can be contextualized in the third generation's increasingly certain, though still ambivalent, sense of themselves as "White."

The racial nature of American democracy meant that:

In the combination of Southern planters and the “plain Republicans” of the North, the Irish were to become a key element. The truth is not, as some historians would have it, that slavery made it possible to extend to the Irish the privileges of citizenship, by providing another group for them to stand on, but the reverse, that the assimilation of the Irish into the White race made it possible to maintain slavery. The need to gain the loyalty of the Irish explains why the Democratic Party, on the whole, rejected nativism.⁵⁵

At least at the political level, the whitening of the Irish had to do with a conservative attempt to preserve slavery. It was the second-generation Jews, we can add, who turned to the Democratic Party in the 1920s and 1930s. As Moore writes, “Jews found the liberal Democratic blend of social reform and internationalism a compelling combination.”⁵⁶ We should remember that this was also the era when Jewish leaders were pushing the doctrine of cultural pluralism. The continuity in the Democratic Party lies not in its liberalism but in its recognition of the importance of enlisting minority groups in its support. This pragmatic concern with minorities led the party to a liberal, reformist agenda. Nevertheless, this may well have been a contributing factor to the third generation’s disillusion with liberalism and party politics.

The whitening of the Irish, which was also played out in the union movement where, as Ignatiev writes, “[o]n the docks, the Irish effort to gain the rights of White men collided with the Black struggle to maintain the right to work,”⁵⁷ took place through the final decades of the nineteenth century. The politicization of the Irish, albeit in a radical rather than conservative manifestation, appears in the Irish contribution to SDS and the Diggers but what underlies this, as it does for third-generation Jews, is an anxiety over racial designation.

Brodkin makes the important distinction between ethno-racial assignment and ethno-racial identity.⁵⁸ The Irish, like the Jews, may have been reassigned by American society as “White,” but, in terms of identity, of self-conception, they were not so certain of their whiteness. In his memoir, Hayden links his Irish background to his radical politics:

The qualities I most liked in my parents—my father’s irony, my mother’s warmth, their resentment of elites, their gut populism—might well be the remnants of their ethnic heritage, while what disturbed me—their desire for acceptance, their civil obedience, their difficulty in embracing a radical son—represented the lures of assimilation.⁵⁹

At the least the resentment of elites and the gut populism, as well as the “negative qualities,” can be sheeted home to the effects of social exclusion. Hayden, himself, remarks: “Now I grasped, for example, why in my

experience Jews were the most liberal ‘Whites’ in American society. It was because they remained the least assimilated, the most sensitive to the experience of oppression.”⁶⁰

Hayden comments on his search for the context of his own radicalism:

I was trying to understand how the various Haydens, Garitys, Foleys, and Duceys were driven by a combination of desperation and hope to seek *their* [sic] identities as Americans, how their Irish ethnicity had been dissolved over a century and replaced by the bland, middle-class American identity of my parents. Not only was this new identity lacking in cultural richness, but I realized that its attainment involved an erasure of a historical consciousness of having once been oppressed.⁶¹

In a colonial irony, Hayden’s attempt to visit his Irish origin failed when American authorities informed Irish officials that he was coming and they, fearing that he was going to Northern Ireland with the Irish Republican Army to agitate, put him on a plane back to New York. Hayden here repeats the dominant assumption, that upward social mobility into the middle class offers members of a group a universalist ideology that would replace the specificity of culture and erase any sense of racial difference—Hayden uses the term “ethnicity,” which presumes the Irish were thought of as White, something we know not to have been the case. Hayden’s radicalism, and that of others of Irish descent in the sixties, suggests an ongoing unsettlement albeit more or less unconscious, founded on their problematic sense of racial identity.

Diggers, Yippies, and “Guerrilla Theater”

The Diggers mutated out of the San Francisco Mime Troupe in 1966. The Mime Troupe had been founded by R. G. (Ronnie) Davis in 1959. Davis, a New Yorker like some of his troupe, wanted to offer radical theatre that would make the audience “question its assumptions about politics, society and their lives.”⁶² To this end, Davis utilized the form of the sixteenth-century *commedia dell’arte*:

Masked stock characters such as Pantalone, Arlecchino, and Dottore were recognizable types distinguished by their exaggerated personalities: crankiness, ebullient foolishness, and pomposity. These archetypes had been lovingly researched and resurrected by the troupe to serve radical agit-prop theater. The company spoofed hypocrisy, misuse of power, and official venality with barbed wit, sexual innuendo, and gusto.⁶³

Peter Berg, along with Coyote and Emmett Grogan decided to leave the Mime Troupe to pursue a more radical, activist theatre. All three came

from the New York area, Berg and Coyote (born Peter Cohon) were both Jewish. Berg came from a radical family. Grogan, born Eugene Grogan, was of Catholic Irish background.⁶⁴ Gitlin writes that, "he and Billy Murcutt [another Digger] were working-class Irish boys from Brooklyn."⁶⁵

Davis remarked that: "I personally like to work with the kooks, the emotionally disturbed, the violent ones, the fallen away Catholics, non-Jewish Jews, the deviates... They do what the well-trained actor can never do—they create."⁶⁶ What can Davis mean when he says that these groups create? And what do lapsed Catholics and non-Jewish Jews have in common, and in common with the other groups Davis identifies? The key here is that lapsed Catholics, for which read lapsed Catholic Irish, and non-Jewish Jews are, as individuals, practicing assimilation, learning to blend in with the dominant culture's everyday life. We could say that they are practicing whiteness. The other groups Davis mentions are all composed of people defined out of the "normal," everyday life of the dominant, all people who must learn to pass to be accepted, and all people who, in the nature of their affiliations, experience everyday life as problematic—something uncertain.

If Davis wanted to use these people to undermine the audience's assumptions, Peter Berg and his colleagues wanted a theatre that transformed everyday life, that took the migrant's and the excluded's preoccupation with the acting of the assimilatory process and used it to critique the established social order. It should not be a surprise that the Diggers were driven by a concern with social justice; that their emphasis on "free," for example shops where the goods were free, was a critique of the inequities of American capitalism. The Diggers' name was taken from the English seventeenth-century radicals of the same name led by Gerard Winstanley. They are often viewed as precursors of the socialist tradition, an allusion that allows us to recognize an echo of the concerns of the first generation's socialism.⁶⁷

Berg described the kind of theatre he wanted:

Theater as breaking glass... the convention of theater [as] sitting in an audience watching a play was like the convention of being a member of society watching television, or cop-opera... the enforcement of society... If you broke the glass people would stream through to the other side of the stage and become life-actors. That's the whole riff.⁶⁸

Equally, Berg could have described the convention of theatre as being like a member of society watching somebody learn to pass or assimilate into that society. In this Berg was describing the experience of his parents' generation. It is not coincidental that the most significant 1960s American sociologist of how people lived everyday life was the Jewish Erving Goffman, and his key theoretical conceit for critically engaging with the practice of daily life was the theatre and the notion of performance.⁶⁹ Berg wanted to take that migrant experience to the non-migrants and non-excluded

to, we might say, White America, and force them to experience life as a performance. Berg's insight was to understand the radical potential in this assimilation process. Coyote writes that:

The phrase "life-actor" was Peter's contribution, describing a person who consciously creates the role he or she plays in everyday off-stage life, a person who marshals skill, imagination, and improvisation in order to break free from imposed roles and restrictions and, by example, demonstrate a path that will free others.⁷⁰

The Diggers' most successful literalization of this idea in performance involved the erection of a twelve-foot square wooden "Free Frame of Reference," painted yellow, at the intersection of Haight and Ashbury Streets in San Francisco. In addition people were given three-inch square Frames of Reference to look through. Thus, people could look through their own Frame of Reference at other people walking through the Frame of Reference.⁷¹

Abbie Hoffman's activist career can be broadly divided into two sections. The first encompasses his work for the civil rights movement that ended when he, along with all other "Whites," was excluded from the SNCC in December 1966. The second included his "guerrilla theatre" which was inspired by the Digger performances in San Francisco, his involvement in the anti-Vietnam War movement and his co-foundation of the Yippies.⁷² From a Jewish perspective, Hoffman's activist career is marked by the Jews' shift of status from ambiguous racialization to marginalized whiteness. Immediately after the exclusion Hoffman published a highly emotional article in *Village Voice*, entitled "SNCC: The Desecration of a Delayed Dream," expressing his anger and sense of betrayal. Hoffman personalized the experience writing that his anger was "the kind of anger one might feel, say, in a love relationship, when after entering honestly you find that your loved one's been balling someone else, and what's worse, enjoying it."⁷³ What underlies this simile is Hoffman's sense of an altered reality, of a loss of the position by which he lived his life.

This article marks a watershed for Hoffman. It is the first in which he identifies his authorial self as "Abbie" rather than his given name of "Abbott." We can note here that the Jews, and the Irish-background Diggers, of the counterculture often changed their names, from Peter Berg known as "the Hun" through to Robert Zimmerman, Bob Dylan. Name-changing was a part of Jewish attempts at assimilation and reflected a more or less unstable identity. In the sixties it could have elements of these but it was also radicalized, becoming a statement about a person's change of identity and, in the hands of the Diggers, a more general statement about the modern association of individual identity with a person's name.

In addition to changing his name, here it would seem a break with his activist past but not with his family signaled by his keeping his family name, Hoffman also began to foreground his Jewishness, more specifically

his Yiddishness. Raskin, himself Jewish and at one time putative Minister for Education for the Yippies, writes:

The expulsion of Whites from SNCC made him feel naked and ashamed; indeed, he felt “like a schmuck.” Abbie had grown up listening to his relatives speak Yiddish, and among friends he would toss out Yiddish expressions, but this was the first time he had used Yiddish in print. In years to come he would introduce Yiddish expressions into the movement at large, injecting a Jewish identity into radical politics.⁷⁴

One way of reading this shift is that, in his civil rights phase, Hoffman, and other Jews, strove for whiteness by comparison with the Blacks on whose behalf they were struggling. Within whiteness, however, Jews asserted their difference as a way of preserving their identity.

Hoffman’s first, and most famous, piece of guerrilla theater took place at the New York Stock Exchange on 24 August 1967. There is some debate about whether Hoffman called the media, in both *Revolution for the Hell of It* and *Soon to Be a Major Motion Picture* he denies it but, according to Raskin, others remember differently.⁷⁵ In the event, the performance became a media spectacle. Where the Diggers affected to despise television, Hoffman, who claims in *Soon to Be a Major Motion Picture* that he learnt how to use the media for his own purposes from Marshall McLuhan’s *Understanding Media*,⁷⁶ merged spectacle and revolution.⁷⁷ Where Berg and the Diggers wanted to incite people to perform, Hoffman understood that the pervasiveness of television meant that everything already was a performance.⁷⁸ What he was after was spectacle.

Hoffman turned up at the Stock Exchange accompanied by Jerry Rubin and a dozen or so others. They lined up along with tourists waiting to take the official tour. When the captain of the security force hesitated to let them in calling them hippies, Hoffman, using his Jewishness as a weapon in this White, Anglo-American world replied, “Who’s a hippie? I’m Jewish and besides we don’t do demonstrations, see we have no picket signs.” On entering the visitors’ gallery the group started throwing dollar bills onto the floor of the exchange. On the floor there was a scramble for the money. When the group was ushered out they were confronted by print and television journalists.⁷⁹ This action, with its New Testament connotations of Jesus’ confrontation with the moneylenders in the temple, works as a social justice-based critique of capitalistic avarice.

Hoffman and Rubin were also both involved in the planning of the anti-Vietnam War demonstration in October 1967. It was Rubin’s idea to hold the protest at the Pentagon.⁸⁰ The demonstration consisted of both a conventional rally and guerrilla theatre, the most important aspect of which was an exorcism and ceremony to levitate the building. While the Pentagon protest was extremely successful both in terms of numbers attending and media coverage, the event which changed the way most

Americans understood television was the Yippie Festival of Life held at the Democratic Convention in Chicago during August 1968. Key to this change was the televised brutality of the Chicago police in their attacks on the demonstrators.⁸¹

This is not the place to detail the Pentagon and Chicago performances, nor to document the invention of the nonparty, Yippie, other than to make the point that in all cases third-generation Jews, in addition to Hoffman and Rubin, occupied a high percentage of leadership roles. Thus, for example, at the foundation of Yippie, as well as Hoffman and Rubin, there were Paul Krassner, Stew Albert, and Phil Ochs.⁸² Robin Morgan, later better known as a feminist activist, was one of the Jewish women involved. Morgan was also one of the founders of WITCH (Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell), along with Sharon Krebs and Nancy Kurshan.⁸³ The point I want to make here about these people, about the personas they presented which merged with the performances they undertook, is that they lacked civility. Their disruption was, at bottom, a public unsettling of the civility that orders American sociality. Cuddihy argues for the importance of the Eastern European Jewish confrontation with modern civility in understanding the position of Jews in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He describes how the Jews' lack of civility, and therefore the failure of Western people's attempts to develop reciprocally civil interactions with Eastern European Jews:

spread shock waves through nineteenth-century society. In arguing a larger alienation—since the norms of civility merely spell out and specify for face-to-face interaction the more general values of the culture—the failure of civility came to define “the Jewish problem” as this problem reconstituted itself in the era of social modernity.⁸⁴

It was this culturally inherited lack of civility that enabled Berg, Coyote, Hoffman, Rubin, and others to engage in uncivil public performances with such sophistication. And it was the White, Anglo-American preoccupation with civility that made these performances so effective.

When Rubin was subpoenaed to appear before HUAC in 1966 he took advice from R. G. Davis and wore the uniform of a 1776 American revolutionary soldier.⁸⁵ Rubin wrote that: “I felt that to take the committee seriously would be devastating.”⁸⁶ Rubin's uncivil gesture simultaneously undermined the formality of the hearing and asserted his Americanness. In October 1968 many of the left-radicals including Hoffman, Rubin and Hayden appeared before HUAC. This time:

Jerry Rubin wore a bandolier of live cartridges and carried a toy M-16 rifle. Abbie appeared in a tie-dyed T-shirt with two feathers in his long hair. [The women of WITCH] carried brooms and wore black dresses and black hats. Forming a circle around Jerry, they burned incense, danced, and chanted.⁸⁷

Hoffman and Rubin's lack of civility in the formal settings of the HUAC hearings extended to the Chicago Conspiracy Trial where they were charged, along with Dave Dellinger, Tom Hayden, Rennie Davis, John Froines, Lee Weiner, and the Black Panther, Bobbie Seale with conspiring to commit offences against the United States. The trial was lengthy and constantly disrupted in uncivil ways. To stop him interrupting, Seale's mouth was taped and his hands and feet were shackled to a chair. Finally, the judge severed Seale's case from that of the others. The judge, Julius Hoffman, was a Jew descended from the earlier, nineteenth-century, migration. A liberal, he was also highly assimilated and, from where Hoffman and Rubin stood, on the side of those in power. As Raskin puts it:

Abbie cast himself and his co-defendants as the "good Jews" and Julius Hoffman and Richard Schultz [the chief prosecutor] as the "bad Jews," who were betraying their own people to the men of German ancestry in power in the White House: Henry Kissinger, Richard Kleindienst, H. R. Haldeman, and John Erlichman.⁸⁸

Abbie began his testimony by making a point about the name he shared with the judge. When asked his last name he replied, "My slave name is Hoffman. My real name is Shapoznikoff."⁸⁹ Abbie knew that his Russian forebears had been called Shapoznikoff. However, as part of their attempt to get to the United States they had acquired the papers of a German Jew called Hoffman. Abbie's paternal grandfather adopted this name during his travels to the United States. Here we see another example of the mobility of names and identities to which, Jews, in particular, have been subject. Calling Hoffman a slave name, Abbie makes a connection between the difficulties of his own Eastern European Jewish family's migration with the forced transportation of Blacks as slaves when their owners took the right to (re)name them. By association, describing Hoffman as a slave name also attacked Julius Hoffman as an assimilated member of the establishment.

Five and a half months later, at the end of the trial, to the judge's horror, Dellinger shouted "bullshit" at the testimony of the deputy chief of the Chicago police. Davis and Rubin then repeated the word and Abbie followed it up with: "You are a disgrace to the Jews. You would have served Hitler better. Dig it."⁹⁰ Abbie begins with the classic Jewish put-down, one that simultaneously acknowledges the Jewish community and suggests anxiety in a Gentile world. He follows this up with an indirect reference to what was just beginning to be called the Holocaust, associating Julius Hoffman with Hitler and, thereby, once more indicting Hoffman's German-Jewish heritage. On the following day Abbie took this attack further, saying to the judge:

"Your idea of justice is the only obscenity in the room. You shtunk. Schande vor de goyim, huh?"

The Court: “Mr Marshall, will you ask the defendant Hoffman to—”

Mr Hoffman: “Tell him to stick it up his bowling ball. How is your stock doing, Julie? You don’t have any power. They didn’t have any power in the Third Reich either.”⁹¹

Rubin follows this up, accusing the judge of equaling Adolf Hitler. Abbie’s maneuver is to assert his greater Jewishness by speaking Yiddish. He refers to the judge as a capitalist and feminizes him. All in all, Abbie attacks the judge as a class and community traitor.

Abbie’s loathing of the judge is founded in the judge’s assimilation, a possibility not offered the racialized Eastern European Jewish migrants and not acceptable to the whitened third generation who, unlike the German Jews who migrated roughly two generations earlier, grew up knowing from the death of relatives in the Holocaust, the impossibility of assimilation. The judge may think he has power but, as Abbie suggests, he doesn’t really, he only has power as long as the White Americans allow him to exercise power. That the Chicago Conspiracy trial judge was German-Jewish allowed Hoffman to express a double anger. It merges his anger as a radical at the organization of American society and its lack of social justice with his anger as a Jew, expressing his disappointment in the way Jews—his, Yiddish-background, Eastern European Jews—have been positioned in that society.

White But Not Acceptable

I have already noted that Jacobson suggests that the whitening of the Jews began in the second half of the 1920s. Brodtkin argues that this whitening took place after World War II. She explains the change as a combination of cultural changes, for example “[a]nti-Semitism and anti-European racism lost respectability,”⁹² and economic prosperity which enabled Jews and other Euro-ethnics to enter the expanding White middle class.⁹³ Both Jacobson and Brodtkin are right. The expansion of whiteness was a long, slow and incomplete process. Moreover, as Brodtkin writes: “Jews had a justifiable wariness about the extent to which America’s embrace was real. They also had qualms about the costs of joining the mainstream to a Jewish sense of personal and social morality.”⁹⁴

Even as Jews were whitened, they were not regarded as the same as Anglo-American Whites. Prell tells us that:

In the decades following World War II, although antisemitism appeared to be waning, Jews’ new affluence did not bring them the social and cultural acceptance that they anticipated from middle-class non-Jews. To the contrary, suburbs fostered the conviction that

Jews were different, and Jewish women and their children became icons of excess and consumption.⁹⁵

While Jews “rested firmly within the color line of their suburban neighbors,”⁹⁶ “sociological studies learned that non-Jews left the suburbs when Jews moved in because they thought that Jews and their children were undesirable.”⁹⁷ Prell writes that: “On the basis of a variety of community studies published in the early 1960s, it appeared that Jews were not finding interaction with their new neighbors at all easy.”⁹⁸ Jews complained that non-Jews made them feel unwelcome and wouldn’t socialize with them.

Betty Friedan, born in 1921 and technically too old to be thought of as a sixties radical, lived in this suburbia and published *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963. In that book, which kick-started second-wave feminism, Friedan offers an extended simile of the suburban housewife as a Holocaust victim:

I am convinced there is something about the housewife state that is dangerous. In a sense that is not as far-fetched as it sounds, the women who “adjust” as housewives, who grow up wanting to be “just a housewife,” are in as much danger as the millions who walked to their own death in the concentration camps—and the millions more who refused to believe that the concentration camps existed.⁹⁹

The anxiety born of the awareness of the Nazi genocide, as yet still unspoken and unnamed, formed a threnody that weaves its way through the Jewish concern with social justice which helped produce the social radicalism, in all its forms, of “the Sixties.” I have noted Hoffman’s reference to it, we can also note, for an example, that Dylan touches on it in “Talkin’ John Birch Paranoid Blues” off his first album, *Bob Dylan* (1962). Speaking as a member of the far-right John Birch Society he says:

Now we all agree with Hitler’s views,
Although he killed six million Jews,
It doesn’t matter too much that he was a fascist,
At least you can’t say that he was a communist!

In Friedan’s case, the metaphorical use suggests Friedan’s greater than average, that is, greater than White women’s, horror at the situation in which postwar middle-class women found themselves. In the 1930s Friedan’s father referred “to the common phenomenon of five o’clock friends. Mr Goldstein told Bettye that socially prominent Christians would simply not talk to him after business hours.”¹⁰⁰ Jews may have become whiter but otherwise things hadn’t changed much in suburbia by the early 1960s.

The Feminist and Protest Movements

The second-wave women's movement grew out of a confluence of disillusionments. The importance of Jewish women is indisputable. Joyce Antler, writes:

Like Friedan, many of the leaders and theorists of the 1960s feminist movement had been Jews, albeit largely secular, unidentified ones. Bella Abzug, Phyllis Chesler, Letty Cottin Pogrebin, and Vivian Gornick—as well as the half-Jewish Gloria Steinem—all played prominent roles in spearheading women's rights in the 1960s and early 1970s. Shulamith Firestone, Robin Morgan, Meredith Tax, Andrea Dworkin, and Naomi Weisstein were among the Jewish women active in the more radical wing of feminism—women's liberation.¹⁰¹

White women in general, as we have seen, were disillusioned with the life that they had been given to lead in the new suburbs. Promising so much, this life turned out to be lonely and spiritually empty. How much more disillusioned were Jewish women who had struggled to be accepted as White, had been only halfheartedly successful, and found themselves even more isolated and restricted in the suburbs than their WASP peers. That, as Antler points out, so many of these women were secular and non-identifying Jews, suggests the high degree of assimilation of these women into an American society that only halfheartedly accepted them. Antler adumbrates other reasons: Friedan's suggestion that the high level of education among Jewish women increased their sense of frustration; Anne Roiphe's idea of the importance of Jewish women's disgust at the way they were portrayed in the media, and by Jewish men.

For the sixties generation themselves there was another disillusion. As Antler tells it:

By 1967, many [activist women] had become outraged at their treatment by male radicals whose belief in freedom and equality apparently only applied to men. After their attempts to introduce women's issues into the movement were met with ridicule, these women began to organize groups of their own, identifying their cause as women's liberation. "The personal is political" became their slogan and consciousness-raising their primary tool.¹⁰²

We can hypothesize that one reason why so many male radicals were against—or, perhaps, at the least, could not understand—the concerns of these women was that they came from Jewish households which, religious or secular, continued the Jewish patriarchal tradition. A reason for the high level of anger of these politicized women was that, as Jews, they too came from just such households. That the personal is political would have been particularly obvious to these women.

If the Jewish women who played such an important part in the founding of both second-wave feminism and women's liberation were ambivalently assimilated, then we can say the same for those Jews who played such an important role in the development of the so-called "protest movement" in folk music. At the moment when folk music ceased to be identified with roots music and with a socialism that celebrated the rural workers and became the radical aspect of commercial popular music, a number of third-generation Jewish singer/songwriters found in this musical form an ideal way to express their concerns about social justice.

In the early part of the twentieth century folk music was constructed as essentially White and American. Benjamin Filene writes that:

Mostly White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, the song collectors asserted that [Appalachian] mountain culture was America's authentic folk inheritance and at the same time stressed that the mountaineers were British. In effect, therefore, the collectors established *their* heritage as the true American culture.¹⁰³

The tradition with which Bob Dylan identified flowed from Woody Guthrie through Pete Seeger. Before Dylan, however, there was Ramblin' Jack Elliott. Elliott, born Elliott Charles Adnopoz in 1931, was the son of a Jewish doctor in Brooklyn. The story goes that at age fourteen, enamored of the cowboy life, he ran away from home to join a rodeo. Returning to New York he became friendly with Woody Guthrie, learning his style of guitar playing and singing. Guthrie, born in 1912, the most outspoken of the folk-singers of his pre-World War II generation, revolutionized folk music as an overtly politically committed musical form.¹⁰⁴ Given his concern with social justice it is understandable that Guthrie's second, and long-term, marriage was to the Jewish Marjorie Mazia. Their children, including the Sixties folk-singer, Arlo, were brought up as Jews—in the late 1950s Arlo was tutored in Judaism by a then-unknown rabbi named Meir Kahane. Ramblin' Jack traveled the country with Guthrie for around five years. The point here is about the complexities of assimilation. Ramblin' Jack's change of name signals his attempt to Americanize himself and downplay his Jewish background. His fantasy about being a cowboy was quintessentially Anglo-American (we should remember Jerry Rubin's cowboy fantasy here), as was his liking for folk music. At the same time, his friendship with Woody Guthrie shows his belief in social justice that, as we have seen, is a central part of the Jewish-American tradition.¹⁰⁵

The commercial breakthrough of folk music came with the 1958 release of The Kingston Trio's soft-folk version of "Tom Dooley." Robert Cantwell, in *When We Were Good*, places this moment in context: "The folk revival . . . is really a moment of transformation in which an unprecedented convergence of postwar economic and demographic forces carried a culture of personal rebellion across normally impermeable social and

cultural barriers under the influence and authority of folk music, at once democratic and esoteric, already imbued with the spirit of protest.”¹⁰⁶ One of the more successful of the soft-folk groups who formed in the wake of The Kingston Trio’s hit was The Limelites. Another trio, it included Lou Gottlieb. Gottlieb was Jewish. Needless to say, he was the comic of the group. After he left the group in 1965, he lived on a farm he called Morningstar that he had bought north of San Francisco. There, Gottlieb founded a commune and supplied organic fruit and vegetables to the Diggers for their free food program. Gottlieb’s life is one of the examples of the interconnections across different facets of cultural and political life in the Sixties. The thread through his life is typically Jewish-American—consciously or not, it explores the problem of how to find a way of living that practiced social justice. As I have explained, such a concern very often emanated from Jewish family backgrounds. Peter Yarrow, of Peter, Paul and Mary, is typical in this regard. Born in 1938, he has said that: “His family . . . ‘placed a great emphasis on ethics, values and culture.’ They also seem to have placed a high value on the arts and scholarship.”¹⁰⁷ It almost goes without saying that Woody Guthrie was one of Yarrow’s idols.

However, Bob Dylan was the most important social commentator and critic, Jewish or not, to come out of the folk music scene of the late 1950s and early 1960s. Dylan, born Robert Zimmerman in 1941, came from a middle-class Jewish background in the small town of Hibbing, Minnesota. His parents moved there from Duluth, also in Minnesota, when he was six. Dylan tells a story about how he took lessons for his bar-mitzvah in 1954 from a rabbi who lived upstairs from the local rock’n’roll café. Dylan would first see the rabbi and then hang out in the juke joint. Dylan’s great-grandparents on his mother’s side migrated from Lithuania to North Hibbing in 1902. On his father’s side, Dylan’s grandparents moved from Odessa to Duluth in 1907.

In September 1959, Dylan moved from Hibbing to Minneapolis where he had a place at the University of Minnesota. He lived in a Jewish fraternity house.¹⁰⁸ At the same time he started erasing the signs of his Jewishness. Asking for a gig at The Ten O’Clock Scholar, he called himself Dylan.¹⁰⁹ Traditionally, this is seen as a reference to that great word-smith Dylan Thomas. It places Dylan in the Anglo-poetic tradition. We need to remember, though, that Dylan Thomas wasn’t English, he was Welsh. Here we have an example of the ambiguity that runs through Dylan’s work. He didn’t express himself as fully Anglo-American even when he was downplaying his Jewishness.

Dylan’s hero was also Woody Guthrie. However, by the time he came to meet the man himself, Guthrie was too sick with Huntington’s chorea to be able to tutor Dylan. Much of what Dylan learnt about singing and playing in the vein of Guthrie came from Ramblin’ Jack. As Ramblin’ Jack has said: “Dylan learnt from me the same way I learned from Woody. Woody didn’t teach me. He just said, ‘If you want to learn something just steal it—that’s the way I learnt from Leadbelly.’”¹¹⁰ There is a, perhaps

apocryphal, story that Dylan found out that Ramblin' Jack was Jewish one day when they were both driving in a car and that Dylan's reaction was to throw Jack out of the car. Dylan was disappointed at Ramblin' Jack's lack of authentic Americanness—something that, of course, Dylan was himself trying to learn.

In this early period Dylan effaced his Jewishness in favor of an all-American rural, if not cowboy, background. In *Writings and Drawings*, published in 1973, Dylan offers a short, poetic autobiography entitled "My Life in a Stolen Moment."¹¹¹ Here he describes being born in Duluth and writes that: "My mother's from the Iron Range Country up north." Not incorrect, but not the whole truth either, this statement suggests Dylan as having that Midwest rural Anglo heritage that would authenticate him as a "real" American.

The complexities of Dylan's ambivalent relation to his Jewishness while assimilating into White America is best expressed in a brief song Dylan started including in his set in 1961 after he got to New York. It's called "Talkin' Hava Negeilah Blues." The recorded version has Dylan prefacing it with "Here's a foreign song I learnt in Utah."¹¹² He then chants 'Ha! Va! Ha-va! Ha-va-na! Hava Nageilah!', following this with a yodel and then a harmonica riff typical of his blues-influenced numbers. Larry Yudelson, in his discussion of the Jewishness of Dylan's work, "Dylan: Tangled Up in Jews," writes that:

With the yodel and a finishing harmonica flourish, Dylan had outlined an epitaph for the Hebrew folk songs sung by folksingers like Theodore Bikel and the Weavers as part of a vaguely leftist, working-man's ethnic repertoire. The mockery was prescient. The left would not be strumming love songs about Israeli soldiers much longer. Dylan, with his inspired instinct for the authentic, was first to smell the phoniness.¹¹³

While certainly there may be something satirical in Dylan's Americanized reworking of the Jewish/Israeli folk song, it also exemplifies the assimilative ambiguities that dogged the third generation and characterized the sixties. Dylan brings together his claimed American heritage with his Jewish heritage, asserting the latter while framing the song with both an Appalachian-style yodel and a reference to Black American music. It is worth commenting very briefly on Dylan's "Utah" reference. Utah simultaneously signifies the American heartland and the slightly not-quite-typical Americanness of the Mormons. Again, then, even here, we have a degree of ambiguity, this time displaced from Jewishness to another, albeit American-originated, religion.

In his study of "Jews and Rock and Roll," E. Anthony Rotundo describes the lack of a Jewish presence in (pre-Glam Rock and punk) rock'n'roll.¹¹⁴ This was not the case in the folk/protest movement. In addition to the people I have already mentioned—and we should certainly

not forget Phil Ochs who was one of the founders of the Yippies and who used his songs for years to sing out against the Vietnam War—there were others, such as Country Joe McDonald, who is of Scots and Jewish background.¹¹⁵ He came from a radical family and became involved in politics himself by way of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. He was the writer of what was, perhaps, the most well-known anti-Vietnam War song, “I Feel Like I’m Fixin’ to Die Rag.”¹¹⁶ Barry Melton and Gary Hirsch, also from Country Joe and the Fish, are Jewish as are Jorma Kaukonen, Spencer Dryden and Marty Balin who used to play with another high profile countercultural San Francisco band, Jefferson Airplane. Then there were also Paul Simon and Art Garfunkel, both from Queens, whose earlier work resonated with the protest movement and whose later work chimed with the angst and disillusionment of (Jewish) middle-class youth on a more personal level.

For all these people the folk/protest movement offered a way of simultaneously identifying as American and offering a social commentary and critique, something born out of their Jewish family backgrounds and their sense of not quite fully belonging—not being allowed to assimilate fully—into Anglo-American society. Gitlin tells how Dylan turned up to SDS’s 1963 National Council meeting in the company of a Mississippi civil rights lawyer. Dylan indicated that he was interested in working on an ERAP (Economic Research and Action Project) and offered to sing benefit concerts for SDS.¹¹⁷ Neither of these things happened but that’s not the point. Dylan here shows the cultural and political convictions that were typical of the third generation’s rebellion against their parents’ too-easy acceptance of American liberalism and the sacrifice of personal values that was the price they paid for the assimilation that, in the end, they were not fully granted. If much of Dylan’s early work dealt with issues associated with social injustice, then much of his later work deals with the ethics of personal life. I am thinking here of material on albums as diverse as *Blood on the Tracks* (1975) and *Desire* (1976) and the much later *Time Out of Mind* (1997) and *Love and Theft* (2001).

The American society in which the third generation of Jews grew up only partially accepted them as White. Many of those Jews who contributed to the average of 325,000 a year at colleges and universities in the early 1960s were lucky to be there. The more or less informal quotas on the number of Jews being allowed into institutions of higher education were gradually done away with after World War II¹¹⁸—certainly an institutional sign of Jewish whitening. This was a world in which the expectations that had seemed so certain to the second generation appeared to have fallen short. The United States had not lived up to its claims to be a socially just society. To the third generation this was most obvious in the increasingly clearly unjust Vietnam War. However, in a more diffuse, yet more fundamental, way the recognition of the generalized lack of social justice in American society was the cornerstone of the counterculture and of the hippie critique. For the Jews who led these movements, their own

lack of acceptance into middle-class White suburban society—the post-World War II American consumerist utopia—grounded this understanding at a personal level.

Sixties' Jewish radicalism which, as we have seen, spread across all aspects of political and cultural life, was founded in the third generation's strong belief in social justice and their recognition that neither their mostly liberal, Democratic-voting Jewish parents nor American society itself lived up to the standards of social justice that were asserted in the syncretized value system of Jewish-American and (WASP) American life. The recognition of the always only ambivalent acceptance of Jews into American whiteness chimed with the experience of the Catholic Irish in the United States and helped to produce a similarity of perception which led to the primarily Jewish but also Catholic Irish-American dominance of Sixties radicalism. It is possible to read out of the epigram that I have taken from Dylan's epic and densely allusive song of disenchantment, 'Desolation Row' (released on *Highway 61 Revisited* in 1965), a recognition of the problematic implications of Jewish assimilation, and its relation to social justice. As well, there can also be read an acknowledgment of the Catholic, by implication Irish, connection. It was the very repositioning of the Jews as White in the post-World War II period, with all that that promised, and with all that American ideology promised in the way of social justice, that produced the conditions for the radicalism of the third generation that underwrote sixties radicalism more generally, when those promises were found to be illusory.

CHAPTER NINE

Punk, Jews, and the Holocaust: The English Story

This ain't Rock'n'Roll
This is Genocide

David Bowie, "Future Legend"
off *Diamond Dogs*.

Punk, I am arguing, was something special. Across the United States and England, and indeed across the whole of the West, punk expressed not only a local politics but also, ultimately, the existential affect of a nihilism born in the slow surfacing of the cultural trauma embodied in what, around 1978, was becoming named, becoming known as the Holocaust.¹ As Ron Eyerman writes, "cultural trauma refers to a dramatic loss of identity and meaning, a tear in the social fabric, affecting a group of people that has achieved some degree of cohesion."² Based in the idea of collective memory, Eyerman goes on to explain that, "the trauma need not necessarily be felt by everyone in the community or experienced directly by any or all."³ It is a collective experience. In this case what I am suggesting is that what became known as the Holocaust was experienced as a cultural trauma by two different groups, first by those identifying as Jews, and second by those considering themselves to be members of the West, the heirs and beneficiaries of the moral and philosophical order of modernity.

Following the work of Cathy Caruth, Eyerman explains that, "it is not the experience itself that produces traumatic effect, but rather the remembrance of it."⁴ There is a time lapse, a latency period, between the event itself and the bringing of it into memory. This does not mean that during the latency period the event does not have effects on the person or, in the terms of cultural trauma the society, but that these effects are not consciously sheeted home to the event. What I am arguing here is that during the 1970s across the West, as the cultural trauma that would be identified as the Holocaust began to surface, so this process produced effects in the way many people experienced their society. For the Jews, the effect was relatively direct, the need to acknowledge and come to terms with, the attempt by a European people to destroy their entire "race."

For the members of the West more generally, the acknowledgment of the Holocaust meant a crisis in the very foundational beliefs that had underpinned the modern world. Punk, and the philosophy behind it, was, perhaps, the most obvious manifestation of this cultural trauma.

Holocaust: The Story of the Family Weiss was screened in 1978, first in the United States and then across Britain and Europe, to huge audiences.⁵ The population was ready for such a program. Culturally speaking, as I have just suggested, the trauma of the Judeocide was not only about the recognition of the attempted extermination of a people, of six million or so individuals, but it was also about the shattering of the certainties that underlay what was called modernity. It was the end of the assumption that reason would pave the way for a better society, that science and industry would bring material improvement, that the West was leading the world in a global history that could be thought of in terms of progress. The awareness of the destruction of the Jews also began the unwinding of the repressed knowledge about the decimation of indigenous populations and the appropriation of local resources in non-European parts of the world that had provided the foundation for the wealth of Europe.

As the Holocaust became a recognized part of the Western cultural imaginary so it signaled the consequences of living without shared moral touchstones, in Nietzsche's prescient phrase, the effect of the death of God. As Karen Carr tells us, "nihilism [was] described by Nietzsche as 'absolute valuelessness,' as the conviction that '*Alles hat keinen Sinn*' ('Nothing has meaning'), and of 'the meaninglessness of events.'"⁶ It was in the 1970s, through the increasing acknowledgment of the events of the Judeocide, and their naming and discursive formulation as the Holocaust, that nihilism became the philosophical basis of the West's cultural imaginary.

The Jewish formative influence on punk as a more or less inchoate expression of cultural trauma was central to punk's development. Victor Bockris concentrates on punk as a rejection of the constant preoccupation with Nazism that was imposed on the postwar generation. Jon Savage describes punk as a white musical form that can express nihilism. Commenting on the proto-punk of American garage bands of the 1960s he writes of:

a purely white, blue-collar style, in which any black rhythmic influence was bleached out in favour of pure noise and texture: fuzz guitar, feedback, drones and whinny vocals. The flatly rhythmic repetition of a song like Mark and the Mysterians' "96 Tears" seemed to be the perfect form through which to express a numb nihilism.⁷

But what is this existential nihilism of the white, American postwar generation? At one level it is the profound consequence of the modern trajectory toward a loss of transcendental meaning, Nietzsche's death of God:

Nietzsche regarded the contemporary onslaught on meaningfulness, of the *umsonst*, as a direct consequence of the collapse of the

Christian moral interpretation of the world, a collapse brought about by the consistent application of its own moral hierarchy. The will to truth, fostered by Christianity above all else as the means whereby one acquires the proper relationship to the divine, ultimately turns against the metaphysical framework that made it intelligible, showing it to be false and untenable.⁸

Jill Marsden suggests that:

At bottom, the nihilist suffers a disappointed passion, a love of wisdom cruelly unrequited by an indifferent object of desire. The world of becoming exhibits the reality of the Schopenhaurian “evil, blind will” in which satisfaction is constantly frustrated, its miserable subjects skewered on the wheel of Ixion for eternity.⁹

The world offers, and makes, no sense in its own right.

The context for punk was the increasing recognition of the Judeocide as the founding caesura of a fundamentally nihilist culture. Avishai Margalit and Gabriel Motzkin remark that: “A negative myth of origin such as the Holocaust infuses the entire culture with a degree of nihilism, for it contains an intuition as to how fragile and tentative our culture is.”¹⁰ The expression of nihilism in the punk experience marks the existential acceptance of this new cultural understanding. A sense of apocalypse presaged the awareness of the cultural trauma that became known as the Holocaust.

Jews and Punk

This chapter concentrates on punk in England. Elsewhere I have focused more on punk in the United States.¹¹ More recently, and indeed, since that article was first published and while an earlier version of this chapter was in press, Steven Lee Beeber has published *The Heebie-Jeebies at CBGB's: A Secret History of Jewish Punk*, a book based on interviews that engages with the American relationship between punk and Jews.¹² In this chapter I will not only be discussing punk but also, to the extent that it is relevant, punk's musical, and in England youth cultural, precursor, Glam Rock. This is because it is in some Glam artists that we first begin to see the concerns that subsequently become so important in punk, concerns that, I will be arguing, are caused by the affect of the Judeocide as it moves into the awareness of collective memory. In addition, as I have already signaled, I shall not be confining myself to Jewish artists but, rather, writing about those artists whose work manifests a connection with the Judeocide. I will discuss the importance of two Jewish men, the managers Malcolm McLaren and Bernie Rhodes, in the production of punk in England—even while none of the Sex Pistols was Jewish and only one member of the

Clash was. At the same time, certain artists, David Bowie and Sid Vicious, at different times claimed to be Jewish when they weren't. For Bowie, as we shall see, this claim was part of a complex and increasingly traumatized relation with Germany and things Nazi. For Vicious the claim is best appreciated as a recognition that his self-destructive personality could be understood in terms of the Jewish experience of genocide, what, as we shall see, James Young has called the Holocaust Jew.

The numbers of Jews involved in the framing of punk in both its American and English formations signal the primary importance of the Judeocide as a *Jewish* trauma before all else, before its importance as a defining cultural trauma for the West. Quoted in Savage's definitive history of the Sex Pistols, and punk in England more generally, *England's Dreaming*, the journalist (and subsequently film director) Mary Harron, remarks that:

[the Sex Pistols] were chaotic. It was wild, whereas everything had been more proficient in New York. There was a sense of chaos, and the New York scene was not about chaos. But the Sex Pistols created a sense of, "What the fuck is happening?" It had politics. American punk had no politics at that stage.¹³

Harron's distinction, that the New York punk scene was not concerned with chaos whereas the Sex Pistols were chaotic, is problematic but holds an important insight. One crucial element in American punk, witness here in different ways the music of Iggy and the Stooges, Richard Hell, and the Ramones, was the deconstruction of the dominant European musical form through the deformation of its defining characteristics: melody, rhythm, and harmony. This provoked in the audience an experience of chaos, of apocalyptic disintegration. The Sex Pistols were, themselves, chaotic, an expression of chaos of which their music was one manifestation.

To a surprisingly significant extent this distinction can be tracked to the different position of Jews in the production of the music. In the United States, while there were many Jewish managers, A and R people, and record company executives, there were also a large number of Jewish proto-punk and punk artists, from Lou Reed to the Dictators, Richard Hell (through his father), Jonathan Richman, and members of the Ramones, to name a few. It is also important to remember that Gene Simmons of the foundational American Glam group, KISS, was Jewish. In England there were far fewer Jewish artists. Keith Levene, who was an early member of the Clash and, later, joined Johnny Rotten/John Lydon in P.I.L., has a Jewish father, and Mick Jones of London SS and the Clash has a Jewish mother. There was also Danny Kustow, lead guitarist with the Tom Robinson Band, a band that was, perhaps, more folk than punk. However, there were few others. Rather, in England the two key managers, friends for a long time, and who between them worked out many of the central elements of English punk—some of which were appropriated

from American punk—Malcolm McLaren and Bernie Rhodes, both had Jewish mothers.¹⁴ The most important direct connection between the American and English Jewish elements in punk lies in the story that McLaren took the basic elements of English punk style, the short, spikey hair, the ripped t-shirt, jeans, chains, and an apparently self-destructive image, from Hell. Certainly at different times McLaren asked Hell, and the Jewish Sylvain Sylvain of the then-fragmented New York Dolls, to front the band that would become the Sex Pistols.¹⁵ As we shall see later, McLaren appears to have been searching, most probably unconsciously, for a substitute for himself as the front-man for the band; a person ambiguously Othered from English society. Harron's suggestion that the Sex Pistols' chaos had a politics reflects McLaren's attempt to construct the Sex Pistols as a subversive force within that society. In the United States it is possible to see a much clearer connection between punk and the cultural trauma that would become known as the Holocaust.¹⁶ In England, where there was a postwar tradition of youth cultural critique, punk was thought of by McLaren, and was taken up more generally, as a topical reaction to the long-term decline in the English quality of life, especially after the end of the localized economic boom that had climaxed in the Swinging Sixties.

In *Lipstick Traces* Greil Marcus argues that in the short life of the Sex Pistols, from the first to the fourth single, from "Anarchy in the U.K." to "Holidays in the Sun," there is a lyrical trajectory that runs from politics to nihilism. Marcus writes that "Anarchy in the U.K." is negationist, that it is, quoting McLaren, "a statement of self-rule, of ultimate independence, of do-it-yourself."¹⁷ Negation, Marcus suggests, is always political. For Marcus, however, "Holidays in the Sun" is nihilistic where: "Nihilism is the belief in nothing and the wish to become nothing; oblivion is its ruling passion."¹⁸ From this point of view, the political engagement of the Sex Pistols was possible because of their distance from the meaninglessness of nihilism. As the unstable band started breaking up, and McLaren lost interest in holding the dynamic together, so he also lost his distance from the band as their manager.

The Great Rock'n'Roll Swindle was McLaren's film project. McLaren had poured the profits from the Sex Pistols into it. Savage writes that in the court case Lydon brought against McLaren, the judge found that of the £880,000 the group had earned, £343,000 had been spent on the film with only £30,000 left over.¹⁹ With the film, McLaren became a performer. Appearing at the start, McLaren plays himself and speaks in a pronounced London Yiddish accent in a characterization that owes a lot to English anti-Semitism, in particular to Charles Dickens' character, Fagin, in *Oliver Twist*. McLaren portrays himself as the Jewish manipulator, a Svengali figure.²⁰ In *Time Travel*, Savage describes how "[*The Great Rock'n'Roll Swindle*] opens with an orchestral version of 'God Save the Queen' with a narrative voice-over by McLaren: in his best Fagan [*sic*] voice, dripping with 'Jewish' greasy greed, he exposes his Dickensian

fetish with relish running through the media-fossilized version of the Pistols myth.”²¹ Later in the film McLaren sings the old Max Bygraves hit “You Need Hands.” He had no distance now at all.

As Savage describes McLaren around this time: “Stress brings out personal extremes: in McLaren’s case, what emerged were persecution mania and self-destruction.”²² We can think of the persecution mania as an extreme form of Jewish anxiety born in the history of pogroms through to the Holocaust, and the self-destruction as the traumatic expression of the nihilistic desire for oblivion. The Sex Pistols were no longer delivering a politics in the sense that Harron uses the term—indeed, with the departure of Johnny Rotten the Sex Pistols no longer existed in their classic form. Rather, they literalized the nihilistic self-destruction that was the practice of so much American punk music and a number of American punk artists.

I have begun by arguing that the differentiation in forms that punk took in England and the United States was due in part to the different positions that Jews occupied in the music industry in each of these countries. This difference was not a chance thing but reflected the diverse contexts in which Jews lived in the United States and England. Crucially, in a society founded on slavery and immigration, the discourse of race has provided a basis for the organization of American society. Karen Brodtkin tells us that:

The U.S. “discovery” that Europe was divided into inferior and superior races began with the racialization of the Irish in the mid-nineteenth century and flowered in response to the great waves of immigration from southern and eastern Europe that began in the late nineteenth century.²³

Jews were racialized within this system and, as Brodtkin suggests, were only “whitened during the 1950s.”²⁴ In this immigrant society highly differentiated along racial lines, each racial group was assumed to have its own culture. When Jews were, more or less, accepted as white they retained their “Jewish” culture, mostly elements of Ashkenazi life in the Pale, while gaining access to white occupations. By the generation of the 1970s, in the main as a consequence of the broadening of the definition of who was accepted as white, American Jews felt confident enough to allow themselves the visibility of whites. In punk music this meant their presence as performers.

England, however, was not an immigrant society into which large groups of diverse migrants had to be integrated. In addition, there was never the economic imperative to whiten the Jews, and other European immigrants, to supply the numerical need of an expanding middle class, as happened in the United States. Rather, the English preoccupation from the nineteenth century has been with how to manage minority groups in the context of the perceived requirement for a homogeneous national

population. Tony Kushner writes about an English “anti-[S]emitism of exclusion,” discussing how Jews were pressured into certain London suburbs and kept out of certain trades, and the higher echelons of political representation.²⁵ This exclusion can be thought of, the other way around, as a preoccupation with national homogeneity. Elsewhere, I have discussed how this works in reference to T. S. Eliot’s ideas.²⁶ This American poet and cultural critic, who adopted England as his home, argued in *After Strange Gods*, published in 1934, that a homogeneous national population was composed of a combination of a single race and a single religion.²⁷ Race provides for a homogeneous culture and religion for a shared moral underpinning to the society. Eliot specifically identifies “any large number of free-thinking Jews” as being “undesirable.” Indeed he writes that, “a spirit of excessive tolerance is to be deprecated.” One consequence of this argument, repeated by him after World War II in *Notes towards the Definition of Culture* (1948) but without the direct reference to Jews, is that a limited number of a minority group, a group that is racially and religiously different, would be acceptable, tolerable, provided that the numbers are so small that the group does not present a threat to the social and cultural homogeneity of the nation. An implication of Eliot’s argument is that Jews, and other racial and religious minorities, are not assimilable. The point here is not about Eliot per se, nor, indeed, about whether or not Eliot was an anti-Semite, but about an English way of thinking that tolerates small numbers of people whom the English think of as different from themselves provided that this group stays invisible or, at the least, exhibit little power. It is within this general context that Jews in England have kept a low profile, not showing themselves in ways that might threaten their clearly always-jeopardous place within the British state. It is no wonder then that, in the history of English entertainment in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Jews were predominant as managers and entrepreneurs rather than as performers.

In a notorious early song, “Love in a Void,” the punk singer Siouxsie Sioux sang:

Too many Jews for my liking
Too many critics too few writing

In later renditions of the song the line was changed. In her 1978 review of Siouxsie Sioux and The Banshees first album, *The Scream*, in *New Musical Express*, Julie Burchill wrote:

“[‘Love in a Void’] featured the line ‘Too many Jews for my liking.’ This, says Siouxsie, was a metaphor for too many fat businessmen waiting to pounce, suck the youth from and cast aside new talent.

I do not see the connection. I, self-righteous square that I am, consider “Too many Jews for my liking” to be the most disgusting and unforgivable lyric-line ever written, though God knows there has

been more appalling filth written within rock and roll than in every other branch of the entertainment business taken together.

Sioux's gloss, as offered by Burchill, does not deny the attack on Jews. It simply focuses it. Indeed, Sioux may well have been thinking of McLaren and Rhodes, and maybe that lineage of Jewish entertainment impresarios in England including, for example, the Grade family and McLaren's model, Larry Parnes. One point to make here is about how the attack on English suburban smugness with regard to the war so easily spills over into an ingrained anti-Semitism. Another point is that Burchill's reaction, her horror at the line even in the context of punk nihilism, suggests the informing moral power of the Judeocide. Punk marks the confrontation with the Judeocide in popular culture, and popular consciousness.

Remembering World War II

There is a further difference in context that needs to be identified. Elsewhere, in a discussion of Jews in American punk, I have quoted the American biographer of the Velvet Underground and Blondie as saying: "Punk was the last great reaction to the Second World War."²⁸ Bockris' point is that the punk generation grew up in the immediate aftermath of the war and its worldview was shaped by the deluge of comic books, war games, films that portrayed the war and, in particular, the evil Nazis. This point is a good one but, in comparing punk in England and the United States, we need to remember that these societies experienced the war quite differently. The United States had taken an isolationist position. Removed from the tribulations of Europe, it was only with the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor that, to Britain's relief, the United States formally entered the war. Nowhere on the American mainland was bombed, civilians lived without fear of either attack from the sky or invasion.²⁹

In England the experience was very different. There was rationing, constant bombing of civilian urban targets, and a very legitimate fear of invasion. The Channel Islands were occupied in 1940. Rationing continued into the 1950s. Meat, for example, was rationed until July 1954. Butter and cheese were rationed until earlier that same year. Petrol only stopped being rationed in 1950. Even by the late 1960s there were still areas of rubble in the cities that were identified as bombsites.³⁰ For the English the war itself was a deeply traumatizing time and a cultural trauma that, unlike the Judeocide, was acknowledged and lived from the time of the war onward.

One mark of this acknowledgment was the television documentary, *The World at War*, broadcast in Britain between October 1973 and May 1974 in twenty-six episodes of an hour each. *The World at War* was produced by Jeremy Isaacs, who happens to be Jewish, at the commercial station Thames Television. Isaacs presented his idea for the program to the Board at Thames

in 1970 and production began in 1971. Twenty-five years after the war, Isaacs' team managed to interview many of the major players, Albert Speer (Hitler's architect and armaments minister), Karl Wolff (Himmler's adjutant), Anthony Eden (British foreign secretary in Neville Chamberlain's government and Winston Churchill's secretary of state for War), John Colville (Parliamentary Private Secretary to Churchill), Avril Harriman (U.S. ambassador to Russia), Karl Doenitz (in charge of the German U-Boat Fleet and, from 1943, commander in chief of the German Navy), among others. The team also interviewed ordinary people caught up in the war: a torpedoed crewman, a Leningrad housewife who had lived through the one-thousand-days siege of the city, and so on. *The World at War* has been extremely influential. It has been shown in over eighty-seven countries and the book based on it has been translated into fourteen different languages and has sold more than half-a-million copies. In 1974 the series won an Emmy for Outstanding Documentary Achievement. *The World at War* enabled those who had lived through the war to gain a new perspective on it and those of the next generation to be confronted (once again and now in a much more detailed way) with what their parents had lived through. *The World at War* can be read as an extraordinary attempt to narrativize, and provide a unitary expression of, the cultural trauma of the war in Britain.

Roughly speaking, where those born between the end of the war and 1955 felt themselves connected to the war, and experienced the late 1960s of Swinging London as evidence of the end of that period with the end of war-related austerity, those born after 1955 and coming to adulthood in the depression that followed the Swinging Sixties, felt themselves to be living in an era not connected to World War II. This was the generation some of whom, in a couple of years or so after the screening of *The World at War*, would become punks. Siouxsie Sioux' response to the war was typical of these punks' attitude: "We hated older people—not across the board but particularly in suburbia—always harping on about Hitler, 'we showed him,' and that smug pride."³¹

A documentary and a popular event, *The World at War* provided a climactic narrativization of World War II that gave a factual backdrop to the individual stories of the war generation, as well as to the war films of the 1950s and 1960s from *Bridge on the River Kwai* (1957) to *Sink the Bismarck* (1960) and television series such as *Dad's Army* (1967–1977). One episode of *The World at War*, on the D-Day landings in France, even made it into the top-ten ratings programs for the week it was shown. That this should have been the highest rating episode in England is not surprising. For the British, D-Day marked the turning point of the war, the end of the fear of invasion and beginning of the end of the Nazi threat.

In England, much more than in the United States, the Judeocide was understood through the more generalized traumatic narrative of World War II. We can see this in *The World at War* where the Judeocide was described in Episode 20, "Genocide." This included interviews with Hitler's adjutant and eight survivors of Auschwitz. In 1975 a number of extra, special

episodes were made on specific issues including, for example, the complicated matter of Hitler's death. Two of these special episodes were devoted to the Judeocide and titled "The Final Solution—Auschwitz." Here we can see that "Holocaust" had not yet become the accepted term for the Judeocide. Although the term was in use, the American miniseries that popularized it was not broadcast until 1978. Instead the special episodes use the Nazi description, "Final Solution," and add the name of one of the two death camps, Belsen being the other, used in Europe and the United States as synecdoches for the Judeocide. In *Holocaust* Joseph and Berta Weiss, and their eldest son Karl, all die in Auschwitz. In England up to this time, Belsen had been the better-known camp because it was liberated by British Forces including the British Army Film and Photographic Unit that shot film there. This was shown in British cinemas. In addition to showing the death camps, the extra episodes of *The World at War* provide a contextualization, looking at Nazi racial policies and, in dealing with the Jews, the transition to extermination. The making of these later episodes suggests an increased cultural awareness of the Judeocide, and an increased awareness of its importance. "Genocide," the original episode, won a Silver Award at the World Jewish Film and TV Festival in 1976.

One place in English punk where we can see the complex alignment of World War II with the Judeocide is in the name of the seminal proto-punk band, London SS. Mick Jones and Tony James, who was subsequently a member of Chelsea and then Generation X, started London SS in early 1975. The use of London echoed the use of New York in the name of the American Glam/punk band of the early 1970s, New York Dolls (the Dolls' eponymous first album was released in 1973). There is a story that SS stood for Social Security, a term for what was more officially known as the Unemployment Benefit, the British government's payment to the unemployed. However, this seems to be an attempt to deflect the Nazi connotations of SS, where the initials stand for the *Schutzstaffel*. Originally Hitler's personal bodyguard, the SS were put under the command of Heinrich Himmler in 1929. It was Himmler and his SS who were in charge of the extermination of European Jewry.

Jones, you will remember, has a Jewish mother. More, Jones, like McLaren, had divorced parents and spent a lot of time with his Jewish grandmother, Stella. Stella was born in Whitechapel in 1899. The man she married, and from whom she was subsequently divorced, was a Jewish refugee from the late turn-of-the-century Russian pogroms.³² Like McLaren, Jones was Jewish but a little more distanced from the Judeocide than Rhodes. Bernie Rhodes, who had a very strong dislike for the use of Nazi imagery, was London SS' putative manager. There is a story that he "threw a handful of Nazi regalia in front of the band and snapped, 'If you're going to call yourself "London SS" you'll have to deal with this.'"³³ The combination of London with SS conjures up the terror of Nazi occupation and its impact on English Jews. London SS spent most of their nearly one year of existence attempting to complete their line-up and

rehearsing. Rhodes gave the band members reading lists including Proust and books on Modern Art. He would later do the same with the Clash.

Terry Chimes and Topper Headon, both of whom later drummed for the Clash at different times, auditioned for the band as did Rat Scabies who, with Brian James who was a guitarist with London SS for a while, subsequently formed the Damned whose name came from Luchino Visconti's 1969 Italian film, *The Damned*, which links Nazism and moral decadence.³⁴ In this film Helmut Berger plays a murderous, incestuous, and pedophilic—he has seduced a young Jewish girl who commits suicide—member of the decaying von Essenbeck dynasty who becomes an SS officer. London SS made one demo and split up around the middle of 1976. Jones, Chimes, and Paul Simonon joined with Joe Strummer to form the Clash with Rhodes, again, as their manager. But we are ahead of ourselves here.

The Difference between Helen Shapiro and Marc Bolan

The first place to go to find a Jewish response, albeit tangential and repressed, to the Judeocide in English popular music is Marc Bolan. Bolan was born Mark Feld, the son of Simeon Feld who, before becoming a long-haul lorry driver, worked for Blooms, the well-known London kosher butchers. Feld married out. Bolan's mother was Phyllis née Atkins. It is often suggested that Bolan had little to do with his Jewish background between his birth and his cremation in a Jewish ceremony at Golders Green Cemetery in 1977. However, we must place his lack of overt Jewish affirmation in the context of English anti-Semitism discussed earlier. Bolan's family lived in the then-Jewish area of Bethnal Green, moving later to Stoke Newington.

As a child Bolan lived through the characters that he read in books or had seen in films. In his biography of Bolan, *Twentieth Century Boy*, Mark Paytress writes that:

The first character Mark took on was Mighty Joe Young... The character provided him with his first protective mask, and the film's blending of the strange and the sentimental was a combination that always stayed with him.³⁵

An important insight comes from a comparison with Superman. In that pre-Judeocide, American, Jewish migrant fantasy, Superman is able to disguise himself and pass as the unassuming Gentile, Clark Kent. *Mighty Joe Young* can be read as a very different migrant, and post-Judeocide, fantasy. Young is a gorilla. Reared by a woman in Africa, he is taken to the United States. Unlike Superman, Young can never assimilate, he can never pass. Mighty Joe Young is very powerful but he always remains

a gorilla, and identifiable as such. This was the lesson the Jews of Bolan's post-Judeocide generation learnt, consciously or not, that if "they" want to get you, they will, no matter how well you pass. You always remain a Jew to those who have the power to identify you as such.

Here, we can compare Bolan with another English Jew of his generation who went into popular music, Helen Shapiro. Bolan was born in September 1947, Shapiro a year earlier, September 1946. Shapiro also came from Bethnal Green. More, she went to the same school as Mark Feld and, in 1956, along with Shapiro's cousins, Susan and Glenn, and another boy called Stephen Gold, they formed a group. They were ten, Feld was nine; this Jewish group didn't last long. Shapiro was discovered in 1961. Her first single, "Please Don't Treat Me Like a Child" reached number three in the charts that year. Her third single, "Walking Back to Happiness," reached number one at the end of 1961. Shapiro never changed her name, she was always identifiably Jewish, but she also blended into the English entertainment industry.³⁶ In this way Shapiro has more in common with the slightly earlier Anglo-Jewish singer, Frankie Vaughan. Vaughan, born Frankie Abelson in Liverpool in 1928, had his first hit in 1953 and had a number-one hit with "Garden of Eden" in 1957. Where Vaughan and Shapiro worked within the parameters allowed for Jews in England (Shapiro eventually discovered Jesus and joined Jews for Christ), Bolan acted out the complexities of being a post-Judeocide Jew.

The context of English anti-Semitism enables us to better understand how Bolan's Anglo-Jewish background triggered his preoccupation with remaking himself. He started out with a Teddy-boy image. Then he adopted the mod look. Commenting on McLaren and his attempt to transform his fantasies into reality Savage writes that: "This is, after all, pop, the modern Hollywood, the one place in English society where you can reinvent yourself; where the donning of a new jacket can appear a political act."³⁷ Where McLaren reinvented the world around him, Bolan reinvented himself.

In 1965, around the time he released his first singles, Feld changed his name to Bolan. The name comes from the singer Bolan admired most at that time, Bob Dylan. Dylan, of course, was also Jewish and the connection would seem to have been Bolan's recognition of Dylan's ability to write strong, poetic lyrics. Like Blue Öyster Cult, that American heavy metal, proto-punk band named and managed by the Jewish Sandy Pearlman, Bolan originally put an umlaut over the "o" thus indicating a German reference and suggesting a nagging, albeit unconscious, Nazi Judeocide overdetermination.

Bolan formed Tyrannosaurus Rex as an acoustic duo with Steve Peregrine Took in 1967. They made three albums in the vein of English hippie music. The title of their first album, released in 1968, signals the kind of music they were playing, *My People Were Fair and Had Stars in Their Hair but Now They Are Content to Wear Stars on Their Brows*. However, at the same time that Bolan had put on the image of a peace loving-hippie, he

had named his band at complete variance. As Paytress writes: "According to the books he shared with Harry [his brother] back in Stoke Newington, this most terrifying dinosaur of all destroyed everything that got in its way. That sounded powerful enough."³⁸ In terms of power, Tyrannosaurus Rex followed in the tradition of Mighty Joe Young. As Bolan made himself visible with a name reworked from another Jew who had changed his name to something non-Jewish, he protected himself by giving his band the name of the most powerful and terrible creature ever to walk the earth. Once again, it would seem that there was an unconscious and traumatized reference to the events not yet publicly acknowledged as the Holocaust, an attempt to distinguish himself from the stories of powerless Jews walking unresistingly into the concentration camps. By the time Bolan helped to instigate Glam Rock that was, after all, all about image, with the hit "Ride a White Swan" at the end of 1970, he had shortened the band's name to T. Rex.

In England the connection between Glam and punk is best found in the complexities of Bolan's presentation of himself. As I have indicated, they are particularly present in the similar concerns of Bolan and McLaren. The connection is closer still. Rhodes, who is not above some embellishment of his life, claims to have been an "ideas person" for T. Rex. His story goes that when Bolan announced his intention of releasing a catchy pop single entitled "Children of the Revolution," Bernie "grew disillusioned with the pop and rock scene's potential for creating change."³⁹ David Thomas of the Cleveland (post)punk band Pere Ubu has seen Bolan's confusions better than anyone. He explains in the United States; "Musically, Marc Bolan was considered to be, quite rightly, a real radical 'cause he was producing a psychodramatic musical form and this is what we were picking up on, not all the teeny trash."⁴⁰ In 1977, when he was making a comeback tour, Bolan asked the Damned, whose name, as we have seen, associated them with Nazi moral decadence and, by implication, with the Judeocide, to be his support band. The Damned had just released the first punk single.

Diamond Dogs and the Thin White Duke

There was another, more cerebral strand to Glam Rock epitomized in bands like Roxy Music and performers such as David Bowie. Here I want to discuss Bowie, a man much of whose reputation comes from his being able to read and express the Zeitgeist of his time. As we will see, there is a trajectory in Bowie's work during the 1970s that shows an increasing fascination with apocalypse. What I want to suggest is that, in this instance, apocalypse serves as the metaphoric understanding for the culturally traumatic recognition and acknowledgment of the Judeocide.

In her book on punk, *Break All Rules!*, Tricia Henry writes that:

Bowie's interest in doomsday imagery, so closely expressed in *The Rise and Fall of Ziggy Stardust* and *The Spiders from Mars* had already

been established on his 1970 album, *The Man Who Sold the World*, when he sang: "The world is doomed, we can't make it any better." The message implicit in Bowie's songs from this period anticipated the punk anthem "No Future" by at least four years.⁴¹

"No Future" was the original title for "God Save the Queen," the Sex Pistols' first single. It was McLaren who retitled it. The song also appears on the Sex Pistols' 1977 album, *Never Mind the Bollocks*. In this negationist attack on the royal family and an England where there is no future, the Queen is described as leading a "fascist regime." England is doomed, Rotten sings, there is no future for you and me. In England fascism and Nazism were equated. This Sex Pistols song transfers Nazi connotations to England and places them within an apocalyptic context.

Bowie also became preoccupied with Hitler. During the spring of 1976 he even moved to Berlin along with Iggy Pop. Bowie had long been interested in Iggy. Iggy is not Jewish but he has a strong identification with the "Holocaust Jew" experience as James Young calls it in *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust*. Young writes:

Of the generation of non-Jewish poets who identified literally as Holocaust Jews, the numbers [who committed suicide] are also disquieting. John Berryman, Randall Jarrel, Anne Sexton and Sylvia Plath all killed themselves after representing themselves literally in light of the Holocaust.⁴²

Lester Bangs, the American music critic, described Iggy's stage performance in the early 1970s as an attempt to "manage the apocalypse" and he writes about *Metallic K.O.*, the album of Iggy and the Stooges' final concert, that it is: "a far more powerful documentation of the Iggy holocaust at its most nihilistically out of control."⁴³ Iggy, it is claimed, was the inspiration for Bowie's Glam Ziggy Stardust persona—as is apparent in the names. Elsewhere I have discussed Iggy's "Holocaust Jew" personality, a personality that has often led people to opine wrongly that he is Jewish. Perhaps it is not surprising, then, that *The Rise and Fall of Ziggy Stardust and the Spiders from Mars*, an album Bowie released in 1972 that has threaded through it a narrative about the career of a rock star, should begin with "Five Years," an apocalyptic track which tells of the discovery that the world is going to end in five years time.⁴⁴ This foreboding about the coming of the apocalypse was a remarkably accurate expression of the movement toward the public, cultural acknowledgment of the Holocaust.

Two years later, in 1974, Bowie released *Diamond Dogs*, a post-Glam album and often thought of musically as English proto-punk. The theme of *Diamond Dogs* is a post-apocalyptic, nightmare world of destruction. My epigram for this article, "This ain't Rock'n'Roll/This is Genocide," comes from the transition from the descriptive, spoken introduction to the album, "Future Legend," to the first musical track that is "Diamond

Dogs.” Bowie shouts the lines over dubbed-in audience applause that eerily seems to suggest approval. Henry writes about Bowie’s preoccupation with human destruction on his earlier album, *Aladdin Sane*, as a concern with “a world on the brink of annihilation.”⁴⁵

Diamond Dogs is set sometime in the future, possibly 1984. As it happens, Bowie had been planning an album, and perhaps a stage show based on George Orwell’s dystopian vision of the future, *Nineteen Eighty Four*, but was refused the necessary permission by Orwell’s wife who was the guardian of his estate. *Diamond Dogs* bears the obvious trace of this history in “1984,” “Big Brother,” and “We Are the Dead” (which, implying the lack of volition of those totally controlled by the Party, is what Winston Smith says to Julia in Orwell’s book before the two are caught by the Thought Police).⁴⁶ However, the title also suggests a sense of being overwhelmed by death, a sense of the experience of being surrounded by the effects of genocide. The track “1984” offers an ominous commentary that lifts off from Orwell’s anxiety about fascist totalitarianism. “Big Brother” provides us with a graphic image of that fascism. It has Big Brother, the all-surveilling, all-controlling dictator being adored by the people as a savior.

On the album as it was reworked after Orwell’s wife refused permission, these tracks are on what in the original vinyl issue was the second side. This fascistic future, written by Orwell after World War II and the Judeocide, is now framed by the apocalyptic, genocidal world of the *Diamond Dogs*. Described in “Future Legend,” this is a world of rotting corpses on the thoroughfare where “ten thousand peoploids split into small tribes,” live at the top of “sterile skyscrapers” while the predatory *Diamond Dogs* prowl the ground of Hunger City dressed in furs and jewels looted from shops. This is “The Year of the *Diamond Dogs*,” not rock’n’roll but genocide.

Genocide was the title given to the episode recounting the Judeocide in *The World at War*. With no other descriptors as yet having general acceptance, genocide was the general term for the Judeocide and, perhaps more importantly in connection with *Diamond Dogs*, the Judeocide was the reference most often conjured up when the term genocide was used. As it happens, the term “genocide” was a neologism coined by the Polish-Jewish jurist Raphael Lemkin in his 1944 book concerned with the legal implications of Nazi extermination practices titled *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. Bowie’s genocidal future connotes, and builds on, the Nazi extermination of the Jews; the peoploids hiding for safety suggest the Jewish remnant being hunted down by the Nazi *Diamond Dogs* dressed in goods looted from assaults on “the glass fronts of Love-Me Avenue” suggesting, perhaps to some as the details of the Judeocide begin to come to the fore in Western popular knowledge, the events of *Kristallnacht* in 1938 when the Nazis encouraged the smashing of Jewish shop-fronts and the looting of Jewish shops.

What complicates the politics of *Diamond Dogs* is the privileging of the *Diamond Dogs*. With the exception of Halloween Jack, the peoploids are

portrayed as weak while the album's title and title song are given to the Diamond Dogs whose depredations offer the driving force for the album. In this genocide, the Diamond Dogs will inherit the Earth. Again, there is here an echo of the image of the Jews of the Judeocide that was current in the postwar period: the Jews as weak and submissive, passively accepting the fate meted out to them by the Nazis.

In early 1975 Bowie moved to Hollywood. There, as Stephen Dalton and Rob Hughes put it, "the artist formerly known as David Jones began a crazed downward spiral into rock'n'roll damnation."⁴⁷ Bowie entered a cocaine psychosis and "became obsessed with occultism, the Kabbalah and magick."⁴⁸ He became "[a] walking skeleton."⁴⁹ There were a number of contingent reasons for this crisis, the slow disintegration of his marriage, problems with his management, the pressure of fame. However, I want to suggest the similarity between Bowie's crisis and Lou Reed's crisis after he had made *Berlin* (1973), the album that followed the Bowie-produced *Transformer* (1972). Reed, who is Jewish, became increasingly emaciated and had an iron cross design cut into the crew cut he acquired. Elsewhere I have argued that Reed was acting out the trauma of the death camps.⁵⁰ Here I want to suggest that Bowie, who is not Jewish but who, as we shall see, went through a period claiming he was, was undergoing a crisis founded in a similar artistic, and personal, identification. It is worth pointing out here that Kabbalah is the corpus of Judaic mysticism. Bowie can be thought of as another of the Holocaust Jew identifiers that Young writes about.

The Judeocide subtext of *Diamond Dogs* presages this crisis. Bowie's resolution to it was to identify with the Diamond Dogs, the oppressor. In 1976, after *Young Americans* (1975), Bowie began to turn back to Europe making *Station to Station*, which referenced the electronic rock of German bands Kraftwerk and Neu!.

Also in this year, with Iggy at his side, Bowie began his White Light Tour. Why White Light? Well, the most obvious connotation is the Velvet Underground's 1967 album, *White Light/White Heat*. This is the album from which much of the sonics of Iggy and the Stooges work, and later punk, derive. Mark Denning describes the album as "the sound of Velvet Underground at ground zero."⁵¹ He goes on to describe "Sister Ray," the most sonically extreme track on the album, in this way:

As Lou Reed wails out an increasingly bizarre tale of sex, drugs, violence, murder and fun at its most dangerous and anti-social, he and Sterling Morrison power out raw and primal rhythm chords, occasionally veering into wildly atonal, fractured solos, while John Cale tries to drown them out (literally) with his Vox organ and Maureen Tucker pounds out a relentless pulse on her drums that holds the whole glorious cacophony together.⁵²

This is the precursor to the Iggy and the Stooges' music that Bangs describes in terms of apocalypse and nihilism. *Station to Station*, and the White Light

tour, mark the beginning of Bowie's confrontation with the cultural trauma that lies at the heart of Reed's music in the 1960s and early 1970s.

For the White Light tour Bowie created his Thin White Duke character, described by Dalton and Hughes as "his last and cruellest."⁵³ They go on: "Uniformed in pleated black pants, waistcoat and white shirt, fire-blond hair scraped back over his head, Bowie calls the Duke 'a very Aryan, fascist type—a would-be romantic with absolutely no emotion at all.'"⁵⁴ The Duke character is a combination of English aristocratic elitism and Nazi fascist referents. Dalton and Hughes write that:

[Bowie's] description proved chillingly apt, as Bowie's obsession with occultism and Germanic culture had evolved into an unhealthy fascination with the Third Reich, Arthurian Grail mythology, and Hitler himself. He gave notorious, unguarded interviews warning of an imminent fascist backlash and sneering that "people aren't very bright, you know. They say they want freedom, but when they get the chance, they pass up Nietzsche and choose Hitler, because he would march into a room to speak and music and lights would come on at strategic moments. It was rather like a rock'n'roll concert."⁵⁵

Harking back to *Diamond Dogs*, for Hitler, of course, it wasn't rock'n'roll, it was genocide.

Bowie survived his crisis of nihilistic self-destruction by identifying with Hitler. In May 1976, returning to England at Victoria Station, he gave the ambiguous wave that became notorious in press reports as a Nazi salute. To Jean Rook, the journalist, he disclaimed the Nazi references for the Thin White Duke, telling her the image was "pure clown...the eternal clown putting over the great sadness of 1976."⁵⁶ Unconsciously echoing Bangs, and others, descriptions of Reed in his crisis, Rook wrote that Bowie "looks terribly ill. Thin as a stick insect. And corpse pale, as if his life blood had all run up into his flaming hair."⁵⁷ It must be from this time, given the reference to fascism, that Bowie laid claim to Jewish ancestry. He is quoted as saying "I'm closer to communism than fascism—[that] at least has some saving graces. Besides, I'm half-Jewish."⁵⁸ Certainly in 1976 *People Magazine* described Bowie as of "Anglican-Catholic-Jewish origin."⁵⁹ It was after the White Light Tour that Bowie and Iggy went to live in Berlin. There it was that Bowie, with Iggy and his new found American-Jewish girlfriend Esther Friedman, resolved his existential crisis, making *Low*, *Heroes* and *Lodger* and producing *The Idiot* and *Lust for Life* for Iggy. The Thin White Duke persona was Bowie's last self-consciously created public image.

Malcolm McLaren

At this point we need to discuss McLaren in more detail. McLaren was born in 1946, a year after the end of World War II and, as it happens,

a year before David Bowie and Marc Bolan were born. He was the younger son of a Scottish engineer, Peter McLaren, and Emily Issacs, the daughter of a middle-class Anglo-Jewish, Sephardi family. In 1948 Emily and Peter separated, Emily returning to her family with her two sons. Subsequently she remarried, this time to a Jew named Martin Levi. With the English pressure for invisibility and assimilation Levi changed his name to Edwards, opening a clothing factory called Eve Edwards—Emily had changed her forename to Eve.⁶⁰ McLaren retained the family name of Edwards until 1971 when he took back his father's name. McLaren and his brother spent a lot of time with their Jewish grandmother, Rose. Like Helen Shapiro and Marc Bolan, the two McLaren boys went to school in Stoke Newington, though a different one from Shapiro and Bolan. Malcolm lasted a day. Subsequently, both boys went to a private Jewish school and Malcolm went on from there to a state grammar school.

McLaren's background simultaneously emphasized his Jewishness and forced him to find ways to fit into, if not assimilate into, gentile, English society. As with Bolan, fashion offered one solution. Savage quotes McLaren: "Dressing up was always a big part of going out."⁶¹ Where the working-class Bolan became a mod, the middle-class McLaren became a beatnik and hung out in coffee bars. He and Bernie Rhodes met as teenagers in Stamford Hill Bowling Alley.⁶² Fashion, of course, would be a dominant theme in McLaren's life, right through punk and the Sex Pistols.

During 1970, while studying film and photography at Goldsmiths College, McLaren worked on a major project, a film that was going to be called *Oxford Street*; Billy Fury's image as a rock'n'roll star was going to play an important part. Why did Billy Fury hold such interest for McLaren? First of all there was, as Savage puts it "the glamour of signs."⁶³ McLaren was becoming fascinated with the possibility of constructing, not just an image for himself but one for somebody else, creating, as the Jewish manager Larry Parnes had done for Billy Fury, a pop star.⁶⁴

Billy Fury was born Ronald Wycherley in April 1940, in Liverpool. In early 1958 Wycherley sent a tape of himself singing and playing guitar to Parnes. Parnes was touring Marty Wilde and asked Wycherley to audition for him while the show was at Birkenhead in October. The story goes that Parnes was so impressed he immediately signed him up and put him in the show. Parnes renamed him and got him a record contract with Decca. By February 1959 Fury had his first hit, "Maybe Tomorrow," which reached number eighteen on the charts. A part of McLaren's fascination with Fury will have been his looks. Blue-eyed, fair-haired, square-jawed, Fury looked every bit the mythical Englishman that McLaren, with his "Jewish" curls and high cheekbones, didn't.

In Parnes' creation of the image of Billy Fury as a sensual, English rocker, McLaren could find a solution to his own confusions over his Jewishness, Englishness, and anxieties over visibility. Where Bolan gave his band the name of the most powerful animal ever to walk the earth,

McLaren started working on an image for himself as an entrepreneur constructing images for others. As Savage writes, "at the same time as he took his father's surname, he slowly built up his Jewishness in imitation of Larry Parnes, the most outrageous flamboyant Rock'n'Roll emperor of them all."⁶⁵ McLaren's ambivalence is clear. He simultaneously distanced himself from his Jewishness, not least by asserting his patrilineal Scottishness (also, of course, not quite English in the national terms of Great Britain), and began to develop a cartoon, music-hall, anti-Semitic image of Jewishness, the sort of Anglo construction of Jewishness as grasping Svengali, that he would later play out in his Fagin-style "God Save the Queen" monologue on *The Great Rock'n'Roll Swindle*.

Savage describes how, shortly after McLaren and his partner Vivienne Westwood (now a high-profile fashion designer) took over the shop at 430 Kings Road, and named it Let It Rock, there are a number of photographs of him:

Ever the chameleon, McLaren is trying on a variety of poses suitable for his new situation. In some photos, he plays the proud Jewish salesman . . . In others, he is a cultist, clutching the *Buddy Holly Story* LP or standing in front of a shrine to Rock'n'Roll heroes past and present. He has already developed an air of glaring, proletarian menace which embodies his infamous future protégé. "He looks exactly like me!" blurts John Lydon when he finally sees the pictures in 1988.⁶⁶

McLaren renovated his image as British working class that enabled him to be more threatening, and simultaneously more accepted, than was possible with his respectable, assimilatory Jewish, middle-class background. And Lydon is right. McLaren's glare is the same as the one Lydon develops as a consequence of his London-Irish Catholic, working-class origins.⁶⁷ The glare of those excluded from the good life by, in Lydon's case, virtue of his semiracialized birth. It is not for nothing that Lydon titled his autobiography, *Rotten: No Irish, No Blacks, No Dogs*, the subtitle being the sign so often seen in house windows in London during the 1950s and 1960s when advertising rooms to let. If, so McLaren's thinking appears to have gone, Fury, and the other stars in Parnes' stable, could stand in as English for Parnes' own impossible assimilation, then Lydon, with his Catholic-Irish, working-class markers of exclusion, while nevertheless presenting as a Londoner, could stand in for McLaren and be visible while McLaren constructed the Sex Pistols as a signifier of negation.

It is in McLaren's reduction of everything to signs that we find a major difference between him and Rhodes. For Rhodes, anything to do with the Judeocide, which by extension meant anything associated with the Nazis, could not be recycled into the public world of signification, even for political purposes. We have already seen him throwing Nazi regalia in front of London SS. Joe Strummer remembers that, before the Clash was formed, "Bernie had fallen out with Malcolm over the swastika, because

Bernie's mother was a refugee from Europe."⁶⁸ Where McLaren took on board the post-Marxian political practices advocated by Guy Debord and the Situationists, Rhodes retained a more modernist politics—something reflected in the Clash's political statements.

For McLaren, more distanced personally from the direct impact of the Judeocide, Nazi imagery was more grist to his signifiatory mill. He understood the power of this material in a country just coming to terms with World War II but may well also have felt the extra charge of the Judeocide reference. Jordan, who used to work in Westwood and McLaren's shop remembers that:

Malcolm was in awe of the symbolism... Not just the swastika, but a lot of artefacts from that era. The Nazi youth badges. They were extremely rare. He had a lot of things, including gold SS wedding rings, which weren't for sale because they were originals. There were a few things for sale. Mock-ups from the regalia shops, the straight wing badges, swastika hankies.⁶⁹

In 1976, with the Kings Road shop now called Sex, and selling fetish-themed fashion, Westwood, with McLaren, was using the swastika on the clothes.⁷⁰ Alan Jones, who used to work in Sex, remembers that when confronted by people for wearing clothes with Nazi iconography, Westwood and McLaren had told him, and the others, to say: "We're here to positively confront people with the past."⁷¹ This past was both the war and the Judeocide.

The Jewish association is clear in what was, most likely, Westwood and McLaren's first use of the swastika. Having costumed the nostalgic rock'n'roll film *That'll Be the Day* (1973)—which happened to include Billy Fury as the rocker Stormy Tempest—Westwood and McLaren were asked by Ken Russell, who was directing a film on the Jewish composer Gustav Mahler, to costume a dream sequence in which Mahler meets the wife of the anti-Semitic composer Richard Wagner. Made as a silent film, the dream of Mahler's conversion to Catholicism has Wagner's wife, Cosima, as a fantastic faux-Nazi dressed in leather with a studded cross on the front and a swastika on the back. The film was released in 1974. Here we can see a clear connection for Westwood and McLaren between the swastika and anti-Semitism.

By September 1976 the use of the swastika had begun to spread. Siouxsie and the Banshees' first performance was planned for the Punk Rock Festival that McLaren had organized at the 100 Club over the twentieth and twenty-first of that month. Rhodes had agreed that the band could use the Clash's equipment but when he saw Siouxsie's swastika armband and the swastikas felt-tipped onto Sid Vicious' t-shirt he reversed his decision.⁷² Rhodes was concerned about the semiotic ambiguity possible in the use of the swastika. This didn't worry McLaren. Vicious was drumming for the Banshees at the time.

Sid Vicious and the Implosion of the Sex Pistols

Vicious was born John Michael Ritchie in May 1957. His mother had made a living as a drug dealer. Vicious, along with Siouxsie Sioux, was a member of the Bromley contingent, an early group of followers of the Sex Pistols and their punk attitude. One story goes that he was dubbed Vicious by Johnny Rotten after the name Rotten had given his pet hamster. Vicious didn't play with Siouxsie and the Banshees again. At that point, the band was shambolic, truly chaotic having only ever had one, possibly two, rehearsals. Marco Pirone describes the music this way:

We did a Velvet Underground thing for what seemed like hours and hours . . . It was horrible. Sid was doing Mo Tucker. I was doing Sister Ray! I remember me and Sid looking at each other and we were fed up so we just stopped.⁷³

The Velvet Underground reference is instructive. The Banshees thought of their music in terms of the deconstructive dissonance that typified part of the Velvet Underground's corpus, a music at the edge of the nihilistic apocalypse. However, whereas by the time of *White Light/White Heat*, the members of the Velvet Underground were experienced musicians, and included one member, John Cale, with training in post-tonal, avant-garde classical music, the Banshees, like the early Iggy and the Stooges, were just a bunch of lads with little or no expertise on musical instruments. Their sound was the sound of a chaos.

After his very brief stint with Siouxsie and the Banshees, Vicious found his way into an unnamed, all-girl punk band. It was, again, Johnny Rotten who suggested calling the band Flowers of Romance. By the end of 1976 Vicious had sacked both Palmolive and Viv Albertine, who went on to form the Slits, and bought in Keith Levene, by this time no longer with the Clash. There were other changes in personnel. By February 1977, the band had fragmented. It had never performed live. However, Vicious had written three songs for Flowers of Romance including "Belsen Was a Gas" which the Sex Pistols started performing in late 1977.

There are two versions of "Belsen," the second, with extra verses, is sung by Ronnie Biggs, the notorious escaped Great Train Robber who, at that time, was living in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The one verse common to both versions is:

Belsen was a gas I heard the other day.
In the open graves where the Jews all lay
Life is fun and I wish you were here
They wrote on postcards to those held dear

The second couplet refers to the postcards that some victims were forced to write to allay the anxieties of Jews not yet deported. Savage writes of the song that: "As originally written for the *Flowers of Romance*, the song was a one-line, very sick joke."⁷⁴ It seems to me more complex than this. The two couplets stand in opposition to one another, the first describing the reality of the murders of the Jews, the second the illusion of holiday pleasure that the Jews were forced to create. There is, then, an ambivalence in the song in its attitude to the Judeocide that is best expressed in the title. That Belsen was a gas is a pun that turns on the slang meaning of gas as being a good time. Although the song can be read as a sick and possibly anti-Semitic joke, it can also be read as a commentary on the hiding of the Judeocide by the Nazis and its later repression in postwar Western culture.

In *England's Dreaming*, Savage reproduces a photograph of a smiling Vicious from 1975. It is inscribed, "I'm Hymie, try me."⁷⁵ Savage doesn't comment on the phrase. "Hymie" is a well-established derogatory, American-originated, slang expression for a Jew. Deriving from the Jewish name, Hyman, itself often abbreviated to Hymie, as a slang term the name carries anti-Semitic connotations because of its frequent use by anti-Semites to identify Jewish men. Why would Vicious who was not Jewish, describe himself in this way?

Vicious met Nancy Spungen about the same time that he joined the Sex Pistols as bass guitarist in February 1977. A year younger than Vicious, Spungen came from a middle-class Jewish background in Main Line, Philadelphia. She ran away from home at seventeen and went to New York where she got involved in the punk scene including having a brief affair with Richard Hell.⁷⁶ Spungen arrived in London with the expressed wish of wanting to seduce Jerry Nolan of the New York Dolls. Savage quotes Simon Barker, on the periphery of the London scene; "She gave Sid a habit and sex...He told me he thought she was the most beautiful woman he'd met in his life, and he didn't want to have sex with anyone else."⁷⁷ Vicious' relationship with Spungen has marked similarities to Iggy Pop's major relationships with Jewish women, the one he married, Wendy Weisberg, and the one he lived with in Berlin, Esther Friedman. Also similar to Iggy, Vicious publicly performed self-mutilation. The point here is that Vicious, even more self-consciously than Iggy, appears to have been another example of Young's Holocaust Jew identifiers.

Spungen's self-destructiveness encouraged Vicious'. In October 1978, Spungen was found dead in the hotel room at New York's Chelsea Hotel that they shared. Out on bail for her murder, which he could not remember, Vicious died of a heroin overdose in February 1979.

In 1981, two years after Vicious' death, nearly four after the demise of the Sex Pistols and three after *Holocaust* was broadcast, John Lydon released his last album with his post-Pistols band, Public Image Ltd. It was called *Flowers of Romance*. In addition to Lydon the other core member of

the band was Keith Levene. One track on the album, "Phenagen," (the title refers to a type of barbiturate), includes the lines:

You are an Ostrich
Bury your head
Personal Austwich

Austwich is an alternative spelling for Auschwitz. However, by the early 1980s the Holocaust reference is almost banal. In addition to the album being named after Vicious' band, which Lydon had named, it also includes an instrumental, credited to Lydon and Levene, called "Hymie's Him." This title, with its play on him/hymn, suggests some acknowledgment not only of Vicious but of his self-destructive, Holocaust Jewish identification.⁷⁸

Replacing Glen Matlock with Sid Vicious diminished McLaren's distance from the Sex Pistols. Though he thought of the band as his creation, increasingly McLaren experienced the Sex Pistols as an extension of himself. At the same time, rather than being a signifying negation in a hyper-real, mediatized world, the band was coming to realize an apocalyptic, self-destructive nihilism. Savage describes the final performances of "Belsen Was a Gas" at the San Francisco Winterland:

"Be a man, hah!" he sneers in the bridge, before launching into a vocal improvisation which begins as scat singing, slips into a forced, mocking laugh, and then breaks into a full-blown shriek of terror and disgust. Lydon is trying to force himself to be sick but the vomit will not come. As the song hurtles towards its conclusion, he begins a deadly countdown: "Be a man/Kill someone/Kill yourself/Be a man/Kill someone/Be a man/Kill yourself!" Propelled by the percussive "Kill's," there is a whistling as the Sex Pistols reach terminal velocity. On the very last word, the group cuts dead, so that the audience, stunned, fails for a few seconds to cheer. The rushing silence is like a black hole: within it the group implodes.⁷⁹

This is the moment of apocalyptic nihilism for the group and its music. And it is centered on Vicious' song about the Judeocide. In this way, this final performance of "Belsen Was a Gas" matches what may have been Lydon's final composition for the group, certainly their fourth and final single with him as lead singer, "Holidays in the Sun"—a song Savage describes as "the sound of a group collapsing in on itself."⁸⁰

Written in Berlin when the group went there for a respite from the media in 1977, "Holidays" also takes Belsen, the Judeocide, as its reference point. On the recorded version, the sound of marching Nazi jackboots has been dubbed on in time with Paul Cook's opening drum rhythm. Then Rotten starts singing:

I don't wanna holiday in the sun
I wanna go to a new Belsen

The association here would seem to be that very English invention, the holiday camp. There is even an echo of names here, Belsen as Butlins. However, the singer doesn't want a relaxing, reenergizing holiday, he wants to be destroyed. Standing in again for the Judeocide, Belsen suggests total annihilation. Here, again, we are in the realm of apocalyptic nihilism.

In "Holidays" what separates the singer from the destruction he craves is the Berlin Wall, psychologically the wall can be read as standing in for the ability to divide himself off from his desire for destruction. And then, at the climactic end of the song:

Gotta go over the Berlin Wall
 I don't understand it
 I gotta go over the wall
 I don't understand this bit at all
 Please don't be waiting for me

In one of the more remarkable transformations in rock lyrics, the words swing from a swaggering assertion of personal action to the simple claim that the singer has no idea what he is singing about. And then the denouement; the plea, to whom? That they/we should not be waiting for him to come back from the place he goes to on the other side of the wall? Or, perhaps this is an expression of anxiety about who might be waiting for him on the other side of the wall. As this is the Berlin Wall those people would be East German communists. However, if this where the new Belsen is, these communists are also Nazis. And, if these people are Nazis, then the singer is also positioning himself as a Holocaust Jew.

As the singer climbs the wall and eliminates the divide between himself and the new Belsen, between himself and his destruction, so the song loses its focus. Savage writes of the end of "Holidays" that:

As the song folds in on itself at the end, it speaks of many things: Lydon's fury and terror at finding that autonomy has turned into another form of bondage, that revolutionary fantasy paled before the reality of Stammheim [the prison where the terrorist German Red Army Faction prisoners were incarcerated] and that, despite the weaponry of their name, the Sex Pistols were just pop musicians. This was not just failure, but annihilation.⁸¹

Rotten killed his image and became Lydon again. "Holidays" is Vicious' epitaph and, it uses the same references that he used in his life; Belsen, the Judeocide. One way of reading Lydon's friendship with Vicious is that they both had personalities that could be described in the terms of Young's Holocaust Jew. However, where Vicious acted out the Holocaust Jew for real, to the death, Lydon acted it out in his persona as Johnny Rotten. Lydon only killed his persona.

The realization of the Judeocide, soon to become conventionally known as the Holocaust, took place in an atmosphere of apocalypse. If we really wanted to stretch things we could read the wall in "Holidays" metaphorically, as the moment of acknowledgment of the Judeocide—an unconscious, or culturally speaking preconscious, expression of the realization of the Judeocide as cultural trauma.

We have seen Bowie's invocation of apocalyptic destruction, and the Sex Pistols acting this out. It is present in other places. Mary Harron, whom we have met before, a Canadian by birth, describes her experiences of living in England in the early 1970s: "In England, there was a nightmare coming to life, it was overpowering and disturbing. Something had been given permission to show itself, it was exploding out."⁸² Savage identifies the swastika as the key symbol of what he calls, "this nightmare." McLaren's liberationist, anarchistic politics, utilizing Situationist tactics, included the swastika, and therefore World War II and, by association, the Judeocide in his play of signs. The Sex Pistols climaxed in a welter of nihilistic annihilation and personal self-destruction.

Bernie Rhodes and Displaced Apocalypse

Rhodes' politics were fundamentally anti-fascist. In addition to the work he claimed to have done with Bolan, he has also claimed to have been "involved with Jerry Rubin and the Yippie movement."⁸³ He forbade the Clash to use Nazi imagery. The Clash too, though, felt the oncoming apocalypse. When London SS split up, Rhodes looked to form a new band with Mick Jones, Terry Chimes, Paul Simonon, and the lead singer from 101ers, Joe Strummer. It was Simonon who suggested calling the band the Clash. The name derives from a reggae track released in Jamaica in 1976 by Culture called "Two Sevens Clash." This is an apocalyptic song lifting off from a Rastafarian prophecy made by Marcus Garvey. Quite what the prophecy foretold is unclear. Indeed, all that is clear is that Garvey said that the 1970s would be some kind of watershed for black people. Joseph Hill and the other two members of Culture reworked this oral foretelling into a song about the approaching apocalypse on the date of the two sevens, or, if you like, the two sets of sevens, 7/7/77. The chorus asks:

Wat a liiv an bambaie
When the two sevens clash

This can be translated as: "What will be left/When the two sevens clash."

The Clash's first single, released in March 1977, was "White Riot." Based in their experience of the Notting Hill Carnival Riot of 1976, this song announced that if black people can riot for what they want then whites should too.⁸⁴ "White Man in the Hammersmith Palais," the band's fifth single released in June 1978, describes being a white man in the black

environment of the Palais and suggests that the more recent punk bands have no politics. The song achieves this by referencing Hitler, suggesting that these groups (maybe the Sex Pistols was one) are “turning rebellion into money” and that they would “send a limousine” if “Adolf Hitler flew in today.” In other words, expressing the political divide between McLaren and Rhodes, these bands have shock value but no (anti-fascist) politics.

In 1978 also, the Clash, along with the Tom Robinson Band and X-Ray Spex, and including the Anglo-West Indian reggae band Steel Pulse, played at the Rock Against Racism rally, organized under the auspices of the Anti-Nazi League (ANL) coalition, in Victoria Park, Hackney. Walking from Trafalgar Square to Victoria Park, the rally attracted around 100,000 people. The very name of the ANL references back to Nazi racial practices. We should remember again that 1978 was also the year that *Holocaust* was shown on British television. The new awareness of the cultural trauma of the Holocaust was interwoven in England with the rise of white English racism against the West Indian and Pakistani/Bangladeshi/Indian migrants who had been coming to Britain since the mid-1950s.

With Rhodes’ refusal to allow the Clash to work with Nazi imagery, the band’s sense of apocalypse was sheeted onto the London Afro-Caribbean/white divide and played out musically not in the sonic deconstruction, and in the end chaos, of the Sex Pistols but in a tension between the chords and beat of punk rock and the rhythms of reggae.⁸⁵ Where the politics of the Sex Pistols lay in their production by McLaren as a Situationist event, those of the Clash, as inspired by Rhodes, were aligned with the anti-fascism of the ANL which had formed in 1977 in response to the increasing popularity of the openly racist National Front party.⁸⁶ Almost thirty years later the Clash are remembered as a great rock band, the Sex Pistols are remembered as the essence of English punk rock.

The classic version of the Sex Pistols ended with Rotten’s exit after the Winterland concert on January 14, 1978. This same year, with the showing of *Holocaust* across the United States, Britain, and mainland Europe, the Judeocide moved into collective memory as cultural trauma. In England, punk would roll on with bands like the Clash and the Buzzcocks and the Adverts but it would not have the incandescent nihilism that McLaren and the Sex Pistols had given it. It would become power-pop. The Sex Pistols would limp on for a while, mostly as a figment of McLaren’s fantastic and overwrought desire. Their moment was gone. Punk was much much more than a reaction to local economic conditions and the long, slow decline of Britain as a world power. Yes, as is usually argued, punk in England became a response to Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative government’s championing of the aspirant middle class, but we need to remember that Thatcher didn’t become prime minister until 1979. In England, as elsewhere, punk expressed the inchoate agony of the experience of the cultural trauma that ended the confidence, and hope, of Euro-American

modernity. In England, the band that exemplified this best was the Sex Pistols. Tracking their history from their beginnings and their management by the Jewish Malcolm McLaren to their self-destruction, we find an expression of the apocalyptic social feeling that accompanied the surfacing of the cultural trauma that has come to be known as the Holocaust.

CHAPTER TEN

Buffy the Vampire Slayer: *What Being Jewish Has to Do with It*

Buffy: "We averted the apocalypse. You gotta give us points for that."
"The Harvest."¹

Section I

Buffy the Vampire Slayer has become one of the great cult successes of the late 1990s and early 2000s on American television.² The series is based on an only moderately successful film of the same name that was also written by Joss Whedon. It has become usual to argue that the relative failure of the 1992 film can be attributed to its almost reflexive, camp quality as a consequence of which the quality of horror that keeps people's attention in the series was lost. The series, comparatively, plays the realist/Gothic disjunction pretty much straight, making Buffy and her friends, nicknamed by Buffy's best friend Willow the Slayerettes, misunderstood teens. In the series the focus of the comedy has shifted from an overall campness to an ironic and referential humor embedded in the dialogue.³

I will argue that, in addition to this stylistic difference between film and series, there has also been a profound subtextual discursive shift. In short, where the film marks the distinction between vampires and humans, here identified with Buffy and her schoolfriends, as located in class, the division within the series utilizes the tropes of race. Moving on from this argument I will discuss the Jewishness of Buffy and her offsider, Willow, and think through the show's preoccupation with Buffy and her friends saving the world from apocalypse. In my discussion I will focus primarily on the first two seasons.

As I have remarked, *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* has become a major cult hit in the United States. The first episode was broadcast on March 10, 1997. At that time Buffy was supposed to be sixteen, born in 1981. In general terms *Buffy* does not rank high in the Nielsen Ratings. In its first season the show consistently placed at around 100 in overall popularity. It placed

approximately mid-way, six or seven out of twelve, in popularity of WB shows, the minor network that airs it. *Buffy*'s success comes from its popularity with a particular demographic, women and men in the age group twelve to thirty-four.

One common claim about the central character is that Buffy is a positive role model for young women, a strong female with attitude who takes life's knocks and comes back with the power to confront her attackers. Although there is some worth in this claim, Buffy's circumstance, especially in the series, is rather more complex. One way in which this is signaled in the demographics is that the series is watched by almost as many males in that age group as females. In a WB press release dated March 1, 2001, *Buffy* gets a rating of 3.0 for all adults aged eighteen to thirty-four, 3.1 for all persons aged twelve to thirty-four, and 3.6 for people aged eighteen to thirty-four, 3.9 for females aged twelve to thirty-four. In addition, Virginia Rohan, a journalist with *The Record Online*, notes that, "In big cities, the show's ratings are especially spectacular. In New York, during October [1997], for example, the series finished first in its time-slot among teens with a 9.3 rating and 24 share."⁴ The show's survival is a consequence of its major success with this demographic, and *Buffy*'s ability to deliver a clearly defined teen and twenties audience to advertisers.

If so many younger males are watching this show, what are they finding in it? Assuming that they are not watching *Buffy* for very different reasons from the women—voyeurism is the everyday claim but Buffy is not Xena the Warrior Princess whose clothes, and those of her offside Gabrielle, as well as the only-just covert lesbian theme, pander to heterosexual male fantasy—then we must begin to think through what concerns the show addresses with which a generation can identify. With her usual insight and erudition Joyce Millman, in the online magazine "Salon," argues that the component elements of *Buffy* are not new. She notes Buffy as "a kickboxing TV warrior heroine in the Xena mode." She recognizes the influence of the witch sitcom tradition of shows such as *Bewitched*, *I Dream of Jeannie*, and *Sabrina, the Teenage Witch*. Had Millman's article been written the following year, she could have noted how, with another WB show, *Charmed* (1998), this tradition has got somewhat more serious and moved into the drama/romance genres. Millman refers to the Anne Rice element and the "Gothic romance/star-crossed lovers theme" to be found in Buffy's involvement in the first two seasons with Angelus/Angel, the vampire with a soul. All up, Millman attributes the show's success to Joss Whedon's ability to "energize his metaphors... with a story-telling style that is both intensely emotional and devastatingly flip." She goes on to suggest that, "*Buffy* approximates, perfectly, the mood swings of adolescence."⁵ This may be, but it does not explain why men and women in their twenties and thirties find the show so enthralling.

Such a description fits the Buffy character of the film much better. Let us then turn to the film and examine how it constructs the major

protagonists. Released in 1992, *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* was written by Joss Whedon and rewritten by him along with Fran Rubel Kuzui who also directed it. Speaking about the film, Rubel Kuzui has said that, "For me, from the very beginning, *Buffy* was always about 'girl power.'" ⁶ This claim is important because, in the film, the narrative offers us a Buffy who moves from being a cheerleader and mindless mall-rat, such as is portrayed in the later and more successful film, *Clueless* (1995), to a young woman whose courage, determination, and personal power enable her to take charge, killing the vampires, including their leader, the evil Lothos, and saving the other school students. In making this transition, Buffy loses her mindless friends and her vacuous boyfriend, acquiring instead a more thoughtful and helpful, if working-class, boyfriend in Pike, played by Luke Perry. Certainly, we have here a narrative of girl power and yet, as I have noted, the film was not very successful, not even in the demographic among which the television show is so popular. Rubel Kuzui puts this lack of success down to a marketing problem. In her words: "I think [the film] was never clearly marketed to one audience."⁷

Centrally, the discursive system through which the difference between the humans and the vampires is expressed is that of class. Buffy and the other school students are middle-class consumers. In this consumption order, class is signified more by financial access to consumption, and what is consumed, than by the traditional Marxian productivist indicators of one's work situation. Where Buffy and the other students are all dressed in designer clothes, the vampires, with the exception of Lothos and his offside, dress in daggy jeans, t-shirts, leather jackets, and the like. Pike is, roughly speaking, the film's equivalent of Angel in the television series. Although Pike is not a vampire, his best friend Benny becomes one and attempts to turn Pike into one as well. Pike and Benny are both working class and, in the film's semiotic structure, have visually more in common with the vampires than with Buffy and the other students. In the café scene where Pike and Benny, not yet a vampire, first talk with Buffy and her friends, Pike eats loutishly and Buffy's friends make fun of the two's clothes-sense and Pike's name. Pike's similarity to Angel lies in boundary transgression. Where Angel is the vampire with a soul who Buffy accepts as a lover, Pike is the working-class guy who, in becoming Buffy's boyfriend, crosses a well-patrolled class boundary—which, in the film, signifies the boundary between vampires and humans.

Pike and Benny are car mechanics. When Buffy's friends discover that she has been associating with Pike, this is the final straw. They find the relationship "gross," as one of them puts it. One way of reading the *Buffy* film, then, is in terms of class warfare. This is most obvious in the climactic dance scene where the dressed-up, middle-class students at the dance in the school gym are threatened by the down-market, unfashionable vampires who are excluded from the dance. In destroying the vampire threat, Buffy, with help from class-traitor Pike, not only asserts her "girl power" but also, conservatively, makes the world—well, Los Angeles—safe for

her mall-rat ex-friends who seem to have learnt nothing from the whole episode. Moreover, while Buffy, as the Slayer, is transformed into a riot grrrl, the effect of her activism is to put the working class/vampires back in their place, no longer entering the lives of young middle-class consumers but, one presumes, invisibly laboring to produce the goods for those consumers to buy as they wander the malls from which such undesirables would, most likely, be excluded.

Although the vampires are working class, their master, Lothos, is dressed as an aristocrat. This associates Lothos with the Old-World vampire myth of Dracula, popularized for the twentieth century by Bram Stoker's eponymous novel, published in 1897. In the film's class narrative, Lothos' aristocracy is simply irrelevant in the New World. Where his working-class minions are reminders of an older, but still relevant, capitalist order, Lothos is altogether out of place in the United States. His threat, in this reading, is fundamentally regressive, to instate a precapitalist, predemocratic, political order with himself as Master.

In the film the vampires' threat to Buffy is not just that she might be killed, there is also a sexual undertone. Buffy, the blond, attractive, all-American girl played by Kristy Swanson, is also a sexualized young woman. This is immediately obvious in an early scene when, in a very short skirt, she dives across her boyfriend's male friend in the front seat of an open-top car to kiss her boyfriend. Later, in the first scene with her Watcher, Merrick, here played by Donald Sutherland, his wish to take her to the cemetery for an unexplained purpose can be read with a sexualized suggestiveness. Buffy's sexualization intersects with what is now a common understanding of vampires, most obviously located in readings of Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, that vampiric bloodsucking is either itself a sexual act or a metaphor for one.⁸ The 1983 film *The Hunger* made the relationship between vampire behavior and sex explicit. In the film of *Buffy* the working-class threat is also a sexual threat. However, for Buffy, the threat is most obvious in her relationship with Lothos, the master vampire.

Buffy's development as a Slayer seems to be intimately connected to her development as a woman. When she gets cramps that appear to be menstrual, Merrick tells her that this is a sign that a vampire is near. When she first meets Lothos, Merrick intervenes telling the vampire that she is not yet ready for him. Merrick appears to mean that Buffy is not yet a worthy opponent but the scene also has a more sexual subtext, as does the penultimate scene when Lothos comes close to biting Buffy's outstretched neck.

I have gone into some detail about the film because we need to understand how its semiotic structure differs from that of the television show, and how this relates to the lack of popularity of the film and the popularity, especially among teens and twenties, of the show.

If the underlying semiotic of human/vampire relations in the *Buffy* film was class, in the television show it is race. The best place to start this discussion is with the humans. In Buffy vampirology, human beings have souls. Souls are what enable a human to feel emotions, and conjointly souls

provide the basis for ethical behavior. When a human becomes a vampire, is sired, to use the Buffy vampirological term, (both female and male vampires can sire), a part of the change that takes place is the loss of the person's soul. In Angel's case, his soul was returned to him by the Romanies as a punishment for a murder. The return was intended to force Angel to live in the world in an agony of remorse for his past actions.⁹ Human beings, then, are, definitionally, caring, moral, and, above all, loving.

But, who are human in *Buff*y, the show? Less than a two-hour drive on the freeway from Los Angeles, the world of Sunnydale is implacably white, and not only white but Anglo-white in the terms of the American everyday discourse of race. By this I mean that, if we look at the names of the major human characters, none have Central or Eastern European-suggestive names, or even Southern European names. A quick roll call of the major characters will easily demonstrate this point. We have Buffy Summers, Xander (short for Alexander) Harris, Cordelia Chase, and later Oz (Daniel Osbourne)—though, unfortunately for Willow who has a relationship with him, he turns out to be a werewolf. Rupert Giles is white and English. Finally, there is Willow Rosenberg who is Jewish. I will have more to say about her whiteness presently. Now, if the main characters are Anglo-white, then a quick perusal of the rest of the students at Sunnydale High suggests that they are all white as well.

This phenomenon of whiteness is not confined to *Buff*y, we should note. Pete Schulberg in an online think-piece for *The Oregonian*, from July 1999, writes that: "If you're not white, young and attractive, you might as well kiss your network series career goodbye."¹⁰ More specifically, Schulberg notes that: "None of the 33 network series set to debut this fall [1999] on ABC, CBS, NBC, Fox Broadcasting and WB include a major character who is African-American." Finishing his article by commenting on what were then two forthcoming shows, Schulberg writes: "Having seen tapes for *Roswell* and *Popular*, I see that the two high schools where the action takes place are glaringly devoid of minorities. It's hard to spot anyone of color, even among the extras."

*Buff*y, then, is part of a general pattern. We can add that, in the transition from film to television, and from Los Angeles to Sunnydale, Buffy loses her one African-American friend.

The human world of *Buff*y, the television show, is remarkably homogeneous, full, as I have said, of Anglo-Americans. These humans/Anglo-Americans all have, of course, souls. In the Introduction to the cast descriptions in *Buff*y the Vampire Slayer: *The Watcher's Guide*, vol. 1, we are told:

Joss Whedon [the creator and chief writer] says of the world of *Buff*y the Vampire Slayer: "At the core, it's an emotionally safe place to be." The main characters care deeply about one another (yes, even Cordelia), and when the chips are down, they can count on one another. They share a common vision, and they serve a common

purpose. They are loyal and true, and yes, they would die for one another.¹¹

Humans/Anglo-Americans love each other. Nonhumans, vampires, and demons, do not. Nonhumans in this *Buffy* universe are non-Anglo-Americans. To make the point clearer we can broaden this high level of homogenization and say nonwhites, members of other races, do not have souls—that is to say, consciences, ethics, and, of course, the ability to love.

Before we move on, there is one more point to make here about the above quotation. It amplifies the relationship between *Buffy* and her friends noting that they “share a common vision” and “serve a common purpose.” To me, this sounds very much like the nineteenth-century ideal of the nation that we can define in shorthand as a racially homogeneous group of people bound together with a shared culture and a shared sense of their own future.¹² In the United States the latter idea evolved into the notion of a Manifest Destiny, a term coined by the journalist, John L. O’Sullivan in the early 1840s to justify American expansionism. In this imagining, race was naturalized as an essential quality. One of the things that is comforting for an Anglo-American viewer is that they see an image of a United States—after all, all the main human characters except for Giles have American accents—that is Anglo-American and unified in purpose. There are no “minorities” here, no need for debates over affirmative action, no racially based demands for multicultural acknowledgement.

Before elaborating on this point I want to discuss further the question of accents. Within this all-white world, accents become very important as markers of difference. Thus, Rupert Giles’ Englishness is signaled to some extent by his clothes and, to at least the same extent, by his accent. Now, Giles is *Buffy*’s Watcher—her second in actual fact—and his Englishness suggests a connection with the Old World, the European world from whence the threatening vampires came but also the safe, white, English world which established the colony that became the United States and now lends its knowledge to help the latter, in the person of *Buffy*, and her friends, defend itself against vampire depredations.

However, the use of Englishness is rather more complex than this, for two of the most regular vampires are also “English” in accent, though played by American actors, Drusilla and Spike. Here, we have the remnants of the class warfare discourse that is so prominent in the film. Drusilla’s accent places her as cockney, or at least, London East End, while Spike’s suggests an upwardly mobile working-class lad. Indeed, to me, with his bleached blond hair and clipped manner Spike stands in a line of such images that tracks back to the late 1970s and early 1980s singer, Billy Idol, originally in the English punk band Generation X, and also to the characters in *The Who*’s remake of mod life in the mid-1960s, *Quadrophenia* (1979), in which Sting plays Ace the blond-haired mod-style leader.¹³ Drusilla and Spike’s working-class English accents do a double

duty. They mark the ancientness of vampires from an American point of view and signal Drusilla and Spike's difference from the middle-class world of Giles, and of Buffy and the rest of Sunnydale High. At the same time, Drusilla and Spike's whiteness does not disturb, or make overt, the racially based human/vampire coding of the show.

Angel speaks English with an accent that was originally partly Irish, his origin, and partly American. He was sired as a vampire by Darla in the Irish city of Galway in 1753. The Irish are, if you like, the distaff aspect of Anglo-American whiteness. Through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when Ireland was colonized by the English, the Irish were represented as racially different, as associated with Negroid blackness.¹⁴ In the nineteenth century in the United States, the Irish tended to be grouped with African-Americans. As Noel Ignatiev describes, the whitening and assimilation of the Irish into Anglo-American society took place through the nineteenth century. He writes that: "The outcome was not a foregone conclusion . . . while the white skin made the Irish eligible for membership in the white race, it did not guarantee them admission; they had to earn it."¹⁵ They earned entry into American whiteness by identifying with the causes of white Americans including supporting slavery, and distinguishing themselves from African-Americans. Thus, in the terms of the *Buffy* show's very limiting and selective account of who is really an Anglo-American/American, Angel's status as a vampire with a soul expresses his historically ambiguous position as an Irishman in the United States, both white and not-completely-white.

It is also important to mention Janna/Jenny Calender here, though I will have more to say about her later in the context of how the show activates similarities and differences between Romanies and Jews. Jenny marks the limits of *Buffy* whiteness. Her American English is perfect yet her background as a Gypsy from Romania suggests her Eastern European exoticness. Jenny's real name is Janna, she has taken the very Anglo name "Jenny Calender" to pass at Sunnydale High where she gets a position as a computer-science teacher. Jenny is played by the Italian-American actor Robia LaMorte whose dark looks contrast with the rest of the main characters. Jenny marks the limit of *Buffy* whiteness, of safe Anglo-Americanness. It is her accent which, in the end, makes her safe, and it is not surprising that, while being a teacher, she is described in her biography in *The Watcher's Guide* as: "A very modern woman, Jenny dressed in similar fashions to her students, spoke in slang, and had an excellent rapport with her students."¹⁶ Her extreme assimilation into student life at Sunnydale High counterbalances her marginal whiteness. However, neither her assimilation nor her romantic involvement with Rupert Giles is enough to save her. In "Passion" she was murdered by Angel after he had again lost his soul.

Finally, we come to the one fully nonwhite character to be included, albeit briefly, in the program's core group. Kendra is a Slayer. Although only one Slayer is supposed to be active at a time, Kendra was activated when Buffy briefly died at the hands of the Master in "Prophecy Girl." Kendra was

played by the African-American actor Bianca Lawson. However, fitting in with the show's semiotic project of excluding American racial minorities, Lawson does not play Kendra as an African-American. Rather, as *The Watcher's Guide* puts it: "Her accent suggests a background on a British, or formerly British, Caribbean island, but her homeland is never identified by name."¹⁷ Lawson herself describes the accent as Jamaican and adds that, "it was like the lower class, with a heavier patois."¹⁸ Nevertheless it was not a broad Jamaican accent and still suggested to those familiar with that accent a more middle-class background. With Kendra we can appreciate how important accents are in this white world. Kendra's accent makes her relatively safe, as did Jenny Calender's in a different way, marking her as non-American, also as Jamaican with its connotations of being an ex-British colony, and more or less middle-class. Again, though, all this was not enough to save Kendra and allow her to take a place in the Anglo-American *Buffy* community. Kendra appeared in three episodes only, being killed by Drusilla in "Becoming, Part 1."

What, then, in this reading, is the apocalypse from which Buffy, and her friends, save the world? If vampires and demons are soulless, racial Others threatening Buffy's loving, Anglo-American, white world, then what we have is some sort of race warfare fear, fear that the racial Others are trying to take over, and destroy, the Anglo-American world.¹⁹ Let us position this anxiety more specifically. *Buffy* first went to air in 1997. It is set in a peaceful all-Anglo-American, white town, Sunnydale, outside of Los Angeles. Yet, the 1990s in the United States, and especially in California, were anything but peaceful. Dale Maharidge begins his Foreword to the 1999 edition of his 1996 book, *The Coming White Minority: California, Multiculturalism, and America's Future*, by writing:

Whites are now a minority in California.

The crossing of this threshold went unheralded when it occurred sometime in 1998.²⁰

Maharidge goes on to write—making, it would seem, a slippage between white Americans and Americans that would do justice to *Buffy*: "Americans elsewhere have grown to realize in the past few years that what is happening in California is their future as well."²¹ He writes that, "By 2050 the nation will be almost half non-white."²² At this time the forecasts suggest, "Hispanics will make up twenty one percent of the American population, blacks fifteen percent, and Asians and Pacific Islanders ten percent."²³ Already whites have become a minority in many major cities: "The 1990 Census found that fifty-one out of 200 cities with populations over 100,000 were minority-majority communities. New York city is, of course, the prime example."²⁴ We should recall here Rohan's comment that the viewing figures for *Buffy* are "especially spectacular" in the big cities, and that she singled out New York in particular.

Sunnydale, we know, is over a Hellmouth, a site of mystical convergence. Acknowledging the previous Spanish/Mexican colonization of California, we also know from "Welcome to the Hellmouth" that the Spanish name of the town has been Boca del Infierno. Alta California, along with what is now Utah and Nevada, and parts of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming, formed the area of Mexico ceded to the United States at the Treaty of Guadalupe that ended the American expansionist Mexican-American War in 1848. In the naming imagery where Sunnydale replaces Boca del Infierno, we have a white Anglo-American civilization supplanting a Spanish-originated "hell." We can note by the by, that there is no recognition here of a precolonial world other than the vague idea that this Hellmouth has "always" existed.

Even though sunny, white civilization has come to Sunnydale, the vampires still come through the Hellmouth and civilization is threatened. Maharidge tells us that: "According to a 1995 U.S. census report, 25 percent, or 7.7 million, of the state's [California's] residents were born outside the United States, most in non-white nations."²⁵ In the American racial system Hispanics are nonwhite so this figure includes Mexicans coming into California. The Hellmouth, then, can be read as a metaphor for the site of nonwhite migration, both legal and illegal, into California and the United States more generally.²⁶

Maharidge sums up white anxiety at the end of the century, especially after the Los Angeles riots of 1992 like this:

[W]hites are scared. The depths of white fear is under-estimated and misunderstood by progressive thinkers and the media. Whites dread the unknown and not-so-distant tomorrow when a statistical turning point will be reached that could have very bad consequences for them. They fear the change that seems to be transforming their state into something different from the rest of the United States.²⁷

And middle-class whites are fighting back, especially at the ballot box. There was, for example, Proposition 187 that was passed in 1994 denying illegal immigrants access to public services. In 1996 the anti-affirmative action Proposition 209 was passed and, in 1998, the passing of Proposition 227 ended bilingual education in California. Earlier, in 1986, there had been a ballot to declare English the official language of California. In this context, Buffy, the apparently all-American, Anglo-American middle-class girl, blonde though not blue-eyed, ex-cheerleader, can be read as the savior of white society, slaying the vampires and demons who wish to take over the world, the United States, in a racial apocalypse.²⁸

Now we have a way of understanding the show's appeal to the 18–34 demographic. Although we do not have any race-based viewing figures, given the racial composition of the characters, and the show's preoccupations, it is highly likely that the majority of viewers identify as white. What the show presents is a reassuringly white world in which whites

fight back against the apocalyptic threat of being overwhelmed by other races. At the onset of their adult lives the members of the white twelve to thirty four age group are the people who would feel the most threatened, and that they would have the most to lose, by the racial transformation of the United States.

Section II

At the end of the previous section I described Buffy as only apparently the all-American girl. I now want to rework the race-based reading of the show that I have developed, inflecting it with a Jewish reading. Unlike Kristy Swanson's Buffy in the film, there is something just a little not-quite-right about Sarah Michelle Gellar's Buffy. She seems to be the all-American, blonde teenager, and yet there is something in the way she looks that suggests all is not quite as it seems. Marcia Shulman, the casting director for *Buffy*, hints that this is exactly why Gellar was chosen for the part when she "reveals that the producers had a very good idea of what they wanted in the actress who would play the title role—until Sarah came along."²⁹ Gellar's just-so-slightly disconcerting difference may well be there to signal her Slayer status; she is, after all, not quite like other mortals, being stronger and having faster reflexes. Gellar's skin is just a little too olive for your run-of-the-mill natural blonde. Her full face and high cheekbones are also not quite normative for an Anglo-American woman. As it happens the blonde hair is not genuine. Gellar's natural color is brunette.

Gellar's parents, it turns out, are both Jewish. In the show Gellar passes for Anglo-American Buffy Summers, daughter of Joyce Summers played by Kristine Sutherland who is an Anglo-American. Sutherland's hair happens to be its natural color when she plays Joyce Summers, a blond-brunette mix. Thus, Buffy's Slayer difference can be read as the effect of Gellar's Jewish difference. Interestingly, Kendra's slayer difference is marked by her racial difference as signified by her black skin.

As it happens, Buffy's best friend and offsider, the Jewish Willow Rosenberg, is played by Alyson Hannigan whose mother is Jewish. However, we should not get too essentialist here. Although coming from what is implied to be an observant Jewish home, Willow evidences no obvious sign of her Jewishness in her public, day-to-day, life. Willow, indeed, acts out the cultural pluralist ideology of keeping her Jewish difference for her private, home life while assimilating to the Anglo-American cultural norm in public.³⁰ Following a well-established liberal, Enlightenment way of thinking, Willow's Jewishness is identified not as racial but as cultural and religious. Willow is so assimilated that it is not until episode twelve of the second season, "Bad Eggs," that we get any sign of her Jewishness other than her family name. With the Anglo-American assimilationist ethos of the show in mind, it also seems to be the case that Willow is the

only Jew at Sunnydale High. Willow is lucky in that she is not subject to any anti-Semitism, but this may be because she is so assimilated that many students are most likely not aware of her Jewishness and, also, she does not “look Jewish”—which is not surprising given the actor who plays her! A generation earlier, Steven Spielberg has recounted the constant anti-Semitic harassment to which he was subjected at Los Gatos High School in Northern California.³¹ One way of reading the lack of anti-Semitism against Willow is the historical “whitening” of American Jews that I shall discuss shortly, however, a more likely reading, more in tune with the show’s racial fantasy, is that the lack of anti-Semitism offers American Jews a fantasy image of their acceptance into Anglo-American society.

Not surprisingly, then, Gail Berman, executive producer and the woman instrumental in getting *Buffy* to air as a television show, has this to say about Willow:

I love Willow’s character, I love what’s going on with her and Xander, and Oz—it feels real to me. I love the fact that she is Jewish—I can’t recall ever having a Jewish character on television that isn’t portrayed in some stereotypical way. For me that is very helpful to say to my daughter: Willow’s Jewish.³²

What Berman appears to mean here is that Willow has not been given any obvious Yiddish identifying markers. In her physical appearance, her accent, her lack of Yiddish grammatical constructions in her speech, lack of Yiddish words and phrases, lack of “uncivilized” excitability and so on, Willow passes for “white.” From the point of view of her presentation of self, Willow could be Anglo-American.

Yet, in other ways, Willow falls precisely into a Jewish stereotype. Willow’s difference comes out in her awkwardness relating to people. This is identified as her being, “A fairly reserved and shy person.”³³ Willow is a nerd, a computer freak. She also loves reading and is the only one of the friends who has used the school library. She is on her way to being an intellectual. After Jenny Calender’s murder, Willow is asked to take her computer-science class until the new teacher arrives. Willow discovers her vocation, she loves teaching. Here, we have the stereotypical cultural construction of the assimilated Jew, awkwardness both social and physical—the stereotype has the Jew with a rather weedy body, while this does not apply to Willow she is certainly not strong and not good in fights—nerdiness, the intellectual bent leading logically to teaching. Willow’s loveable weakness is exemplified in her response to Buffy’s remark in “Becoming, Part 1” that if she fights Angel and loses “Willow might be our only hope,” to which Willow replies: “I don’t want to be our only hope, I crumble under pressure. Let’s have another hope.” Interestingly the qualities I have identified are most usually associated with Jewish men. Woody Allen’s image comes to mind as an example. The equivalent stereotypes for Jewish women are the Jewish-American

Princess and the neurotic mother.³⁴ It is the transposition that makes this stereotype harder to recognize. It is also the case that, compared to the negative stereotypes of Jewish women, the male stereotype of the Jewish nerd is much more positive.

Willow's cultural pluralist assimilation into white Anglo-American society can take place because her Jewishness is not identified racially. Rather, it is religious and cultural. Willow's biography in *The Watcher's Guide*, vol. 1, describes her as coming from "a very Jewish household."³⁵ This seems to be an extrapolation from Willow's remark that, as a kid, she used to have to go round to Xander's house to watch *Charlie Brown's Christmas*, and her mentioning to Buffy that her father would be horrified that she was putting up crucifixes in her room—this is to keep Angel out. However, Willow is clearly nowhere near as observant as her parents. For example, neither her boyfriends nor girlfriend—when she comes out as a lesbian—are Jewish. In a United States where interracial relationships are still an oddity, Willow's unrequited love for Xander, and subsequent relationships with Oz (Daniel Osbourne) and later Tara, emphasize not only her assimilation and loss of Jewish values but also her whiteness, her acceptability in, and as a part of, Anglo-American society.

In this regard we can usefully compare Willow, the Jew, with Jenny, the Romany. Both Jews and Gypsies have been regarded as outcasts from modern society, as diasporic wanderers owing no deep allegiance to the nation-states in which they found themselves. However, as Karen Brodtkin has argued, in post-World War II United States, Jews were reconstituted as white and incorporated into Anglo-American society.³⁶ Thus, while Willow, with her non-Jewish New Age name, is Jewish through religion and culture—in "Bad Eggs," when the students are given eggs to look after and Xander asserts that they should be taught Christian values, Willow dissents, stating that hers is Jewish, with the implication that she will teach it Jewish values—Jenny is so marginally white that, as I have discussed earlier, she even has to change her name. Where Willow, and Jews generally, are, in fantasy and to some extent in reality since the 1950s, accepted into American society as "white," and American, Janna/Jenny is constructed as Old World, as Eastern European. Janna/Jenny was given the background that many Jews in the United States have in terms of their ancestry but which is not apparent in this, fourth or fifth, generation with the effect that Willow is whitened even more through the contrast.

One way of thinking about Willow and Buffy is that they are a Jewish fantasy dyad along the lines of Clark Kent and Superman. The idea of Superman with his mild-mannered alter ego, Clark Kent, was developed by two Jews, Jerome Siegel and Joseph Schuster in the early 1930s. In the Willow/Buffy dyad, Willow is the physically weak, intellectual Jew while Buffy is the passing "tough Jew," to use Paul Brien's term.³⁷ Brien argues that, in the latter part of the 1960s, especially after the Six Day War of 1967,

there evolved in the United States a new image of the tough Jew who was prepared to stand up and fight to defend his [sic] people. Such an image has been integral to the construction of the native-born Israeli Jew, the sabra, since the inception of the Israeli state. Thus, in Willow and Buffy rather than the 1930s Jewish-American assimilationist fantasy of becoming the superhuman goy we have a more complex complementarity of images. In Willow we have the older, diasporic, Eastern European-originated image of the ineffectual, bookish, but morally worthy Jew. These European Jews are also the ones that Israeli, and also Jewish-American, mythology have as walking unresistingly into the Nazi gas chambers. In Buffy we have the tough Jew, physically strong though not very intellectual, ready to defend her people even at the cost of her own life.

What I am beginning to suggest here is that there can be read into *Buffy*, both the film and the television show, a Jewish subtext that is much more pervasive than the presence of a single Jewish character. In the film of *Buffy*, in which, as I have already argued, the structuring discourse is class, there is no Jewish character, no Willow—the film is set in Los Angeles, in narrative terms before Buffy and her mother go to Sunnydale—and there are no Jewish undertones to Buffy and her friends. Rather, Jewishness is played out in a vampiric echo of the Holocaust in the characters of Buffy's Watcher, Merrick, and Lothos, the master of the vampires. Now, while Donald Sutherland is not Jewish, he plays Merrick wearing a felt hat and long overcoat, clothes reminiscent of a pre-World War II Eastern European migrant, including an accent which, while not clearly Yiddish, is not quite fully American. It is, therefore, not surprising that, when Buffy asks him what sort of a job he would have liked had he not been a Watcher, Merrick replies, "a job—I would have made a wonderful bootmaker." Cobbling, along with the garment trade, was one of those occupations stereotypically associated with Eastern European Jews. For comparison, the flashback scene in "Becoming, Part 1," which shows Buffy meeting Merrick for the first time, is quite different from the original scene in the film. Aside from being in a different location, outside the school rather than in the gym, Buffy is now played by Sarah Michelle Gellar and Merrick by Richard Riehle who portrays the part of the Watcher very differently from Donald Sutherland. This Merrick looks like a rather faded American gentleman, overweight with a large moustache, rumpled white shirt and tie, and a blazer. I have already discussed Lothos in class terms as having the image of an aristocrat, now I can add that he is played by the most Aryan-looking actor in Hollywood, Rutger Hauer, and that his cravat is held in place with what looks to be an iron cross. Lothos is reminiscent of a combination of the decadent aristocrat and a Nazi SS officer from Luchino Visconti's 1969 film *The Damned*.

In other words, while class is the dominant discourse in the film, the vampiric threat is also, to some extent, figured in terms of the Nazi genocide of European Jewry, what has become known as the Holocaust.

This reference becomes much stronger in the show, as I will explain. In the film, the only other suggestion of Jewishness is the name on the gravestone of the youth who, having been killed three days earlier, rises from the dead while Merrick and Buffy are in the cemetery. It is Robert Berman. However, the connection between Jews and vampires that, as we shall see, becomes very important in the series is not followed through.

Where the Jew/Nazi Holocaust undertones are muted and limited in the film, in the television show, where the discourse of race is the main structuring force, the references are much more important. I have already discussed Willow and Buffy as Jewish types. It is now necessary to say something about the Nazi qualifications of the Master as he appears in the series. The Master dominates the vampiric evil of the show's first season. It transpires, though never revealed on television, that his name is Heinrich Joseph Nest.³⁸ Neither Heinrich nor Joseph is a common name in post-World War II Germany because Himmler's forename was Heinrich and Goebbels' was Joseph. Heinrich Himmler was Reichsführer of the SS and responsible for the implementation of the Final Solution, the genocide of the Jews. Joseph Goebbels was Hitler's minister for propaganda who had a particular hatred of Jews. Thus, the Master's name carries the connotations of two of Hitler's most powerful associates. Joseph was also Stalin's forename. For those who know their Nazi history, Nest connotes Eagle's Nest. This term is the name given to Hitler's residence in the Bavarian village of Obersalzberg where there was also the southern command center for military operations. In "The Harvest" we are told that the Master arrived in Sunnydale from overseas sixty years earlier from 1997 when the show went to air, and that he came "not just to feed."³⁹ It seems that the Master knew that Sunnydale was built over the Hellmouth and that he wanted to open it to allow the demons out to walk the earth once more.⁴⁰ Now, sixty years before 1997 places the Master's arrival in 1937, when the Nazis were consolidating their power in Germany and beginning their persecution of the Jews. At the same time the American Nazi Party was at its most powerful.

How, then, to think of this vampiric threat that the Master brought to Sunnydale, and the greater threat that he attempted to unleash, thwarted only by a chance earthquake that trapped him in the Hellmouth? Even after the Master's death this greater threat of a vampiric or demonic apocalypse remains.⁴¹ We can now rework the idea of a racial apocalypse, rereading it as a fear marked and connoted in the show by reference to the Jewish Holocaust which was, of course, founded on the Nazi racialization of the Jews. In this reading the Nazis are soulless, threatening vampires determined to destroy American society figured not just as middle-class Anglo-American but, ultimately, as Jewish.

The figuring of the Nazis as vampires inverts a long-standing anti-Semitic usage of vampires as a way of describing Jews. For example, in the United States, Benjamin Franklin used the metaphor in the course of

an anti-Semitic diatribe during a break in the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1787. He said:

For 1,700 years, the Jews have been bewailing their sad fate in that they have been exiled from their homeland, as they call Palestine. But, gentlemen, did the world give it to them in fee simple, they would at once find some reason for not returning. Why? Because they are vampires, and vampires do not live on vampires. They cannot live only among themselves. They must subsist on Christians and other people not of their race.⁴²

In the 1860s, Wolfgang Menzel, a German literary critic, “described how the Jewish literati robbed the German people of its national vigor: ‘The Jewish demon fanned it [the people] with its vampire wings, while it gently sucked away its blood.’”⁴³

Hitler, himself, used the image in *Mein Kampf* when describing his claim that the Jewish Bolshevik takeover of Russia had resulted in the deaths of thirty-nine million people: “The result is not only the end of freedom for the people oppressed by the Jews, but rather also the end of these parasites of the peoples themselves. After the death of the victim, the vampire dies sooner or later.”⁴⁴

The metaphor continues to have currency in anti-Semitic circles. In 1996, the *Milli Gazette*, the organ in Europe of the Turkish ultranationalist organization Milli Gorus (National Vision), describes Jews as “blood-sucking vampires” and Western countries as “instruments of the secret Jewish worldwide conspiracy.”⁴⁵

The reversal of use is founded on a moral reversal. Anti-Semites think of Jews as an evil force, an evil race, parasitic on a fundamentally moral world and conspiring to destroy it. In *Buffy*, the vampiric racial Others are evil, trying to destroy Anglo-American civilization and all it stands for. What conjoins the present-day racial apocalypse reading with the Holocaust reading is that both are premised on the show’s distinction between humans and vampires as operating in the discourse of race. In this context, the Nazi genocide of the Jews is being invoked as a way of justifying white, Anglo-American fear and legitimating white aggression.

This said, we need to understand how *Buffy*, both film and television show, is historically located in relation to the Holocaust. The term “Holocaust” for the genocide of the Jews has an obscure prehistory during World War II, however, through the 1950s the most common description was by way of a reference to concentration camps.⁴⁶ It seems that the Israeli memorial to the Jewish dead, Yad Vashem, began using the term in the late 1950s and, according to Brieness in *Tough Jews*, it gradually entered American usage during the 1960s.⁴⁷ “Holocaust” seems to have become capitalized, marking the increasing use of the event it describes as a moral touchstone, in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The breakthrough of the term's general acceptance in popular Western culture as the way to describe the Nazi genocide of the Jews was in some part a consequence of the broadcasting in 1979, in the United States in the first instance, of *Holocaust*, a television miniseries about the genocide. Jeffrey Shandler writes: "At the same time that *Holocaust* prompted millions to discuss the Nazi persecution of European Jewry, it also engendered an extended public exchange on the representation of the Holocaust on television."⁴⁸ Elie Wiesel, survivor and one of the loudest objectors to attempts to represent the Holocaust, published an article in the New York Times entitled, "Trivializing the Holocaust" in which, "he denounced *Holocaust* as transforming 'an ontological event into soap-opera.'"⁴⁹ Thus, the miniseries both popularized the genocide of the Jews in the discursive form of the Holocaust and set the parameters for an ongoing debate over the possibility of its representation. The locus classicus of this debate is Saul Friedlander's edited collection entitled *Probing the Limited of Representation: Nazism and the "Final Solution,"* published in 1992. The next year Steven Spielberg released the first feature film to attempt directly to portray the events of the Holocaust.

Yosefa Loshitzky argues that, "*Schindler's List* (along with the Holocaust Museum in Washington) can be viewed as part of a symbolic rite of passage introducing the Holocaust into mainstream American culture."⁵⁰ *Holocaust* was marketed as a one-off special event; in an important sense *Schindler's List* normalized the Holocaust, acknowledging its availability for narrational realism. At its most basic this has to do with a generational shift that was taking place. Loshitzky puts it this way:

Today, the desire to represent (as well as to "consume") the Holocaust is motivated by a deep anxiety nurtured by the gradual disappearance of Holocaust survivors—the last eyewitnesses to a catastrophe—from the land of the living. Steven Spielberg's *Schindler's List* may be seen as the great locus of this angst... the film reifies the fragile moment of transition in historical consciousness from lived, personal memories to collective, manufactured memory.⁵¹

Here, Loshitzky is making explicit the important connection between a generational shift from survivors who lived through the events of the Holocaust, many of whom like Wiesel feel that it cannot be fictionally depicted without some crucial loss, who are now dying, to the second and third generations since the Holocaust, and the movement toward fictionalized representations as a way of preserving memory.

Now, the television show of *Buffy* first went to air four years after the watershed of *Schindler's List*. Of course, *Buffy* does not offer us a representation of the Holocaust. Rather, it can be read as refiguring the Holocaust in the Gothic terms of vampire and demon threat. More significantly the show draws on the affect associated with second and third generation

Holocaust survivors as a way of comprehending the racial apocalypse implicated through the show's utilization of the discourse of race. I would like here to recall Marianne Hirsch's idea of postmemory that I discussed in "Before Holocaust Memory" in order to understand this generational, and indeed communal, transference of the affect of trauma. In one account, Hirsch writes that:

Postmemory is a powerful and very particular form of memory precisely because its connection to its object or source is mediated not through recollection but through an imaginative investment and creation. This is not to say that memory itself is unmediated, but that it is more directly connected to the past. Postmemory characterises the experience of those who grow up dominated by narratives that preceded their birth, whose own belated stories are evacuated by the stories of the previous generation shaped by traumatic events that can be neither understood nor recreated.⁵²

Hirsch is writing about the handing on of traumatic affect within families, from parent(s) to children. I would like to generalize this idea to the Jewish community but also, in the context of *Buffy*, to the white, Anglo-American community in its "Jewished" reformulation.

What I am arguing here is that, as American society has taken up the Holocaust as the site of a moral absolute, so the traumatic affect of the Holocaust gets expressed in ways that break the bounds of narrative realism. From this point of view *Buffy*, the non-Jewish-but-Jewish character, evinces many of the characteristics of second, and indeed more properly third, generation trauma and, more generally, the show acts this out.⁵³ We might start exemplifying this quite banally by thinking about the dreams of past slayers and their destruction at the hands of vampires that *Buffy* has before she is told that she is a Slayer. These are more obvious in the film than the television show that begins after the introductory events of the film. Dreams, as Freud realized, are an important site of the return of the repressed. Ruth Leys writes that:

the general problem of repetition, especially the tendency of traumatized people to repeat painful experiences in their dreams...compelled Freud in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920) to acknowledge the existence of a "beyond" of pleasure, or death drive, acting independently of and often in opposition to the "pleasure principle."⁵⁴

The repressed that is handed down from one generation to the next in the form of postmemory can, likewise, be expressed in dreams. In the show *Buffy* also has prescient dreams about the future. Just as the show displaces the repressed Holocaust on to the fear of a future racial apocalypse, so *Buffy*'s dreams work to displace the return of past trauma with an imagining of future trauma.

In an important paper given at the Twenty-Ninth Annual Conference of the Association for Jewish Studies in 1997, Lucia Ruedenberg-Wright, talking about second and third generation survivors noted that:

Many second generation come from families where the underlying dynamics are shrouded in a "conspiracy of silence." The impact of a "return of the repressed" within these families depends on the severity of the parents' conflicts and the susceptibility of each child.⁵⁵

Although *Buffy* herself appears to suffer from the return of others' repressions, the show acts out the return of a repressed experienced as either too awful to depict realistically or that has too much affect for a realistic portrayal to do it justice.⁵⁶

Ruedenberg-Wright explains that: "Many clinicians note that an important characteristic of the second generation is that they have fantasies about their parents' past."⁵⁷ As a show, *Buffy* produces the affect of the postmemory of the Holocaust in fantasies played out in the present. In one of the as yet very few sites on the Web dedicated to third-generation survivors, Gilad Evrony tells his story. At one point he writes:

Of all the emotions conjured up by my Grandfather's story, one stands out the most. Here I am sitting in a beautiful house, free from oppression, free from hunger, free from anything that could restrict my freedom, yet only fifty years ago, six million Jews experienced exactly the opposite. They went through a hell which I can hardly even fathom. I was filled with feelings of guilt, horror, and sadness...⁵⁸

Evrony describes the Holocaust as a hell he can hardly even fathom. He emphasizes the contrast with his life today. *Buffy* can be read as enacting the affect of Evrony's characteristic feelings of guilt, horror and sadness in a Gothic structure where the Nazi past has returned to haunt the safe, suburban present. In this world, in every episode, *Buffy* the tough Jew, rallies her forces including the "weak" diasporic Jew, Willow, and goes out to patrol, restaging the Holocaust only this time, every show, rather than the Nazi vampires and demons winning and sending the Jews to the concentration camps, *Buffy* rewrites the past saving grandparents and parents with the Jews winning and the Nazi vampires destroyed.⁵⁹

To recapitulate: what I am arguing is that the television show of *Buffy* works through the discourse of race, and of racial apocalypse. However, it draws its affect from the Jewish experience of the Holocaust. The show can be read as a second and third generation postmemory revisiting of the Holocaust where this time the tough Jews of the United States fight off and destroy the Nazi threat figured in the show's vampires and demons. While the show offers itself to be read as an expression of white Anglo-American anxiety at the changing racial composition of California and

the United States more generally, the affect it brings to this expression is that of second and third generation Holocaust survivors. This is one example of the way that the Holocaust affect has been generalized or, at least, transferred to another context, and, indeed, here used conservatively to reinforce the sense of threat to white Americans of the racial transformation in American society. This transference is happening as the Holocaust itself has become generalized in the “West,” and particularly the United States, as, perhaps, the last absolute moral reference point in a postmodern, relativistic world, for all Anglo-Americans, all Americans and, in *Buffy*’s terms, all humans.

NOTES

Introduction

1. Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (Ithaca, NY; London: Cornell University Press, 1998), 26.
2. Lyotard, Jean Francois, *Heidegger and "the jews,"* trans. Andreas Michel and Mark S. Roberts (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990).
3. Kathy Acker, *Empire of the Senseless* (New York: Grove Press, 1988).
4. Charles Maier, *The Unmasterable Past, History, Holocaust and German National Identity* (Harvard University Press, 1988), 1.
5. See Maurizio Passerin d'Entrèves and Seyla Benhabib, eds., *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996).
6. LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz*, 22, note 14.
7. *Ibid.*, 41.
8. *Ibid.*, 40–41.
9. Jeffrey Alexander et al., *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).
10. Idith Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*, trans. Chaya Galai, Cambridge Middle East Studies 21 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 4.
11. Angi Buettner, "Animal Holocausts," *Cultural Studies Review* 8.1 (2002): 28.
12. Angi Buettner, *Haunted Images: The Aesthetics of Catastrophe in a Post-Holocaust World* (PhD diss., University of Queensland, 2005), 139.
13. *Ibid.*, 139.
14. *Ibid.*, 157.
15. *Ibid.*, 159–160.
16. *Ibid.*, 219.
17. Tim Cole, *Selling the Holocaust: From Auschwitz to Schindler, How History Is Bought, Packaged and Sold* (New York: Routledge, 1999).
18. LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz*, 21.

Chapter One Producing the "Jewish Problem": Othering the Jews and Homogenizing Europe

1. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, "Exile and Expulsion in Jewish History," in *Crisis and Creativity in the Sephardic World 1391–1648*, ed. Benjamin R. Gampel (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 20.
2. For another reading of this history see Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), especially Chapter 2. Bauman works with a rather more universalist understanding of Jewish difference. Thus, for example, Bauman writes that: "Once the term 'antisemitism' had been coined and come into general use toward the end of the nineteenth century, it was acknowledged that the phenomenon that the newly forged term

- tried to capture had a long past, reaching deep into antiquity, virtually unbroken continuity was recognized in historical evidence of resentment and discrimination towards Jews extending over two millennia." 33.
3. See Enrique Dussel, *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of the "Other" and the Myth of Modernity* (New York: Continuum, 1995), 35. See also Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997).
 4. Jon Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities* (London: Routledge, 2000).
 5. Doreen Massey, "A Global Sense of Place," in *Studying Culture: An Introductory Reader*, ed. Ann Gray and Jim McGuigan (Arnold: London, 1993), 232.
 6. James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 3.
 7. Christopher Columbus, *Journal of 1492*.
 8. Jael Silliman, *Jewish Portraits, Indian Frames: Women's Narratives from a Diaspora of Hope* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2001), 5–6.
 9. *Ibid.*, 167–168.
 10. Jonathan Israel, *European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism 1550–1750* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 7.
 11. Frédéric Mauro, "Merchant Communities 1350–1750," in *The Rise of Merchant Empires: Long Distance Trade in the Early Modern World 1350–1750*, ed. James D. Tracy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 267.
 12. Timothy Brennan, *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 21.
 13. Joseph Goebbels, "Heil Moskau!" *Der Angriff* 21 November (1927).
 14. Anna Foa, *The Jews of Europe after the Black Death* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 25.
 15. *Ibid.*, 24.
 16. Kenneth Stow, *Alienated Minority: The Jews in Late Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 62.
 17. Anthony Giddens, *The Nation-State and Violence*, vol II of *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 20.
 18. Foa, *The Jews of Europe after the Black Death*, 27.
 19. Israel, *European Jewry*, 5.
 20. Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 281.
 21. Israel, *European Jewry*, 6.
 22. *Ibid.*
 23. Foa, *The Jews of Europe after the Black Death*, 154–155.
 24. Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*, 48–49.
 25. Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish*, 183.
 26. See Esther Benbassa and Aron Bodrigue, *Sephardi Jewry: A History of the Judeo-Spanish Community, 14th–20th Centuries* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).
 27. Ella Shohat, *Israeli Cinema: East/West and the Politics of Representation* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989), 3–4.
 28. James Clifford, "Notes on Travel and Theory," *Inscriptions* 5 (1989) at http://humwww.ucsc.edu/DivWeb/CultStudies/PUBS/Inscriptions/vol_5/clifford.html/.
 29. Edward Said, *The World, the Text and the Critic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 226.
 30. Foa, *The Jews of Europe after the Black Death*, 130–131.
 31. Israel, *European Jewry*, 18.
 32. Israel, *European Jewry*, 20.
 33. Foa, *The Jews of Europe after the Black Death*, 106.
 34. *Ibid.*, 105–106.
 35. See also Milton Shain, *The Roots of Antisemitism in South Africa* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994), 48–50 for a summary of the arguments about the implications of this development.
 36. Ella Shohat, "Taboo Memories and Diasporic Visions: Columbus, Palestine, and Arab-Jews," in *Performing Hybridity*, ed. May Joseph and Jennifer Natalya Fink (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 136.
 37. *Ibid.*, 137.

38. *Ibid.*, 136.
39. Denys Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 1968), 73.
40. *Ibid.*, 95.
41. *Ibid.*, 86.
42. *Ibid.*, 107.
43. *Ibid.*, 117.
44. José Rabasa, *Inventing America: Spanish Historiography and the Formation of Eurocentricism* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), 207.
45. Jonathan Boyarin, *Storm from Paradise: The Politics of Jewish Memory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), 85 describes how, in the German-Jewish development of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, in which “they wished to purify Judaism of elements of folkloric ‘superstition,’ to separate out those universal elements that could inform a modern Judaism compatible with ecumenical liberalism,” there was “a strategy of Othering in time, allowing identity to draw on identification with a heritage that now can be dispensed with.”
46. Yerushalmi, “Exile and Expulsion in Jewish History,” 22.
47. Jon Stratton, *Writing Sites: A Genealogy of the Postmodern World* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1990), 50.
48. Enrique Dussel, *The Invention of the Americas*, 35.
49. *Ibid.*, 38.
50. Quoted in Hay, *Europe*, 120–121.
51. Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (New York: Orion Press, 1965), 15.
52. *Ibid.*, 15–16.
53. Silliman, *Jewish Portraits*, 176.
54. *Ibid.*
55. Janet L. Abu-Lughod, *Before European Hegemony: The World System 1250–1350* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 354–355.
56. For the role of Jews in the Mediterranean area of the premodern world system see the six volumes of S. D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967–1993).
57. Abu-Lughod, *Before European Hegemony*, 355.
58. For a discussion of the historical shift of the center of modernity from Spain and Portugal to the countries of the northwest of Europe see the lengthy Preface to Walter Mignolo, *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality and Colonization* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995). After this shift Spain, Portugal, and Italy get marginalized—indeed, their inhabitants get constructed as only marginally “white.”
59. Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System* (New York: Academic Press, 1974), 38.
60. Israel, *European Jewry*, 44–45.
61. *Ibid.*, 49.
62. Foa, *The Jews of Europe*, 167.
63. *ibid.*, 39.
64. Jacob Katz, *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770–1870* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 9.
65. *Ibid.*, 15.
66. Perry Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (London: New Left Books 1974), 15.
67. *Ibid.*, 28.
68. *Ibid.*, 17.
69. *Ibid.*, 18.
70. Johann Fichte, quoted in Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, eds. *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 309.
71. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (London: Hutchinson, 1974), 138. Hitler wrote that: “The Jewish state was never spatially limited in itself, but universally unlimited as to space, though restricted in the sense of embracing but one race. Consequently, this people has always formed a state within states.”
72. Fichte in Mendes-Flohr and Reinharz, *The Jew in the Modern World*, 309.
73. Foa, *The Jews of Europe*, 138.
74. *Ibid.*, 140.
75. *Ibid.*, 142.

76. Ibid., 140.
77. Ibid., 141.
78. Israel, *European Jewry*, 74.
79. Stow, *Alienated Minority*, 305–306.
80. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage, 1979), 141.
81. Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Ippermann, *The Racial State: Germany 1933–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 36.
82. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: Octagon, 1978), 144.
83. Benny Morris, *1948 and After: Israel and the Palestinians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 103–104.
84. Gershon Shafir, *Land, Labor and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 11. For an overview of discussions of Israel as a colonial state see Laurence Silberstein, *The Postzionism Debates: Knowledge and Power in Israeli Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1999).
85. The history of relations between the Jewish National Fund and the Palestine Land Development Fund is discussed in Kenneth Stein, “The Jewish National Fund: Land Purchase Methods and Priorities, 1924–1939,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 20.2 (1984): 190–205.
86. Quoted from Benny Morris, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947–1949* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 27. For a general account see Nur Masalha, “The Palestinian Refugee Problem: Israeli Plans to Resettle the Palestinian Refugees 1948–1972” at <http://www.shaml.org/publications/monos/mono2.htm/>.
87. Morris, *1948 and After*, 89–90.
88. For his discussion of refugee numbers see Morris, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem*, Appendix 1, 297–298.
89. See *ibid.*, 113–114.
90. *Ibid.*, 222.
91. See Morris, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem*, on Operation Hiram in the north of the country, 224–234. There were investigations into these atrocities that resulted in: “the disciplining of some of the soldiers and officers involved—a few were cashiered from the army, others gaoled for relatively short periods—and the publication in the IDF [Israel Defence Forces] of strict rules on the treatment of Arab civilians.” 234.
92. Quoted in Morris, *1948 and After*, 98.
93. Eric Rentschler, *The Ministry of Illusion: Nazi Cinema and Its Afterlife* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 156.
94. Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 276 (Hitler’s italics).
95. See, in general, David Pearson, *The Politics of Ethnicity in Settler Societies: States of Unease* (Palgrave: Basingstoke, 2001).
96. Mendes-Flohr, and Jehuda Reinharz, *The Jew in the Modern World*, Protocols of the Wannsee Conference (January 20, 1942), 662.
97. Foa, *The Jews of Europe*, 141.

Chapter Two Life on the Edge: Liminality and the (European) Jews

1. Albert Memmi “Jews, Tunisians, and Frenchmen,” trans. Debbie Barnard, *Literary Review* 41.2 (1998).
2. Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 24.
3. Robert Young, *White Mythologies* (London: Routledge, 1990), 3.
4. Suzanne Gearhart also makes this point in “Colonialism, Psychoanalysis, and Cultural Criticism: The Problem of Interiorization in the Work of Albert Memmi,” in “*Culture and the Problem of the Disciplines*,” ed. John Carlos Rowe (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 173–174.
5. Leela Gandhi, *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* (St. Leonard, Australia: Allen and Unwin), 6.
6. There is a small amount on Memmi’s background in Judith Roumani, *Albert Memmi* (Philadelphia, PA: Celfan Edition Monographs, 1987).

7. Edith Haddad Shaked and Bat-Ami Bar On, in their chapter "On the State of Being (Jewish) between 'Orient' and 'Occident,'" in *Jewish Locations*, ed. Lisa Tetsman and Bat-Ami Bar On, position Albert Memmi and his work within the context of the changing circumstances of Tunisian Jewry.
8. The first person to discuss the Jews as a colonized people within Europe was John Murray Cuddihy, *The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Lévi-Strauss, and the Jewish Struggle with Modernity* (New York: Basic Books, 1974).
9. Jonathan Israel, *European Jewry in the Ages of Mercantilism 1550–1750* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 87.
10. Marcia Leveson, "The Enemy Within: Some South African Jewish Writers," in *Jewries at the Frontier*, ed. Sander Gilman and Milton Shain (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 244. See also Milton Shain, *The Roots of Anti-Semitism in South Africa* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994), and the discussion by Claudia Bathsheba Braude in her "Introduction" to her edited collection, *Contemporary Jewish Writing in South Africa: An Anthology* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001).
11. André Chouraqui, *Between East and West: A History of the Jews of North Africa*, new ed. (Skokie, IL: Varda Books, 2002), 95.
12. Esther Benbassa and Aron Rodrigue, *Sephardi Jewry: A History of the Judeo-Spanish Community, 14th–20th Centuries* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), iiv.
13. *Ibid.*, 36–37.
14. *Ibid.*, 42.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. Jane Gerber, *The Jews of Spain: A History of the Sephardic Experience* (New York: Free Press, 1992), 34.
18. Benbassa and Rodrigue, *Sephardi Jewry*, 46.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*, 47.
21. Chouraqui, *Between East and West*, 141.
22. Israel, *European Jewry*, 42.
23. *Ibid.*, 41.
24. *Ibid.*, 51.
25. *Ibid.*, 87.
26. *Ibid.*, 128.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*, 113–114.
29. *Ibid.*, 114.
30. Chouraqui, *Between East and West*, 132–133.
31. Quoted in *ibid.*, 143.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. Quoted in *ibid.*, 150.
36. Edith Shaked, "The Holocaust: Re-examining the Wannsee Conference, Himmler's Appointments Book, and Tunisian Jews" at <http://nizkor.org/hweb/people/s/shaked-edith/re-examining-wannsee.html/>.
37. Quoted in Michael Abitbol, *The Jews of North Africa during the Second World War* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 120.
38. *Ibid.*, 130.
39. Shaked, "The Holocaust."
40. Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 4.
41. *Ibid.*, 2.
42. *Ibid.*, 3.
43. *Ibid.*, 1.
44. *Ibid.*, 2.
45. *Ibid.*, 1.
46. *Ibid.*, 136.

47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., 135.
49. See Elizabeth Grosz, "Judaism and Exile: The Ethics of Otherness," *New Formations* 12 (December 1990): 77–88.
50. Elizabeth Grosz, "The Body of Signification," in *Abjection, Melancholia, and Love: The Work of Julia Kristeva*, ed. John Fletcher and Andrew Benjamin (London: Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature, 1990).
51. Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 4.
52. See Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 8.
53. On the relation between Derridean deconstruction and Jewish thought see Susan Handelman, *Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1982).
54. See, for example, *ibid.*
55. Judith Butler, "Gender As Performance: An Interview with Judith Butler" by Peter Osborne and Lynne Segal, *Radical Philosophy* 67 (1994).
56. Butler, *Bodies That Matter*, 3.
57. Ibid., 8.
58. Albert Memmi, *La Statue de Sel* (The Pillar of Salt), trans. Edouard Roditi (Boston, MA: Beacon Press 1992), ix.
59. Heidi Grunebaum-Ralph, "Jewishness and Otherness in *La Statue de Sel*," in *Jewries at the Frontier: Accommodation, Identity, Conflict*, ed. Sander L. Gilman and Milton Shain (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1999), 294–296.
60. Ibid., 295.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid., 302.
63. Yimiyahu Yovel, *Dark Riddle, Hegel, Nietzsche and the Jews* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 3. See also the earlier book by Nathan Rotenstreich, *Jews and German Philosophy: The Polemics of Interpretation* (New York: Schocken Books, 1984).
64. Yovel, *Dark Riddle*, 7.
65. Ibid., 8.
66. Ibid., 17.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid., 81.
69. Ibid., 75.
70. Ibid., 62.
71. Raymond Plant, *Hegel* (New York: Routledge 1999), 117.
72. Ibid., 123.
73. Clark Butler, *G. W. F. Hegel* (Boston, MA: Twayne 1977), 40.
74. Gary Wilder, "Irreconcilable Differences: A Conversation with Albert Memmi," *Transition* 71 (1997): 162.
75. Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (New York: Grove Press, 1986), 181.
76. Albert Memmi, *Portrait of a Jew* (London: Orion Press, 1963), 262.
77. Jonathan Judaken, "The Queer Jew: Gender, Sexuality and Jean-Paul Sartre's Anti-Antisemitism," *Patterns of Prejudice* 33.3 (1999): 49.
78. Young, *White Mythologies*, 42.
79. Homi Bhabha, "Foreword," to *Black Skin, White Masks* (London: Pluto, 1986), xiii.
80. Yovel, *Dark Riddle*, 39.
81. Memmi, "Preface," to *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, trans. Howard Greenfield (New York: Orion Press, 1965), vii.
82. Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 54–55.
83. Ibid., 15–16.
84. Albert Memmi, *Dominated Man*, n.p.
85. Gearhart, "Colonialism, Psychoanalysis, and Cultural Criticism," 188.
86. Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, 91.
87. Memmi, *Portrait of a Jew*, 153.
88. Ibid., 253.

89. Albert Memmi, "The Colonized Jew," in *Jews and Arabs*, trans. Eleanor Ceizeux (Chicago: J.P. O'Hara, 1975), 38.
90. Memmi, "The Colonized Jew," 39 (Memmi's italics).
91. *Ibid.*, 40.
92. *Ibid.*, 44.
93. Jonathan Boyarin, *Storm from Paradise: The Politics of Jewish Memory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), 125.

Chapter Three It Almost Needn't Have Been the Germans: The State, Colonial Violence, and the Holocaust

1. Such a proposition flies in the face of the many proponents of the claim that the Holocaust was a unique event. These mainly fall into two categories. First, there are the survivors and writers of that generation such as, and perhaps most importantly, Elie Wiesel. These people very often argue that not only is the Holocaust unique but that it is also unspeakable. The second group consists of postmodern theorists—including such luminaries as Jean-Francois Lyotard—who argue that the Holocaust represents, in some way, a break with the European modern past (on these see Elizabeth Bellamy, *Affective Genealogies: Psychoanalysis, Postmodernism, and the "Jewish Question" after Auschwitz* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998)). Although this may be the case, the reason for it is not the uniqueness of the Holocaust per se, which often appears to be the implication of the argument being put forward. Such a position ignores, perhaps more correctly, especially in the case of French theorists, represses, the long history of colonialist treatment that I will discuss in this article. I single out French theorists here for their lack of acknowledgment of any connection between French practices in Algeria, in particular during the Algerian war of independence, and Nazi racist practices. This can be seen most obviously in Alain Finkielkraut's diatribe against the defense lawyers' arguments in the Klaus Barbie case (see Alain Finkielkraut, *Remembering in Vain: The Klaus Barbie Trial and Crimes against Humanity*, trans. Roxanne Lapidus with Sima Godfrey (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992)).
2. Another book in this area is Richard Rubenstein's, *The Age of Triage: Fear and Hope in an Overcrowded World* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1984). Rubenstein's starting point is the idea of "population redundancy" or "mass surplus population." For Rubenstein, genocide appears to be a solution to this modern problem. The book begins with the British enclosures but really starts with the Irish Famine of the mid-nineteenth century. Rubenstein does not mention the destruction of the indigenous peoples of the continent we call America.
3. Ward Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas, 1492 to the Present* (San Francisco, CA: City Lights, 1997), 35.
4. Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989). Bauman argues that: "We know of many massacres, pogroms, mass murders, indeed instances not far removed from genocide, that have been perpetrated without modern bureaucracy, the skills and technologies it commands, the scientific principles of its internal management. The Holocaust, however, was clearly unthinkable without such bureaucracy" (17). Bauman's phrasing is ambiguous. He may be arguing that genocide requires modern, rational bureaucracy. Alternatively, he may be arguing that the use of such rational means is what makes the Holocaust unique.
5. Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide*, 63–64.
6. Raphael Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944), 79.
7. Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*.
8. For discussions on the use of the term see, among other books, Charles B. Strozier and Michael Flynn, eds., *Genocide, War, and Human Survival* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996); George J. Andreopoulos, ed., *Genocide: Conceptual and Historical Dimensions* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1994); Leo Kuper, *Genocide* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1981).
9. Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*, 91.

10. Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Joan Pinkham (1972; reprint New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000), 14.
11. *Ibid.*, 20.
12. *Ibid.*, 21.
13. Michael Burleigh, *Germany Turns Eastwards: A Study of Ostforschung in the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 6.
14. Quoted in *ibid.*, 7–8.
15. Jon Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities* (London: Routledge, 2000).
16. Patrick Brantlinger, “‘Dying Races’: Rationalizing Genocide in the Nineteenth Century,” in *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge and Power*, ed. Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh (London; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books, 1995), 43.
17. *Ibid.*, 47.
18. Quoted in *ibid.* (Brantlinger’s italics).
19. Quoted in *ibid.*
20. Jonathan Boyarin, *Storm from Paradise: The Politics of Jewish Memory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), 106.
21. The color of Jews in European thought is a matter of great complexity. The best discussion of this is to be found in Sander Gilman, *The Jew’s Body* (New York: Routledge, 1991).
22. Boyarin, *Storm from Paradise*, 86.
23. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage, 1979), 48–49.
24. *Ibid.*, 55.
25. *Ibid.*, 49.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.*, 80.
29. *Ibid.*, 115.
30. We should also remember that, in addition, violence was removed from everyday life. Following Norbet Elias, Zygmunt Bauman writes in *Modernity and the Holocaust*, that: “Elimination of violence from daily life is the main assertion around which [‘the familiar self-definition of civilized society’] revolves,” 107.
31. Henri Lefebvre, *Everyday Life in the Modern World*, trans. Sacha Rabinovitch (London: Allen Lane, 1971), 147.
32. *Ibid.*
33. Claude Lefort, *Democracy and Political Theory*, trans. David Macay (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), 72.
34. *Ibid.*, 86.
35. *Ibid.*, 70.
36. Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust*, 98.
37. Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish*, 196.
38. Saul Friedlander, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, vol. I, *The Years of Persecution, 1933–1939* (New York: Harper Collins, 1997), 27.
39. *Ibid.*, 142.
40. *Ibid.*
41. On the historical production of non-European populations as Other—the book concentrates on post-Columbian America—see Enrique Dussel, *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of the “Other” and the Myth of Modernity*, trans. Michael D. Barber (New York: Continuum, 1995).
42. Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide*, 97.
43. *Ibid.*
44. Michael Taussig, *Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 34.
45. *Ibid.*
46. On the Belgian depredations in the Congo see Adam Hochschild, *King Leopold’s Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa* (London: Papermac, 2000).
47. Quoted in Sven Lindqvist, *Exterminate All the Brutes*, trans. Joan Tate (New York: New Press, 1996), 8.
48. Quoted in *ibid.*, 9.
49. Taussig, *Shamanism*, 133.

50. *Ibid.*, 45.
51. Raymond Evans, *Fighting Words: Writing about Race* (St. Lucia, Australia: University of Queensland Press, 1999), 15. Henry Reynolds, *Frontier: Aborigines, Settlers and Land* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1996) notes that: "The concept of savagery bolstered the belief that Aborigines, 'like savages all over the world,' could only by subdued with violence, controlled by terror."
52. Quoted in Evans, *Fighting Words*, 25.
53. On the legal history of *terra nullius* in Australia see Henry Reynolds, *The Law of the Land* (Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1987).
54. Quoted in Reynolds, *Frontier*, 33.
55. *Ibid.*, 38.
56. *Ibid.*, 33.
57. *Ibid.*
58. Paul Gilroy, "Afterword: Not Being Inhuman," in *Modernity, Culture and "the Jew,"* ed. Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), 288.
59. *Ibid.* The reference to Hitler's willing executioners here is to the contentious book by Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996).
60. Woodruff D. Smith, *The German Colonial Empire* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 15.
61. *Ibid.*, 23.
62. *Ibid.*, 35.
63. *Ibid.*, 51.
64. Quoted in Horst Drechsler, *Let Us Die Fighting: The Struggle of the Herero and Nama against German Imperialism (1884–1915)*, trans. Bernd Zollner (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1986), 154.
65. Quoted in *ibid.*, 156–157.
66. *Ibid.*, 207.
67. *Ibid.*, 208.
68. I should mention here Isobel Hull's recent book, *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005). Hull sees a continuity in German military practise running from before the colonial war against the Herero to World War I, where her book ends. For Hull, though, the cause of German military extremism, as she calls it, is rooted in the institutional organisation of the German armed forces. She writes that: "The Imperial German case shows that militaries, because violence is their business, do not need external ideologies or motivations to encourage excess; their task and doctrines, habits and basic assumptions (the military culture) they develop to handle it may be sufficient in themselves" (324). Needless to say I think this argument, while having a certain worth, is inadequate.
69. Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, 68.
70. Quoted in *ibid.*, 80.
71. *Ibid.*, 229.
72. *Ibid.*
73. Burleigh, *Germany Turns Eastwards*, 21.
74. *Ibid.*, 20–21.
75. Robert-Jan van Pelt, "A Site in Search of a Mission," in *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, ed. Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 98.
76. Quoted in *ibid.*, 99.
77. *Ibid.*
78. Thomas A. Vogler, "Poetic Witness: Writing the Real," in *Witness and Memory: The Discourse of Trauma*, eds. Ann Douglass and Thomas A. Vogler (New York, London: Routledge, 2003), 204.
79. *Ibid.*, 204–205.
80. *Ibid.*, 205.
81. Smith, *The German Colonial Empire*, 233.
82. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York, 1973). Richard Bernstein, *Hannah Arendt and the Jewish Question* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996) points out that Arendt's discussion in *The Origins* is a revision of a piece titled "The Concentration Camps" published in *Partisan Review* 15/7 (July 1948): 743–763.
83. Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 392.

84. Ibid., 464.
85. Ibid.
86. Ibid.
87. Wolfgang Sofsky, *The Order of Terror: The Concentration Camp*, trans. William Templer (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).
88. Walter Laqueur, *Guerrilla: A Historical and Critical Study* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977), 59.
89. Ibid., 89.
90. Along with very many other Germans of his generation Hitler's favorite author was Karl May (1842–1912) who, in the words of Richard Cracroft, "The American West of Karl May," *American Quarterly* 19 (1967): "made the Wild West of North America as exciting to German *Burger* and their children as to their American counterparts" (249). Tassilo Schneider writes that "May's novels regularly celebrate the cultural achievements of Native American tribes and bemoans the tragedy of their annihilation by European settlers" (Tassilo Schneider, "Finding a New *Heimat* in the Wild West: Karl May and the German Western of the 1960s," *Journal of Film and Video* 47, 1995, 3). Nevertheless, the books portray the annihilation as inevitable. As Boyarin, *Storm from Paradise* puts it following Peter Uwe Hohendahl, May's "esthetic required that the noble Red Man be doomed," 17. Although it may have been an aesthetic necessity, as we have seen there was a common perception of the inevitable extermination of indigenous races. Hitler is reputed to have made May recommended reading for his General Staff. He is also supposed to have likened the Russians to "Redskins."
91. Marquis de Sade, *The One Hundred and Twenty Days of Sodom*, Intro. Simone de Beauvoir, trans. Austryn Wainhouse (London: Arrow Books Ltd., 1989), 236.
92. Ibid., 672.
93. van Pelt, "A Site in Search of a Mission," 94.
94. Joan Dayan, *Haiti, History and the Gods* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 212.
95. Ibid., 213.
96. Arno J. Mayer, *The Furies: Violence and Terror in the French and Russian Revolutions* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 336.
97. Ibid., 337.
98. Ibid., 344.
99. Ibid., 347.
100. Aly Götz, *The Final Solution: Nazi Population Policy and the Murder of the European Jews* (London: Arnold, 1999), 2.
101. On the history of the Dachau concentration camp, see Harold Marcuse, *Legacies of Dachau* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2001.

Chapter Four The Wall at the End of the World: Zionism, Colonialism, Messianism

1. Gush Shalom, *The Wall*, 4. The text of this pamphlet can be found at: <http://www.gush-shalom.org/thewall/thewall.pdf/>.
2. Jeffrey Goldberg, "Among the Settlers," *The New Yorker* (March 31, 2004) at: http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?040531fa_fact2_d/.
3. Ibid.
4. Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces" at: <http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault.heteroTopia.en.html/>.
5. Ibid.
6. Tom Segev, *Elvis in Jerusalem: Post Zionism and the Americanization of Israel* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2002), 102.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., 104.
9. Esther Benbassa and Jean-Christophe Attias, *The Jews and Their Future: A Conversation on Judaism and Jewish Identities*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Zed Books, 2004), 16.
10. Baha Abushaqa, "The Barrier to Peace," (August 22, 2003) at: <http://www.ramallahonline.com/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=1571/>.

11. Ibid.
12. Edward Said, "An Ideology of Difference," in *The Politics of Dispossession, The Struggle for Palestinian Self Determination 1969–1994* (New York: Vintage, 1994), 81–82.
13. Slavoj Žižek, "The Iraqi MacGuffin" at: <http://www.lacan.com/iraq1.htm/>.
14. Jacqueline Rose, *States of Fantasy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 4.
15. Laurence Silberstein, *The Postzionism Debates: Knowledge and Power in Israeli Culture* (New York; London: Routledge, 1999), 2.
16. Segev, *Elvis in Jerusalem*, 14.
17. Benedict Anderson developed the term "imaginary community" as a way of thinking about how the nation thinks about itself in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London; New York: Verso, 1983).
18. Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, ed. Jacob M. Alkow (New York: American Zionist Emergency Council, 1946), 96.
19. Charles Price, *The Great White Walls Are Built, Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australasia 1836–1888*. (Canberra: Australian National University, 1974), 23.
20. Ibid., 24.
21. Goldberg, "Among the Settlers."
22. Slavoj Žižek, *Welcome to the Desert of the Real* (New York: Wooster Press, 2001), 151.
23. Vladimir Jabotinsky, "The Iron Wall: We and the Arabs" at: <http://www.marxists.de/middleast/ironwall/ironwall.htm/>.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall—Israel and the Arab World* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2000), 12.
27. Jabotinsky, "The Ethics of the Iron Wall" at: <http://www.jabotinsky.org/Jaboworld/docs/ethics.doc/>.
28. Jabotinsky, "The Iron Wall."
29. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*.
30. Segev, *Elvis in Jerusalem*, 33.
31. Goldie, *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Literatures* (McGill, Canada: Queen's University Press, 1989), 12.
32. Ibid.
33. Richard Terdiman, "Ideological Voyages," quoted in *ibid.*, 15.
34. Shlaim, *The Iron Wall*, 4.
35. Edward Said, *Orientalism*, quoted in Goldie, *Fear and Temptation*, 11.
36. See, for example, Henry Reynolds, *The Law of the Land* (Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1987).
37. Norman Finkelstein, *Image and Reality of the Israel–Palestine Conflict* (London: Verso, 2001), Chapter 4, "Settlement Not Conquest."
38. Finkelstein, *Image and Reality*, 23.
39. Ibid., 22.
40. Goldie, *Fear and Temptation*, 15.
41. Ibid.
42. Finkelstein, *Image and Reality*, 112.
43. Ibid., 96.
44. Goldberg, "Among the Settlers."
45. Ibid.
46. Sander Gilman, *Difference*, quoted in Goldie, *Fear and Temptation*, 15.
47. Finkelstein, *Image and Reality*, 114.
48. Ibid., 115.
49. Goldie, *Fear and Temptation*, 15.
50. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 1995), 188.
51. Goldberg, "Among the Settlers."
52. Gershom Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), 1.
53. Ibid., 4.
54. Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 13.
55. Baruch Kimmerling, reviewing Richard Ben Gramer, *How Israel Lost: The Four Questions for* *salon.com* at: http://www.salon.com/books/review/2004/07/19/cramer/index_np.html/.

56. Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots*, 24.
57. Quoted in Segev, *Elvis in Jerusalem*, 5.
58. Quoted in *ibid.*, 120.
59. Quoted in *ibid.*
60. Douglas Robinson, *American Apocalypses: The Image of the End of the World in American Literature* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), xii (Robinson's italics).
61. *Ibid.* (Robinson's italics).
62. Segev, *Elvis in Jerusalem*, 82.
63. Michel de Certeau, *Heterologies: Discourses on the Other* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1986), 51.
64. Segev, *Elvis in Jerusalem*, 18.

Chapter Five The Banality of Representation:

Generation, Holocaust, Signification, and

Empire of the Senseless

1. As will become apparent, my title relates to the problem of the relation between representation and the extraordinary. However, it also deliberately echoes Hannah Arendt's title for her book on Adolf Eichmann's trial, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, rev. ed. (New York: Penguin, 1994).
2. Kathy Acker, Interview with *Tattoo Jew* at: <http://www.tattoojew.com/tattoo.html/>.
3. Kathy Acker, *Empire of the Senseless* (New York: Grove Press, 1988), 3.
4. Acker, *Empire of the Senseless*.
5. Acker, Interview with *Tattoo Jew*.
6. Acker, *Empire of the Senseless*, 7.
7. *Ibid.*, 3.
8. "First Racial Definition (April 11, 1933)," in *The Jew in the Modern World*, ed. Paul Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinharz, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 642.
9. I have not referred to Abhor's name which, as Jodey Castricano notes in "If a Building Is a Sentence, So Is a Body: Kathy Acker and the Postcolonial Gothic," in *American Gothic: New Interventions in a National Narrative*, ed. Robert Martin and Eric Savoy (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1998), has an etymology deriving from the Latin *abhorrere* meaning "to shrink back in dread; to be far from; to be inconsistent with; to regard with horror, extreme repugnance and disgust," 105. Castricano emphasizes Abhor's connection with horror and, following Georges Bataille, desire. I want to emphasize the abhorrent's connection to abjection. In short, what is abject is experienced as abhorrent. Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982) argues that the abject is "[w]hat disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The inbetween, the ambiguous, the composite" (4). Culturally, in modern thought, this has been the situation of the Jew. The Jew has, for example, often been referred to as the stranger who stayed. Abhor's Jewishness can be read in her abject circumstance.
10. Acker, Interview with *Tattoo Jew*.
11. James E. Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), 87.
12. For a more developed discussion of this history see Jon Stratton, "Thinking Through the Holocaust: A Discussion Inspired by Hilene Flanzbaum, ed., *The Americanization of the Holocaust*," *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 14.2 (2000): 231–245.
13. Jeffrey Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 159.
14. Michael Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Representation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 5.
15. *Ibid.*, 6.
16. Elie Wiesel, "Trivializing Memory," republished in *From the Kingdom of Memory: Reminiscences* (New York: Schocken Books, 1995), 165.
17. *Ibid.*, 169.

18. Ibid., 172.
19. Yosefa Loshitzky, "Introduction," in *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 3.
20. Loshitzky, "Introduction."
21. Ibid., 4.
22. Saul Friedlander, "Introduction," in *Probing the Limits of Representation Nazism and the "Final Solution"* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 2.
23. Ibid., 3.
24. Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 9–10.
25. This may account for why Lemkin writes using the term "ethnic groups" rather than "race." With the exception of the Germans, Europeans and Americans thought of the Poles as white, albeit as only just.
26. Quoted in Friedlander, "Introduction," 3.
27. Ibid.
28. Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism*, 99.
29. Michael Taussig, *Shamanism, Colonialism and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 35.
30. Quoted in *ibid.*
31. Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (Ithaca, NY; London: Cornell University Press, 1998), 180–181.
32. Saul Friedlander, *Reflections of Nazism: An Essay on Kitsch and Death*, trans. Robert Weyr (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 91.
33. Friedlander, *Reflections of Nazism*, 92.
34. Taussig, *Shamanism*, 39.
35. Perhaps the most detailed discussion of this term is still Jonathan Culler's, in *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), 137–152.
36. Henri Lefebvre, *Everyday Life in the Modern World*, trans. Sacha Rabinovitch (London: Allen Lane, 1971), 148.
37. Ibid., 147.
38. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage, 1979).
39. Alice Jardine, *Gynesis: Configurations of Woman and Modernity* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 122–123.
40. Ibid., 124–125.
41. Taussig, *Shamanism*, 4.
42. Ibid., 5. The Artaud quotation comes from Antonin Artaud, *The Theater and Its Double*, trans. Mary Caroline Richards. (Grove Press Inc., 1958 [1938]).
43. Taussig, *Shamanism*, 4.
44. Quoted, unreferenced, in *ibid.*, 11.
45. Quoted in *ibid.*, 10.
46. Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1995), 99.
47. Taussig, *Shamanism*, 10.
48. Homi Bhabha, in the "Introduction" to his edited collection, *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1990) writes of "the *unheimlich* terror of the space or race of the Other."
49. Sigmund Freud, "The 'Uncanny,'" in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xvii (London: The Hogarth Press, 1962 [1919]), 245.
50. Geoffrey Hartman, "The Book of Destruction," in *Reflections of Nazism*, ed. Friedlander, 321.
51. Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989).
52. The American release was entitled *In the Realm of the Senses*.
53. "The One Measure of True Love Is: You Can Insult the Other," by Sabine Reul and Thomas Deichmann. An interview with Slavoj Žižek. at: <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/00000002D2C4.htm/>.
54. Irving Howe, *World of Our Fathers* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976).
55. Acker, *Empire of the Senseless*, 186.
56. Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism*, 8.
57. Ibid., 265.
58. Acker, *Empire of the Senseless*, 134.

59. Frederic Jameson, *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972).
60. Acker, *Empire of the Senseless*, 134.
61. Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism*, 271.
62. Ibid.
63. Operation MK-ULTRA and George Hunter White's use of a brothel to find unsuspecting subjects on whom to test drugs is described in detail in Martin Lee and Bruce Shlain, *Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD; the CIA, the Sixties and Beyond* (London: Pan, 2001), 27–55. Acker renames White, George Black and moves the brothel from San Francisco to Paris.
64. This quote, from Daladier's *Prison Journal*, is from Omer Bartov, *Mirrors of Destruction: War, Genocide, and Modern Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 58.
65. Jodey Castricano, "If a Building Is a Sentence," 203.
66. Ibid., 209.
67. Jodey Castricano, "If a Building Is a Sentence."
68. Acker, *Empire of the Senseless*, 77.
69. Jean-Paul Sartre, "Preface," in Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin ed., 1967), 24.
70. Ibid., 25.
71. Jonathan Boyarin, *Storm from Paradise: The Politics of Jewish Memory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), 113.
72. For an informed discussion on the role of French intellectuals in the French-Algerian War, see James Le Sueur, *Uncivil War: Intellectuals and Identity Politics during the Decolonization of Algeria* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).
73. In "Sorties" in Hélène Cixous and Catherine Clement, *The Newly Born Woman* trans. Betsy Wing (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 71, Cixous writes: "I was born in Algeria, and my ancestors lived in Spain, Morocco, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Germany." This suggests that Cixous' background is both Sephardi and Ashkenazi.
74. Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, 80.
75. Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*, trans. Joan Pinkham (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000).
76. Samira Kawash, "Terrorists and Vampires: Fanon's Spectral Violence of Decolonization," in *Frantz Fanon: Critical Perspectives*, ed. Anthony Alessandrini (London: Routledge, 1999), 237.
77. Kawash, "Terrorists and Vampires."
78. Ibid., 237–238.
79. Ibid., 239–240.
80. LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz*, 37.
81. Here I would like to acknowledge the influence of Amanda Third's thinking about apocalypse in "Limits of Feminist Agency: Valerie Solanas, Feminist Terrorist, Sexocide, and the Shooting of Andy Warhol," paper given at the conference Gendering Ethics/The Ethics of Gender, June 23–25, 2000 at the University of Leeds.
82. Acker, *Empire of the Senseless*, 227.

Chapter Six Trauma and Memory in the Post-Holocaust West

1. Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 4.
2. Ibid., 177.
3. Ibid., 4.
4. Ibid., 11.
5. Jacques Lacan, *The Four Fundamentals of Psycho-Analysis* (London: Hogarth 1979), 55.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid., 69.
8. Ibid., 70.
9. Ibid.

10. Cathy Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 58.
11. See, for example, my discussion in Jon Stratton, "Thinking Through the Holocaust. A Discussion Inspired by Hilene Flanzbaum, ed., *The Americanization of the Holocaust*," *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 14.2 (2000): 231–245.
12. Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (Ithaca, NY; London: Cornell University Press, 1998), 9.
13. *Ibid.*, 11.
14. Shoshana Felman, "Education and Crisis, Or the Vicissitudes of Teaching," in *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 6.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*, 5.
17. Yosefa Loshitzky, "Introduction," in *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 3.
18. Walter Benn Michaels, "'You Who Never Was There': Slavery and the New Historicism, Deconstruction and the Holocaust," *Narrative* 4.1 (1996): 11.
19. Yosefa Loshitzky, "Hybrid Victims: Second Generation Israelis Screen the Holocaust," in *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*, ed. Barbie Zelizer (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 155.
20. James E. Young, *At Memory's Edge: After Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 2000), 1. Young is quoting Kaplan from "Theweleit and Spiegelman" in *Remaking History* edited by Barbara Kruger and Phil Marian (Seattle: Bay Press, 1989).
21. Eric Santner, *Stranded Objects: Mourning, Memory, and Film in Postwar Germany* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 37.
22. In *Modernity and the Holocaust*, Bauman quotes John B. Roth ("Holocaust Business," *Annals of AAPS* 450 [1980]): "Had Nazi Power prevailed, authority to determine what ought to be would have found that no natural laws were broken and no crimes against God and humanity were committed in the Holocaust."
23. Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), 190.
24. *Ibid.*, 190.
25. *Ibid.*, 272.
26. Quoted in Jeffrey Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 203.
27. *Ibid.*, 163.
28. Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life*, 273.
29. Shandler, *While America Watches*, 166–167.
30. *Ibid.*, 176.
31. Alan Mintz, *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), 182. Mintz provides a useful discussion of Holocaust video testimony in a section titled "Videotaped Survivor Testimony As the New Archive of the Holocaust."
32. Lawrence Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 1991), 204.
33. Cathy Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience*, 2.
34. Elizabeth Bellamy, *Affective Genealogies: Psychoanalysis, Postmodernism and the "Jewish Question" after Auschwitz* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press 1997), 21–22.
35. *Ibid.*, 21.
36. *Ibid.*
37. Nicholas Rand, "Introduction," in *The Shell and the Kernel*, ed. Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
38. Nicolas Abraham, "'The Phantom of Hamlet' or 'The Sixth Act' preceded by 'The Intermission of Truth,'" in *The Shell and the Kernel*, ed. Abraham and Torok.
39. Nicolas Abraham, "Notes on the Phantom: A Complement to Freud's Metapsychology," *Critical Inquiry* 13 (1987) 291–292.
40. Bellamy, *Affective Genealogies*, 146.
41. *Ibid.*, 146–147.
42. Ruth Leys, *Trauma: A Genealogy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 19.
43. *Ibid.*, 3.

44. Ibid.
45. Ian Hacking, "Memory Sciences, Memory Politics," in *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*, ed. Paul Antze and Michael Lambek (New York: Routledge, 1996), 76.
46. Ian Hacking, *Rewriting the Soul: Multiple Personality and the Sciences of Memory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), 185.
47. Ibid., 185.
48. Leys, *Trauma*, 3.
49. Hacking, *Rewriting the Soul*, 188–189.
50. Leys, *Trauma*, 4.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., 21.
53. Eric Leed, *No Man's Land: Combat and Identity in World War I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
54. Quoted in *ibid.*, 164.
55. Hacking, *Rewriting the Soul*, 188.
56. Omer Bartov, *Mirrors of Destruction: War, Genocide, and Modern Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 76.
57. Sigmund Freud, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xiii (London: Hogarth Press, 1962), 29.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid., 22.
60. Ibid., 32.
61. Ibid., 36 (Freud's italics).
62. Ibid., 33.
63. Nicolas Abraham, "Notes on the Phantom: A Complement to Freud's Metapsychology" in *The Shell and the Kernel*, ed. Abraham and Torok, 175.
64. Leys, *Trauma*, 5.
65. Ibid., 15.
66. Ibid., 15–16.
67. Sigmund Freud, "Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics," in *The Standard Edition*, ed. Strachey, 146.
68. Ibid., 142.
69. Ibid., 147.
70. Jon Stratton, *The Desirable Body: Cultural Fetishism and the Erotics of Consumption* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).
71. Antze and Lambek, "Introduction" to *Tense Past*, Hacking, xvii.
72. Mark Seltzer, "Wound Culture: Trauma in the Pathological Public Sphere," *October* 80 (1997): 15–16 (Seltzer's italics).
73. Quoted in Seltzer, "Wound Culture," 17.
74. Lawrence Langer, *The Holocaust and the Literary Imagination* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1975), 35.
75. Andreas Huyssen, "Monument and Memory in a Postmodern Age," in *The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History*, ed. James Young (Munich; New York: Prestel Verlag, 1994), 10.
76. Jean-Francois Lyotard, "Ticket to a New Decor," *Copyright* 1.10 (Fall 1987): 14–15.
77. Ibid., 15.
78. Freud, "Mourning and Melancholia," 243.
79. Santner, *Stranded Objects*, 8.
80. Ibid., 3.
81. Freud, "Mourning and Melancholia," 251.
82. Enrique Dussel, *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of "the Other" and the Myth of Modernity*, trans. Michael D. Barber (New York: Continuum, 1995), 39.
83. Freud, "On Narcissism: An Introduction," *The Standard Edition*, ed. Strachey, 88.
84. Freud, "Mourning and Melancholia," 249.
85. Santner, *Stranded Objects*, 9.
86. Nicolas Abraham, "Notes on the Phantom: A Complement to Freud's Metapsychology," in *The Shell and the Kernel*, ed. Abraham and Torok, 174.
87. Hacking, "Memory Sciences, Memory Politics," 81.

88. Ibid., 80.
89. Ibid., 81.
90. Ibid., 85.
91. Ibid.
92. Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History," *Representations* 26 (1989): 15.
93. Ibid., 7.
94. Ibid., 8.
95. Ibid., 15.
96. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982), 5.
97. Nora, "Between Memory and History," 16.
98. Ibid.
99. Ibid., 19.
100. Ibid., 13.
101. Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience*, 18.
102. Michael Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Representation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 103.

Chapter Seven Before Holocaust Memory:

Making Sense of Trauma between

Postmemory and Cultural Memory

1. See "Introduction," in *Coming Out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities* Jon Stratton (London: Routledge, 2000).
2. Ari Sherman, *Island Refuge: Britain and the Refugees from the Third Reich 1933–1939*, 2nd ed. (Ilford, UK: Frank Cass, 1994), 4.
3. Louise London, "Jewish Refugees, Anglo-Jewry and British Government Policy, 1930–1940," in *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, ed. D. Cesarani (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 184.
4. Victor Jeleniewski Seidler, *Shadows of the Shoah: Jewish Identity and Belonging* (Oxford: Berg, 2000), 3.
5. Ibid., 4.
6. Ibid.
7. London, "Jewish Refugees," 165. For a more political history see Sherman, *Island Refuge*.
8. London, "Jewish Refugees," 170.
9. Ibid., 180–181.
10. Since my father's death and my mother's institutionalization it has become easier for my sister and me to reconnect with our Jewish relatives. As a part of this process I am now in email contact with Walter who has kindly provided me with details about his life.
11. London, "Jewish Refugees," 190.
12. Seidler, *Shadows of the Shoah*, 3.
13. Ibid., 5–6.
14. Ibid., 10.
15. Sigmund Freud, "The 'Uncanny,'" in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Translated under the general editorship of J. Strachey, vol. xvii (London: Hogarth, 1955 [1919]), 235.
16. Saul Friedlander, *Reflets du Nazisme*, trans. as *Reflections of Nazism: An Essay on Kitsch and Peath*, 1982.
17. Ibid.
18. Kali Tal, *Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literatures of Trauma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 116.
19. Michael Rothberg, *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Representation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 103.
20. Ernst van Alphen, "Symptoms of Discursivity: Experience, Memory and Trauma," in *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, ed. M. Bal, J. Crewe, and L. Spitzer (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999), 27.

21. van Alphen, "Symptoms of Discursivity," 27.
22. Recently, Ron Eyerman, *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) has defined cultural trauma as, "a tear in the social fabric, affecting a group of people that has achieved some degree of cohesion. In this sense, the trauma need not necessarily be felt by everyone in a community or experienced directly by any or all" (2). In the collection *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, ed. Jeffrey Alexander, et al. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004) Alexander has a chapter on the Holocaust as a cultural trauma entitled "On the Social Construction of Moral Universals: The 'Holocaust' from War Crime to Trauma Drama."
23. Maurice Halbwachs, "The Social Frameworks of Memory," in *On Collective Memory*, trans. and ed. L. A. Cozer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 38.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982), 94.
27. Omer Bartov, *Mirrors of Destruction: War, Genocide, and Modern Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 76.
28. Ibid.
29. This biographical information on Halbwachs comes from Lewis Cozer's "Introduction," to Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*.
30. Mieke Bal, J. Crewe, and L. Spitzer, eds. *Acts of Memory*, vii.
31. Ibid.
32. Tim Cole, *Selling the Holocaust: From Auschwitz to Schindler: How History Is Bought, Packaged and Sold* (New York: Routledge 1999), 7.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid., 64.
35. Gerd Korman, "The Holocaust in American History Writing," *Societas* 2 (1972): 255.
36. Ibid., 256.
37. Lawrence Douglas, "The Shrunk Head of Buchenwald: Icons of Atrocity at Nuremberg," in *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*, ed. B. Zelizer (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 286.
38. Korman, "The Holocaust in American History Writing," 258.
39. Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (New York: Penguin, 1994), 267.
40. Paul Breines, *Tough Jews: Political Fantasies and the Moral Dilemma of American Jewry* (New York: Basic Books, 1992), 72.
41. Ibid., 72–73.
42. Cole, *Selling the Holocaust*, 98.
43. Korman, "The Holocaust in American History Writing," 260.
44. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: Octagon, 1978).
45. Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), 141.
46. Breines, *Tough Jews*, 71.
47. Korman, "The Holocaust in American History Writing," 261.
48. Jeffery Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
49. Lawrence Langer, *Versions of Survival: The Holocaust and the Human Spirit*. (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1982), 185.
50. On the history of "Belsen Was a Gas," see Jon Savage, *England's Dreaming: Anarchy, Sex Pistols, Punk Rock and Beyond* (New York: St. Martin's, 1992).
51. Ruth Leys, *Trauma: A Genealogy*. (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2000), 231–232.
52. I discuss these stories in "Ghetto Thinking and Everyday Life," in Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish*.
53. Marianne Hirsch, "Projected Memory: Holocaust Photographs in Personal and Public Fantasy," in *Acts of Memory*, ed. Bal et al., 8.
54. Ibid., 13.
55. For a discussion of this myth see Douglas, "The Shrunk Head of Buchenwald," 289–291.
56. Twenty or so years later a friend and colleague at an Australian university, forgetting I was Jewish, as she later told me apologetically, sent me a postcard from Dachau showing the camp gates with "Arbeit Macht Frei" in them. Quite something to find unexpectedly in one's letterbox.

57. James Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation*, 1st Midland ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 118. For a more positive view of Plath's Holocaust poetry see Susan Gubar "Prosopopoeia and Holocaust Poetry in English: The Case of Sylvia Plath," in *Extremities: Trauma, Testimony and Community*, ed. N. K. Miller and J. Tougaw (Urbana: University of Illinois Press), 112–128.
58. See "Ghetto Thinking and Everyday Life," in Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish*.
59. Seidler, *Shadows of the Shoah*, ix.
60. Ibid.
61. History is more complex. Alain Finkielkraut, *The Imaginary Jew* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska 1994) tells how, in May 1968, when news got out that the German-Jewish activist Daniel Cohn-Bendit had been refused permission to re-enter France: "Thousands of people gathered spontaneously in the streets, and began to chant: 'We are all German Jews!'" 17–18. Finkielkraut recounts his mixed emotions at this appropriation of his heritage.
62. James Young, *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 121–122.
63. Ibid., 140.
64. For a discussion of the film, and the novel on which it is based, see Millicent Marcus, "De Sica's Garden of the Finzi-Continis: An Escapist Paradise Lost," in *Vittorio De Sica: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. H. Curle. and S. Snyder (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 258–279.
65. Saul Friedlander, *Reflections of Nazism: An Essay on Kitsch and Death*, trans. Robert Weyr (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993).
66. Ibid., 135 (Friedlander's italics).
67. Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London: Verso, 1989) 50.
68. Sigmund Freud, "Civilization and Its Discontents," *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xxi. (London: Hogarth, 1961 [1929]), 129.
69. Dieter Duhm quoted in D. Herzog, "'Pleasure, Sex and Politics Belong Together': Post-Holocaust Memory and the Sexual Revolution in West Germany," in *Intimacy*, ed. L. Berlant (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 130.
70. On the historical production of European dichotomous thinking in relation to the "discovery" of the New World see most relevantly Enrique Dussel, *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of the "Other" and the Myth of Modernity* (New York: Continuum, 1995). I would argue that the evolution of this binary thinking in what was becoming known as Europe began before Columbus' voyages and, indeed, one place it can be identified is in the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, also in 1492.
71. Andrea Dworkin, *Pornography: Men Possessing Women* (London: Women's Press, 1981), 144–145.
72. Joan Smith, *Misogynies: Reflections on Myths and Malice*, rev. ed. (London: Faber and Faber, 1993), 127. As its title suggests, the entirety of Smith's essay "Holocaust Girls" is relevant to my argument. Smith also writes about D. M. Thomas' *The White Hotel* and argues that, in these portrayals, "sex-as-death [is] the one thing that women really desire, and Lisa [in *The White Hotel*], like Sophie [in *Sophie's Choice*], is fortunate enough to have men on hand who are ready to give it to her," 137.
73. Alan Kaufman, *Jew Boy: A Memoir* (New York: Fromm International, 2000), 49.
74. What I am describing is the "unacceptable," taboo encounter with Holocaust imagery. This is not a reading mentioned, for example, by Marianne Hirsch in her very fine "Surviving Images: Holocaust Photographs and the Work of Postmemory" in *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*, ed. Barbie Zelizer (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001). Hirsch begins her piece with two quotations that narrate Susan Sontag's and Alice Kaplan's first encounters with images taken in the camps. Sontag offers the conventional reaction: "One's first encounter with the photographic inventory of ultimate horror is a kind of revelation, the prototypically modern revelation: a negative epiphany" (cited in Hirsch, "Surviving Images," 215). Sontag writes that she came across the images in a Santa Monica bookstore when she was twelve. That Hirsch, Sontag, and Kaplan are all women may be a clue to the lack of attention Hirsch pays to the pornographic possibilities of these images. Similarly, Barbie Zelizer, in "Gender and Atrocity: Women in Holocaust Photographs," in *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*, does not write about the pornographic possibilities of these images.

75. Alan Mintz, *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001), 143.
76. Omer Bartov, "Spielberg's Oskar: Hollywood Tries Evil" in *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List*, ed. Y. Loshitzky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 49. See also S. R. Horowitz, "But Is It Good for the Jews?: Spielberg's Schindler and the Aesthetics of Atrocity," in *Spielberg's Holocaust*, ed. Loshitzky. 119–139.
77. Bartov, *Mirrors of Destruction*, 192–193.
78. Ibid., 207. Bartov discusses Ka-Tzetnik, his life and work, in detail in his chapter entitled "Apocalyptic Visions." Ka-Tzetnik moved to Tel Aviv after the war and was called to give evidence about life in Auschwitz at the Eichmann trial.
79. On English punk style see Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London: Methuen, 1979).
80. Bartov, *Mirrors of Destruction*, 194.
81. This can be seen in the name of the band formed out of Joy Division after the death of Ian Curtis. New Order was taken from Hitler's description of the new racial order in Europe that the Nazis were trying to create.
82. Hirsch, "Projected Memory," 8–9.

Chapter Eight Why Were the Sixties So Jewish?

1. A relevant article on sixties Jewish radicals is Anthony Ashbolt, "Prodigal Sons and Political Amnesia: American Radicalism, Jewish Identity, Israel," *Australasian Journal of American Studies* 11.1 (1992): 15–26.
2. Jonathan Kaufman, *Broken Alliance: The Turbulent Times between Blacks and Jews in America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988), 66.
3. Jonah Raskin, *For the Hell of It: The Life and Times of Abbie Hoffman* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996), 75.
4. Arthur Liebman, *Jews and the Left* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979), 67.
5. On the League for Industrial Democracy and its relations with Students for a Democratic Society see Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1987), 109–111 and James Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), Parts I and II.
6. Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 67.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Peter Collier and David Horowitz, *Destructive Generation: Second Thoughts about the Sixties* (New York: Free Press Paperbacks, 1996), 81. Ron Jacobs has written the history of the Weather Underground in *The Way the Wind Blew: A History of the Weather Underground* (London: Verso, 1997).
11. See Gitlin, *The Sixties*, 82–83.
12. Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 68.
13. Ibid., 541.
14. Ibid., 68.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., 543.
17. Arnold Eisen, *The Chosen People in America: A Study in Jewish Religious Ideology* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), 8.
18. Ibid., 6.
19. Nelson Glueck, quoted in *ibid.*, 38.
20. Deborah Dash Moore, *At Home in America: Second Generation New York Jews* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), 150.
21. Ibid., 149.
22. Ibid., 11.
23. Dominick Cavallo, *A Fiction of the Past: The Sixties in American History* (New York: Palgrave, 1999), 72.

24. Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 68.
25. Melanie Kaye/Kantrowitz, "Stayed in Freedom: Jews in the Civil Rights Movement and After," in *The Narrow Bridge: Jewish Views on Multiculturalism*, ed. Marla Brettschneider (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996), 111.
26. Abbie Hoffman, *Soon to Be a Major Motion Picture* (New York: Putnam, 1980), 15.
27. Raskin, *For the Hell of It*, 117.
28. Dominick Cavallo, *A Fiction of the Past: The Sixties in American History* (New York: St. Martin's, 1999), 70–71.
29. Riv-Ellen Prell, *Fighting to Become Americans: Jews, Gender, and the Anxiety of Assimilation* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1999), 159–160. The study to which she refers is Marshall Sklare with Joseph Greenblum, *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979).
30. Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets*, 13.
31. Hayden's background is detailed in *ibid.*, 42–50.
32. Gitlin, *The Sixties*, 117.
33. Eisen, *The Chosen People in America*, 55.
34. The Port Huron Statement is reprinted in its entirety in Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets*, 331.
35. *Ibid.*, 332.
36. Eisen, *The Chosen People in America*, 51.
37. Cavallo, *A Fiction of the Past*, 74.
38. See "Making Space for Jews in America" in Jon Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities* (London: Routledge, 2000).
39. Miller, *Democracy Is in the Streets*, 94–95.
40. Arnold Kaufman, "Human Nature and Participatory Democracy," in *Responsibility*, ed. Carl J. Friedrich (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1960), 272.
41. Cavallo, *A Fiction of the Past*, Chapter 8, "The Political Ferment of the Late Eighteenth Century and SDS's Failed Quest for Community."
42. Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1998), 8.
43. Karen Brodtkin, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 27.
44. Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race* (New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1970), Chapter 2, "The Physical Basis of Race."
45. John Murray Cuddihy, *The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Lévi-Strauss, and the Jewish Struggle with Modernity* (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1974), 4–7.
46. Brodtkin, *How Jews Became White Folks*, 109.
47. Kaufman, *Broken Alliance*, 21–23.
48. *Ibid.*, 25.
49. L. Perry Curtis, jr, *Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature*, rev. ed. (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997). See also Ann McClintock's discussion in *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).
50. Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 40.
51. *Ibid.*, 41.
52. *Ibid.*, 76.
53. *Ibid.*, 68.
54. "Making Space for Jews in America," in Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish*.
55. Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, 69.
56. Moore, *At Home in America*, 211.
57. Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, 120.
58. Brodtkin, *How Jews Became White Folks*, 3.
59. Tom Hayden, *Reunion: A Memoir* (New York: Random House, 1988), 433.
60. *Ibid.*, 433.
61. *Ibid.*, 432.
62. Cavallo, *A Fiction of the Past*, 117.
63. Peter Coyote, *Sleeping Where I Fall: A Chronicle* (Washington, DC: Counterpoint, 1998), 12.
64. Emmett Grogan's autobiography is *Ringolevio: A Life Played for Keeps* (London: Heineman, 1972).
65. Gitlin, *The Sixties*, 223.
66. Davis quoted in Cavallo, *A Fiction of the Past*, 118.

67. On the seventeenth-century Diggers see Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Idea during the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1972). Coyote himself refers to the principles of Winstanley's Diggers becoming "part of the basic tenets of the socialist tradition," *Sleeping Where I Fall*, 68.
68. Unreferenced quotation from Peter Berg in Coyote, *Sleeping Where I Fall*, 33.
69. See, for example, Erving Goffman's book, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York: Anchor Books, 1959).
70. Coyote, *Sleeping Where I Fall*.
71. For descriptions of this event see Cavallo, *A Fiction of the Past*, 100; and Gitlin, *The Sixties*, 223.
72. Peter Berg invented the term "guerrilla theater" to describe the work that R. G. Davis was doing with the San Francisco Mime Troupe. In *The San Francisco Mime Troupe: The First Ten Years* (Palo Alto, CA: Ramparts Press, 1975), Davis writes: "I had written a long essay on the workings of the company and an analysis of what we had done in the past few years. The article was read to the company in May 1965, just as we moved from Capp Street in the Mission to our new large downtown loft on Howard Street. [Bill] Graham heard it and liked the toughness. [Peter] Berg understood it and called it 'Guerrilla Theater'" (70). Graham was born Wolfgang Grajonza to Jewish parents in Berlin in 1931. After walking across France he reached Ellis Island in 1941. Graham's mother died on the journey to Auschwitz. For Graham's biography see John Glatt, *Rage & Roll: Bill Graham and the Selling of Rock* (New York: Carol Publishing, 1993)). According to Glatt's biography (Chapter 3), Graham began his career in 1965 managing the Mime Troupe: "Davis, impressed with Graham's fast-talking confidence and his obvious talents as a salesman, offered him the job as Mime Troupe business manager. Graham accepted on the spot with the proviso that he could bring his devoted girlfriend/secretary Bonnie MacLean along with him" (26). Davis tells a different version of Graham's relation to the Mime Troupe: "Bill Graham, who was hired to help us tour from location to location (we had no stable theatre), had promoted himself to 'Bill Graham Presents' and was on the way out of our company when we went to the Northwest" (58). Graham helped Ken Kesey run the celebrated Trips Festival in 1966 and went on to become the most important promoter of the new San Francisco sound, putting on bands at the Fillmore.
73. Quoted in Raskin, *For the Hell of It*, 76.
74. *Ibid.*
75. *Ibid.*, 114.
76. Abbie Hoffman, *Soon to Be a Major Motion Picture*, 85.
77. In this, Hoffman was working in a similar manner to the Situationists in France. On the Situationists see Sadie Plant, *The Most Radical Gesture: The Situationist International in a Postmodern Age* (London: Routledge, 1992).
78. It could be argued that it was Hoffman's assimilatory background that sensitized him to the idea of performance and, therefore, to the way television transforms life into performance.
79. Accepting that Hoffman's accounts are unreliable, the most detailed version of the Stock Exchange event is to be found in Raskin, *For the Hell of It*, 114–117.
80. *Ibid.*
81. See, for example, Norman Mailer's account of the Chicago confrontation in *Miami and the Seige of Chicago: An Informal History of the American Political Conventions of 1968* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1969).
82. Sometime during this period Rubin and Hoffman start writing "America" as "Amerika." Certainly this is the way the country is written in Jerry Rubin's book, *Do It! Scenarios of the Revolution* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970). Norman Podhoretz, the right-wing Jewish-American commentator writes in his 1999 book, *Ex-Friends: Falling Out with Allen Ginsberg, Lionel and Diana Trilling, Lillian Hellman, Hannah Arendt, and Norman Mailer* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999), that: "What [Hoffman, Rubin, Dylan, and others] all had in common was a fierce hatred of America, which they saw as 'Amerika,' a country morally and spiritually equivalent to Nazi Germany" (47). Although there is truth in this, and it once more reminds us of how much the ghost of the Holocaust haunts the Jewish radicals of the sixties, we should, in addition, remember Amerika is also the Yiddish spelling and that the Jewish sixties, at some albeit deep level, can be traced back to the complicated reactions of this generation's grandparents who thought they were migrating to *die golden medinah*, the golden land.

83. On feminist guerrilla theater see Robin Morgan's piece, "Feminist Guerilla Theater, 1968," reprinted in Susan Ware, ed., *Modern American Women: A Documentary History* (Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1989), 341–344.
84. Cuddihy, *The Ordeal of Civility*, 3.
85. Rubin tells his version of this story in, *Do It!*, 58–65.
86. Quoted in Raskin *For the Hell of It*, 118.
87. *Ibid.*, 177.
88. *Ibid.*, 200–201.
89. The segment of Hoffman's testimony is reprinted in Larry Sloman, *Steal This Dream: Abbie Hoffman & the Countercultural Revolution in America* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 204–205.
90. The segment of the trial is reprinted in Sloman, *Steal This Dream*, 211.
91. This segment of the trial transcript is in *ibid.*, 211–212.
92. Brodtkin, *How Jews Became White Folks*, 36.
93. *Ibid.*, 37.
94. *Ibid.*, 139.
95. Prell, *Fighting to Become Americans*, 144.
96. *Ibid.*, 158.
97. *Ibid.*
98. *Ibid.*
99. Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1963), 305. The discursive connections between the second-wave feminist movement and the Holocaust are complex. Many of these get invoked thirty-six years after *The Feminine Mystique* in Andrea Dworkin's tour de force, *Scapegoat: The Jews, Israel, and Women's Liberation* (New York: Free Press, 2000). It should go without saying that Dworkin, like Friedan and so many other second wave feminists, is Jewish.
100. Daniel Horowitz, *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminine Mystique: The American Left, the Cold War, and Modern Feminism* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 23.
101. Joyce Antler, *The Journey Home* (New York: Free Press, 1997), 260.
102. Antler, *The Journey Home*, 261.
103. Benjamin Filene, *Romancing the Folk: Public Memory and American Roots Music* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 25.
104. See Joe Klein, *Woody Guthrie: A Life* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1980).
105. The record label devoted to the recording of American folk music, *Folkways*, was established by Moses Asch, the son of the Yiddish writer Sholem Asch (1905–1986), in 1948. Once again we have the connection between what is considered quintessentially American music and Jewish-Americans. Asch is said to have turned down the opportunity to record Dylan when he was looking for a record company.
106. Robert Cantwell, *When We Were Good: The Folk Revival* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 346.
107. At: <http://www.peterpaulmary.net/history/ruhlmann1.htm/>.
108. The early biographies of Dylan, such as Anthony Scaduto, *Bob Dylan: An Intimate Biography* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1971) tend to ignore Dylan's Jewish background. Bob Spitz, *Dylan: A Biography* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1989), offers most constant attention to the Jewish aspects of Dylan's life and career.
109. This information comes from Clinton Heylin, *Bob Dylan: A Life in Stolen Moments* (New York: Schirmer Books), 1996.
110. Quoted in Ramblin' Jack Elliott's biography at: <http://www.ramblinjack.com/bio2.html/>.
111. Bob Dylan, *Writings and Drawings* (New York: Random House, 1974), 49.
112. The song can be found on Bob Dylan, *The Bootleg Series, Volumes 1–3* (1991).
113. Larry Yudelson, "Dylan: Tangled Up in Jews" at: <http://www.radiohazak.com/Tangled.html/>.
114. E. Anthony Rotundo, "Jews and Rock and Roll: A Study in Cultural Contrast," *American Jewish History* 72 (1982): 82–107.
115. Personal communication.
116. For Country Joe McDonald's biography see: <http://www.countryjoe.com/cjmbio.htm#1/>. The song "I Feel Like I'm Fixin' to Die Rag" was released on the second Country Joe and the Fish album entitled *I Feel Like I'm Fixin' to Die* released in 1967.
117. Gitlin, *The Sixties*, 198.
118. Marcia Graham Synnott, "Anti-Semitism and American Universities: Did Quotas Follow the Jews?" in *Anti-Semitism in American History*, ed. David Gerber (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 233–271.

Chapter Nine Punk, Jews, and the Holocaust: The English Story

1. On the idea of cultural trauma see Jeffrey Alexander et al., eds., *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2004).
2. Ron Eyerman, *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 2.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., 3.
5. On this history see Jeffrey Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
6. Karen Carr, *The Banalization of Nihilism: Twentieth Century Responses to Meaninglessness* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1992), 38.
7. Jon Savage, *England's Dreaming: Anarchy, Sex Pistols, Punk Rock and Beyond* (New York: St. Martin's, 1992), 82.
8. Carr, *The Banalization of Nihilism*, 39.
9. Jill Marsden, "Interminable Intensity: Nietzsche's Demonic Nihilism," in *Evil Spirits: Nihilism and the Fate of Modernity*, ed. Gary Banham and Charlie Blake (Manchester: Manchester University Press; New York: Distributed in the USA by St. Martin's Press, 2000), 75.
10. Avishai Motzkin and Gabriel Margalit, "The Uniqueness of the Holocaust," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 25.1 (Winter 1996).
11. Jon Stratton, "Jews, Punk and the Holocaust: From the Velvet Underground to the Ramones—the Jewish-American Story," *Popular Music* 24.1 (2005): 79–115.
12. Steven Lee Beeber, *The Heebie-Jeebies at CBGB's: A Secret History of Jewish Punk* (Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 2006).
13. Quoted in Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 241.
14. Geoff Travis who started the highly influential alternative record label and distribution system, Rough Trade, in England in 1978 is also Jewish.
15. Savage, *England's Dreaming*, quotes Sylvain Sylva: "[McLaren] copied the New York groups... He loved Richard Hell." Savage goes on: "[McLaren] had a new hero. Before he returned to England, he tried to persuade Hell to front the group he had back home," 92.
16. See my, "Jews, Punk, and the Holocaust." See also Beeber's, *The Heebie-Jeebies at CBGB's*.
17. Quoted in Greil Marcus, *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 8–9.
18. Ibid., 9.
19. Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 533.
20. Savage (ibid., 532) notes the Svengali likeness. It should be remembered that, in George du Maurier's anti-Semitic novel, *Trilby*, published in 1894, from where the name, Svengali, has gained its currency, Svengali was the evil Jewish hypnotist who turns the artist's model, Trilby, into a great singer.
21. Jon Savage, *Time Travel: From the Sex Pistols to Nirvana: Pop Media and Sexuality 1977–96* (London: Vintage, 1997), 91.
22. Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 524.
23. Karen Brodtkin, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 27.
24. Ibid., 10.
25. Tony Kushner, "The Impact of British Anti-Semitism, 1918–1945," in *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, ed. David Cesarani (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 197.
26. See the my chapter "Speaking as a Jew in British Cultural Studies," in Jon Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities* (London: Routledge, 2000).
27. See my discussion in ibid., 44–45.
28. Quoted in Stratton, "Jews, Punk and the Holocaust."
29. In August 1942, a plane was launched from a Japanese submarine off the coast of Oregon. also tried floating incendiary and antipersonnel bombs across the Pacific on crewless balloons. These events are simply not comparable to the prolonged and sustained bombing of British military and civilian targets by the German Luftwaffe.
30. A useful background article is Roland Quinault, "Britain 1950," *History Today* 51.4 (April 2001): 14–21.

31. Quoted in Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 241.
32. The biographical information on Jones comes from Marcus Gray, *Last Gang in Town: The Story and Myth of the Clash* (London: Fourth Estate, 1995), 6–7.
33. Aiden, "Through the Past Darkly: London SS," *Midnight Calling* (January 2005) at: <http://midnightcalling.com/issues/01/01-music-LondonSS.html/>.
34. In *England's Dreaming*, Savage notes that: "After the thirties retro fad of the early 1970s, the Weimar period of *Cabaret* and Visconti's *The Damned* became an accepted metaphor for Britain's decline" (241).
35. Mark Paytress, *Twentieth Century Boy: The Marc Bolan Story* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1992), 14.
36. Shapiro's autobiography is called *Walking Back to Happiness* (London: Fount 1993).
37. Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 12.
38. Paytress, *Twentieth Century Boy*, 105–106.
39. Gray, *Last Gang in Town*, 47.
40. Quoted in Clinton Heylin, *From the Velvets to the Voidoids: A Pre-Punk History for a Post-Punk World* (London: Penguin, 1993), 147–148.
41. Tricia Henry, *Break All Rules!: Punk Rock and the Making of a Style* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Research Press, 1989), 36.
42. James E. Young, *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation*, 1st Midland ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990 [1988]), 127.
43. Lester Bangs, in *Psychotic Reactions and Carburetor Dung*, ed. Greil Marcus (London: Serpent's Tail, 2001), 206. I discuss Iggy Pop, including his "Holocaust Jewishness" in more detail in, Stratton, "Jews, Punk and the Holocaust."
44. Also in 1972 Bowie produced Lou Reed's comeback album, *Transformer*, giving Reed a Glam makeover.
45. Tricia Henry, *Break All Rules!*, 31. While *Pin Ups* (1973) comes between *Aladdin Sane* and *Diamond Dogs* it is, really, light relief between Bowie's albums developing the apocalyptic theme. The album is a collection of sixties covers.
46. Later Joe Strummer's band prior to the Clash, the 101ers are said to have taken their name from the number of the torture room in 1984. Strummer also references 1984 in the coda of "1977" the B-side of the Clash's first English single, "White Riot 1977," released in 1977. "Remote Control," to be found on the Clash's self-titled first album, released in 1977, carries overtones of 1984's Big Brother. In *Last Gang in Town*, Gray writes that this was intentional, that next to the lyric in *The Clash Songbook* (1978) is a poster image that reads "Big Brother is watching you" (259).
47. Stephen Dalton and Rob Hughes, "Trans-Europe Excess," *Uncut* (April 2001).
48. Ibid.
49. Ibid.
50. Stratton, "Jews, Punk and the Holocaust."
51. Mark Denning, "Sister Ray," *All Music Guide* (April 2005) at: <http://www.allmusic.com/cg/amg.dll?p=amg&token=&sql=33:yta9q37y0jja/>.
52. Ibid.
53. Dalton and Hughes, "Trans-Europe Excess."
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid.
56. Quoted in *ibid.*
57. Ibid.
58. Found (April 2005) at: <http://www.prettiethings.com/prettiethings/quotes.html/>.
59. *People Magazine* taken here (September 6, 1976) from: <http://www.teenagewildlife.com/Appearances/Press/1976/0906/people.html/>, accessed April 2005.
60. All this biographical information comes from Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 14–15.
61. Quoted in *ibid.*, 17.
62. *Ibid.*, 18.
63. *Ibid.*, 44.
64. There is a chapter, including a biography, on Parnes in Johnny Rogan, *Starmakers and Svengalis: The History of British Pop Management* (London: MacDonald, 1988).
65. Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 44.
66. *Ibid.*, 46.
67. For Lydon's background see his autobiography, John Lydon with Keith and Kent Zimmerman, *Rotten: No Irish, No Blacks, No Dogs* (New York: Picador USA, 1995).

68. Quoted in Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 172.
69. *Ibid.*, 188–189.
70. For a history of McLaren and Westwood's shop see Jane Withers, "From *Let It Rock* to *World's End*: 450 King's Road," in *Impresario: Malcolm McLaren and the British New Wave*, ed. Paul Taylor (New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1988).
71. Quoted in Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 189.
72. *Ibid.*, 219.
73. *Ibid.*
74. *Ibid.*, 458.
75. *Ibid.*, 119.
76. *Ibid.*, 311.
77. Quoted in *ibid.*, 312.
78. And the music? In an online retrospective review from 2003, Chris Smith writes that: "The title track, with dizzying, raw violin and a swooping, disoriented vocal, does a good job of summing up the album to the listener, but it's the chasms probed on the instrumental 'Hymie's Him'—little more than a muddled abstraction of running water, arrhythmic drums, and low-budget synths—that prove most interesting" (Chris Smith, "Public Image Ltd – The Flowers of Romance," *Stylus Magazine* [April 2005] at: <http://www.stylusmagazine.com/feature.php?ID=533/>).
79. Savage, *England's Dreaming*, 458–459.
80. *Ibid.*, 410.
81. *Ibid.*, 412.
82. Mary Harron quoted in *ibid.*, 241.
83. Gray, *Last Gang in Town*, 47.
84. On the Clash's presence at the 1976 Notting Hill Riot see Gray, *Last Gang in Town*, Chapter 7, "White Riot."
85. Jones didn't sing about his Jewish background until well after the naturalization of Holocaust discourse. In "Beyond the Pale," on *No 10 Upping Street*, the second album by Jones' post-Clash band Big Audio Dynamite, made with the help of Joe Strummer, released in 1986, Jones tells of his grandfather's escape from the Russian pogroms. The song is a plea for refugees.
86. In 1976 the National Front had polled 19 percent of the vote in local elections in Hackney South and Bethnal Green. For a short history of the Anti-Nazi League by the English academic Dave Renton see: "The Anti-Nazi League 1977–82," *Dave Renton's Homepage* (April 2005) at: <http://www.dkrenton.co.uk/anl/1970s.html/>.

Chapter Ten *Buffy the Vampire Slayer:*

What Being Jewish Has to Do with It

1. "The Harvest," second episode in the first season of the television series, *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*.
2. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* has already spawned two academic edited collections: *Fighting the Forces: What's at Stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, ed. Rhonda V. Wilcox and David Lavery (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001), and *Red Noise: Buffy the Vampire Slayer and Critical Television Studies*, ed. Lisa Parkes and Elana Levine (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002). There is also an online academic journal devoted to *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* called *Slavage*.
3. For an alternative comparison of the film and the television series from a gender-based perspective—"cinematic 'Buffy' of the Valley girl eighties, television 'Buffy' of the Girl Power nineties"—see Gabrielle Moss, "From the Valley to the Hellmouth: Buffy's Transition from Film to Television," in *Slavage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies*, 2 (2001).
4. Virginia Rohan "Nielsen Rank Doesn't Tell the Whole Story," *The Record Online* (November, 16, 1997) at <http://www.bergenrecord.com/yourtime/hiddenhit1997.11162.htm/>.
5. These quotations come from Joyce Millman "Why Must I Be a Teenage Vampire in Love?" at: <http://www.salon.com/ent/tiv/mill/1998/06/08mill.html/>.
6. Quoted in Christopher Golden and Nancy Holder, *Buffy the Vampire Slayer: The Watcher's Guide*, vol. 1 (New York: Pocket Books, 1998), 248.

7. Quoted in *ibid.*
8. Traditionally, a vampire is created by a human having their blood sucked by a vampire. In the *Buffy* television show's vampire lore a vampire can only be created if the human and the vampire suck each other's blood. In a sexual reading perhaps this can be read as equality in sexual practices.
9. For further details on Angelus/Angel see "Angelus" in Golden and Holder, *The Watchers Guide*, 127–129.
10. Pete Schulberg, "Lack of African American Roles Dominates Press Tour." *The Oregonian* at: http://olive-live.webnet.advance.net/ent/tv/99/07tv990722_schulberg.html/ (July 21, 1999).
11. "What All That Is, Is Love," in Golden and Holder, *The Watchers Guide*, 196.
12. The historical understanding of the nation is very complex: see, for example, Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983); E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). I make the argument about race, nation, and homogeneity in Chapter 1 of Jon Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish*.
13. Mods were an English working-class youth culture of the mid-1960s. They were upwardly mobile. On mods see Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London: Methuen, 1979), also Stanley Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of Mods and Rockers* (Oxford: MacGibbon and Kee, 1972).
14. On this see Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest* (New York: Routledge, 1995). See also L. Perry Curtis, *Apes and Angles: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature*, rev. ed. (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997).
15. Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995).
16. Golden and Holder, *The Watchers Guide*, 41.
17. *Ibid.*, 45.
18. *Ibid.*, 232.
19. In a 1980s article, Burton Hatlen "The Return of the Repressed/Oppressed in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*," reprinted in *Dracula: The Vampire and the Critics*, ed. Margaret L. Carter (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988) argues that Stoker's *Dracula* can also be read as a racial Other: "In so far as *Dracula* has become a Turk, his invasion of England represents an assault by a racial outsider. . . . The fear that the racial outsider will creep out of the stinking sewer to rape our women (and then, probably, slit our throats too) has been endemic in our century, and in the figure of Count *Dracula* we find a nightmarish embodiment of these fears" (129).
20. Dale Maharidge, *The Coming White Minority: California, Multiculturalism, and America's Future* (New York: Vintage, 1999), xvii.
21. *Ibid.*, xvii.
22. *Ibid.*, 3.
23. *Ibid.*, 13.
24. *Ibid.*, 14.
25. *Ibid.*, 7.
26. *Ibid.*, 23.
27. *Ibid.*, 11.
28. From this point of view *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* can be understood as a conservative feel-good program for white Americans. It enables them to avoid the pressing problems of living in an increasingly diverse and racialized society. This is one way of accounting for the exceptional amount of academic interest that has already been expended on the program, something that I outlined in note 1. Basically, it allows white academics to avoid confronting the pressing issues of race and multiculturalism in present-day American society.
29. Golden and Holder, *The Watchers Guide*, 197.
30. On Jews and cultural pluralism in the United States see my "Making Social Space for Jews in America" in Stratton, *Coming Out Jewish*.
31. Andrew Yule, *Spielberg: Father of the Man* (London: Warner Books, 1997), 18.
32. Golden and Holder, *The Watchers Guide*, 250.
33. *Ibid.*, 28.
34. I have already mentioned the connection between the mall-rat Buffy of the film and the mall-rat character of Cher Horowitz (Alicia Silverstone) in *Clueless*. Cher is Jewish. Her consumerism is identified as an aspect of her Jewish American Princess personality. Extended to the Buffy of the film who prefigures Cher we can reread her through JAP characteristics, a potential never realized in the film and replaced in the series by her "tough Jew" persona.

35. Golden and Holder, *The Watchers Guide*, 28.
36. See Karen Brodtkin, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998).
37. Paul Brienes, *Tough Jews: Political Fantasies and the Moral Dilemma of American Jewry* (New York: Basic Books, 1990).
38. Golden and Holder, *The Watchers Guide*, 129.
39. The Master's travel to the United States from, one presumes, Europe, echoes, and intertextually references Count Dracula's travel, in Stoker's novel, from Transylvania to England.
40. This is all told in "The Harvest" and it can also be found in the Master's biography in Golden and Holder, *The Watchers Guide*, 129–130.
41. We can note, in connection with the term Hellmouth, that, according to Lucia Ruedenberg-Wright in "The Second and Third Generations, Where Do We Go from Here," paper presented at the Association for Jewish Studies 29th Annual Conference (Boston MA, December 21–23, 1997) at: <http://lrw.net/~lucia/pubs/ajs/> "[Many] children of survivors who live in Germany today, whether by choice or because they were born there to survivor parents [describe themselves as having] settled 'in the mouth of the beast.'"
42. Benjamin Franklin "Chit Chat around the Table during Intermission," at the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1787. This statement was recorded in the dairy of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, a delegate from South Carolina. To be found at: <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/clilist.htm/>.
43. Quoted in Ivan Kalmar, *The Trotskys, Freuds and Woody Allens: Portrait of a Culture* (Toronto, Canada: Viking, 1993), 49.
44. Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (London: Hutchinson, 1974), 358.
45. "Anti-Semitism Worldwide 1998/9: 'Netherlands'" at <http://www.tau.ac.il:81/Anti-Semitism/asw98~9/nether.html/>
46. Jon Stratton, "Thinking Through the Holocaust: A Discussion Inspired by Hilene Flanzbaum, ed., *The Americanization of the Holocaust*," *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 14.2. (2000): 231–245. For another history of the use of the term Holocaust see Robert Young, *White Mythologies* (London: Routledge, 1990), Chapter 5.
47. Paul Brienes, *Tough Jews*, 71.
48. Jeffrey Shandler, *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 167.
49. Elie Wiesel quoted in *ibid.*, 168.
50. Yosefa Loshitzky, *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 2.
51. *Ibid.*, 3.
52. *Ibid.*, 22.
53. In "Welcome to the Hellmouth" there is an intriguing moment when Buffy, hunting a vampire, is surprised by Cordelia and her friends. Buffy nearly kills her, to which Cordelia responds by exclaiming: "God, what is your childhood trauma?"
54. Ruth Leys, *Trauma: A Genealogy* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2000), 23.
55. Ruedenberg-Wright, "The Second and Third Generations."
56. It is intriguing to note that the series rarely, if ever, shows people of the generation that would have lived through the Holocaust. With this in mind it could be argued that the lack of this generation evidences the series' repression of the Holocaust as an actual event. I would like to thank my colleague and friend Ron Blaber for this insight.
57. Ruedenberg-Wright, "The Second and Third Generations."
58. Gilad Evrony, "My Grandfather's Story," *The Third Generation Holocaust* at: www.holocaust3rd-gen.com/.
59. In "Becoming, Part 1," Buffy tells her mother that she'd love to be "upstairs watching TV or gossiping about boys, or, God, even studying. But I have to save the world. Again."

WORKS CITED

- Abitbol, Michel. *The Jews of North Africa during the Second World War*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
- Abraham, Nicolas. "Notes on the Phantom: A Complement to Freud's Metapsychology." In *The Shell and the Kernel*, edited by Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- . "Notes on the Phantom: A Complement to Freud's Metapsychology." *Critical Inquiry* 13 (1987) 291–292.
- Abu-Lughod, Janet L. *Before European Hegemony: The World System 1250–1350*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Abushaqra, Baha. "The Barrier to Peace" (August 22, 2003), at: <http://www.ramallahonline.com/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=1571/>.
- Acker, Kathy. *Empire of the Senseless*. New York: Grove Press, 1988.
- . Interview with *Tattoo Jew*, at: <http://www.tattoojew.com/tattoo.html/>.
- Aiden. "Through the Past Darkly: London SS." *Midnight Calling* (January 2005), at <http://midnightcalling.com/issues/01/01-music-LondonSS.html/>.
- Alexander, Jeffrey. "On the Social Construction of Moral Universals: The 'Holocaust' from War Crime to Trauma Drama." In *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, edited by Jeffrey Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernhard Giesen, Neil Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Alexander, Jeffrey, Ron Eyerman, Bernhard Giesen, Neil Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka, eds. *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Aly, Götz. *The Final Solution: Nazi Population Policy and the Murder of the European Jews*. London: Arnold, 1999.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London; New York: Verso, 1983.
- Anderson, Perry. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. London: New Left Books, 1974.
- Andreopoulos, George J., ed. *Genocide: Conceptual and Historical Dimensions*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.
- Antler, Joyce. *The Journey Home*. New York: Free Press, 1997.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Rev. and enl. ed. New York: Penguin, 1994.
- . *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, 1973.
- Artaud, Antonin. *The Theater and Its Double*. Translated by Mary Caroline Richards. New York: Grove Press, 1958 (1938).
- Ashbolt, Anthony. "Prodigal Sons and Political Amnesia: American Radicalism, Jewish Identity, Israel." *Australasian Journal of American Studies* 11.1 (1992): 15–26.
- Bal, Mieke. "Introduction." In *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, edited by Mieke Bal, J. Crewe, and L. Spitzer. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999.
- Bal, Mieke., J. Crewe, and L. Spitzer, eds. *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999.

- Bangs, Lester. *Psychotic Reactions and Carburetor Dung*, edited by Greil Marcus. London: Serpent's Tail, 2001.
- Bartov, Omer. *Mirrors of Destruction: War, Genocide, and Modern Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "Spielberg's Oskar: Hollywood Tries Evil." In *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List*, edited by Y. Loshitzky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Bauer, Yehuda. *Rethinking the Holocaust*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
- . *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.
- Beeber, Steven Lee. *The Heebie-Jeebies at CBGB's: A Secret History of Jewish Punk*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Review Press, 2006.
- Bellamy, Elizabeth. *Affective Genealogies: Psychoanalysis, Postmodernism, and the "Jewish Question" after Auschwitz*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Benbassa, Esther and Aron Rodrigue. *Sephardi Jewry: A History of the Judeo-Spanish Community, 14th–20th Centuries*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Benbassa, Esther and Jean-Christophe Attias. *The Jews and Their Future: A Conversation on Judaism and Jewish Identities*. Translated by Patrick Camiller. London: Zed Books, 2004.
- Bernstein, Richard. *Hannah Arendt and the Jewish Question*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
- Bhabha, Homi. "Foreword." In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Frantz Fanon. London: Pluto, 1986.
- . ed. "Introduction." In *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Boyarín, Jonathan. *Storm from Paradise: The Politics of Jewish Memory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. "'Dying Races': Rationalizing Genocide in the Nineteenth Century." In *The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge and Power*, edited by Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh. London; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books, 1995.
- Braude, Claudia Bathsheba, ed. *Contemporary Jewish Writing in South Africa: An Anthology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- Breines, Paul. *Tough Jews: Political Fantasies and the Moral Dilemma of American Jewry*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
- Brennan, Timothy. *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Brodkin, Karen. *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1998.
- Buettner, Angi. "Animal Holocausts." *Cultural Studies Review* 8.1 (2002): 28–44.
- . *Haunted Images: The Aesthetics of Catastrophe in a Post-Holocaust World*. PhD diss. Brisbane, Australia: University of Queensland, 2005.
- Burleigh, Michael. *Germany Turns Eastwards: A Study of Ostforschung in the Third Reich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Burleigh, Michael and Wolfgang Wippermann. *The Racial State: Germany 1933–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Butler, Clark. *G. W. F. Hegel*. Boston, MA: Twayne, 1977.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.
- . "Gender As Performance: An Interview with Judith Butler." Interview by Peter Osborne and Lynne Segal. *Radical Philosophy* 67 (1994).
- Cantwell, Robert. *When We Were Good: The Folk Revival*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Carr, Karen L. *The Banalization of Nihilism: Twentieth Century Responses to Meaninglessness*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Castricano, Jodey. "If a Building Is a Sentence, So Is a Body: Kathy Acker and the Postcolonial Gothic." In *American Gothic: New Interventions in a National Narrative*, edited by Robert Martin and Eric Savoy. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1998.
- Cavallo, Dominick. *A Fiction of the Past: The Sixties in American History*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999.

- Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Translated by Joan Pinkham in 1972. Reprint. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000.
- Chouraqui, André. *Between East and West: A History of the Jews of North Africa*. New ed. Skokie, IL: Varda Books, 2002.
- Churchill, Ward. *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas, 1492 to the Present*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights, 1997.
- Cixous, Hélène and Catherine Clement. *The Newly Born Woman*. Translated by Betsy Wing. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Clifford, James.. "Notes on Travel and Theory." *Inscriptions* 5 (1989), at: http://humwww.ucsc.edu/DivWeb/CultStudies/PUBS/Inscriptions/vol_5/clifford.html/.
- . *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Cohen, Stanley. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of Mods and Rockers*. Oxford: MacGibbon and Kee, 1972.
- Cole, Tim. *Selling the Holocaust: From Auschwitz to Schindler, How History Is Bought, Packaged and Sold*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Collier, Peter and David Horowitz. *Destructive Generation: Second Thoughts about the Sixties*. New York: Free Press Paperbacks, 1996.
- Columbus, Christopher. *Journal of 1492*.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1995.
- Coyote, Peter. *Sleeping Where I Fall: A Chronicle*. Washington, DC: Counterpoint, 1998.
- Cracroft, Richard. "The American West of Karl May." *American Quarterly* 19 (1967).
- Cuddihy, John Murray. *The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Lévi-Strauss, and the Jewish Struggle with Modernity*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Curtis, L. Perry. *Apes and Angles: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature*. Rev. ed. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997.
- Dalton, Stephen and Rob Hughes. "Trans-Europe Excess." *Uncut* (April 2001).
- Davis, R. G. *The San Francisco Mime Troupe: The First Ten Years*. Palo Alto, CA: Ramparts Press, 1975.
- Dayan, Joan. *Haiti, History and the Gods*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- de Certeau, Michel. *Heterologies: Discourses on the Other*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1986.
- de Sade, Marquis. *The One Hundred and Twenty Days of Sodom*. Introduction by Simone de Beauvoir. Translated by Austryn Wainhouse. London: Arrow Books, 1989.
- Denning, Mark. "Sister Ray." *All Music Guide* (April 2005), at: <http://www.allmusic.com/cg/amg.dll?p=amg&token=&sql=33:yta9q37yojja/>.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Douglas, Lawrence. "The Shrunken Head of Buchenwald: Icons of Atrocity at Nuremberg." In *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*, edited by B. Zelizer. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001.
- Drechsler, Horst. *Let Us Die Fighting: The Struggle of the Herero and Nama against German Imperialism (1884–1915)*. Translated by Bernd Zollner. 3rd ed. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1985.
- Dussel, Enrique. *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of the "Other" and the Myth of Modernity*. New York: Continuum, 1995.
- Dworkin, Andrea. *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*. London: Women's Press, 1981.
- . *Scapegoat: The Jews, Israel, and Women's Liberation*. New York: Free Press, 2000.
- Dylan, Bob. *Writings and Drawings*. New York: Random House, 1974.
- Eisen, Arnold. *The Chosen People in America: A Study in Jewish Religious Ideology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983.
- Evans, Raymond. *Fighting Words: Writing about Race*. St. Lucia, Australia: University of Queensland Press, 1999.
- Evrny, Gilad. "My Grandfather's Story," at: www.holocaust3rdgen.com/.
- Eyerman, Ron. *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove Press, 1986.
- Felman, Shoshana. "Education and Crisis, Or the Vicissitudes of Teaching." In *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Filene, Benjamin. *Romancing the Folk: Public Memory and American Roots Music*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Finkelstein, Norman. *Image and Reality of the Israel–Palestine Conflict*. London: Verso, 2001.
- Finkelkraut, Alain. *The Imaginary Jew*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1994.
- . *Remembering in Vain: The Klaus Barbie Trial and Crimes against Humanity*. Translated by Roxanne Lapidus with Sima Godfrey. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Foa, Anna. *The Jews of Europe after the Black Death*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- . "Of Other Spaces," at: <http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault.heteroTopia.en.html/>.
- Sigmund Freud, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Translated under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xiii (London: Hogarth Press, 1962).
- . "Civilization and Its Discontents." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xxi. London: Hogarth, 1961 (1929).
- . "Mourning and Melancholia." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xiii. London: Hogarth Press, 1962.
- . "On Narcissism: An Introduction." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xiii. London: Hogarth Press, 1962.
- . "Totem and Taboo: Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and Neurotics." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xiii. London: Hogarth Press, 1962.
- . "The 'Uncanny.'" In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated under the general editorship of James Strachey, vol. xvii. London: Hogarth Press, 1955 (1919).
- Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Dell Publishing, 1963.
- Friedlander, Saul. "Introduction." In *Probing the Limits of Representation Nazism and the "Final Solution."* Edited by Saul Friedlander. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- . *Nazi Germany and the Jews*. Vol. I. *The Years of Persecution, 1933–1939*. New York: Harper Collins, 1997.
- . *Reflections of Nazism: An Essay on Kitsch and Death*. Translated by Robert Weyr. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen and Unwin, 1998.
- Gearhart, Suzanne. "Colonialism, Psychoanalysis, and Cultural Criticism: The Problem of Interiorization in the Work of Albert Memmi." In *"Culture" and the Problem of the Disciplines*, edited by John Carlos Rowe. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Gerber, Jane. *The Jews of Spain: A History of the Sephardic Experience*. New York: Free Press, 1992.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Nation-State and Violence*. In *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. Vol. II. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Gilman, Sander. *Difference*. Quoted in *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Literatures*, by Terry Goldie. McGill, Canada: Queen's University Press, 1989.
- . *The Jew's Body*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Gilroy, Paul. "Afterword: Not Being Inhuman." In *Modernity, Culture and "the Jew,"* edited by Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. New York: Bantam Books, 1987.

- Glatt, John. *Rage & Roll: Bill Graham and the Selling of Rock*. New York: Carol Publishing, 1993.
- Goebbels, Joseph. "Heil Moskau!" *Der Angriff*. November 21, 1927.
- Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books, 1959.
- Goitein, S. D. *A Mediterranean Society*. 6 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967–1993.
- Goldberg, Jeffrey. "Among the Settlers." *The New Yorker* (March 31, 2004), at: http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?040531fa_fact2_d/.
- Golden, Christopher and Nancy Holder. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer: The Watcher's Guide*, vol I. New York: Pocket Books, 1998.
- Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.
- Goldie, Terry. *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Literatures*. McGill, Canada: Queen's University Press, 1989.
- Grant, Madison. *The Passing of the Great Race*. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1970.
- Gray, Marcus. *Last Gang in Town: The Story and Myth of the Clash*. London: Fourth Estate, 1995.
- Grogan, Emmett. *Ringolevio: A Life Played for Keeps*. London: Heinemann, 1972.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. "The Body of Signification." In *Abjection, Melancholia, and Love: The Work of Julia Kristeva*, edited by John Fletcher and Andrew Benjamin. London: Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature, 1990.
- . "Judaism and Exile: The Ethics of Otherness." *New Formations* 12 (December 1990): 77–88.
- Grunebaum-Ralph, Heidi. "Jewishness and Otherness in *La Statue de Sel*." In *Jewries at the Frontier: Accommodation, Identity, Conflict*, edited by Sander L. Gilman and Milton Shain. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Gubar, Susan. "Prosopopoeia and Holocaust Poetry in English: The Case of Sylvia Plath." In *Extremities: Trauma, Testimony and Community*, edited by N. K. Miller and J. Tougan. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.
- Gush Shalom. *The Wall*, at: <http://www.gush-shalom.org/thewall/thewall.pdf/>.
- Hacking, Ian. "Memory Sciences, Memory Politic." In *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*, edited by Paul Antze and Michael Lambek. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- . *Rewriting the Soul: Multiple Personality and the Sciences of Memory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. "The Social Frameworks of Memory." In *On Collective Memory* Translated and edited by L. A. Cozer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Handelman, Susan. *Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1982.
- Hartman, Geoffrey. "The Book of Destruction." In *Reflections of Nazism: An Essay on Kitsch and Death*, edited by Saul Friedlander. Translated by Robert Weyr. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Hatlen, Burton. "The Return of the Repressed/Oppressed in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*." Reprinted in *Dracula: The Vampire and the Critics*, edited by Margaret L. Carter. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Research Press, 1988.
- Hay, Denys. *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 1968.
- Hayden, Tom. *Reunion: A Memoir*. New York: Random House, 1988.
- Hebdige, Dick. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Methuen, 1979.
- Henry, Tricia. *Break All Rules!: Punk Rock and the Making of a Style*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Research Press, 1989.
- Herzl, Theodor. *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, edited by Jacob M. Alkow. New York: American Zionist Emergency Council, 1946.
- Herzog, D. "'Pleasure, Sex and Politics Belong Together': Post-Holocaust Memory and the Sexual Revolution in West Germany." In *Intimacy*, edited by L. Berlant. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Heylin, Clinton. *Bob Dylan: A Life in Stolen Moments*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1996.
- . *From the Velvets to the Voidoids: A Pre-Punk History for a Post-Punk World*. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Hilberg, Raul. *The Destruction of the European Jews*. New York: Octagon, 1978.
- Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*. London: Temple Smith, 1972.

- Hill, Christopher. "Projected Memory: Holocaust Photographs in Personal and Public Fantasy." In *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, edited by M. Bal., J. Crewe, and L. Spitzer. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999.
- . "Surviving Images: Holocaust Photographs and the Work of Postmemory." In *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*, edited by B. Zelizer. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001.
- Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*. London: Hutchinson, 1974.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth Reality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hochschild, Adam. *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa*. London: Papermac, 2000.
- Hoffman, Abbie. *Soon to Be a Major Motion Picture*. New York: Putnam, 1980.
- Horowitz, Daniel. *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminine Mystique: The American Left, the Cold War, and Modern Feminism*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.
- Horowitz, S. R. "But Is It Good for the Jews?: Spielberg's Schindler and the Aesthetics of Atrocity." In *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List*, edited by Yosefa Loshitzky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Howe, Irving. *World of Our Fathers*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976.
- Hull, Isobel. *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Huyssen, Andreas. "Monument and Memory in a Postmodern Age." In *The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History*, edited by James Young. Munich; New York: Prestel Verlag, 1994.
- Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Israel, Jonathan. *European Jewry in the Age of Mercantilism 1550–1750*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Jabotinsky, Vladimir. "The Ethics of the Iron Wall," at: <http://www.jabotinsky.org/Jaboworld/docs/ethics.doc/>.
- . "The Iron Wall: We and the Arabs," at: <http://www.marxists.de/middleast/ironwall/iron-wall.htm/>.
- Jacobs, Ron. *The Way the Wind Blew: A History of the Weather Underground*. London: Verso, 1997.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Jameson, Frederic. *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Jardine, Alice. *Gynesis: Configurations of Woman and Modernity*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Judaken, Jonathan. "The Queer Jew: Gender, Sexuality and Jean-Paul Sartre's Anti-Antisemitism." *Patterns of Prejudice* 33.3 (1999): 45–63.
- Kalmar, Ivan. *The Trotskys, Freuds and Woody Allens: Portrait of a Culture*. Toronto, Canada: Viking, 1993.
- Katz, Jacob. *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation 1770–1870*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Ka-Tzetnik. *The House of Dolls*. London: Shakespeare Head Press, 1956.
- Kaufman, Alan. *Jew Boy: A Memoir*. New York: Fromm International, 2000.
- Kaufman, Arnold. "Human Nature and Participatory Democracy." In *Responsibility*, edited by Carl J. Friedrich. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1960.
- Kaufman, Jonathan. *Broken Alliance: The Turbulent Times between Blacks and Jews in America*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988.
- Kawash, Samira. "Terrorists and Vampires: Fanon's Spectral Violence of Decolonization." In *Frantz Fanon: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Anthony Alessandrini. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Kaye/Kantrowitz, Melanie. "Stayed in Freedom: Jews in the Civil Rights Movement and After." In *The Narrow Bridge: Jewish Views on Multiculturalism*, edited by Marla Brettschneider. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996.
- Kimmerling, Baruch. Reviewing Richard Ben Gramer. *How Israel Lost: The Four Questions*, at: http://www.salon.com/books/review/2004/07/19/cramer/index_np.html/.

- Klein, Joe. *Woody Guthrie: A Life*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1980.
- Korman, Gerd. "The Holocaust in American History Writing." *Societas* 2 (1972): 251–270.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Kuper, Leo. *Genocide*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1981.
- Kushner, Tony. "The Impact of British Anti-Semitism, 1918–1945." In *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, edited by David Cesarani. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Lacan, Jacques. *The Four Fundamentals of Psycho-Analysis*. London: Hogarth, 1979.
- LaCapra, Dominick. *History and Memory after Auschwitz*. Ithaca, NY; London: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Langer, Lawrence. *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.
- . *The Holocaust and the Literary Imagination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1975.
- . *Versions of Survival: The Holocaust and the Human Spirit*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1982.
- Laqueur, Walter. *Guerrilla: A Historical and Critical Study*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.
- Le Sueur, James. *Uncivil War: Intellectuals and Identity Politics during the Decolonization of Algeria*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Lee, Martin and Bruce Shlain. *Acid Dreams: The Complete Social History of LSD; the CIA, the Sixties and Beyond*. London: Pan, 2001.
- Leed, Eric. *No Man's Land: Combat and Identity in World War I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *Everyday Life in the Modern World*. Translated by Sacha Rabinovitch. London: Allen Lane, 1971.
- Lefort, Claude. *Democracy and Political Theory*. Translated by David Macey. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.
- Lemkin, Raphael. *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1944.
- Leveson, Marcia. "The Enemy Within: Some South African Jewish Writers." In *Jewries at the Frontier*, edited by Sander Gilman and Milton Shain. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Leys, Ruth. *Trauma: A Genealogy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Liebman, Arthur. *Jews and the Left*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979.
- Lindqvist, Sven. *Exterminate All the Brutes*. Translated by Joan Tate. New York: New Press, 1996.
- London, Louise. "Jewish Refugees, Anglo-Jewry and British Government Policy, 1930–1940." In *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, edited by David Cesarani. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
- Loshitzky, Yosefa. "Hybrid Victims: Second Generation Israelis Screen the Holocaust." In *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*, edited by Barbie Zelizer. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001.
- . "Introduction." In *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Lydon, John with Keith and Kent Zimmerman. *Rotten: No Irish, No Blacks, No Dogs*. New York: Picador USA, 1995.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois. *Heidegger and "the jews."* Translated by Andreas Michel and Mark S. Roberts. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- . "Ticket to a New Décor." *Copyright* 1.10 (Fall 1987): 14–15.
- Maharidge, Dale. *The Coming White Minority: California, Multiculturalism, and America's Future*. New York: Vintage, 1999.
- Maier, Charles. *The Unmasterable Past, History, Holocaust and German National Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Mailer, Norman. *Miami and the Siege of Chicago: An Informal History of the American Political Conventions of 1968*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1969.
- Marcus, Greil. *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Marcus, Millicent. "De Sica's Garden of the Finzi-Continis: An Escapist Paradise Lost." In *Vittorio De Sica: Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by H. Curle and S. Snyder. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2000.
- Marcuse, Harold. *Legacies of Dachau*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

- Margalit, Avishai and Gabriel Motzkin. "The Uniqueness of the Holocaust." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 25.1 (Winter 1996).
- Marsden, Jill. "Interminable Intensity: Nietzsche's Demonic Nihilism." In *Evil Spirits: Nihilism and the Fate of Modernity*, edited by Gary Banham and Charlie Blake Manchester: Manchester University Press; New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Masalha, Nur. "The Palestinian Refugee Problem: Israeli Plans to Resettle the Palestinian Refugees 1948–1972," at: <http://www.shaml.org/publications/monos/mono2.html/>.
- Massey, Doreen. "A Global Sense of Place." In *Studying Culture: An Introductory Reader*, edited by Ann Gray and Jim McGuigan. London: Arnold, 1993.
- Mauro, Frédéric. "Merchant Communities 1350–1750." In *The Rise of Merchant Empires: Long Distance Trade in the Early Modern World 1350–1750*, edited by James D. Tracy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Mayer, Arno J. *The Furies: Violence and Terror in the French and Russian Revolutions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Memmi, Albert. "The Colonized Jew," in *Jews and Arabs*. Translated by Eleanor Ceizeux. Chicago: J.P. O'Hara, 1975.
- . *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York: Orion Press, 1965.
- . *Dominated Man*, n.p.
- . "Jews, Tunisians, and Frenchmen." Translated by Debbie Barnard. *Literary Review* 41.2 (1998); 223–227.
- . *La Statue de Sel* (Pillar of Salt). Translated by Edourd Roditi. Boston, MA: Beacon Press 1992.
- . *Portrait of a Jew*. London: Orion Press, 1963.
- Mendes-Flohr, Paul and Jehuda Reinharz, eds. *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Michaels, Walter Benn. "'You Who Never Was There': Slavery and the New Historicism, Deconstruction and the Holocaust." *Narrative* 4.1 (1996).
- Mignolo, Walter. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality and Colonization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- Miller, James. *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Millman, Joyce. "Why Must I Be a Teenage Vampire in Love?" at: <http://www.salon.com/ent/tiv/mill/1998/06/08mill.html/>.
- Mintz, Alan. *Popular Culture and the Shaping of Holocaust Memory in America*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001.
- Moore, Deborah Dash. *At Home in America: Second Generation New York Jews*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Morgan, Robin. "Feminist Guerrilla Theater, 1968." In *Modern American Women: A Documentary History*, edited by Susan Ware. Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press, 1989.
- Morris, Benny. *1948 and After: Israel and the Palestinians*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- . *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947–1949*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Moss, Gabrielle. "From the Valley to the Hellmouth: Buffy's Transition from Film to Television." *Slayage: The Online International Journal of Buffy Studies* 2 (2001) at: <http://www.middleenglish.org/slayage/slayage2.htm/>.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–25.
- Novick, Peter. *The Holocaust in American Life*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1999.
- Parkes, Lisa and Elana Levine, eds. *Red Noise: Buffy the Vampire Slayer and Critical Television Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Passerin d'Entrèves, Maurizio and Seyla Benhabib, eds. *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity Critical Essays on the Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press; Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996.
- Paytress, Mark. *Twentieth Century Boy: The Marc Bolan Story*. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1992.

- Pearson, David. *The Politics of Ethnicity in Settler Societies. States of Unease*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2001.
- People Magazine (September 6, 1976) at: <http://www.teenagewildlife.com/Appearances/Press/1976/0906/people.html/>.
- (April 2005) at: <http://www.prettiethings.com/prettiethings/quotes.html/>.
- Plant, Raymond. *Hegel*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Plant, Sadie. *The Most Radical Gesture: The Situationist International in a Postmodern Age*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Podhoretz, Norman. *Ex-Friends: Falling Out with Allen Ginsberg, Lionel and Diana Trilling, Lillian Hellman, Hannah Arendt, and Norman Mailer*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999.
- Prell, Riv-Ellen. *Fighting to Become Americans: Jews, Gender, and the Anxiety of Assimilation*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1999.
- Price, Charles. *The Great White Walls Are Built*. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1974.
- Quinault, Roland. "Britain 1950." *History Today* 51.4 (April 2001): 14–21.
- Rabasa, José. *Inventing America: Spanish Historiography and the Formation of Eurocentricism*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994.
- Rand, Nicholas. "Introduction." In *The Shell and the Kernel*, edited by Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Raskin, Jonah. *For the Hell of It: The Life and Times of Abbie Hoffman*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Raul, H. *The Destruction of the European Jews*. Chicago, IL: Quadrangle, 1961.
- Renton, Dave. "The Anti-Nazi League 1977–82," *Dave Renton's Homepage* (April 2005), at: <http://www.dkrenton.co.uk/anl/1970s.html/>.
- Rentschler, Eric. *The Ministry of Illusion: Nazi Cinema and Its Afterlife*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Reul, Sabine and Thomas Deichmann. "The One Measure of True Love Is: You Can Insult the Other." An interview with Slavoj Žižek at: <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/00000002D2C4.htm/>.
- Reynolds, Henry. *Frontier: Aborigines, Settlers and Land*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1996.
- . *The Law of the Land*. Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1987.
- Robinson, Douglas. *American Apocalypses: The Image of the End of the World in American Literature*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Rogan, Johnny. *Starmakers and Svengalis: The History of British Pop Management*. London: MacDonald, 1988.
- Rohan, Virginia. "Nielsen Rank Doesn't Tell the Whole Story." *The Record Online* (November 16, 1997), at: <http://www.bergenrecord.com/yourtime/hiddenhit1997.11162.htm/>.
- Rose, Jacqueline. *States of Fantasy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Rotenstreich, Nathan. *Jews and German Philosophy: The Polemics of Interpretation*. New York: Schocken Books, 1984.
- Rothberg, Michael. *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Representation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
- Rotundo, E. Anthony. "Jews and Rock and Roll: A Study in Cultural Contrast." *American Jewish History* (1982): 72.
- Roumani, Judith. *Albert Memmi*. Philadelphia, PA: Celfan Edition Monographs, 1987.
- Rubenstein, Richard. *The Age of Triage: Fear and Hope in an Overcrowded World*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1984.
- Rubin, Jerry. *Do It!: Scenarios of Revolution*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.
- Ruedenberg-Wright, Lucia. "The Second and Third Generations, Where Do We Go from Here." Paper presented at the Association for Jewish Studies 29th Annual Conference, Boston MA, December 21–23, 1997 at: <http://lrw.net/~lucia/pubs/ajs/>
- Shafir, Gershon. *Land, Labor and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Said, Edward. "An Ideology of Difference." In *The Politics of Dispossession, The Struggle for Palestinian Self Determination 1969–1994*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. Reprint. London: Penguin, 1995.
- . *Orientalism*. Quoted in *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Literatures*, by Terry Goldie. McGill, Canada: Queen's University Press, 1989.
- . *The World, the Text and the Critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Santner, Eric. *Stranded Objects: Mourning, Memory, and Film in Postwar Germany*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. "Preface." In *The Wretched of the Earth*, by Frantz Fanon. Translated by Constance Farrington. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin ed., 1967.
- Savage, Jon. *England's Dreaming: Anarchy, Sex Pistols, Punk Rock and Beyond*. New York: St. Martin's, 1992.
- . *Time Travel: From the Sex Pistols to Nirvana: Pop Media and Sexuality 1977–96*. London: Vintage, 1997.
- Scaduto, Anthony. *Bob Dylan: An Intimate Biography*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1971.
- Schneider, Tassilo. "Finding a New Heimat in the Wild West: Karl May and the German Western of the 1960s." *Journal of Film and Video* 47 (1995): 50–66.
- Scholem, Gershom. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Schulberg, Pete. "Lack of African American Roles Dominates Press Tour." *The Oregonian* (July 21, 1999), at http://olive-live.webnet.advance.net/ent/tv/99/07tv990722_schulberg.html/.
- Segev, Tom. *Elvis in Jerusalem: Post-Zionism and the Americanization of Israel*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2002.
- Seidler, Victor Jeleniewski. *Shadows of the Shoah: Jewish Identity and Belonging*. Oxford: Berg.
- Seltzer, Mark. "Wound Culture: Trauma in the Pathological Public Sphere." *October* 80 (1997): 15–16.
- Shain, Milton. *The Roots of Antisemitism in South Africa*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1994.
- Shaked, Edith. "The Holocaust: Re-examining the Wannsee Conference, Himmler's Appointments Book, and Tunisian Jews," at: <http://nizkor.org/hweb/people/s/shaked-edith/re-examining-wannsee.html/>.
- Shaked, Edith Haddad and Bat-Ami Bar On. "On the State of Being (Jewish) between 'Orient' and 'Occident.'" In *Jewish Locations*, edited by Lisa Tessman and Bat-Ami Bar. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Shandler, Jeffrey. *While America Watches: Televising the Holocaust*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Shapiro, Helen. *Walking Back to Happiness*. London: Fount, 1993.
- Sherman, Ari. *Island Refuge: Britain and the Refugees from the Third Reich 1933–1939*. 2nd ed. Ilford, UK: Frank Cass, 1994.
- Shlain, Avi. *The Iron Wall—Israel and the Arab World*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2000.
- Shohat, Ella. *Israeli Cinema: East/West and the Politics of Representation*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989.
- . "Taboo Memories and Diasporic Visions: Columbus, Palestine, and Arab-Jews." In *Performing Hybridity*, edited by May Joseph and Jennifer Natalya Fink. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Silberstein, Laurence. *The Postzionism Debates: Knowledge and Power in Israeli Culture*. New York and London: Routledge, 1999.
- Silliman, Jael. *Jewish Portraits, Indian Frames: Women's Narratives from a Diaspora of Hope*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2001.
- Sklare, Marshall with Joseph Greenblum. *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Sloman, Larry. *Steal This Dream: Abbie Hoffman and the Countercultural Revolution in America*. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Smith, Chris. "Public Image Ltd—The Flowers of Romance." *Stylus Magazine* (April 2005) at: <http://www.stylusmagazine.com/feature.php?ID=533/>.
- Smith, Joan. *Misogynies: Reflections on Myths and Malice*. Rev. ed. London: Faber and Faber, 1993.
- Smith, Woodruff D. *The German Colonial Empire*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978.

- Sofsky, Wolfgang. *The Order of Terror: The Concentration Camp*. Translated by William Templer. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Spitz, Bob. *Dylan: A Biography*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1989.
- Stein, Kenneth. "The Jewish National Fund: Land Purchase Methods and Priorities, 1924–1939." *Middle Eastern Studies* 20.2 (1984):190–205.
- Stow, Kenneth. *Alienated Minority: The Jews in Late Medieval Latin Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Stratton, Jon. *Coming Out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- . *The Desirable Body: Cultural Fetishism and the Erotics of Consumption*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- . "Jews, Punk, and the Holocaust: From the Velvet Underground to the Ramones—the Jewish–American Story." *Popular Music* 24.1 (2005): 79–105.
- . "Thinking Through the Holocaust. A Discussion Inspired by Hilene Flanzbaum (ed.), 'The Americanization of the Holocaust.'" *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 14.2 (2000): 231–245.
- . *Writing Sites: A Genealogy of the Postmodern World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990.
- Strozier, Charles B. and Michael Flynn, eds. *Genocide, War, and Human Survival*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996.
- Synnott, Marcia Graham. "Anti-Semitism and American Universities: Did Quotas Follow the Jews?" In *Anti-Semitism in American History*, edited by David Gerber. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986.
- Tal, Kali. *Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literatures of Trauma*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Taussig, Michael. *Shamanism, Colonialism and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Third, Amanda. "Limits of Feminist Agency: Valerie Solanas, Feminist Terrorist, Sexocide, and the Shooting of Andy Warhol." Paper presented at the conference Gendering Ethics/The Ethics of Gender, June 23–25, 2000, University of Leeds.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1997.
- van Alphen, Ernst. "Symptoms of Discursivity: Experience, Memory and Trauma." In *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, edited by M. Bal, J. Crewe, and L. Spitzer. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999.
- van Pelt, Robert-Jan. "A Site in Search of a Mission." In *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, edited by Yisrael Gutman and Michael Berenbaum. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Vogler, Thomas A. "Poetic Witness: Writing the Real." In *Witness and Memory: The Discourse of Trauma*, edited by Ann Douglass and Thomas A. Vogler. New York, London: Routledge, 2003.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System*. New York: Academic Press, 1995.
- Wiesel, Elie. "Trivializing Memory." Republished in *From the Kingdom of Memory: Reminiscences*. New York: Schocken Books, 1995.
- Wilcox, Rhonda V. and David Lavery, eds. *Fighting the Forces: What's at Stake in Buffy the Vampire Slayer*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001.
- Wilder, Gary. "Irreconcilable Differences: A Conversation with Albert Memmi." *Transition* 71 (1997): 158–177.
- Withers, Jane. "From *Let It Rock* to *World's End*: 450 King's Road." In *Impresario: Malcolm McLaren and the British New Wave*, edited by Paul Taylor. New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1988.
- Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. "Exile and Expulsion in Jewish History." In *Crisis and Creativity in the Sephardic World 1391–1648*, edited by Benjamin R. Gampel. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
- . *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982.
- Young, James E. *At Memory's Edge: After Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- . *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation*. 1st Midland ed. 1988. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

- Young, Robert. *White Mythologies*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Yovel, Yirmiyahu. *Dark Riddle, Hegel, Nietzsche and the Jews*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.
- Yudelson, Larry. "Dylan: Tangled Up in Jews," at: <http://www.radiohazak.com/Tangled.html/>.
- Yule, Andrew. *Spielberg: Father of the Man*. London: Warner Books, 1997.
- Zelizer, Barbie. "Gender and Atrocity: Women in Holocaust Photographs." In *Visual Culture and the Holocaust*, edited by Barbie Zelizer. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2001.
- Zertal, Idith. *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*. Translated by Chaya Galai. Cambridge Middle East Studies 21. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Zerubavel, Yael. *Recovered Roots*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Žižek, Slavoj. "The Iraqi MacGuffin," at: <http://www.lacan.com/iraq1.htm/>.
- . *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso, 1989.
- . *Welcome to the Desert of the Real*. New York: Wooster Press, 2001.

INDEX

- abjection, 41–44, 252n9
- Aborigines, Australian, 65–67, 89, 115, 249n51
- Abraham, Nicolas, 126, 130, 136, 153
- absolutism, 24
- Absolutist state, the, 9–10, 12, 22–23, 25, 32
- Abu-Lughod, Janet, 21
- Abushaqra, Baha, 80–81
- Abzug, Bella, 187
- Acker, Kathy, 2, 97–100, 109–110, 113
- Ad Dawayima, 28
- Africa, 2, 47, 75–76, 107
 - colonialism in, 20, 67–70
 - South Africa, 26, 34
 - See also* North Africa
- African-Americans, 165, 173, 174–175, 227
- Ai No Corrida* (film), 108
- Albert, Stew, 182
- Alexander, Jeffrey, 4
- Algeria, 36, 55, 86, 111–113, 247n1
 - Jews in, 33, 39–40, 43
- Allen, Woody, 231
- van Alphen, Ernst, 145
- Althusser, Louis, 113
- American Continent, 2, 9, 63–64, 65
 - See also* United States
- Amsterdam, 15, 37–38
- anamnesis, 134, 137
- Anderson, Benedict, 83
- Anderson, Perry, 23
- Anti-Nazi League (ANL), 218
- Anti-Semite and Jew* (Sartre), 47–49
- anti-Semitism, 26, 44, 48, 76, 127, 234–235, 241n2
 - English, 142, 197, 199, 203–204
 - film and, 28, 158
 - in Germany, 62–63
 - of Hitler, 28–29, 46
 - in U.S., 170–171, 184–185, 231, 235
- Antler, Joyce, 187
- Antze, Paul, 133
- apartheid, 26, 79, 81
- apartheid wall. *See* security fence, Israeli
- apocalypse, 95, 115, 195–196, 205–206, 213, 217–218, 228–229
 - racial, 234, 235, 237–238
- Appignanesi, Lisa, 7
- appropriation, 88, 89
- Arabs, 27–28, 78, 84–92
 - Israeli-Arab conflict and, 89–92
- Arafat, Yasser, 80
- Arendt, Hannah, 70–72, 149, 151
- Argentina, 34, 93
- Armenia, 54
- Armistice line, 77–79
- Artaud, Antonin, 106
- Ashkenazi Jews, 14–16, 23, 32, 34, 40–41, 84, 198
- assimilation, 1, 10, 26, 46, 51, 144, 158, 179, 184
 - Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and, 230, 232–233
 - in England, 141–142, 210, 227
 - folk music and, 190–191
 - of Irish, 177
 - name changing and, 180
 - in U.S., 167, 172, 186–187, 190–191
 - in Western Europe, 9
 - women and, 187
- Attias, Jean-Christophe, 80
- Attwood, Bain, 65
- Auschwitz, 3, 6, 40, 75, 91, 102–103, 163, 202
 - French Revolution and, 73–74
 - Freud and, 120
 - Israel and, 4

- Auschwitz—*continued*
 modernity and, 134, 136
 uniqueness of, 149
 Australia, 2, 65, 84, 87, 89, 115
 Aztecs, 54
- Badmor, Aliza, 94
 Baghdadi Jewish community, 11, 21
 Bal, Meike, 148
 Balfour Declaration, 93
 Balin, Marty, 190
 Ballard, J.G., 133
 Bangs, Lester, 206
 Barker, Simon, 214
 Baron, Salo, 149
 Bartov, Omar, 129, 147, 162
 Bauer, Yehuda, 102
 Bauman, Zygmunt, 15, 31–32, 53–54, 61, 108, 118
 Bedouins, 28–29, 90
 Beeber, Steven Lee, 195
 Belges, Leimare de, 18
 Belgium, 69
 Bellamy, Elizabeth, 126
 Belsen, 150, 152, 155, 202, 213, 215–216
 “Belsen Was a Gas” (song), 144, 152, 213–215
 Belzec, 75
 Benbassa, Esther, 35, 80
 Ben-Gurion, David, 27, 93, 148
 Benjamin, Walter, 115
 Bentham, Jeremy, 62
 Ben-Zui, Izhak, 90
 Berg, Peter, 165, 178–180, 182, 262n72
 Bergen-Belsen. *See* Belsen
 Berger, Helmut, 203
 Berlin Wall, 216
 Berman, Gail, 231
 Berryman, John, 206
Beyond the Pleasure Principle (Freud), 119, 125, 130, 237
 Bhaba, Homi, 48, 49
 Biggs, Ronnie, 213–215
 Bikel, Theorore, 188
 Binrmaum, Nathan, 93
 Black Death, 14
Black Skin, White Masks (Fanon), 48, 49
 Blanchot, Maurice, 117
 Bloch, Marc, 147
 Blue Öyster Cult, 204
 Bockris, Victor, 194
 Boer War, 71
 Bogarde, Dirk, 159
 Bohemia, 22
 Bolan, Marc, 203–205, 210, 217
 Bosnia, 54
 Bourdieu, Pierre, 113
 Bowie, David, 193, 196, 205–209, 210, 217
 Boyarin, Jonathan, 52, 57, 113
 Brantlinger, Patrick, 56
 Brazil, 34, 37
 Brennan, Timothy, 12
 Brieness, Paul, 149–151, 232
 Britain. *See* England
 British Columbia, 84
 British Malaya, 26
 Brodtkin, Karen, 174, 175–177, 184, 198
 Bromley contingent, 213
 Buchenwald, 40, 147
 Buettner, Angi, 5–6
Buffy the Vampire Slayer (film), 221, 222–225, 230, 233–234
Buffy the Vampire Slayer (TV program), 221–222, 225–239, 267n28
 demographics of viewership, 222, 229
 Holocaust and, 233, 235, 238
 Jewishness and, 221, 230–234, 238
 Nazis and, 233–235, 238
 racial composition of, 225–228, 229
 Burchill, Julie, 199–200
 Burleigh, Michael, 26, 55
 Burroughs, William, 97
 Butler, Clark, 47
 Butler, Judith, 43
- California, 84, 228–229, 238
 Cambodia, 54
 Cameroon, 67, 69
 Camus, Albert, 113
 Canada, 87
 Cantwell, Robert, 187
 Carmichael, Skokely, 165
 Carolingian Empire, 13
 Carr, Karen, 194
 Caruth, Cathy, 8, 119, 125, 139, 193
 Casement, Roger, 105, 106
 Castricano, Jodey, 112
 Catholicism, 11, 19, 179, 212
 Cavallo, Dominick, 170, 171, 173

- Cavani, Lilliana, 158–159, 162
 Cazes, David, 104
 Céline, 42
 Céline, Louis, 47
 de Certeau, Michel, 95
 Césaire, Aimé, 33, 47, 55, 57, 74, 113–114
 Chamberlain, Neville, 142
 Chamberlain, Stewart, 26
 Chaney, Jim, 175
 Chernin, Kim, 166
 Chesler, Phyllis, 187
 Chimes, Terry, 203, 217
 China, 47
 Chouraqui, André, 35, 36, 39
 Christians, 11, 21, 36–37, 46, 185, 195, 232
 Jews and, 13, 17–19, 24–26, 139
 Churchill, Ward, 63
 citizenship, 10, 11, 24, 26, 61–62, 75, 177
 civility, 182–183
 civil rights movement, 170–171, 174–175, 176
 Cixous, Hélène, 33, 113
 The Clash (band), 196, 203, 212, 217–218, 265n46
 Class, Heinrich, 69
 Clifford, James, 10, 16
Clueless (film), 223, 267n34
 Cohn-Bendit, Daniel, 259n61
 Cole, Tim, 6, 148
 collective memory, 101, 146, 193, 195, 218
 Jews and, 48, 138–140, 147
 See also memory
 Collier, Peter, 166
 colonialism, 20–21, 26, 32, 36, 38, 160
 in Africa, 20, 67–70
 in Australia, 65
 France and, 39, 73, 112–113
 genocide and, 55, 65, 68, 115
 Holocaust and, 1, 67, 113–114
 Israel and, 87, 88–89
 Memmi and, 49–51
 Nazis and, 29, 34, 55–58, 69–70, 74–76, 114
 in Palestine, 88–89
 violence and, 53–55, 63–66, 70, 89, 107
 Zionism and, 83, 86
 colonization, 34, 37–38, 49, 50, 53, 62
 in America, 63, 229
 decolonization, 114
 in Europe, 69–70, 114
 French model of, 27–28, 33, 35–36, 38
 German, 27, 67–70, 74–76
 in Palestine, 85–86
The Colonizer and the Colonized (Memmi), 20, 33, 48–49
 colonizer/colonized relationship, 20–21, 32–35, 44, 49–51, 55, 112–114
 in Israel, 87, 92
 Columbia, 63–64
 Columbus, Christopher, 10–12, 19–20, 63
 Columbus Platform, 168, 172
 Colville, Jon, 201
The Communist Manifesto (Marx), 117–118
 concentration camps, 5–6, 53, 65–66, 70–76, 99, 149–151, 185
 in Africa, 68–69
 in fiction, 111
 films about, 152, 158–159
 Holocaust and, 122, 124, 235
 Plath and, 154–155
 sexuality and, 158–163
 trauma and, 131, 133, 208
 Congo, 64, 106–107, 115
 Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), 165
 Conrad, Joseph, 64, 106–107, 112
 Constantinople, 18
 Cook, Paul, 215
 Cortés, Hernan, 20, 54
 Counter-Reformation, 22
 Coyote, Peter, 165, 178–180, 182
 Crémieux, Adolphe, 39
 Cuba, 71
 Cuddihy, John Murray, 174
 cultural memory, 100, 144–148, 150–152, 157, 163–164
 See also memory
 cultural pluralism, 177
 cultural trauma, 4, 146, 153, 197, 200–201, 209, 258n22
 Holocaust and, 163, 193–195, 196, 217–219
 See also trauma
 Culture (reggae band), 217
Cum nimis absurdum, 24
 Curtis, L. Perry Jr., 176
 Czechoslovakia, 70, 102

- Dachau, 75, 155
 "Daddy" (poem), 154–155
 Daladier, Edouard, 112
 Dalton, Stephen, 208, 209
The Damned (film), 203, 233
 Davis, R.G. (Ronnie), 178–179, 182, 262n72
 Davis, Rennie, 183
 Dawidowicz, Lucy, 89
 death camps. *See* concentration camps
 Debord, Guy, 212
 decolonization, 114
 deconstruction, 43, 127, 196, 218
 Deir Yasin, 28
 Dellinger, Dave, 183
 Denning, Mark, 208
 Derrida, Jacques, 43, 113, 117–118
Diamond Dogs (album), 206–208
 The Dictators (band), 196
 Diggers, the, 165, 171, 177, 178–181, 188
Discipline and Punish (Foucault), 58, 62
 Doane, Mary Ann, 133
Doctor Who (television program), 4–5
 Doenitz, Karl, 201
 Dryden, Spencer, 190
 Duhm, Deiter, 160
 Dussel, Enrique, 9, 19–20, 135
 Dworkin, Andrea, 160–161, 187
 Dylan, Bob, 165, 180, 185, 187–190, 204

 Eastern Europe, 9, 34, 232–233
 Jews in, 12, 15, 62, 76, 182–184
 Nazis and, 55–56, 58, 69–70, 75–76
 East Timor, 54
 Eden, Anthony, 201
 Eder, M.D., 129
 Egypt, 86
 Eichmann, Adolf, 148–149
 Eisen, Arnold, 168
 Eitam, Effie, 90
 Eliot, T.S., 199
 Elliott, Ramblin' Jack, 187–189
The Empire of the Senseless (Acker), 2, 97–98, 100, 108–112, 115
 England, 5–6, 23–24, 61, 86, 142, 217, 227
 anti-Semitism in, 142, 197, 199, 203–204
 assimilation in, 141–142, 210, 227
 expulsion of Jews from, 14, 24
 minorities in, 198–199
 Nazism and, 206
 punk in, 197–198, 218–219
 WWII and, 200–202
 Englishness, 226–227
 Enlightenment, 125
 Eretz Israel, 93, 95
 Erichsen, John, 128
Etsi Iudaeos, 13–14
 Eurocentrism, 32, 47, 48
 Europe, 1, 3, 18–19
 boundaries of, 34
 colonization in, 69–70, 114
 definition of, 40
 expansionism of, 21–22, 63–64
 expulsion of Jews from, 9–10, 14, 28
 genocide in, 103, 137
 homogenization of, 37
 immigration from, 173
 Israel and, 52
 Jewish re-settlement in, 15
 premodern, 58
 production of, 117–118, 132, 135, 140
 return of Jews to, 22–23, 31–32
 See also Eastern Europe; Western Europe
 European identity, 41
 Evans, Raymond, 65
Everything is Illuminated (Foer), 7
 Evron, Boas, 15
 Evrony, Gilad, 238
 expulsions, 17–18, 27, 41–42
 from England, 14, 24
 from Europe, 1–2, 9–10, 11, 13–14, 17, 18, 22, 37, 40, 118–119
 Nazis and, 27, 72
 from Spain, 1–2, 9–10, 11, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34–35, 37, 43, 259n70
 extermination camps. *See* concentration camps
 Eyerman, Ron, 193

 Fabri, Freidrich, 67
 Fanon, Franz, 33, 47–48, 112, 113
 Feiglin, Moshe, 90
 Felman, Soshana, 120–121, 125
 feminism, second-wave, 165–166, 185–187, 263n99
 Fichte, Johann, 24
 Filene, Benjamin, 187

- Finkelstein, Norman, 89–91
 Firestone, Shulamith, 187
 First Zionist Congress, 93
 Flaubert, Gustave, 91
 Foa, Anna, 13–15, 17, 24–25, 29
 Foer, Jonathan Safran, 7
 folk music, protest movement in,
 165–166, 187–191
 Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust
 Testimonies, 124–125
 Foucault, Michael, 25, 58–59, 62, 79
 France, 23–24, 61, 128, 147, 168, 259n61
 Algeria and, 39–40
 colonialism and, 39, 73, 112–113
 colonization and, 27–28, 33, 35–36, 38
 expulsion of Jews from, 14, 24
 Germany and, 67, 69, 112–113
 Nazis and, 3, 157
 See also French Revolution
 Frank, Anne, 123–124
 Frank, Leo, 175
 Franklin, Benjamin, 234–235, 268n42
 Freedom Riders, 170
 Free Speech Movement (FSM), 167, 171,
 190
 Freidman, Esther, 209
 French Revolution, 59–61, 65, 73–74
 Freud, Sigmund, 42, 47, 107, 132, 134–136,
 144
 Auschwitz and, 120
 on dreams, 130, 237
 on memory, 138–139
 Oedipus complex and, 109, 160
 on trauma, 119, 125, 129–130, 139–140,
 146
 Friedan, Betty, 166, 185–186
 Friedlander, Saul, 62, 102–105, 144–145,
 158–159, 236
 Friedman, Esther, 214
 Froines, John, 183
 Fury, Billy, 210, 212

 Gainsbourg, Serge, 144
 Gandhi, Leela, 33
The Garden of the Finzi-Continis (film), 158
 Garfunkel, Art, 166, 190
 Garvey, Marcus, 217
 Gaza Strip, 77–78, 82, 85, 90
 Gearhart, Suzanne, 50
 Gellar, Sarah Michelle, 230, 233

 Generation X (band), 226
 genocide, 54–57, 76, 102, 123, 185,
 201–202
 colonialism and, 55, 65, 68, 115
 in Europe, 103, 137
 Holocaust and, 3, 5, 80, 99, 102, 124,
 132, 135, 137, 149, 152, 207,
 233–234, 235–236
 Palestinian, 81
 “population redundancy” and, 247n2
 punk and, 196, 206–208, 209
 Gerber, Jane, 36
 Germany, 7, 22–23, 25, 34, 84, 98, 123
 anti-Semitism in, 62–63
 Bowie and, 196
 colonial practices of, 27, 67–70, 74–76
 Eastern Europe and, 55–56, 75–76
 France and, 67, 69, 112–113
 memory of Holocaust in, 134–135,
 157
 refugees from, 142
 South West Africa and, 67–70
 totalitarianism and, 70
 WWII and, 153
 See also Nazis
 Gertz, Jochen, 157
 ghettos, 23–26, 27, 29, 75, 80, 151
 Israeli “security fence” and, 79, 87
 Giddens, Anthony, 13
 Gilman, Sander, 90–91
 Gilroy, Paul, 67
 Gitlin, Todd, 165, 171, 190
 Glam Rock, 195, 205
 Glueck, Nelson, 168, 169
 Goebbels, Joseph, 13, 234
 Goffman, Erving, 179
 Golan Heights, 77
 Goldberg, Jeffery, 77, 90, 92
 Goldie, Terry, 87–89
 Goldman, Mitzi, 154
 Goodman, Andy, 175
 Gornick, Vivian, 187
 Gottlieb, Lou, 188
 Grant, Madison, 174
 Greece, 47
 Grogan, Emmett, 178
 Grosz, Elizabeth, 42
 Grunebaum-Ralph, Heidi, 44–45
 guerilla theatre, 180–181, 262n72
 Gush Shalom, 77–78

- Guthrie, Woody, 187–188
 Gypsies, 27, 55–57, 70, 76, 112, 232
- Haber, Al, 165, 172
 Habermas, Jürgen, 3, 102
 Hacking, Ian, 128, 129, 137–138
 Haganah, 78
 Haiti, 112
 Halbwach, Maurice, 146–147
 Hanem, Kuchik, 91
 Hannigan, Alyson, 230
 Harriman, Avril, 201
 Harrington, Michael, 171
 Harron, Mary, 196, 217
 Hartman, Geoffrey, 107
 von Hartmann, Eduard, 64
 Hauer, Rutger, 233
 Hay, Denys, 18
 Hayden, Tom, 171–173, 178, 182, 183
 Headon, Topper, 203
Heart of Darkness (Conrad), 64, 107, 111–112, 115
 Hegel, 32–33, 46–48, 50, 127
 Hell, Richard, 196–197, 214
 Henry, Tricia, 205, 207
 Herero people, 2, 67–68, 76, 249n68
 Herzl, Theodor, 83–86, 93
 heterotopia, 79
 Heydrich, Reinhard, 27–28, 29, 75
 Hilberg, Raul, 27, 151
 Hill, Joseph, 217
 Himmler, Heinrich, 75, 91, 123, 202, 234
 Hindus, 21
 Hippler, Fritz, 28
 Hirsch, Gary, 190
 Hirsch, Marianne, 153, 163, 237
 Hispanics, 228–229
The History of Love (Krauss), 7
 Hitler, Adolph, 24, 55–56, 57, 70, 159, 243n71
 anti-Semitism of, 28–29, 46
 Bowie and, 206, 209
 Buffy the Vampire Slayer and, 234
 comparisons with, 80, 183–184
 punk and, 218
 Hoess, Rudolf, 91
 Hoetzsch, Otto, 69
 Hoffman, Abbie, 165, 170–171, 172, 180–184, 185, 262n82
 Hoffman, Julius, 183–184
- the Holocaust, 1–8, 239
 awareness of, 150–152, 194
 Buffy the Vampire Slayer and, 233, 235, 238
 bureaucracy and, 247n4
 colonialism and, 1, 67, 113–114
 colonial violence and, 53–56, 64, 65, 74–76
 discourse of, 120–123, 125, 140, 148, 150, 157, 163
 feminism and, 263n99
 genocide and, 3, 5, 80, 99, 124, 132, 135, 137, 149, 152, 207, 233–234, 235–236
 ghettoization and, 29
 history and, 52
 Israel and, 4, 80–81
 literature and, 7–8
 memorializing of, 99, 157
 memory and, 134, 137, 139, 144–145, 150
 modernity and, 3, 4, 54, 126, 132, 135, 136, 137, 139, 194
 moral power of, 200
 naming of, 100, 148–149, 235–236
 North Africa and, 40
 pervasiveness of, 4–6
 pornography and, 159, 161–163, 259n74
 punk and, 193–196, 197, 205, 214, 217
 representation and, 97, 101–103, 107, 110–111, 121, 207
 spaces of death and, 106
 trauma and, 4, 120–121, 125–126, 131–132, 133, 136, 145–146, 154, 164, 196, 218–219, 237
 as triumph of rationality, 108
 uniqueness of, 3, 53–54, 247n1
 violence and, 113–115
 WWII and, 201–202
Holocaust: The Story of the Family Weiss (documentary), 100, 124–125, 151, 163, 202, 218, 236
 international audience of, 194
 Holocaust Jew, 155, 196, 206, 208, 214, 216
 Holocaust studies, 100
 Holocaust survivors, 100–101, 121, 124–127, 131, 139, 148, 247n1
 disappearance of, 236
 Israel and, 148–149

- trauma and, 145–146
See also post-Holocaust generations;
 “second generation” Jews; “third
 generation” Jews
 homogeneity, 9–10, 12, 17, 22, 53, 87, 134
 England and, 198–199
 Europe and, 26, 32, 37, 118
 Horowitz, David, 166
 House Un-American Committee
 (HUAC), 182–183
 Hovevei Zion, 93
 Howe, Irving, 109
 Hübbe-Schleiden, Wilhelm, 67
 Hughes, Rob, 208, 209
 humanism, 47, 54, 60–61, 70, 103,
 113
 human rights, 24
 Hussein, Saddam, 80
 Huyssen, Andreas, 4, 134–135, 137

 Idol, Billy, 226
 Iggy Pop, 196, 206, 208–209
 Ignatiev, Noel, 175–176, 227
Ilsa, She-Wolf of the S.S. (film), 159
 inclusion, 53
 incorporation, 89
 India, 21, 32, 47
 indigenous people, 19–20, 56, 87, 88–90,
 103–105, 250n90
 extermination of, 2, 18, 57, 63–66, 67,
 68, 194
 individual memory, 145–147
 Iraq, 80, 86
 Ireland, 227
 Irish, the, 171, 174–178, 191, 198, 227
 Isaacs, Jeremy, 200–201
 Islam. *See* Moslems
 Israel, Johnathan, 14, 22, 37–38
 Israel, nation of, 2–3, 4, 16, 27–28, 52, 77–96
 boundaries of, 77–78, 94
 colonialism and, 87, 88–89
 Eichmann trial and, 148–149
 Israeli-Arab conflict and, 89–92
 Palestinians and, 29, 82, 89
 population of, 84–85
 “security fence” in, 77–81, 85, 87, 92,
 95–96
 settlers and, 77–78, 90, 92
 “tough Jew” stereotype and, 233
 Zionism and, 88, 93–95

 Italy, 14–15, 22–23, 35, 158
 ghettos in, 24, 26, 29

 Jabotinsky, Vladimir, 85–87, 89
 Jackson, Robert H., 149
 Jacobson, Matthew Frye, 173–174, 184
 James, Tony, 202–203
 Jameson, Frederic, 110
 Jardine, Alice, 106
 Jarrell, Randall, 206
 Jerusalem, 77, 82, 95
 Jewish National Fund, 28
 Jewish Territorial Association, 93
 Jews, 34, 37–38, 39, 98
 African-Americans and, 165
 Algerian, 33, 39–40, 43
 in American counterculture, 165–166,
 167–168, 171, 182, 190–191
 Christians and, 13, 17–19, 24–26, 139
 in civil rights movement, 165, 170,
 174–175, 176
 collective memory and, 48, 138–140,
 147
 colonialism and, 20–21, 34, 50–51, 56,
 68, 70, 74–76
 Dutch, 37–38
 in Eastern Europe, 12, 15, 62, 76,
 182–184
 emancipation of, 61–62
 in England, 5–6, 198–199
 European-ness of, 40, 43, 84, 86
 exclusion from history of, 32–33, 44,
 45, 46–47, 48–49, 127
 expulsion from Europe of, 1–2, 9–10,
 11, 13–14, 17, 18, 22, 37, 40,
 118–119
 in feminist movement, 186–187
 folk/protest music and, 187–189
 ghettoization of, 24–26, 29
 gypsies and, 232
 in Italy, 158
 modernity and, 40, 42, 118, 127
 in music industry, 198
 in North Africa, 32, 34–37, 38–40, 51
 Othering of, 10, 17–19, 24–25, 32, 44,
 62, 75–76, 91, 139–140, 243n45
 punk and, 194–196
 racialization of, 24, 26–27, 62–63,
 75–76, 84, 174–175, 180, 184, 198,
 234

- Jews—*continued*
 reentry to Europe of, 22–23, 31–32
 socialism and, 174
 stereotypes of, 12–13, 44, 231–233, 267n34
 as vampires, 234–235
 as victims, 123–124, 155
 whiteness of, 57, 76, 174, 177–178, 180–181, 184–185, 190–191, 231
See also Ashkenazi Jews; Holocaust Jew; Judaism (religion); Sephardi Jews
- Joffe, Adrian, 6
- Jones, Alan, 212
- Jones, Mick, 196, 202–203, 217, 266n85
- Joy Division, 163
- Judaism (religion), 26, 45–46, 92–93, 174, 243n45
See also Jews; Reform Judaism
- Judaken, Jonathan, 48
- Judeocide. *See* Holocaust, the
- Kabbalah, 208
- Kahane, Meir, 187
- Kallen, Horace, 176
- Kamuf, Peggy, 118
- Kant, Emmanuel, 45–46
- Kaplan, Alice Yeager, 122
- Karl, Frederick, 107
- Katz, Jacob, 23
- Ka-Tzetnik, 163
- Kaufman, Alan, 161
- Kaufman, Arnold, 173
- Kaufman, Jonathan, 165, 174–175
- Kaukonen, Jorma, 190
- Kawakubo, Rei, 6
- Kawash, Samira, 114–115
- Kaye/Kantrowitz, Melanie, 170, 172
- Khmer Rouge, 54
- Kimmerling, Baruch, 94
- Kindertransport*, 142
- The Kingston Trio, 188
- Kiryat Arba, 92
- Knox, Robert, 56–57
- Korman, Gerd, 100, 148–149
- Krassner, Paul, 182
- Krauss, Nicole, 7
- Krebs, Sharon, 182
- Kristallnacht*, 75, 142–143, 151, 157, 208
- Kristeva, Julia, 41–44
- Ku Klux Klan, 175
- Kurshan, Nancy, 182
- Kushner, Tony, 199
- Kustow, Danny, 196
- Kuzui, Fran Rubel, 223
- Lacan, Jacques, 118, 128, 130
- LaCapra, Dominick, 2, 4, 5, 6, 104, 120
- “Lady Lazarus” (poem), 154–155
- Lambek, Michael, 133
- Lamkin, Raphael, 207
- Langer, Lawrence, 125, 133, 151
- Laqueur, Walter, 71
- Last Orgy of the Third Reich* (film), 159, 161
- Lawson, Bianca, 228
- League for Industrial Democracy (LID), 166, 171
- Lebensraum*, 69, 86
- Leed, Eric, 129
- Lefebvre, Henri, 59–60, 105
- Lefort, Claude, 60–61
- Leibowitz, Samuel, 175
- Leivine, Keith, 196
- Lemkin, Raphael, 54, 102
- Levine, Keith, 215
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude, 48
- Leys, Ruth, 8, 127, 129, 131, 237
- Lieberman, Arthur, 166–167
- Likud party, 90
- Lithuania, 15
- Livorno, 23, 36
- Locke, John, 137
- London, Louise, 142
- London SS (band), 196, 202–203, 211, 217
- Loshitzky, Yosefa, 101, 121–122, 125, 236
- Lydon, John, 196, 198, 211, 214–216
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois, 2, 4, 107–108, 113, 119, 127
 Holocaust and, 134–135, 137, 247n1
- McDonald, Country Joe, 190
- Mackandal, 112
- McLaren, Malcolm, 197–198, 200, 202, 209–212
 Jewishness of, 195, 219
 politics of, 217–218
 Sex Pistols and, 206, 215
- McLuhan, Marshall, 181
- Madagascar, 75
- Maghreb Jews, 39, 51
- Maharidge, Dale, 228–229

- Maier, Charles, 3
 Majdanek, 75
 Manifest Destiny, 226
 Manne, Robert, 89
 Marcus, Greil, 197
 Margalit, Avishai, 195
 Marsden, Jill, 195
 Marx, Karl, 117
 Marxism, 33, 44, 48, 115
 Massey, Doreen, 10
 Matlock, Glen, 215
 Mauro, Frédéric, 12
 May, Karl, 250
 Mayer, Arno, 74
 Medici family, 14, 22, 36
Mein Kampf (Hitler), 24, 29, 55–56, 70
 Melton, Barry, 190
 Memmi, Albert, 20–21, 31, 33, 40,
 44–45, 47–52
 memory, 101, 121–122, 134, 193
 cultural, 100, 144–148, 150–152, 157,
 163–164
 European, 65, 129, 137–140
 individual, 145–147
 Jewish, 124–125, 139
 narrative, 144
 social, 144, 147
 testimony and, 122
 trauma and, 126, 140
 See also collective memory;
 postmemory
The Memory Man (Appiganesi), 7
 messianic Zionism, 90, 92–95
 Michaels, Walter Benn, 121
 Miller, James, 171, 173
 Millman, Joyce, 222
 Mintz, Alan, 125
 Mizrahim, 16
 See also Sephardi Jews
 modernity, 1–2, 20, 51, 61, 76, 125, 140,
 193
 colonialism and, 65, 150
 concentration camps and, 65, 134
 Europe and, 117, 135
 expulsion of Jews and, 9, 118–119
 Holocaust and, 3, 4, 54, 126, 132, 135,
 136, 137, 139, 194
 Jews and, 40, 42, 118, 127
 Othering and, 81
 postmodernity and, 133
 trauma and, 120, 128, 130, 133, 219
 violence and, 58, 106–108, 115, 135–136,
 159, 161–162
 WWI and, 129
 See also postmodernism
 modernization, 15
 Moore, Deborah Dash, 169, 172
 Moors, 19
 Morel, Edmund, 106–107
 Morgan, Robin, 166, 182, 187
 Morocco, 38–40, 86
 Morris, Benny, 28
 Morris, Edwin, 128
 Motzkin, Gabriel, 195
 Muslims, 11, 17–18, 21, 33, 36, 37, 39
 Mussolini, 158

 Nadler, Josef, 69
al-Nakba, 81
 Nantes, 74
 narcissism, 135–136
 narrative memory, 144
 Nasser, Abdal, 80
 Nation, Terry, 4
 National Association for the Advancement
 of Colored People (NAACP), 175
 nationalism, 11, 42, 51, 95, 98, 235
 Nazis, 29, 46, 86, 108, 144–145, 160
 Amerika and, 262n82
 anti-Jewish policies of, 3, 26–27, 44,
 62, 68, 70, 75–76, 99, 123, 149,
 202, 207–208, 234–235, 236
 Bowie and, 196, 209
 Buffy the Vampire Slayer and, 233–234,
 238
 colonialism and, 29, 34, 55–58, 69–70,
 74–76, 114
 Doctor Who and, 4–5
 expulsions and, 27, 72
 films about, 159
 France and, 3, 157
 French Revolution and, 74
 imagery of, 212, 217
 memory and, 134, 137
 North Africa and, 40
 Poland and, 27–28, 55–57, 67, 70, 75,
 114
 propaganda of, 13
 punk and, 194, 202–203, 211–212
 Russia and, 55–57, 65, 75, 102, 250n90

- Nazism, 42, 53, 114, 194, 203, 206
 discourse of, 144, 158–159, 163
 Netanyahu, Binyamin, 80
 Netherlands, the, 3, 22, 37–38
 New Christians, 12, 17
 New York Dolls, 197
 New Zealand, 84, 87
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 194–195
The Night Porter (film), 158–159, 162
 nihilism, 194–195, 197–198, 200, 208, 215
 Nolan, Jerry, 214
 Nora, Pierre, 138–139
 Norfolk Island, 66
 North Africa, 15, 20–21, 35–40
 Jews in, 32, 34–37, 38–40, 51
 Novick, Peter, 123, 151
 Nuremberg Laws, 62, 143
 Nuremberg Trials, 149

 Ochs, Phil, 182, 190
 Oedipus complex, 109, 126, 129, 160
 Operation Hiram, 244n91
 Oppenheim, Paul, 128
 orientalism, 85, 88
 Orwell, George, 207
 Oshima, Nagisa, 108
 O'Sullivan, John L., 226
 Othering, 2–4, 9, 26, 56, 81–82, 115, 135–136, 197
 of Arabs, 84, 86, 87–90
 in *Buffy the Vampire Slayer*, 228, 235
 colonialism and, 112, 160
 of indigenous people, 2, 19–20, 90
 of Jews, 10, 17–19, 24–25, 32, 44, 62, 75–76, 91, 139–140, 243n45
 violence and, 58, 63–64, 67, 72, 74, 102
 See also Same/Other binary
 Ottoman Empire, 22, 32, 35–36, 38

 Pale of Settlement, 15, 25, 34, 70, 143, 198
 exodus of Jews from, 34, 98
 migration from, 109, 167–168
 Palestinians, 16, 28–29, 77–81, 82, 85–86, 92, 94–95
 Othering of, 87–90
 Paley, Grace, 111
 Parnes, Larry, 200, 210
 participatory democracy, 173

 Paul IV, 17
 Paytress, Mark, 203
 Pearlman, Sandy, 204
 van Pelt, Robert-Jan, 69, 73
 penetration, 88–90
 People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), 5
 Peres, Shimon, 91
 Pergola, Sergio Della, 85
 Perry, Luke, 223
 Peru, 63–64
 Peters, Carl, 67
 Peters, Joan, 89
 philanthropy, 169
 physiognomy, 176
 Piercy, Marge, 166
The Pillar of Salt (Memmi), 44–45, 49
 Pinsker, Leo, 93
 Pirone, Marco, 213
 Pius II, 18
 Plant, Raymond, 46
 Plath, Sylvia, 154–155, 206
 Pogrebin, Letty Cottin, 187
 pogroms, 124, 143, 149
 Poland, 3, 25, 28–29, 69, 102–103, 103, 142, 175
 Nazis and, 27–28, 55–57, 67, 70, 75, 114
 pornography, 159, 160–163, 259n74
 Port Huron Statement, 171–172
Portrait of a Jew (Memmi), 49, 50–51
 Portugal, 12, 14, 19, 21–22, 35
 post-Absolutist states, 13, 27
 post-Holocaust era, 108–109, 120, 122, 127–128, 135, 140, 163–164
 post-Holocaust generations, 99, 101, 122–123, 146, 204
 See also Holocaust survivors; “second generation” Jews; “third generation” Jews
 postmemory, 144–145, 153–154, 156, 163–164, 237–238
 See also memory
 postmodernism, 97, 109–110, 127, 134–136, 137, 239
 modernity and, 107–108, 128, 133
 post-traumatic society, 146, 161, 164
 Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), 128, 131, 152
 post-Zionism, 83, 88, 95

- Prague, 23
 Prell, Riv-Ellen, 171, 184
 des Pres, Terrance, 124–126
 primitivism, 107
Prisoners of Paradise (film), 159
 Proposition 187, 229
 Proust, Marcel, 138
 punk, 193–203, 206–209, 213–219
 anti-Seminitism and, 199–200
 in England, 197–198, 218–219
 Holocaust and, 193–196, 197, 205, 214, 217
 Jews and, 194–196
 Nazis and, 194, 202–203, 211–212
 WWII and, 200–202
 Purchas, Samuel, 20
 von Puttkamer, Jesko, 69
 Putumayo people, 103–105, 107
- Rabinowitz, Dorothy, 124
The Races of Man (Knox), 56
 racialization, 26, 34, 44, 55–57, 67–68, 73–74, 267n28
 of Arabs, 84
 of Irish, 171, 174, 175–176, 198
 of Jews, 24, 26–27, 62–63, 75–76, 84, 174–175, 180, 184, 198, 234
 slavery and, 137
 racism, 18, 48, 170, 175, 184, 218
 The Ramones (band), 196
 Rampling, Charlotte, 159
 Rand, Nicholas, 126
 Rann, Rudolph, 40
 Rasaba, José, 19
 Raskin, Jonah, 171
 Ratzel, Freidrich, 70
 realism, 103–108, 110, 145, 236, 237
 Reed, Lou, 196, 208–209
 Reform Judaism, 168, 174–175, 176
 See also Judaism (religion)
 refugees, 28, 142–144
 rejection and penetration discourse, 88–90
 Rentscheler, Eric, 28
 revenants, 126, 136
 Reynolds, Henry, 66
 Rhodes, Bernie, 195, 197, 200, 202–203, 205, 211–212, 217–218
 Richman, Jonathan, 196
 Riehle, Richard, 233
- Robinson, Douglas, 95
 Rodrigue, Aron, 35
 Rohan, Virginia, 222
 Roiphe, Anne, 187
 Rook, Jean, 209
 Rose, Deborah Bird, 65
 Rose, Jacqueline, 82
 Ross, Bob, 165, 172
 Rothberg, Michael, 100–101, 103–104, 110–111, 140, 145
 de Rothschild, Edmund, 27
 Rotten, Johnny. *See* Lydon, John
 Rotundo, E. Anthony, 188
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 54
 Rousset, David, 70, 133
 Roxy Music, 205
 Rubin, Jerry, 165, 171, 181–184, 187, 217, 262n82
 Ruedenberg-Wright, Lucia, 238
 Ruppin, Arthur, 27
 Russell, Ken, 212
 Russia, 3, 70, 93, 175, 235
 Nazis and, 55–57, 65, 75, 102, 250n90
 pogroms in, 143, 202
 Rwanda, 54
- Saarbrücken, 157
 Sade, Marquis de, 72–73, 160–161
 Said, Edward, 16, 82, 88
 Salem, 77
 Sameness, 1, 12, 17, 22, 26, 42, 136
 Same/Other binary, 1, 2–3, 20, 22, 31, 52, 135, 160
 colonialism and, 33
 See also Othering
 San Francisco Mime Troupe, 178, 262n72
 Santler, Eric, 135–136
 Sartre, Jean-Paul, 47–49, 112–113
 Savage, Jon, 194, 196, 198, 214–215
Schindler's List (film), 6–7, 100–101, 121, 124–125, 162, 236
 Scholem, Gershom, 92
 Schulberg, Pete, 225
 Schultz, Richard, 183
 Schuster, Joseph, 232
 Schwerner, Mickey, 175
 Seale, Bobbie, 183
 “second generation” Jews, 6–7, 100–102, 121–123, 124, 153–154, 238

- “second generation” Jews—*continued*
 American culture and, 168–169, 170,
 172–173, 176–177, 190
See also post-Holocaust generations
 security fence, Israeli, 4, 77–81, 85, 87,
 92, 95–96
 cost of, 80
 naming of, 81–83
 Seeger, Pete, 187
 Segev, Tom, 83, 87, 94–95
 segregation, 25, 29
 Seidler, Victor Jeleniewski, 142, 143–144
Seinfeld (television show), 101
 Seltzer, Mark, 133
 Sephardic Jews, 2, 9, 14–17, 22–24,
 32–38, 41
 Serbia, 102
The Seventh Day (Shapira), 90–91
 The Sex Pistols (band), 144, 152, 195–198,
 206, 215, 218–219
 Sexton, Anne, 206
 sexuality, 108, 158–163
 Shafir, Gershon, 27
 Shaked, Edith, 40
 Shalim, Avi, 86
 Shandler, Jeffrey, 100, 124–125, 236
 Shapiro, Helen, 203–204
 Sharon, Ariel, 77–79, 81, 85, 90, 91
 Sherman, Ari, 142
 Shlaim, Avi, 86, 88
shoah, 150–151
See also Holocaust, the
 Shoah Visual History Foundation,
 124–125
 Shohat, Ella, 16, 18
 Shulman, Marcia, 230
 De Sica, Vittorio, 158
 Sicily, 1, 86
 Siegel, Jerome, 232
 Silberstein, Laurence, 83
 Silliman, Jael, 11–12, 21
 Silverstone, Alicia, 267n34
 Simenon, Paul, 203, 217
 Simmel, Georg, 118
 Simmons, Gene, 196
 Simon, Paul, 190
 Sioux, Siouxsie, 199–200, 201, 212, 213
 Six Day War, 77, 80, 90–91, 100, 149–150,
 232
 Sklare, Marshall, 171
 slavery, 63, 65, 73, 114, 119, 121
 colonialism and, 68, 76
 master-slave relationship and, 32, 49, 51
 Nazis and, 71–72, 159
 in U.S., 136–137, 174, 176–177, 183,
 198, 227
 Slavs, 55–57, 114
 Smith, Joan, 161
 Smith, Robertson, 132
 Sobibor, 75
 socialism, 174–176
 social justice, 169, 171, 175, 188
 social memory, 144, 147
Sophie's Choice (Styron), 161
 South Africa, 26, 34
 Southern Christian Leadership
 Conference (SCLC), 165
 spaces of death, 65, 66, 73, 106, 115
 Spain, 17, 22
 expulsion of Jews from, 1–2, 9–10,
 11, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34–35, 37, 43,
 259n70
 Speer, Albert, 201
 Spencer, Herbert, 64
 Spielberg, Stephen, 100–101, 121, 124,
 162, 231, 236
 Spinoza, 45
 Springarn, Joel, 175
 Spungen, Nancy, 214
 Stalags, 162
 Stalin, Josef, 54, 234
 Steinem, Gloria, 166, 187
 Sting, 226
 Stoker, Bram, 224, 267n19
 Stow, Kenneth, 13, 25
 Strummer, Joe, 203, 211, 217, 265n46
 Student Nonviolent Coordinating
 Committee (SNCC), 165, 170, 175,
 180–181
 Students for a Democratic Society (SDS),
 165–166, 171, 177, 190
 Styron, William, 161
 suppression, 31
 Sutherland, Donald, 224, 233
 Swanson, Kristy, 224, 230
 Sylvain, Sylvian, 197
 Syria, 86
 T. Rex (band), 204–205
 Tal, Kali, 145

- Talmud, 17
 Taussig, Michael, 63–65, 103–107, 114
 Tax, Meredith, 187
 Tench, Watkin, 66
 Terdiman, Richard, 88
 territorial law, 13
 terror, 59–61, 63–66, 71–74, 107
 terrorism, 85
 testimony, 121, 122
 theater, 179
theorein, 16
 Theresienstadt, 120
 “third generation” Jews, 7, 122–123, 236–239
 American 60’s counterculture and, 167–169, 171–173, 176–177, 182, 184, 189–191
 See also post-Holocaust generations
 Thomas, David, 205
 Thorne, Dyanne, 159
 Todorov, Tzvetan, 9, 19–20
 Togo, 67–68
 Took, Steve Peregrine, 204
 Torok, Maria, 126
 torture, 58–59, 64, 73
 totalitarianism, 70–71, 149
 trade, 11–12, 14, 22, 41, 137
 Sephardic Jews and, 2, 15, 23–24, 32, 35–38, 41
 transgenerational haunting, 126–127, 145, 153, 157
 trauma, 8, 117–120, 127, 138–140, 152, 193–194
 concentration camps and, 131, 133, 208
 discourse of, 133
 founding, 4
 Holocaust and, 4, 120–121, 125–126, 131–132, 133, 136, 145–146, 154, 164, 196, 218–219, 237
 modernity and, 120, 128, 130, 133, 219
 postmemory and, 145, 153, 237
 violence and, 104, 130
 witnessing and, 120–121
 WWI and, 129–130, 137
 See also cultural trauma
 traumascapes, 145, 154
 traumatic realism, 110, 145
 traumatic repetition, 159
 Treblinka, 75, 120
 von Trotha, Lothar, 68, 74, 76
 Tunisia, 35, 36, 38–40, 86
 Tyrannosaurus Rex. *See* T. Rex (band)
tzedekah, 167, 169–170
 Uganda, 93
 United States, 72, 98, 123, 168, 232, 262n82
 anti-semitism in, 170–171, 184–185, 231, 235
 counterculture in, 165–167, 190–191
 demographics of, 228–230, 238–239
 immigration to, 34, 98–99, 109, 176
 Nazi Party in, 234
 punk in, 198
 slavery in, 136–137, 174, 176–177, 183, 198, 227
 socialism in, 174
 WWII and, 200–202
 United States Holocaust Museum, 110
 Usque, Samuel, 19, 41
 Vad Yashem, 150–151, 235
 vampirism, 224–225, 226–227, 234–235, 238, 267n8, 267n19
 Vaughan, Frankie, 204
 Velvet Underground, 208, 213
 Vicious, Sid, 144, 152, 196, 212, 213–217
 Vienna, 18
 Vietnam War, 131, 152
 antiwar movement and, 171, 180–181, 190
 violence, 1–2, 3, 8, 92, 98, 111–115
 colonial, 53–55, 63–66, 70, 89, 107
 concentration camps and, 73, 159–160
 modernity and, 58, 106–108, 115, 135–136, 159, 161–162
 non-European people and, 103–105, 107, 136
 Othering and, 58, 63–64, 67, 72, 74, 102
 premodern, 58–59
 sexuality and, 108, 161–163
 the State and, 13, 72
 terror and, 59–61, 63
 trauma and, 104, 130
 Visconti, Luchino, 203, 233
 Vogler, Thomas, 70
 Wallerstein, Immanuel, 22
 Wannsee Conference, 29, 40, 75

- Warburg, Otto, 27
 Weathermen, the, 165–166
 Weber, Max, 108
 Weiner, Lee, 183
 Weisberg, Wendy, 214
 Weisel, Elie, 101, 123–124, 127, 151, 236, 247n1
 Weiss, Joseph and Berta, 202
 Weisstein, Naomi, 187
 Weitz, Yosef, 27–28
 West Bank, 4, 77–78, 80–82, 85, 87, 95
 Western Europe, 9, 15, 34
 Western Wall, 95
 West Indies, 38
 Westwood, Vivienne, 211, 212
 Weyler, Valeriano, 71
 Whedon, Joss, 221–223, 225
White Light/White Heat (album), 208
 whiteness, 57, 173–174, 177–181, 184, 191
 Buffy the Vampire Slayer and, 225, 227, 232
 See also Jews
 white supremacy, 176
 Wilder, Gary, 47
 Windschuttle, Keith, 89
 Winstanley, Gerard, 179
 Wippermann, Wolfgang, 26
 Wolff, Karl, 201
 women's liberation, 186–187
The World at War (documentary), 200–202, 207
 World War I, 3, 69, 129–130, 133, 137, 147
 World War II, 123, 142, 150, 153, 200–202, 212
 World Zionist Organization, 27–28
 Xena, 222
 Yarrow, Peter, 188
 Yehoshua, A.G., 94
 Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim, 9, 19, 138
 Yiddish, 181
 Yiddishkeit, 15
 Yuppies, the, 165, 170–171, 180–182, 217
 Yishuv, 28
 Young, James, 100, 122, 155, 196, 206, 208, 214
 Young, Robert, 32, 48
 Yovel, Yirmiah, 45–46
 Yudelson, Larry, 188
 Zangwill, Israel, 89, 93
 Zech, Julius Graf, 68
 Zerubavel, Yael, 94
 Zionism, 15, 27, 82–83, 85–88, 92–96
 messianic, 90, 92–95
 Žižek, Slavoj, 82, 85, 94, 108–109, 159–160, 163