
INTRODUCTION

Holocaust Historiography, Anxiety and the Formulations of a Diasporic Jewishness

The premier demand upon all education is that Auschwitz not happen again. Its priority before any other requirement is such that I believe I need not and should not justify it.

—Theodore Adorno, *Can One Live after
Auschwitz? A Philosophical Reader*

To establish a set of norms that are beyond power or force is itself a powerful and forceful conceptual practice that sublimates, disguises and extends its own power play through recourse to tropes of normative universality . . . [T]he task is to interrogate what the theoretical move that establishes foundations *authorizes*, and what it precisely excludes or forecloses.

—Judith Butler, ‘Contingent Foundations:
Feminism and the Question
of “Postmodernism”’

When I was at school, a game occasionally played by my friends was to ask, ‘Are you a Jewish Australian or an Australian Jew?’ The idea was that whatever you put first was what you prioritized. I remember my brother pointing out once that, grammatically, it was whichever one put second that was the key idea around which they organised their identity. But the terms signified for all of us that what came first was most important; and that, from a young age, we were already contemplating which came first. The two terms (or ideas, or identities), it seemed, did not sit well together; it was a competition between the two. One came first. The other was deprioritized.

Many years later I read Judith Butler’s resonant words, where she writes, ‘[c]onsider that it may be a mistake to declare one’s affiliation by stating an order of priorities: I am X first and then Y. It may be that the ordering of such identifications

is precisely the problem produced by a discourse on multiculturalism which does not yet know how to relate the terms that it enumerates.¹

I never answered the question, as it didn't seem to make much sense to me to choose one to prioritize in that way. My brother made a seemingly semantic point to disagree with the premise of the question. Both of us refused to engage with the terms of Jewishness – or Australianness – that it offered. I was reminded of this when in Israel undertaking fieldwork for this project, and having dinner with some friends, all of whom had migrated to Israel: in the terms of the Zionist project, they had made *aliyah*, or 'ascended'. One woman commented that the 'long-lasting problem of the Diaspora Jew is choosing who to vote for in elections – does one vote based on domestic issues, or based on each party's attitudes to Israel?'² In her rendering, there is a split, irreconcilable, identity at work. This, she claimed, was part of her motivation for making *aliyah* – as though in Israel one could be Jewish without having any ties to a separate nation-state. As though nationalism was natural and inevitable. As though Israel and Jewishness were inseparable. And as though this split was a problem – that one could be a better Jew when one only had a sole allegiance. As though being Jewish outside Israel meant that one would always have one eye looking towards Israel.

What governs the original question, I now understand, is a network of ambivalences and anxieties. We were being asked – and we were asking each other – where we felt comfortable; where we felt at home; where we located our identities; where we belonged. Israel was probably in the question, perhaps unarticulated or conflated with the signifier 'Jewish', but some sort of presence nonetheless. The questioner, as well as the person providing the answers, was interrogating the level of anxiety over where we as Jews belong in a world made up of nation-states, and how we felt about our Jewishness and its possibilities for creating a space of syncretic belonging.

What though if the story were to be changed? Instead of Diaspora as a static, troublesome, divisive place, what if the Jewish diaspora were to be thought of as primarily a story of travel and movement, 'hither and thither', in the terms offered by Homi Bhabha.³ What if, as David Shneer and Caryn Aviv have suggested, we conceptualise the Jewish world *not* in terms of Homeland/Diaspora, but as everywhere that Jews live being places of diaspora.⁴ If Israel, for instance, was removed as the centre and we viewed Jewishness as having many places of origin and on-going presence; and the communities in Melbourne and New York, and, indeed, everywhere, as not being shaped by a condition of centre and periphery, but rather of (dis)placement. And, more than that, of 'in-betweenness' or liminality.⁵ As being about potentially moving homes, but still being able to be rooted somewhere, anywhere. As a relationship between various lands and, perhaps most importantly, interactions with different peoples and nations – as, indeed, a condition of being various. Would this lessen our anxieties about the order or affiliation of our identities? What would this do to the ways we narrate our histories?

In this book I locate this anxiety about how to live in the world, or about how to understand one's affiliations, within a body of historiography. I am interested in denaturalizing the historical narratives about the Holocaust that are being taught in a selection of Jewish schools in Melbourne, Australia and New York City, United States. By locating them within a wider body of historiographical production I explore the ideas of Holocaust history that are being formulated. In doing so I provide an understanding of the work that such narratives undertake: the work they do to create histories and identities. As I will show, the Holocaust as a profound moment of genocidal violence, horror and displacement for Europe's Jews has since served to structure many subsequent Jewish understandings of history.

Indeed, a governing concern of Holocaust pedagogy for one teacher in New York at the beginning of the twenty-first century is that 'we're dealing with how do these students live and work with this memory and what are they supposed to do about it.'⁶ Memories of the Holocaust, for this teacher as for others, are something one carries with them; they require work to be understood and incorporated; and they require the carrier to undertake some action. But the carrying of these memories also makes a difficult demand on the teacher: how to formulate memories – or histories – of the Holocaust such that the students are able to live, work and *do* something with them.

This book is thus formulated around a series of questions: What work are the histories of the Holocaust that are being taught in these Jewish schools in Melbourne and New York undertaking? What lessons are being taught? What identities are being negotiated and formulated? How are the deep, terrifying horrors of the Holocaust and their after-effects being managed? What is the Holocaust being made to mean in these Jewish schools? Histories of the Holocaust taught in these conditions are not mere dispassionate histories. For many, they are not lessons of a foreign land nor a foreign people. When teachers in these Jewish schools teach their students about the Holocaust they (feel they) are teaching something of themselves and their students. This, importantly, determines what is being taught.

As this book progresses we will come to understand that there is one thread which concerns all of the teachers in various ways. This is the problem, or the anxiety, that after the Holocaust the Jews' place in the world is precarious. Indeed, this is somewhat understandable: it is difficult to teach about a world that seemingly does not want you to be a part of it, while still trying to stake a claim to a position within it. And, moreover, these teachers live in Melbourne and New York and maintain strong Zionist feelings. As such, they are deeply ambivalent about how Jews can fit in within both Jewish and non-Jewish worlds, as well as the various intersections of these worlds. This ambivalence results in an overwhelming anxiety which permeates not just these teachings but also the Jewish communities in which they are more broadly situated.

In this book I argue that teachers in the schools under consideration are anxious about how Jews can fit into the Australian, U.S. and Jewish worlds in which

they live. Indeed, they are anxious about how to negotiate the ways in which these worlds interconnect and interact. This can be seen in a number of ways which I will explore in this book: for example, in the reports of the ongoing hostility of the non-Jewish world to Jews living in their midst; in the ways in which particular ideas of strength are articulated, ideas which primarily concretise around hyper-masculine forms of physical strength and the creation and existence of a Jewish nation-state; in the clear delineation of particular ways in which Jewish women are to be present in the histories, segmenting them off from men and thereby working to recuperate European incarnations of Jewish masculinities; in the adoption of settler colonial ways of remembering and forgetting; and in the use of modes of history and historiographies which strive to be coherent with those utilised by the dominant societies in which the teachers and students live. In this book these various histories will be read as products of a set of anxieties.

Holocaust education in this framework functions as both a symptom of and a way of working through these anxieties. It is a working-through of the fear that Jews do not fit, that they are not allowed to live securely in these particular non-Jewish, modern, Western worlds of Australia and the United States – that it is impossible to be acceptably ‘Jewish’ in these places, or, indeed, outside of Israel. Importantly, the reactions to and deployments of the incarnations of modernity which exist in Holocaust education in these schools are neither stable nor unitary. Rather, they are multifarious and changing – an unease or anxiety can be detected, but it is not constant. Zygmunt Bauman describes this as ambivalence, as ‘the possibility of assigning an object or an event to more than one category’, which brings with it an ‘acute discomfort we feel when we are unable to read the situation properly and to choose between alternative actions.’⁷ There exists an ambivalent relationship on the part of diasporic Jews to these societies – they are unsure of where Jews fit, and unsure of where and how they want Jews to fit in. In part, this is what makes them diasporic. This, as will be shown, these teachers convey over and over to their students. In this book then, the ways in which this anxiety works to create a particular body of Holocaust historiography will be explored.

Methodologies of the Text

This book is in large part an excursion in critique. In it I provide a close, deconstructive analysis of a series of texts – and locate these texts within broader collections of historical literature – in order to unravel and understand a body of historical narration. As follows this project, my intention here is not to describe an objective truth, or reading, of what teachers are teaching. My intention, rather, is to open a series of questions, to complicate the narratives, and not to provide definitive answers. I am interested in how the discourses that the teachers pursue are productive: what do they say? What do they produce, or help to constitute? Some

of the teachers, I should note, may not recognise themselves in my analysis of their teachings: this is perhaps an inevitable outcome of the methodologies I have used. In this text I also attempt to show the difficulties involved in constructing a narrative of the Holocaust which can be taught in history classes in schools: there are many impossibilities involved in such pedagogical pursuits.

The historical narration, or historiography, being explored in this book is predominantly based on curricula collected from, and a series of interviews with, teachers of the Holocaust in a selection of Jewish dayschools in Melbourne and New York in 2006. In this way, I am not presenting a longitudinal study of Holocaust education: this is more of a snapshot, or a glimpse at an archive captured at one year in time. Curricula were collected where available – four schools in Melbourne and three in New York supplied curricula. Interviews were conducted with teachers of the Holocaust in five schools in Melbourne and seven schools in New York.⁸ Some of these schools were co-educational, and some were all-girls schools. No all-boys schools participated in the study – teachers were either too busy to participate, did not return phone calls or emails, or explained that they do not teach about the Holocaust, as they teach only ‘modern Jewish history (nationhood to present)’.⁹ As such, the conclusions being presented are not intended as totalizing. This book does not present information about the general state of Holocaust education today, but rather moves through some questions and ideas that arose through interactions with these twelve schools, and the fifteen teachers at the schools, involved in the research. Some of these conclusions could apply to the teaching at other schools, others may not.

The schools in New York were overwhelmingly Orthodox-oriented.¹⁰ One non-Orthodox school participated in the study, and this was a non-denominational school.¹¹ To be an Orthodox school means that the school is associated with the Orthodox Jewish movement, which, in brief, entails a belief that the Torah was written by God and that it must therefore be strictly followed.¹² The schools in Melbourne included a Progressive school, two Modern Orthodox schools, one Orthodox school, and one secular school. The Progressive school is associated with the Progressive movement, which entails a particular idea of the modernization of Judaism, involving not only different understandings of the ways in which the Torah and Talmud should function, but also a belief that Judaism should be moulded to a degree with the secular societies in which it exists.¹³ The secular school in Melbourne and the non-denominational school in New York both predominantly focus on Jewishness as cultural and nationalistic, rather than religious. While Jewish religious festivals are observed to a degree, the emphasis is placed on history and culture rather than religion.

The schools which participated are overwhelmingly Ashkenazi in orientation. Apart from one New York school which is predominantly Sephardi, the students and families which make up the school bodies are predominantly of Eastern European heritage. One school in Melbourne is – according to an interviewee – largely

made up of families with Russian backgrounds, as is one of the schools in New York. Most of the schools in Melbourne are dominated by descendants of survivors of the Holocaust, although there are certainly also students from other national and ethnic backgrounds. In New York the schools all contain some students who are descendants of survivors of the Holocaust, however not to the same degree as in Melbourne. This is largely due to the different histories of the two cities, wherein the vast majority of Jews migrated to New York from Russia and other parts of Eastern Europe at the turn of the twentieth century, whereas Melbourne had its biggest influx of Eastern European Jews after the Holocaust.

How then, if New York and Melbourne have such different Jewish histories, can teachings of the Holocaust within their Jewish communities be compared? It is important to note that a comparison is not being made between the two communities in general. They are importantly different, not just in their histories but in their size: while New York holds the most Jews of any city in the world outside of Israel, Melbourne's Jewish population is considerably smaller.¹⁴ But a comparison of Holocaust education in the two cities is still viable for a number of reasons. Firstly, both communities are located within settler colonial states. Here it is useful to understand that a settler colonial state entails the creation of a nation-state based on the premise that the colonizers/settlers colonize with the purpose of themselves remaining on, and possessing, the land.¹⁵ Various forms of domination of Indigenous peoples are perpetrated as a result (as well as various forms of Indigenous resistance to this domination and attempted erasure). From the colonizer's perspective, this necessarily requires the formulation of a national identity which coalesces around the colonizer as the justifiable occupier of that land. As such, the formulation of histories which support the colonizer's place in the country is required. The specific ways in which this functions and how it impacts upon the pedagogies under consideration will be interrogated further in Chapter Four. For our purposes here, it is simply important to note that Holocaust education in both cities occurs within these settler colonial conditions.

Secondly, every teacher at every school who participated in this study expressed strong Zionist feelings and ideas as a basis for the school and their teachings, yet this Zionism is one which coexists with the maintenance of Jewish communities outside Israel. The specific formulations of Zionism which this creates will be explored in Chapter Three; again, however, it is important that at this point we consider the importance of ideas of Zionism to this Holocaust education as providing a fertile ground for meaningful comparison between teachings in Melbourne and New York. A structuring force of both of these incarnations of settler colonialism and Zionism are anxieties about the place of the protagonists in the world: this has an important impact upon the creation of group histories. As will be explored, for settler colonizers, as for Zionists living outside Israel, an anxiety about not fitting in persists. The presence of this anxiety, and the effects which it produces, makes comparison between Holocaust education in these Jewish schools in Melbourne

and New York useful and meaningful. It is important to note that these systems of settler colonialism and Zionism are, to an extent, structural forces. Alongside other dominant frameworks of Western societies – capitalism and the patriarchy, to name but two of the most significant – their structuring force has a profound impact upon the teachings which I am exploring in this book. Sitting next to this is a series of political and ideological decisions that the teachers make, informed by certain understandings of history.

And so while there are considerable differences between the two histories and the various communities within the two cities, there are aspects of their current incarnations which mitigate against these differences, particularly when considering the ways in which histories of the Holocaust are formulated, narrated and taught in these Jewish high-school classrooms. This book prioritizes these similarities. Thus in this book I will consider not just the explicit ways in which Zionism and settler colonialism impact upon the histories being taught, but also the ways in which teachings about Jewish women in the Holocaust and the very structures of these historiographical forms are inflected by these larger contexts. Moreover, the focus of this book is on education in Jewish schools – rather than in schools more generally – as they are sites for the exploration of some of the ideas and histories which circulate within these Jewish communities. The question being posed, therefore, is one of how Jews represent themselves and their own histories.

My use of ‘Jewish communities’ here is not intended to homogenize these communities, but rather to point to the diversity within and between different individual Jews and the communities which exist. For ease and simplicity of expression ‘Jewish communities’ will be referred to throughout this book, but this ought not to be taken as homogenizing these diverse peoples and ideas. As the examples will show, there are differences in pedagogical approaches.

By virtue of the narrow frame of this book – an examination of Holocaust education in Jewish schools – emphasis is being placed on the role of a predominantly Ashkenazi event in formulating Jewishnesses.¹⁶ Following the work of Ella Shohat and Ammiel Alcalay, we can understand that within Jewish historiography, the histories of European Jews maintain an institutionalized dominance over those of Jews from the Levant, Sephardi and Mizrahi Jews.¹⁷ As Alcalay explains:

[h]and in hand with European military, technological, financial, and political predominance has come the institutionalized transmission of European culture. The excising of references to the Levant, with its common and uncommon, Semitic and non-Semitic past . . . , from most if not all standardized versions of the European curriculum has made myths of European superiority and self-containment that much harder to dislodge.¹⁸

Highlighting stories of Europe’s Jews in this book is not intended to reproduce this excising and the attendant power structures; rather, by specifically focusing on areas of Holocaust storytelling – its gendered aspects and its anxieties, to name two – which

are rarely discussed, in a more general sense conversations which have previously been foreclosed will be opened. The intention therefore in focusing on the teaching of histories of the Holocaust is not to *overemphasize* their role. This book will problematize the ideas and histories of the Holocaust which are taught, and the identities which they in turn teach, in a manner which is hopefully attached to – and is certainly informed by – the project which seeks to dislodge hegemonic Ashkenazi histories and identities from their dominant positions within Jewish historiographies.¹⁹

There are some key terms around which this book is organized, and it is important therefore that we understand the meanings that they contain, and the different histories which they carry with them. Let us examine them in turn: education, anxiety, diaspora, nation-state and modernity and mimicry. Let us also remember, as we move through the critique of historiographies contained within this book, that it will appear at times that there are contradictions: that I critique the individualization of women's experiences, but also the collectivization of experiences; that I critique the use of particular languages, but also note that history has no existence independent of its representation. These, however, are not contradictions, but rather remind us that there is no truly adequate way to teach about the Holocaust. Every narrative, every system of representation, falls short in some way. The problems of representation, of containing history within a narrative or relying on a set of signifiers, forever remain. In this sense, as will become increasingly clear throughout this book, ambivalence can indeed be productive.

Education

While there are many avenues through which the anxieties under consideration are negotiated and incorporated into narrative, and many different spaces in which Holocaust historiographies are being created, a focus on Holocaust education provides a significant site through which to explore these matters. This is the case as education crystallises versions of what is thought in the present, producing them in order to ensure the ideas move into the future. By studying Holocaust education we can gain a sense of what communities prioritize in remembering the Holocaust, and the ways in which these memories and histories are produced by current political, social and cultural conditions.²⁰ This pedagogy is noteworthy as the teaching of the Holocaust in Jewish schools in Melbourne and New York functions primarily not just as a way of teaching students about what happened in the past, but rather, and perhaps most importantly, as a way of teaching them a collective, social history.²¹ In sharing this collective past, the students are constituted as part of a broader Jewish nation, who are all invested in this history.

The histories which are taught in these schools are fashioned through the remembering and forgetting which produces national stories, myths, collective memories and histories more generally. As Jonathan Boyarin articulates it, 'what we remember

to do, the way we remember things happening, is not only an academic exercise but integral to the persistence of hegemony and resistance.²² That is, the project of establishing which collective memories, which histories, will be privileged by the collective is not simply a question of what happened in the past – rather, it serves to dictate the future of that collective; to assist in the negotiation of hegemonic ideas, which rely on their being simultaneously asserted and challenged, in a dialectical relationship. The memories are thereby always changing, always being (re)made. In taking lessons from the past and privileging certain memories over others, while forgetting or distorting others, the collective's sense of what they are and can be is disciplined. Importantly though, I am not asserting that the creation of histories is always a conscious and coherent process. As was clear from interviews with the teachers, many of them do not make conscious decisions about every aspect of the histories, and there are many ways in which these histories are ambivalent or seemingly contradictory. What is perhaps more prevalent is an incorporation of ideas which circulate.²³ Not every step in the chain of the construction of the history is conscious, but each step serves to confirm the dominant position of a series of particular histories. At each step the histories are built upon, altered and their authority reinforced. In noting that some decisions are not made consciously, I do not wish to downplay their seriousness: instead, I am making an argument for the importance of consideration of the role of the unconscious, and for attention to be paid to the force of the normative, in the construction of historiography.

It is this idea of the creation of specific memories by the powerful within the collective, embodied in specific *lieux de mémoire*, for the purpose of creating a collective history and thus identity, which will guide this book through an examination of the protracted effects of anxious Jewishness(es) on Holocaust education. This education thus can be understood as a series of *lieux de mémoire*: as Pierre Nora explains, *lieux de mémoire* are the sites, monuments and memorials which a nation creates in order to remember the past.²⁴ By forming memorials – whether made of concrete or written on paper – memories are solidified and frozen in time. National histories, whether of a nation bounded by a state or a transnational group such as the Jews, are produced relying on these collective memories.²⁵

History education is a particularly fruitful site for the discussion of group memories and histories because of its political motivations: history education involves the formulation of narratives in the present with the intent of instructing the future.²⁶ What we teach the children of a particular collective will inevitably influence the memories they grow up with. Anna Clark argues that 'history syllabuses and textbooks, with their capacity to define the nation's past, are central to the development of national narratives.'²⁷ The centrality of history education for the instruction of definitive group identities was similarly highlighted by Joyce Dalsheim. In writing about the teaching in Israel of the continuing conflict between Palestinians and Israelis, Dalsheim describes the pervasive imagining of objectivity in history-teaching:

[s]tudents and parents also seem to take for granted that ‘history’ is being taught, in which history comes to stand for an accurate portrayal of the past, rather than an imagined historiography which (consciously) employs certain key terms, chooses to include and exclude particular time periods within the narrative form creating continuity and unity out of fragmentation and difference.²⁸

History education, in this formulation, is imagined as not portraying what happened, but *is* what happened, in an objective, thoroughly accurate sense. The potency of this form is contained within this idea: if the history education describes the past as it really was, then its power to determine the identity of the community whose history it is, is enhanced. This conception of history will be returned to in Chapter Two.

These ideas about collective memory were first offered by Maurice Halbwachs, and have since been built upon by many others.²⁹ As has been explained, this book is based on a series of interviews with individual teachers, as well as explorations of their curricula. This then raises a question – if the work of individuals is being examined, how does that work to constitute group identities? The teachers rely upon each other, rather than, for instance, Yad Vashem or the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for their information, and so it becomes important to ask: how are these curricula created in the ways in which Clark and Dalsheim suggest?³⁰ It is here that the work of Halbwachs becomes important. As Jonathan Crewe frames it, Halbwachs asserted that ‘individual memory [is] a function of social memory, not an isolated repository of personal experience.’³¹ The memories which individuals maintain are not produced by themselves in isolation from others but rather result from their place in social, cultural and political worlds – they are products of specific times and spaces. It is this question of the production of those collective memories which this book shall examine.

Historiographical practices are also important in the structuring and inscribing of group histories. As will be explored in Chapter Two, how a narrative proceeds, which events are described and whose voices are heard all fundamentally impact upon how the contents of the histories will be understood. Dalsheim argues that ‘these frameworks . . . giv[e] meaning and power through moral authority to the narratives.’³² The historical education gains its authority through the morality of the tales which are told, coupled with its foundations in and reproductions of collective memories. We can thus appreciate the centrality of historical educational narratives in formulating Jewish group identities.

Holocaust

It is important to gain a sense of what is being symbolized in the word ‘Holocaust’. To what does the Holocaust refer, and why do I use that word here, instead of

others such as Shoah or Churban? At its most general sense, the Holocaust refers in the Jewish imagination and historiography to the Nazi-directed programme of destruction of Jewish communities in Europe in the 1930s and 1940s.³³ But the meaning contained in this term is constantly evolving.³⁴ Giorgio Agamben notes that ‘Holocaust’ is a translation from Latin (*holocaustum*), which in turn is a translation from Greek (*holocaustos*, which is, however, an adjective . . . the corresponding Greek noun is *holocaustōma*), and originated in the idea of a completely burnt offering to a god.³⁵ Shoah, the Hebrew term, Agamben explains ‘means “devastation, catastrophe” and, in the Bible, often implies the idea of a divine punishment.’³⁶ How then to choose between these two imperfect terms, Holocaust and Shoah?³⁷ While teachers at times use both Shoah and Holocaust, I made a decision for this book to use the most widely recognised terminology, and that, in Melbourne and New York at least, at this point in time is Holocaust. Using this term also opens up the possibility that the destruction being discussed could involve non-Jewish victims; to use a Hebrew term seems to inevitably refer only to Jews.

What then does ‘Holocaust’ signify? No term is forever stable or always already established. Zev Garber argues that ‘Holocaust’s’ deeply religious basis as signifying a sacrifice to God – which, he argues, creates a holy relationship between Jews, Nazis and God, with the Nazis as sacred beneficiaries – means that it cannot be divorced from these connotations.³⁸ While ‘Holocaust’ might carry the connotations which Garber suggests, is it true to argue that it cannot be separated from them? Particularly as, as Garber states, most people – both Jewish and non-Jewish – have no knowledge of these sacrificial connotations. If usage of a term can change its meaning, to what extent does it necessarily retain its original meanings? Most discussions of Holocaust, or Shoah, point to an understanding of an event which, while there may be some differences, is generally understood to have not been a sacred sacrifice. Sander Gilman argues that:

any understanding of the Shoah must acknowledge that its meaning and function has changed over the fifty years since it occurred. The murder of the Jews moved from being one aspect of the crimes of the Nazis to being their central, defining aspect over half a century. Over the past decade or so, it has evolved from a specific, historical moment to the metaphor for horror itself.³⁹

This is but one of many ways in which Holocaust discourses have shifted over time. Yet how can the historicity of the event be captured in a single word, or a chain of words? Surely any naming is always inadequate to the task. While the term ‘Holocaust’ is being utilised in this book as a descriptor of a set of events, this term does not and cannot contain everything to which it refers, nor can it hold these meanings in a stable manner. What this Holocaust means in the historiographies being negotiated and created in some Jewish schools in Melbourne and New York today will be explored throughout this book.

Anxiety

In his book *Coming Out Jewish*, in a chapter entitled ‘Ghetto Thinking and Everyday Life’, Jon Stratton writes that ‘Fear is an important component in the lives of those of us who come from Ashkenazi and in particular Yiddish, backgrounds.’ Some of this feeling, he argues, is not particular to Jews, but is present in many other migrant and minority groups. Moreover, he writes:

What I will argue is that over many centuries the Jews of Europe evolved a way of being in the world which was premised on an assumption that the world in which they lived their everyday lives was fundamentally antagonistic to them. Fear was an adaptive defence mechanism which kept the Jews on their guard, ever watchful, ever protective of their own. The Holocaust did not produce this attitude to the world. Rather, for Jews, it was mediated through this prior existing lens.⁴⁰

While Stratton writes of fear, I am interested in this book in approaching this particular relationship to Jewish histories, presents and futures, through the frame of anxiety.

Many teachers spend a great deal of time discussing the problems they perceive Jews face in the West today, in Melbourne and New York specifically, but in Western countries more generally too. Through this we can detect an anxiety in the manner suggested by Sigmund Freud, who wrote that ‘anxiety . . . is in the first place something felt.’⁴¹ This feeling has an ‘unpleasurable character’: as ‘anxiety arose as a response to a situation of *danger*; it will be regularly reproduced thenceforward whenever such a situation recurs.’⁴² This situation was, originally, birth, or a ‘biological helplessness’; this is played out in later life as a ‘psychic helplessness.’⁴³ That is, in this formulation which will be deployed throughout this book, anxiety results from a feeling of helplessness, or a lack of sureness about one’s place in relation to the object which they desire.⁴⁴ In the particular circumstances and histories under consideration here, that object is most predominantly a safe, known and ‘homely’ place in the world.⁴⁵

The anxieties over these problems find expression in numerous ways. Firstly, these teachers are anxious about the place of Jews in non-Jewish societies: we can detect an anxiety that Jews are not really welcome in these spaces. Indeed, it is taught that just as Jewish life thrived in Europe before the Holocaust and was then ruined, so too today’s thriving Jewish worlds could be threatened and destroyed. Charles S. Maier, in his essay ‘A Surfeit of Memory’, refers to this when he speaks of Holocaust museums which are built, he argues, for Jews to teach others that they have ‘suffered incredibly and want recognition of the fact.’⁴⁶ If we follow the implications of Maier’s argument, we could argue that teachers teach about the Holocaust in order to remind their students that Jews have suffered at the hands of Western nation-states. This functions as a caution about being Jewish in the

West, as well as, at particular times, a caution about the West and whether or not its national systems can be trusted and embraced. The anxiety persists – will they accept us? Will we be allowed to remain civil subjects?⁴⁷ There is, as Ghassan Hage has suggested, therefore an investment in the state of the nation; in this case, both the Jewish nation and the Australian and U.S. nations.⁴⁸

Conversely, it has been argued that the history of Jewish interactions with modernity can be understood as having reached a point, in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, where Jews are in fact comfortable within the (late) modern, non-Jewish national locations in which they find themselves.⁴⁹ In this scenario, the anxiety becomes one of a *lack* of difference: how can Jews assert their difference when they are, fundamentally, the same?⁵⁰ As David Biale argues in the U.S. context, Jews are no longer a completely marginal group: through ‘economic success and social integration’ Jews have been made white, in distinction to the still marginalized black peoples.⁵¹ There is, according to this idea of Jewish acceptability, the belief that Jews in these states heighten their histories of antisemitism and discrimination in order to formulate an identity which is based on discrimination and marginalization. In the face of a situation with no discrimination and no difference, these anxious Jews focus on histories of the Holocaust and its accompanying radical difference. This argument was proposed by Kerwin Lee Klein, who asserts that memory discourses arose together with identity politics: that, within Jewish history, Holocaust memory is being seized upon in order to return to older ways of narrating Jewish experience.⁵² In the face of experiencing a space where no difference exists between Jews and others, the working-through of traumatic pasts which memory provides is considered a resource.⁵³ Memory-work in this formulation can therefore provide the ground for the narration of difference, a difference which, Klein suggests, is no longer present in the societies of the U.S. and Europe within which these memories are proposed. Indeed, this is also an argument which Maier proposes. These heightenings of a dangerous difference, as the argument goes, function to negotiate an anxiety that there is no difference.

As will become apparent as this book proceeds, the converse is being proposed as motivating the historical- and memory-work being undertaken by the teachers of the Holocaust under consideration. While it may appear that this anxiety of which Klein – amongst others – writes exists amongst Jews in the U.S., it was not evident in the discourses of Holocaust history being explored in the Jewish schools under consideration here. The anxiety persists that there is a difference, and, as Chapter One will demonstrate, this difference is a result not just of Jewish particularity but, just as fundamentally, of the specific ways in which these Australian and U.S. societies are formulated along lines of racialised difference. This, however, is not to suggest that there are not times when Jews are comfortable in Melbourne or New York, nor that the anxieties over antisemitism and the recurrence of the Holocaust are not, at times, excessive. The moments at which we can see this other

anxiety, the anxiety about a lack of difference, coming through will therefore be pointed to as the book proceeds.

But if we return to the anxiety which this book is arguing is manifested and worked through in the curricula – the anxiety that these Jews do not belong in the Jewish and non-Jewish national spaces within which they desire to be – we can understand that embedded within this anxiety is the question of structures of power. Do Jews have any formal power, or are they disempowered, permanently trapped on the margins? As will be explored in greater detail throughout this book, there are numerous ways in which discourses and feelings of empowerment are actualised in Holocaust pedagogy. The importance of this interplay between power and powerlessness was explained by David Biale when he wrote that ‘[t]he very rapidity with which the Jews have moved from powerlessness to power has produced a crisis of Jewish ideology. . . . In both Israel and the Diaspora, a new political language is only beginning to emerge, a language for understanding both the possibilities and the limitations of Jewish political power in the modern world.’⁵⁴ This juxtaposition of power and powerlessness is part of the anxiety: in a short span of time European Jews have moved from the powerlessness of the Holocaust to being relatively empowered, whether in the U.S., Australia or Israel. Yet the story of the Holocaust is necessarily predominantly one of Jewish powerlessness (with important moments of resistance). How then to write this history of powerlessness, particularly within a Zionist framework which creates stories of specific moments of survival and endurance, coupled with instances of absolute degradation? It seems inevitable that this would create some sort of ambivalent response to the world, some anxiety about the possibilities available for Jews. This ‘crisis of Jewish ideology’ and the ‘new political language’ which necessarily must be formed are thus under exploration in this book.

We can also note that the ways in which this anxiety is manifested are gendered. By examining the anxieties through a gendered lens we can better understand the aspects of the anxieties which are produced by the governing structures of Jewish Zionist thought. As Claire Kahane has argued, representation – language, or discourse – is fundamentally gendered, and that gendering occurs through the very act of symbolization and representation.⁵⁵ That is, as Judith Butler and Elisabeth Cowie have variously explained, language is created through the same processes that create gendered systems of knowledge. Neither exists prior to the other; they are formed together.⁵⁶ Kahane is interested in exploring the question of, if representations are inherently gendered, how are Holocaust representations gendered?⁵⁷ In this book I will argue in response that, in light of the interviews with teachers of the Holocaust in Jewish schools and an examination of their curricula, these are gendered representations which are shaped by anxiety. It is an anxiety regarding the ways in which Jews, and Jewishnesses, are gendered in the aftermath of the Holocaust.

As will be explored in greater depth in Chapter Three, the gendered representations of this anxiety follow from Zionist ideas of what characterises the ‘Diaspora Jew’. I use capitals here and throughout the text to denote the particularity of this figure: it is the idea of Diaspora contained in the Zionist imaginary, not that of the diasporic (which will be designated throughout by the use of a lower-case ‘d’). I outline this further in the next section of this Introduction.⁵⁸ These teachers are worried that Jews will become like the supposed pre-Israel diasporic Jews: that they will become victims, powerless, dependent, lacking. In a word, that they will become feminized.⁵⁹ As Melanie Kaye/Kantrowitz articulates it, ‘from a Zionist perspective diaspora signifies a frail gaping female absence where oppression and assimilation lurk, along with an attenuated identity which owes . . . Israel.’⁶⁰ These teachers feel that they must be masculine, as the feminine has, in this modern Jewish thinking, which follows much modern Western thinking, been characterised as negative. These teachers are referencing a particular masculinist conception of strength: an idea of strength as predominantly informed by militarism. And so they borrow this image of masculinity from Israel, which in turn has been borrowed, in mimicry, from the West. This is not to suggest that these Jews see themselves as possessing this type of strength, but rather that Israel, in this imagining, vouches for the strength of all the Jews. Hence, teachers standing in these spaces outside Israel are, it seems, staking their lives on the existence of Israel’s masculine virility. In this imagining, the Holocaust was a slip, a moment when both Western civilization and Jews failed to be what and who they are meant to be. The current Israeli masculine strength, coupled with a belief in the re-established modern order, will ensure that this is not repeated.

This idea entails the understanding that it may be enough for Diaspora Jews to support Zionism, or to profess a Zionist ideology and politics, for them to have their strength redeemed.⁶¹ But, in this claiming support for Zionism (or assuming the identity of the Zionist) there is a slippage. For the Diaspora Zionist is a mimic – they mimic the ideology which Israeli Zionism mimics from modernity. As such, the Diaspora Jew’s masculinity is the *almost the same but not quite* of which Homi Bhabha speaks, which in turn works to produce the anxiety that this masculinity is not masculine enough – that they are *not quite* masculine.⁶² I will return to Bhabha’s important ideas of mimicry below.

Zionist thought today about where Jews can and should feel at home centres on Israel – that Jews can only be themselves and at home when in Israel.⁶³ Zionist narratives foreground ideas of centre and periphery, where the centre (Israel) is the strong, powerful (masculine) home, and the periphery (Diaspora) is the inferior, weak (feminine) site of displacement. Jon Stratton, writing about Jewishness in the West, explains that ‘[t]he core-periphery model is central to [Western] modernity.’⁶⁴ This notion of centre and periphery, which structures Western narratives and Zionist narratives of history, also permeates these examples of

Holocaust education, as will be shown. Yet there is a twist. These narratives of the Holocaust focus on the past in Europe, the present in the U.S. or Australia, and the imagined future in Israel. And so where then is the centre? Which country? It can be understood that, discursively, it is the U.S./Australia, which is where these Jews are today living, looking backwards and forwards to Europe and Israel. This then is another source of anxiety. Israel is meant to be the centre, yet these teachers are implicitly proposing that they and their students can be, and are, comfortable in the U.S./Australia. We can therefore understand that these teachers are thus made anxious about their own strength or masculinity, for this Western modernity stresses that the way to be a safe and secure people is to be strong (in the sense of a hyper-masculine virility), and that this can only be achieved by maintaining a nation-state as a site of self-determination, and thus as the national centre.⁶⁵

Finally, it is crucial for me to state that I frame this book in terms of anxiety, and the creation of anxious histories, not as a way to denigrate these feelings and their effects. Instead, I hope that this book can contribute to historians – and Jews – taking these feelings and their negotiation more seriously, as we work together to understand the ways that the Holocaust continues to cast its shadows. Anxiety, as will become clear, can be incredibly productive. And given the historical circumstances – that of teaching about this moment of destruction, while remaining in the West – it is not surprising to me that it takes such a dominant place. Indeed, if the histories narrated in these conditions were calm, rational and disengaged, then we would certainly have something to worry about.

Diaspora

The teachers in this study are, it will become clear, unsure of what it means for Jews to live outside Israel, in the space commonly referred to as the Diaspora. Diasporas in this way are often written about as being a relationship – ambivalent, stressful, joyful, continuing – between people and their homeland. They are part of a thinking of a type of world that has homelands, centres and peripheries.⁶⁶ I would like to suggest, following James Clifford (amongst others), that instead of seeing people in Diaspora as connected through their mutual relationship to a central location, diaspora could be about creating worldwide communities of ‘displacement’.⁶⁷ This would entail a re-evaluation of those things which have typically been understood to encompass diaspora – the presence of a central homeland from which a people has been displaced, are now in a state of exile, and maintain and exhibit longings for that homeland.⁶⁸ The presence of a site of displacement, and a lack of complete homeliness in the newfound location need not be eradicated in this model. Rather, it is the *site* of displacement that is removed from the centre of the model, and stories of movement reinscribed as central.⁶⁹

For this reason, I use *Diaspora* to signify the ‘*Diaspora*’ contained in the *Diaspora/Homeland* binary (or the *centre/periphery* binary), and *diaspora* to signify a notion of a diaspora that does not coalesce around such binaries, but instead attains coherence through ideas of commonality expressed through history, memory and culture, as well as through movement, travel, displacement, and an embracement of multiple allegiances. By avoiding capitalization, I aim to point towards the lack of definity, or sureness, in its naming: it is not one thing, nor is its meaning easily captured and contained. This diaspora is a floating idea, not a proper noun.

As such, the idea of diaspora offered by Australian academic and ‘neither Jew nor non-Jew’, John Docker, becomes relevant and useful as a starting place. *Diaspora*, for Docker, entails movement, knowledge and history, as well as expanding and ever-evolving identities. Docker writes that diaspora provides:

a sense of belonging to more than one history, to more than one time and place, more than one past and future. *Diaspora* suggests belonging to both here and there, now and then. *Diaspora* suggests the omnipresent weight of pain of displacement from a land or society, of being an outsider in a new one. *Diaspora* suggests both lack and excess of loss and separation, yet also the possibility of new adventures of identity and the continued imagining of unconquerable countries of the mind.⁷⁰

This was reiterated and expanded on by the photographer Jason Francisco, who writes of the bringing of memories of old homelands to new places. He claims that ‘[i]t appears that the self-retracting trail of Jewish migrations confirms . . . a distinctive feature of the Jewish diaspora . . . : rediasporization, the centuries-old phenomenon of (imaginary) Jewish homelands having been transferred and palimpsested upon one another, “such that Cairo becomes a remembered Cordoba and the new Jerusalem a remembered Vilna”.’⁷¹ This idea of locations being moved to and inhabited, then discarded – whether by choice or by force – and remembered, is useful.

Indeed, perhaps this is a model of Jewishness which is reinforced through Holocaust education – a model of places of inhabitation remembered and held onto, yet an identity which is reinscribed with the current places of living. A model of being located in both Melbourne/New York and Europe and Israel. For the histories of the Holocaust which are being written might be based in Zionist thought but, as will be shown in Chapter Three, they are inflected by a particularly diasporic Zionism. This is a Zionism which rests on anxiety, a Zionism which is expressed through language, history and various deeds. But not through the making of Israel a physical home. These diasporic Holocaust histories are also inflected by the histories of the U.S. and Australian nations in which they are being written. Indeed, it is perhaps their specific anxieties which renders them diasporic.

This brings us to consider the character of the diasporic Jewish people who are writing these histories of the Holocaust. For Jonathan and Daniel Boyarin, group

identity – and, more specifically, Jewish identity – reaches its greatest potential when it is diasporic, or non-hegemonic. For them, ‘cultures, as well as identities, are constantly being remade. While this is true of all cultures’ they assert, ‘diasporic Jewish culture lays it bare because of the impossibility of a natural association between this people and a particular land – thus the impossibility of seeing Jewish culture as a self-enclosed, bounded phenomenon.’⁷² In the Boyarins’ formulation of Jewishness, identity rests on ‘family, history, memory, and practice’ – on genealogy and practice, rather than ‘autochthony or indigenouness.’⁷³ As they assert, ‘we not only do these things because we are this thing, but we are this thing because we do these things.’⁷⁴ In this book it is the making and passing on of histories of the Holocaust which is ‘this thing’. Histories in the Jewish diaspora thus become of fundamental importance as a means of ensuring group cohesion, a useful way of tracking the changing ideas of the group, as will become clear throughout the text. As was discussed previously with reference to history education more generally, the purpose of teaching a group about its past is to formulate that group’s identity: a group in this sense is both the individual students who are being interpellated and the broader group identity of which the individuals are a part. In the diaspora this becomes all the more important for, as the Boyarins suggest, identity is based not on connection to land, but on a connection to the past and to present group practices. These histories of the Holocaust therefore are made all the more diasporic.

This interplay between history writing and diasporic thinking is explored by Bryan Cheyette in his recent book *Diasporas of the Mind*. Cheyette writes that:

At one end of the spectrum, diaspora is on the side of impurity and hybridity (and points in the direction of emergent or lost cultures) and, at the other end, diaspora is conservative and “roots-defined” and has as its end point a return to an autochthonous (pure) space. The celebratory version of diaspora tends to foreground a transgressive imagination and precolonial histories of intertwined cultures (and is associated with Postcolonial and Diaspora Studies), whereas a victim-centred version tends to stress particular communities of exile with specific and unique histories of suffering (and is associated with Holocaust and Genocide Studies).⁷⁵

Cheyette argues in response for an embrace of a kind of thinking – which he terms ‘metaphorical thinking’, as distinct from ‘disciplinary thinking’ – which would be able ‘to make connections across histories and communities.’⁷⁶ While Cheyette makes the argument here for a distinction between how the formulation of the diaspora has been understood within these different academic fields, the work of this book is, in part, to evade these distinctions and bring postcolonial studies and Holocaust studies together. Similarly, Michael Rothberg’s book *Multidirectional Memory* brings these different fields into conversation, thereby enhancing both. Thus a similar mode of understanding of the diaspora, critical thinking and the

Holocaust seems to me to inform Cheyette's, Rothberg's, as well as my own, work. All three present the possibilities that are opened up when diasporic thinking informs how we conceptualise the histories and memories of the Holocaust, or when seemingly different memories and histories are placed alongside each other, helping us to recognise that we do not make memories in isolation, or in sealed-off communities.⁷⁷

Moreover, Jewish peoples in New York and Melbourne formulate identities not solely in response to a Zionism which describes them as lacking, or to the narratives of out-of-placeness and insecurity which are created through Holocaust education. As Paul Gilroy makes clear with reference to the African diaspora, it is necessary to consider 'how blacks [in Britain] define and represent themselves in a complex combination of resistances and negotiations, which does far more than provide a direct answer to the brutal forms in which racial subordination is imposed'.⁷⁸ In both New York and Melbourne there are many different Jewish communities and peoples formulating and negotiating living in diasporas, creating and representing Jewishness in diverse, multivalent ways. We can see this through music, writing and academia. While a fuller exploration of this does not fall within the boundaries of this book, it is important for us to remember.

Yet, a problem might still remain. Regardless of the model of diaspora deployed to understand these histories and contexts, by writing about a single Jewish diaspora, or diasporas, one risks homogenizing the diverse peoples within that group. Indeed, the very notion that there is such a group has the potential to efface difference. Ella Shohat points to this problem in her discussions of the relationship between Zionism and Sephardim and Mizrahim, asserting that the Zionist narrative of a return to a homeland 'disauthorizes' any positive attachment to a previous place of inhabitation.⁷⁹ It erases the fact that Jews in other countries – specifically, in her telling, 'the Arab Muslim world' – may have had stronger relationships and affiliations with the people with whom they once lived, rather than with other Jews. Shohat asserts that these histories are disavowed because they 'threatened the conception of a homogenous nation akin to those on which European nationalist movements were based'.⁸⁰ Moreover, in the Zionist telling, '[a]ll Jews are defined as closer to each other than to the cultures of which they have been a part'.⁸¹ That is, these other(ed) histories threaten the narrative of national cohesion that Zionist writers and thinkers work so hard to create and perpetuate. The homogenizing work which these histories do will be considered in more detail in Chapters Three and Four.

The Nation-State and Modernity

Throughout this book, ideas of Western modernity will be invoked. There are many definitions and understandings of modernity which proliferate so it becomes

important to ask, to what do these ideas refer, within the context of this book? Firstly, it is important to see the term 'Western modernity' as referring to a system of organizing of the world, and of knowledge produced about that world. It is a representational system with material effects. Dipesh Chakrabarty explains that 'following the tenets of the European Enlightenment, many Western intellectuals thought of modernity as the rule of institutions that delivered us from the thrall of all that was unreasonable and irrational'.⁸² We can see here the expression of ideology through institutions. Similarly, Partha Chatterjee explains that the French Revolution has come to symbolize the classic moment of European enlightenment and modernity because of its mythic uniting 'of the identity of the people with the nation and, in turn, the identity of the nation with the state. There is no question that the legitimacy of the modern state is now clearly and firmly grounded in a concept of popular sovereignty'.⁸³ He is pointing here to a material result of this modernist ideology, which foregrounds national cohesion embodied in the joining together of nation and state. This symbolic aspect is central to our understandings of Western modernity.

Secondly, the teachers whose words and work are being examined in this book have a broad understanding of a world which they negotiate. While they may rarely speak explicitly of the West or of modernity, an overarching sense of these concepts and materialities inflects their ideas. The teachers articulate a vision of a world in which they want to be a part. It is, more often than not, a world based on a set of ideas of Western modernity – predominantly the conception of the importance of the nation-state and its associated structures in containing group identities – even if it is not explicated explicitly as such.⁸⁴ It is not being suggested here, or within the teachings, that Western modernity is any one thing. But we can appreciate some overarching concerns which press upon the teachings, as will be outlined next.

Where, as stated above, Chakrabarty and Chatterjee write of symbolic conceptions of modernity, it is also useful for us to consider the historical ways in which modernity has been formulated, particularly with regard to Jewish interactions with a modernizing West. Indeed, the process of Jews negotiating their place within the Western societies in which they live has a long and involved history. Jews living in European countries have sought a place within the changing social structures and processes of a modernizing Europe, and indeed have been fundamental to the development of this modernity.⁸⁵ For Jacob Katz, one of the first historians to theorize the Jewish relationship with a modernity which came both from outside and within the Jewish people, the negotiation involved a movement 'from their former distinct Jewish pattern toward the standard common in their non-Jewish surroundings'.⁸⁶ Katz describes this as a movement 'out of the ghetto', where Jewish distinctiveness was lost as part of this move which was demanded of the Jews in order to gain acceptance within non-Jewish European systems and institutions of modernity, in particular European nation-states.⁸⁷ As Jonathan

Frankel explicates it, 'it is above all, perhaps, in his [*sic*] analysis of two major themes in the development of the Jewish people during the nineteenth century . . . – enlightenment and emancipation – that the historian first finds himself [*sic*] confronted by the clash between tradition and modernity.'⁸⁸ It was the processes of European enlightenment and emancipation that brought forward the assimilatory movements of Jewishness, whose echoes are seen in the Holocaust pedagogy under consideration in this book.

Yet, as Michael Meyer explains, there are two processes of Jewish modernization: the first is 'a process whereby Jews increasingly participate in the modernization of the societies in which they dwell . . . In other words, modernization becomes a concomitant or effect of integration.'⁸⁹ The second is a more inwardly-focused, specifically Jewish process of modernization wherein it is not just Jews as individuals who are modernizing, but Jewish practices and institutions which are changing shape and modernizing.⁹⁰ It seems, however, that whether it is individuals or institutions that are changing, the process is fundamentally similar: the motivating force is one of alteration in accord with the changing modernizing non-Jewish society.

There have been various challenges to these models of Jewish interactions with modernity, and formulations of Jewish modernity. One comes from Paula E. Hyman, who has illuminated the gendered implications of these processes. Men and women, Hyman argues, experienced the beginnings of Jewish modernity differently because of their varying relationships to the public and private spheres.⁹¹ Moreover, as she stresses, gender relations are relationships of power which are played out within Jewish communities as well as in relation to the non-Jewish European communities in which Jews have lived.⁹² These gendered relationships, as was shown in the discussion of Zionism previously, have had a significant impact upon the ways in which Jews have identified and negotiated their relationships with modernity. Arnold M. Eisen provides a second challenge, wherein he accepts the basic premise of the contestations provided by the Emancipation and Enlightenment movements of the nineteenth century, but critiques the ideas of modernity which historians of Jewish modernity have relied upon. Eisen argues that Emancipation was, and is, the most significant aspect of modernity for the key question it poses: 'whether Jews of varying commitments . . . can create plausible structures of sufficient flexibility and strength to develop and hold their various allegiances to Jewish traditions.'⁹³ These structures have involved both the secular and the sacred, although, as Eisen suggests, these categories cannot be simplistically divided into modernity and Judaism, respectively. Rather, 'Judaism in the modern period should not be viewed as a set of beliefs concerning revelation, choeness and God, but as a set of actions and beliefs, such actions in the nature of the modern case being defined primarily as ritual but including communal, political and professional activities.'⁹⁴ In short, Jewish interactions with broader systems of modernity have not simply been a one-way force, with Judaism and Jewishness

irrevocably changed. Instead, this modernity and Judaism have impacted upon each other, changing the ways in which both modernity and Jewishness are, and can be, thought about.

There are numerous specific examples of Jewish traditions and practices being shaped around the practices which existed in the broader non-Jewish communities, in order to aid in 'establishing [a] claim to Western norms of civilization.'⁹⁵ One important one is the *Wissenschaft des Judentums* movement, which, as Michael Meyer and Yosef Yerushalmi explain, sought to express Jewish history within the dominant scientific method that pervaded Western modernist historical practices in the nineteenth century.⁹⁶ In these various examples, which only account for a minute sample of the full range of aspects of Jewish practices which were affected by similar processes, we can appreciate that an important aspect, historically and contemporarily, of Jewish modernity and relations with non-Jewish modernity is the changing shape of Jewishness. Obviously, the two systems of modernity – Jewish and non-Jewish – are not discrete, as various incarnations of modernity have impacted upon each other to create the diverse range of systems which continue to shift and evolve. But the changes which we can identify have occurred in order to negotiate a place for Jews within these broader societies and systems of knowledge.

How then do these various processes of modernization impact upon the histories of the Holocaust and the ways in which we can interrogate them? Primarily it is through a consideration of the importance of the commingling of nation and state which has become so fundamental to Western ideas of modernity and has been adopted within Jewishness, coupled with the histories of Jewish negotiations with/in that model. As Jon Stratton makes clear, the '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.'⁹⁷ That is, some important forms of difference are produced through the organization of modern nation-states. These modern differences – many different forms of which will be discussed throughout this book – are always created together in conversation. Belonging can only be constituted through the simultaneous formulation of not-belonging.

Moreover, the modern nation-state is figured, according to Ghassan Hage, within conceptions of home. Control of the nation-state is the ultimate prize, and the fulfilment of national desires, for the modern nation. The nation-state is seen by those with power in the state – writing in an Australian context he described this as whiteness, and the ability to gain whiteness – as their domain to control: they imagine themselves as having 'a managerial capacity over [the] national space.'⁹⁸ In the modern nation-state those not in the position of 'managing' the nation are seen as inferior and able to be excluded. Hage's focus on the discourse of home is most useful here. For in narrating these histories of the past – particularly histories of the Holocaust, a moment when European Jews were not sure what

home was – one conjures up ideas about home. Moreover, if Jews do not always have the capacity to be a part of the managerial class – those people who, in Hage's description, have proprietorial control over the nation – feelings of anxiety will result. It is these anxieties which lead to the concern that Jews do not belong in these modern nation-states.

Modernism and nationalism, as Hage describes them, are based on ideas of exclusivity and the battle for homeliness that comes with that. How then is this negotiated within modernist Jewish thinking? Perhaps this is the role which Israel fulfils, and why, to return to the question I described previously, people are so concerned to articulate their relationship to both the country in which they live and the 'Jewish homeland'. Israel, as the so-called homeland, then, is the projected site of these modern, diasporic anxieties over who fits in and has control, and who should be excluded. We can thus understand that Israel is the anxious site for the affirmation of the Jews as a part of modernity, because it is the site for the articulation of a Jewish home in this tradition of Western modernity.⁹⁹ And the histories created – in this case, the histories of the Holocaust – serve as a buttress for that potential homeliness.

Mimicry

In the histories of the Holocaust being taught in the Jewish schools under examination here, as I have raised at various points, we can identify mimicry at work. Zionists gaze upon the West, upon the Western idea of the modern nation-state, and how one would narrate that history; Holocaust educators in Melbourne and New York gaze upon Zionism, upon Israel, for ideas of how to narrate the recent past. In this gazing, what they each see is distorted. And thus they mimic, in the manner Homi Bhabha describes as being '*almost the same but not quite*'.¹⁰⁰ In this formulation 'the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an *ambivalence*; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference.'¹⁰¹ We can understand Zionism here as a mimicry of Western modernity, and diasporic history-telling as a mimicry both of that Zionism and of Western modernity more generally. The slippage, excess and difference is evident in the history-telling about the Holocaust – the mimicry occurs in the ways in which these histories are narrated, mimicked from Zionist narrations. Moreover, this mimicry is a means of dealing with the teachers' anxieties – they attempt to replicate the ways that the West narrates history in their attempt to be a part of the West. But it is mimicry, not perfect replication, and it is responded to as such by the West. This serves to create a further anxiety, produced by the lack of authenticity of the mimicry. This Bhabha identifies as part of the 'final irony of partial representation': that there is a 'desire to emerge as "authentic" through mimicry – through a process of writing and repetition' that can never be an authentic, exact replication.¹⁰² Nor does this mimicry ever deal with the fact that, as Bhabha suggests, the mimicry

unsettles the colonial discourses which are being mimicked. The mimicry is thus both a way of dealing with the anxieties and a source of anxiety: it tries to replicate that which it undoes in its very act of replication.

Daniel Boyarin picks up on this point in his discussion of Herzlian Zionism as an attempt at colonial mimicry. He explains that ‘the parodists too often do not themselves see how their mimicry disarticulates the colonialist text and thus find themselves trapped within the imaginary of its articulation.’¹⁰³ Two instances of mimicry jump out from Boyarin’s text as instructive. Firstly, he describes how ‘[a]mong the first acts of [Herzl’s] enactment of Zionism was the foundation of “the Jewish Company” – precisely under that name and in London. Herzl had finally found a way for the Jews to become Europeans; they would have a little colony of their own.’¹⁰⁴ That is, Herzl mimicked modernity’s (capitalist) institutions by founding a colonial company. Secondly, Boyarin discusses participation in acts of physical violence as necessary, arguing that the enactor of violence is considered the superior. He suggests that:

it is also true that the seemingly most forceful resistance can turn into the most efficient complicity with the cultural project of the colonizer, by becoming just like him, sometimes even more than he is himself, and that this is what we need to understand about Zionism. The socialist cocommander of the Warsaw revolt, the anti-Zionist Marek Edelman, who [until his death in 2009] remain[ed] in Poland as a Diasporic Jewish (Yiddish) nationalist and member of Solidarity, saw this very clearly: “This was a revolt! The whole point was not to let them slaughter you when your turn came. The whole point was to choose your method of dying. All of humanity had already agreed that dying with a weapon in the hand is more beautiful than without a weapon. *So we surrendered to that consensus*”¹⁰⁵

These words from Edelman draw attention to the discursivity of violence – that it is widely agreed upon within Western modernity that to die while violently retaliating is better than dying ‘without a weapon’. In Zionist narratives of the Holocaust, both within and outside Israel, those who violently rose up are seen as a separate, superior, group. This is the ‘parodic performativity’ which Bhabha describes.¹⁰⁶ It is the mimicking of Western, modern ways of writing into history the past and the present, as Bhabha discusses, in which there is an ambivalence and an uncertainty over whether these are the best ways of representing Jewishness and indeed of *being* Jewish. This mimicry is therefore both an attempt at the resolution of anxieties as well as productive of further feelings of anxiety.

Framing the Text

This book is broadly divided into two parts. Chapters One and Two, which map the borders of the historical narratives being produced, and Chapters Three, Four

and Five, which fill in the contours and expand on what these histories contain. My intention throughout is to denaturalize – and thus destabilize – those forms which are considered to be the most obvious ways of narrating a history of the Holocaust. Chapter One locates the anxiety under consideration in this book as arising from a concern about the place of Jews in the U.S. and Australia, these settler colonial, modern, Western nation-states. The outlines of the anxiety, as expressed by the teachers, will be sketched, as will the ways in which these are nation-states founded on, and depending upon, difference. This chapter asks how this (diverse) diasporic group is negotiating its liminal place in relationship to nation-states which define themselves through difference and exclusion.

Chapter Two will foreground questions of historical methodology. It will examine the ways in which chronological narratives and survivor testimonies are used by teachers in an effort to make the Holocaust coherent and knowable for the students. This chapter problematizes the ideas of history and truth contained in these examples of Holocaust education. Here I ask, why do the teachers follow these modes of historical narration? There are a number of explanations, the most significant of which is that they are following the dominant Western modes of historical narration. The adoption (or mimicry) of these modes of narration is part of the project which is being described throughout this book: that of attempting to manage the anxiety over the place of the Jews in these modern, Western societies through the adoption of modern, Western forms of historical understanding.

Chapter Three turns to questions of the influence of Zionist ideas of the Holocaust upon these histories. I argue that the Zionist positioning of Israel as the masculine subject to the Diaspora's feminine subject has had a large effect on the politics of the narratives which are being taught. This chapter will explore the various manifestations of this influence in the curricula and interviews, and the ways in which this occurs as a negotiation of the anxieties about the place of Jews within the Jewish world.

Chapter Four will locate these histories within their nation-state contexts – the U.S. and Australia – through an exploration of the influence of settler colonialism. It will be argued that these teachings carry within them an implicit settler colonial quality. It is not that the teachers explicitly formulate their histories based on settler colonial historiographical principles, but rather that settler colonialism haunts these histories of the Holocaust. This occurs most predominantly in the form of forgetting, and the prioritization of Jewish histories of the Holocaust. This works, I argue, in order to negotiate a place for Jews within these settler colonial societies: by mimicking these settler colonial histories the histories, and the historians, are located on the side of the colonizer, rather than the colonized. This is undertaken in order to relieve these anxieties.

And finally, Chapter Five will examine the ways in which Jewish women's experiences of the Holocaust are written into these histories. I will argue that there are a series of very specific ways in which women are included in these histories. This

is most predominantly as a group, yet at times individual women are drawn upon to illustrate particular points and ideas. I will show that this occurs in order to, in the face of Zionist ideas of Jewish Diasporas, recuperate Diasporic masculinity. If Jewish womanhood can be segmented off and given the responsibility for femininity, then masculinity can perhaps be redeemed. Anxieties about the perceived femininity and masculinity of Jews in Melbourne and New York can thereby be partially relieved. While what it means to be a Jewish man in this context is also important to examine, in this book I am interested in examining that which is excised from the histories. To examine the boundaries of Jewish manhood as presented through these teachings is therefore outside its scope.

One teacher at a school in Melbourne explained in an interview that she tells her students from the start of the subject that although she is not very religious she has:

a very strong Jewish identity, and sometimes when I'm cooking for Shabbat on a Friday afternoon, or when I'm in [synagogue], and I think, even if I wanted to stop doing it, I just don't think that I could because of the obligation to keep it going after what happened. And I think that's okay, you know. I think that that's a part of it but partly we're teaching it so they know, but also partly because of the *mitzvah* of *zachor* [remembrance].¹⁰⁷

The ways that the histories of the Holocaust which are created in these high schools function to create new Jewish historiographies, and in doing so act as these (anxious) memorials, is the focus of this text. By foregrounding the teaching of a pivotal moment in Western Jewry's interactions with modernity – the Holocaust – I am arguing that we can learn much about Jewish identities in Melbourne and New York today. Moreover, by examining these new histories and historiographies being created we can understand much about how migrant groups, and post-genocide groups, negotiate their marginality, how diasporic identities are (re)made, and how we can thus grasp some of the pain – and some of the possibilities – imbricated in such marginality.

Notes

Part of the project of this book is to point to the multiple, ambivalent, complex, liminal and multi-layered ways in which Jewish identities are lived today. As will become clear throughout this book, this is an important element of what is being understood as a diasporic excess: an overflowing of meaning, which cannot, and should not, be easily contained. For that reason, the endnotes – as a (literally) marginal site – herein at times become an important site for the elaboration and contestation of the ideas addressed in the main body of this book. They are also a space for the expansion of the discussion of the literature which has been produced on the matters and ideas which are discussed in the main text of this book. As such, the endnotes here are a vital part of an ongoing and ever-evolving conversation between peoples and literature.

1. J. Butler. 1996. 'Universality in Culture', in J. Cohen (ed.), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston: Beacon Press, 45.
2. This was echoed in a posting on a Melbourne Jewish blog called *The Sensible Jew*. Liss, 'My Cousin Sammy (OR: The Single-Issue Voter: A Portrait)'. Retrieved 24 June 2009 from <http://sensiblejew.wordpress.com/2009/06/23/my-cousin-sammy-or-the-single-issue-voter-a-portrait/>; Retrieved 2 January 2014 from <http://galusastralis.com/2009/06/261/my-cousin-sammy-or-the-single-issue-voter-a-portrait/>. Author now listed as 'The Hasid'.
3. H.K. Bhabha. 1994. *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge, 12.
4. C. Aviv and D. Shneer. 2005. *New Jews: The End of the Jewish Diaspora*, New York: New York University Press, 1–25. This is the model that I will follow in this book. With that said, a particular idea of the 'diaspora' is constructed within the Zionist imaginary. At times in this book I will refer to this as the Diaspora, not to endorse the distinction between Israel and Diaspora, but rather to make clear how this idea of Diaspora is constructed and narrated. This idea of Diaspora will be rendered with a capital D; the diasporic with a lower-case.
5. See generally Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 1–18.
6. Interview with Teacher A at School NYA. To protect the anonymity of teachers and schools, they are referred to throughout by anonymous acronyms. 'NY' indicates a school in New York, while 'M' indicates a school in Melbourne.
7. Z. Bauman. 1991. *Modernity and Ambivalence*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1.
8. While there are countless Jewish schools in New York, there are only seven in Melbourne that teach at a high-school level. For that reason, a comparative number of schools in New York were involved in this study.
9. Email from Principal A at School NYH, 28 November 2006.
10. This is representative of the composition of Jewish schools in New York and the U.S. more generally. Marc Lee Raphael explained that 'in 2005, approximately 205,000 students were enrolled in 760 schools (elementary and secondary) – about two-thirds in New Jersey and New York – an increase of more than 10 percent in the past five years. Of these students . . . more than 80 percent are affiliated with Orthodox institutions, and Orthodox-affiliated schools are growing at a slightly faster rate than the non-Orthodox schools. This is in part the result of an insistence in most Orthodox synagogues today that boys and girls attend Jewish day schools as well as of a higher fertility rate among the Orthodox.' M.L. Raphael. 2008. 'Introduction', in M.L. Raphael (ed.), *The Columbia History of Jews and Judaism in America*, New York: Columbia University Press, 11.
11. There are schools in New York which are organized by the Conservative movement, but they did not participate in the study.
12. Riv-Ellen Prell provides a history of the Orthodox movement in the U.S., and particularly New York. See R.-E. Prell. 2008. 'Triumph, Accommodation, and Resistance: American Jewish Life from the End of World War II to the Six-Day War', in M.L. Raphael (ed.), *The Columbia History of Jews and Judaism in America*, New York: Columbia University Press, 124–6. Andrea Gotzmann and Christian Wiese explain that Orthodox Judaism 'attempts to dissociate the interpretation of law and thus also the history of law from historical and even natural processes. At the same time, even for those who embraced this dynamic model of interpretation, history served as a means of defining meta-historical contents. These range from securing religious contents as fixed points of orientation in the historical flux, through to ideologized constants of Jewish tradition and of communal life.' A.G. Gotzmann and C.W. Wiese. 2007. 'Introduction', in A. Gotzmann and C.W. Wiese (eds), *Modern Judaism and Historical*

- Consciousness: Identities, Encounters, Perspectives*, Boston: Leiden, xix. For histories of and debates within Orthodox Judaism see J. Neusner (ed.). 1993. *The Alteration of Orthodoxy*, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
13. Dana Evan Kaplan provides an overview of Progressive and Reform Jewish beliefs. See D.E. Kaplan. 2003. *American Reform Judaism: An Introduction*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. Alan T. Levenson provides a description of the U.S. Reform movement, which informs the Australian Progressive and Reform movement to a great degree. See A.T. Levenson. 2008. 'Contemporary Jewish Thought,' in M.L. Raphael (ed.), *The Columbia History of Jews and Judaism in America*, New York: Columbia University Press, 409–10. For the perspective from the organisation's roof-body see 'History: World Union for Progressive Judaism'. Retrieved 31 March 2014 from <http://wupj.org/About/history.asp>. On histories of and debates within this stream of Judaism see J. Neusner. 1993. *The Reformation of Reform Judaism*, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
 14. According to a survey conducted in New York by the United Jewish Appeal (UJA)-Federation of New York, there are 643,000 Jewish households in the New York area and 'over 1,412,000 Jews reside in these households – adults who consider themselves Jewish, and children being raised as Jews.' UJA-Federation of New York. October 2004. *Jewish Community Study of New York: 2002*, 24. Retrieved 21 June 2009 from <http://www.ujafedny.org/atf/cf/%7BAD848866-09C4-482C-9277-51A5D9CD6246%7D/JCommStudyHouseholdandPopulation.pdf>. According to the Melbourne B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission there are approximately 45,000 Jews in Melbourne, out of a total of approximately 100,000 Jews in Australia. Information taken from B'nei B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission Inc., *Jews in Australia*. Retrieved 21 June 2009 from <http://www.antidef.org.au/www/309/1001127/displayarticle/1001458.html>.
 15. See P. Wolfe. 2000. 'Logics of Elimination: Colonial Policies on Indigenous Peoples in Australia and the United States', *University of Nebraska Human Rights and Human Diversity Initiative Monograph Series 2*, no. 2.
 16. 'Ashkenazi' refers to Jews who themselves or whose ancestors are from Western and Eastern Europe. 'Sephardi' refers to Jews who themselves or whose ancestors are from the Iberian Peninsula. 'Mizrahi' refers to Jews who themselves or whose ancestors are from the Middle East and North Africa. For a brief explanation see M. Kaye/Kantrowitz. 2007. *The Colors of Jews: Racial Politics and Radical Diasporism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 69.
 17. See E. Shohat. 2006. 'Taboo Memories, Diasporic Visions: Columbus, Palestine, and Arab-Jews', in *Taboo Memories, Diasporic Voices*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 201–32; E. Shohat. Autumn 1988. 'Sephardim in Israel: Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Jewish Victims', *Social Text* no. 19/20, 1–35; A. Alcalay. 1993. *After Jews and Arabs: Remaking Levantine Culture*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. See also S. Lavie. Spring 2002. 'Academic Apartheid in Israel and the Lillywhite Feminism of the Upper Middle Class', *Women in Judaism: A Multidisciplinary Journal*; S. Lavie. 2014. *Wrapped in the Flag of Israel: Mizrahi Single Mothers and Bureaucratic Torture*, New York: Berghahn Books.
 18. Alcalay, *After Jews and Arabs*, 3.
 19. This project of dislodging hegemonic histories echoes Dipesh Chakrabarty's work of 'provincializing Europe'. See D. Chakrabarty. 2008. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press. Ella Shohat, writing with reference to the use by European Jews of the texts of the Cairo Geniza – that great storehouse of Egyptian Jewish life and culture, which was emptied out and its contents taken to England – writes of the 'asymmetrical power relations' that exist

- between the Egyptian worlds that are documented in these texts, and the European scholars who use the texts to write histories. She claims that '[w]ithin these asymmetrical power relations, Euro-Jewish scholars infused the colonized history with national meaning and telos, while, ironically, Arab-Jews were simultaneously being displaced and, in Israel, subjected to a school system in which Jewish history textbooks featured barely a single chapter on their history.' Shohat, 'Taboo Memories, Diasporic Visions', 227. For further discussion of the Cairo Geniza, see A. Ghosh. 1993. *In an Antique Land*, New York: A.A. Knopf; Alcalay, *After Jews and Arabs*, 128–43; J. Docker. 2001. *1492: The Poetics of Diaspora*, London: Continuum, 1–19.
20. Marianne Hirsch's ideas of postmemory can be usefully deployed here to aid our understanding of the work which Holocaust pedagogy is undertaking. Postmemory here 'characterizes 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.' Moreover, 'postmemory is distinguished from memory by generational distance and from history by deep personal connection. 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.' The teachings, therefore, carry this postmemory. See M. Hirsch. 1997. *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative and Postmemory*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 22.
 21. For explorations of the ways in which histories of the Holocaust are taught in Israel see, for instance, Y. Auron. 2005. *The Pain of Knowledge: Holocaust and Genocide Issues in Education*, trans. Ruth Ruzga, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers; Idit Gil. Summer 2009. 'Teaching the Shoah in History Classes in Israeli High Schools', *Israel Studies* 14(2), 1–25. While it is different to teach a national history of the Jewish people in Israel (where the nation is attached to a state) and outside of it, some of the considerations are similar.
 22. J. Boyarin. 1992. *Storm from Paradise: The Politics of Jewish Memory*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, xx.
 23. 'Identities and memories', John R. Gillis argues, 'are not things we think about, but things we think with. As such they have no existence beyond our politics, our social relations, and our histories.' J.R. Gillis. 1994. 'Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship', in J.R. Gillis (ed.), *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 5. See also J.E. Young. 1993. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 6.
 24. P. Nora. Spring 1989. 'Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux De Memoire*', *Representations*, no. 26, 7–24.
 25. See N.Z. Davis and R. Starn. Spring 1989. 'Introduction', *Representations*, no. 26, 1–6; Y. Zerubavel. 1995. *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press; M. Bal, J. Crewe and L. Spitzer (eds). 1999. *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England; C. Bold, R. Knowles and B. Leach. Autumn 2002. 'Feminist Memorializing and Cultural Countermemory: The Case of Marianne's Park', *Signs* 28(1), 125–48. Yosef Yerushalmi and Amos Funkenstein discuss this question of memory and history from within specifically Jewish contexts, albeit starting from very different ideas about the relationship between memory and history. See Y.H. Yerushalmi. 1982. *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*, Seattle: University of Washington Press and A. Funkenstein. 1993. *Perceptions of Jewish History*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 3–21.

26. A. Clark. 2004. 'Teaching the Nation: Politics and Pedagogy in Australian History,' PhD Thesis, University of Melbourne, 21–22. The words of Chris Healy echo this: '[s]ocial memory is not the only effect of history in schools, but it is certainly one of them. The teaching of history in elementary schools is precisely one of those moments when histories are performed.' C. Healy. 1997. *From the Ruins of Colonialism: History as Social Memory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 109.
27. Clark, 'Teaching the Nation', 6.
28. J. Dalsheim. 2004. 'Settler Nationalism, Collective Memories of Violence and the "Uncanny Other"', *Social Identities* 10(2), 155. See also E. Podeh. Spring/Summer 2000. 'History and Memory in the Israeli Educational System: The Portrayal of the Arab-Israeli Conflict in History Textbooks (1948-2000)', *History & Memory* 12(1), 65.
29. M. Halbwachs. 1992. *On Collective Memory*, trans. Lewis A. Coser, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
30. The teachers were all asked where they get their information from: predominantly it was from other teachers, or their own research and work. Yad Vashem, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), and the Jewish Holocaust Museum and Research Centre were not really relied upon by these teachers.
31. J. Crewe. 1999. 'Recalling Adamastor: Literature as Cultural Memory in "White" South Africa', in M. Bal, J. Crewe and L. Spitzer (eds), *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*, Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 75.
32. Dalsheim, 'Settler Nationalism, Collective Memories of Violence and the "Uncanny Other"', 155–56.
33. Zev Garber points out that while Holocaust with a capital H refers to this, holocaust (with an uncapitalized h) is used to describe genocides more generally. Z. Garber. 1994. *Shoah: The Paradigmatic Genocide. Essays in Exegesis and Eisegesis*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 52. He also argues that Holocaust typically refers to, as stated above, the destruction of Jewish communities and the killing of six million Jews. But this works to remove the deaths of the five million others who were killed in Nazi concentration and death camps, which 'seems to imply that Gentile deaths are not as significant as Jewish deaths.' *Ibid.*, 63.
34. V.M. Patraka. 1997. 'Situating History and Difference: The Performance of the Term *Holocaust* in Public Discourse', in J. Boyarin and D. Boyarin (eds), *Jews and Other Differences: The New Jewish Cultural Studies*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 54.
35. G. Agamben. 1999. *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*. New York: Zone Books, 28. Garber expands on the connotations of Holocaust as signifying a burnt whole. 'Why Do We Call the Holocaust "The Holocaust?" An Inquiry into the Psychology of Labels' in Garber, *Shoah*, 53–54.
36. Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz*, 31.
37. There are many historians and theorists who engage with this question of which name to use. For discussions of this see H. Kellner. 1998. "'Never Again' Is Now", in B. Fay, P. Pomper and R.T. Vann (eds), *History and Theory: Contemporary Readings*, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 234–35; A.-V. Sullam Calimani. October 1999. 'A Name for Extermination', *The Modern Language Review* 94(4), 978–99; J.E. Young. 1988. 'Names of the Holocaust: Meaning and Consequences', in *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 83–98.
38. 'Why Do We Call the Holocaust "The Holocaust?"', in Garber, *Shoah*, 55–6. Garber explained that the term was enforced by Elie Wiesel, who based it on a reading of the biblical story of the *Akedah*, the binding of Isaac. *Ibid.*, 59–62.

39. S.L. Gilman. Winter 2000. 'Is Life Beautiful? Can the Shoah Be Funny? Some Thoughts on Recent and Older Films', *Critical Inquiry* 26(2), 281.
40. J. Stratton. 2000. *Coming out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities*, London: Routledge, 84. Stratton later goes on to distinguish fear from anxiety; however, the way he characterises fear in the quote above has important parallels, I think, with what I am here characterizing as anxiety.
41. S. Freud. 1936. *The Problem of Anxiety*, trans. Henry Alden Bunker, M.D., New York: The Psychoanalytic Press and W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 69.
42. *Ibid.*, 69, 72. Emphasis in original.
43. *Ibid.*, 71–2, 77.
44. *Ibid.*, 83–4.
45. I take this idea of the 'homely' from Ghassan Hage, and will return to it in my discussion of the nation state and modernity below.
46. C.S. Maier. Fall/Winter 1993. 'A Surfeit of Memory? Reflections on History, Melancholy and Denial', *History & Memory* 5(2), 145.
47. There is an additional source of anxiety: what will be the costs of being accepted? To what extent will Jewish difference (as elastic as such a concept is) be acceptable, and to what extent will Jewish differences be rejected? That is, at what point do the movements of mimicry and assimilation which this book is describing become mandatory? Further exploration of these questions – which can only be answered through a thorough exploration of U.S. and Australian nationalisms – is outside the scope of the book.
48. G. Hage. 2003. *Against Paranoid Nationalism: Searching for Hope in a Shrinking Society*, Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press, 1–3.
49. Robert Seltzer points out that this has been part of the process of a generalized Americanization of Jews and Jewishness: there has been a 'paradoxical effect of the Americanization of the Jews: America undermined and energized Jewish commitment. Much was discarded and much was saved'. R.M. Seltzer. 1995. 'Introduction: The Ironies of American Jewish History', in R.M. Seltzer and N.J. Cohen (eds), *The Americanization of the Jews*, New York: New York University Press, 5. Michael Galchinsky explores the ways in which Jews in the U.S. have seen themselves as relatively comfortable, particularly through a reading of Philip Roth's *Operation Shylock*. M. Galchinsky. 1998. 'Scattered Seeds: A Dialogue of Diasporas', in D. Biale, M. Galchinsky and S. Heschel (eds), *Insider/Outsider: American Jews and Multiculturalism*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 203–9.
50. As Ruth R. Wisse makes clear, a lack of difference entails Jews in the U.S. giving up something of themselves, of their Jewish identity. R.R. Wisse. 1995. 'Jewish Writers on the New Diaspora', in R.M. Seltzer and N.J. Cohen (eds), *The Americanization of the Jews*, New York: New York University Press, 66–67. When we consider that the Jews under consideration in this book are involved in formal Jewish dayschool education, we necessarily identify a disjuncture between this argument about anxiety and that which the book is pursuing: the Jews under consideration evidently, to some degree, foreground their particular, and different, Jewish identities.
51. D. Biale. 1998. 'The Melting Pot and Beyond: Jews and the Politics of American Identity', in D. Biale, M. Galchinsky, and S. Heschel (eds), *Insider/Outsider: American Jews and Multiculturalism*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 28. The question of the racializing of Jews will be taken up in Chapter One. For further exploration of the idea that the U.S. has been a welcoming place to Jews, who have found a comfortable place there, because of their relative whiteness but also because of their development of 'multiple identities', see D. Biale, M. Galchinsky and S. Heschel. 1998. 'Introduction:

- The Dialectic of Jewish Enlightenment', in D. Biale, M. Galhinsky and S. Heschel (eds), *Insider/Outsider: American Jews and Multiculturalism*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1–13.
52. K.L. Klein. Winter 2000. 'On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse', *Representations* 69, 143.
 53. *Ibid.*, 145.
 54. D. Biale. 1986. *Power & Powerlessness in Jewish History*, New York: Schocken Books, 4.
 55. C. Kahane. 2001. 'Dark Mirrors: A Feminist Reflection on Holocaust Narrative and the Maternal Metaphor', in E. Bronfen and M. Kavka (eds), *Feminist Consequences: Theory for the New Century*, New York: Columbia University Press, 161–88.
 56. See J. Butler. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1–15, and E. Cowie. 1990. 'Woman as Sign', in P. Adams and E. Cowie (eds), *The Woman in Question: M/F*, London: Verso, 117–33.
 57. Kahane, 'Dark Mirrors', 162.
 58. In Lee Edelman's discussion of the figure of the Child in relation to reproductive futurity he writes about 'the image of the Child, not to be confused with the lived experiences of any historical children'. L. Edelman. 2004. *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*, Durham: Duke University Press, 11. I am arguing that something approximately similar is the case for the Diaspora Jew in the Zionist imagination, as I will explain in more detail in this introduction, in the section entitled 'Diaspora'.
 59. Jean Radford writes about a similar relationship between Jews and women in Otto Weininger's writing: that they are both situated as disempowered and lacking. J. Radford. 1998. 'The Woman and the Jew: Sex and Modernity', in B. Chetty and L. Marcus (eds), *Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 91–92. Anxieties about national identity and gender differences is a thread which runs throughout this book.
 60. Kaye/Kantrowitz, *The Colors of Jews*, 195.
 61. Daniel Boyarin makes this point with regard to Freud's ideas of his own Zionism, which entailed the belief that 'merely being a stalwart Zionist was enough to transform the Jewish man from his state of female degeneracy into the status of [a] . . . mock Aryan male', thereby solving 'the Jewish problem'. D. Boyarin. 2000. 'The Colonial Drag: Zionism, Gender, and Mimicry', in F. Afzal-Khan and K. Seshadri-Crooks (eds), *The Pre-Occupation of Postcolonial Studies*, Durham: Duke University Press, 236.
 62. See 'Of Mimicry and Man' in Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 85–92.
 63. This is bound up in the Hebrew idea of Diaspora as *galut*, or exile: as Howard Wettstein argues, '[t]o view one's group as in *galut* is to suppose that what is in some sense the proper order has been interrupted'. H. Wettstein. 2002. 'Coming to Terms with Exile', in H. Wettstein (ed.), *Diasporas and Exiles: Varieties of Jewish Identity*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 47. For religious settlers in the West Bank and East Jerusalem the belief that Israel is the only possible home for Jews has biblical origins. Jacqueline Rose describes how 'many settlers insist, that Israel is the land God promised to the Jews'. J. Rose. 2005. *The Question of Zion*, Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 98. For a thorough exploration of settlers see I. Zertal and A. Eldar. 2007. *Lords of the Land: The War Over Israel's Settlements in the Occupied Territories, 1967–2007*, New York: Nation Books. For explorations of the idea of 'Zionism as Messianism' in more detail, see Rose, *The Question of Zion*, 1–57. Erich S. Gruen expands on these biblical histories of the relationship between the Jewish Diaspora and a Jewish homeland centred around Jerusalem. See E.S. Gruen. 2002. 'Diaspora and Homeland', in H. Wettstein (ed.), *Diasporas and Exiles: Varieties of Jewish Identity*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 18–46.

64. Stratton, *Coming out Jewish*, 117.
65. See T. Mayer. 2000. 'From Zero to Hero: Masculinity in Jewish Nationalism', in T. Mayer (ed.), *Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the Nation*, London: Routledge, 282–303.
66. S.L. Gilman. 1999. 'Introduction: The Frontier as a Model for Jewish History', in S.L. Gilman and M. Shain (eds), *Jewries at the Frontier: Accommodation, Identity, Conflict*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1.
67. J. Clifford. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 249–50.
68. See R. Cohen. 1997. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*, London: UCL Press for explanations of different models of diaspora. Michael Galchinsky similarly examined 'traditional Jewish' ideas of diaspora against more recent postcolonial approaches. See Galchinsky, 'Scattered Seeds', 185–211.
69. Perhaps though this model is similarly problematic, as it still relies on there being a centre. But, then, what model of identity does not rely on a centre, or commonality, which is produced by and productive of the group?
70. Docker, *1492*, vii–viii.
71. J. Francisco. 2006. *Far from Zion: Jews, Diaspora, Memory*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 97.
72. D. Boyarin and J. Boyarin. Summer 1993. 'Diaspora: Generation and the Ground of Jewish Identity', *Critical Inquiry* 19(4), 721.
73. *Ibid.*, 714.
74. *Ibid.*, 705.
75. B. Cheyette. 2013. *Diasporas of the Mind: Jewish and Postcolonial Writing and the Nightmare of History*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 6.
76. *Ibid.*, 264.
77. Michael Rothberg describes this through his framing of 'multidirectional memory' and writes that 'pursuing memory's multidirectionality encourages us to think of the public sphere as a malleable discursive space in which groups do not simply articulate established positions but actually come into being through their dialogical interactions with others; both the subjects and spaces of the public are open to continual reconstruction . . . Memories are not owned by groups – nor are groups 'owned' by memories. Rather, the borders of memory and identity are jagged; what looks at first like my own property often turns out to be a borrowing or adaptation from a history that initially might seem foreign or distant.' M. Rothberg. 2009. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 5.
78. P. Gilroy. 2002. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*, London: Routledge Classics, 204.
79. Shohat, 'Taboo Memories, Diasporic Visions', 222–23.
80. *Ibid.*, 225.
81. *Ibid.*, 215.
82. D. Chakrabarty. 2002. *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, xix.
83. P. Chatterjee. 2004. *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*, Delhi: Permanent Black, 27.
84. Sanjay Seth traces a similar process of the adoption of colonial, modern western knowledge through education in India. He argues through this that 'the status of modern western knowledge – the assumption that it is not merely one mode of knowledge but is knowledge "as such," . . . – is questionable, and needs to be rethought.' S. Seth.

2007. *Subject Lessons: The Western Education of Colonial India*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 3.
85. For explorations of the many different ways in which Jews in different parts of Europe, the Ottoman Empire, the Middle East and the U.S. participated in, and were an essential part of the development of, modernity, see the chapters in 'Part Three: Modern Encounters' of D. Biale (ed.). 2002. *Cultures of the Jews: A New History*, New York: Schocken Books, 725–1146.
86. J. Katz. 1973. *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770-1870*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2.
87. Paula E. Hyman and Arnold Eisen characterize this as the master narrative of Jewish modernity and Jewish relationships with non-Jewish modernities. See P.E. Hyman. 2002. 'Gender and the Shaping of Modern Jewish Identities', *Jewish Social Studies* 8(2–3), 153–4; A.M. Eisen. Fall 1994. 'Rethinking Jewish Modernity', *Jewish Social Studies* 1(1), 1–2.
88. J. Frankel. 1992. 'Assimilation and the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe: Towards a New Historiography?', in J. Frankel and S.J. Zipperstein (eds), *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 6. Zygmunt Bauman focuses on the question of assimilation and the various processes which occurred in order to shape Jewish political movements, particularly those of socialism and communism, within Western societies. See Z. Bauman. Fall 1988. 'Exit Visas and Entry Tickets: Paradoxes of Jewish Assimilation', *Telos* 77, 45–78, and Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*, 102–59.
89. M.A. Meyer. 1998. 'Reflections on Jewish Modernization', in E. Carlebach, J.M. Efron and D.N. Myers (eds), *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Haim Yerushalmi*, Hanover, MA: Brandeis University Press, 370.
90. *Ibid.*, 371–3.
91. Hyman, 'Gender and the Shaping of Modern Jewish Identities', 154.
92. *Ibid.*, 159.
93. Eisen, 'Rethinking Jewish Modernity', 10.
94. *Ibid.*, 18.
95. Hyman, 'Gender and the Shaping of Modern Jewish Identities', 155.
96. M.A. Meyer. 1991. 'The Emergence of Modern Jewish Historiography: Motives and Motifs', in A. Rapoport-Albert (ed.), *Essays in Jewish Historiography*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 160–75; Yerushalmi, *Zakhor*, 84–88.
97. J. Stratton. 2008. *Jewish Identity in Western Pop Culture: The Holocaust and Trauma through Modernity*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 10.
98. G. Hage. 1998. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press, 20, 42. Hage follows Pierre Bourdieu's conception of whiteness as a form of cultural capital, able to be accumulated. See Hage, *White Nation*, in particular 52–5 and Chapter 2 (48–77) more generally.
99. Jon Stratton presents a similar consideration of Jewish relationships with homelands. See Stratton, *Coming out Jewish*, 53–83. Daniel Schroeter problematizes this idea of Israel as the Jewish home, as, he argues, Jews often had a stronger relationship with the countries in which they are located, rather than to Israel: this entailed the existence of 'a Diaspora culture that transcends national boundaries'. D.J. Schroeter. 2002. 'A Different Road to Modernity: Jewish Identity in the Arab World', in H. Wettstein (ed.), *Diasporas and Exiles: Varieties of Jewish Identity*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 150. Daniel Boyarin critiques the gendered, imperial ideas of home which are encompassed in Theodor Herzl's writings of the need for a Jewish home. This is part of the mimicry which is now to be discussed. See Boyarin, 'The Colonial Drag', 252.

100. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86. Emphasis in original.
101. Ibid. Emphasis in original.
102. Ibid., 88.
103. Boyarin, 'The Colonial Drag', 257.
104. Ibid., 253.
105. Boyarin, 'The Colonial Drag', 255. Emphasis in Boyarin. Marek Edelman quote is originally in I. Zertal. Spring 1994. 'The Sacrificed and the Sanctified: The Construction of a National Martyrology', *Zemanim* 12(48), 38.
106. Boyarin, 'The Colonial Drag', 255.
107. Interview with Teacher A at School MC.