REPRESENTATIONS OF JEWISH-MUSLIM RELATIONS IN CONTEMPORARY FRANCE

A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Humanities

2020

Adi S. Bharat

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

Table of Contents

Word count: 77,013

Abstract

This thesis examines representations of Jewish-Muslim relations in contemporary French newspaper discourse, literary writing, and interreligious dialogue initiatives. Specifically, it analyses the extent to which a dominant discourse of inherently tense binary Jewish-Muslim relations exists and how individual Jewish and Muslim writers and interreligious dialogue activists navigate this difficult socio-political terrain. While I conceptualize some aspects of literary writing and interreligious dialogue as counter-narratives, this thesis does not simply seek to counterbalance the dominant narrative of polarization found in the media, but to demonstrate, first, how this narrative constructs public Jewish and Muslim identities and shapes the terrain on which interactions between Jews and Muslims occur. My thesis reveals that Jewish and Muslim writers and interreligious activists are deeply invested in challenging the oppositional model of Jewish-Muslim relations. However, my research also suggests that their level of success depends in large part on their ability to navigate normative understandings of Jewishness and Muslimness that are often overdetermined by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. First, this thesis traces how Jewish-Muslim relations are defined and constructed in the media, focusing on the national dailies *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* due to their considerable agenda-setting and framing power as elite and prestigious sites of journalistic expression. Subsequently, I consider how a set of contemporary novelists, Emilie Frèche, Thierry Cohen, and Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf, formulate their visions of intergroup relations within this broader context. The novelists in this project have been included in the extent to which their works can be read as—and often are explicitly stated by these authors to be—a set of political interventions into the contemporary and highly politicized category of Jewish-Muslim relations. Finally, I examine how Jewish and Muslim activists promote interreligious dialogue and the challenges they face in doing so within a French republican framework that privileges the non-differentiation of ethnoreligious specificities. I conclude that the initiatives most likely to effectively challenge the dominant model of polarized Jewish-Muslim relations in contemporary France are those that de-emphasize Jewishness and Muslimness as separate and mutually exclusive categories, and instead emphasize hybrid identities and shared histories, while adopting an embodied, differentiated approach to solidarity.

Declaration

I declare that no portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the memory and legacy of Malcolm X whose life and work have been of utmost importance to my life-long, unfinished process of intellectual and spiritual decolonization, a process he once described as removing colonialism from the mind.

Acknowledgments

All academic work is, to some degree, collaborative, especially multi-year projects such as a doctoral thesis. My sincerest thanks and gratitude go, first and foremost, to my supervisors, Joseph McGonagle and Barbara Lebrun, whose exemplary guidance and support proved invaluable to the successful completion of this thesis. I am also very grateful to Dalia Mostafa for her detailed feedback on the main chapters of this thesis.

I would also like to thank all the participants I interviewed for the last chapter of this thesis. I am particularly grateful to Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf and Thierry Cohen for discussing their work with me at great length.

I am deeply grateful for the seemingly inexhaustible source of support that has been Jeffrey Mehlman, a remarkable thinker who continues to inspire me with his adventures in the French Trade. I can only hope that my adventures end up half as meaningful as his.

I also benefited greatly from the support of my colleagues in Manchester. The Centre for Jewish Studies, in particular, provided me with a second academic home. I am indebted to Jean-Marc Dreyfus, Alexander Samely, Daniel Langton, and Laura Mitchell for their support and kindness. I would be remiss if I did not also mention David Alderson, the director of the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in the Arts and Languages (CIDRAL) and a brilliant conversationalist. David and CIDRAL have been of great moral and intellectual assistance to me. Finally, I thank Katharine Halls, with whom I founded the Jewish-Muslim Research Network (JMRN). The JMRN has proved to be an invaluable interdisciplinary forum.

I am also grateful to Elizabeth Johnstone for all her help and solidarity.

Last, but not least, I thank my family, friends, and cats back in Singapore for their constant support, even if they have not always understood what I have been doing all these years.

Chapter One: Introduction and Background

In recent decades, with antisemitism and Islamophobia on the rise, relations between France's Jews and Muslims have been depicted as increasingly tense. In particular, a group of French writers have pinpointed the source of a new antisemitism to be France's Muslim population (Brenner 2002, 2004; Draï 2002; Taguieff 2002; Trigano 2003; Finkielkraut 2003; Attal 2004; Giniewski 2005). With state school seen as a hotbed of antisemitism, Jews have increasingly turned to private Jewish schools. According to Kimberly Arkin (2014), this sense of siege has in turn led to private-schooled (mainly Sephardi) Jewish youths racially constructing their Jewishness as separate from and hostile to Muslims and Arabs (and 'white' French people), as a defence mechanism to a perception of being under attack from both broader French society and, especially, Muslims and Arabs.

This situation is partly a result of the particular histories of France's colonial presence in the Maghreb and of France's related postcolonial realities (see Chronology, Table 1 in Appendix). Economic crisis, high unemployment rates, especially for segments of Muslims, increasing antisemitic and anti-Muslim discourse and hate crimes, as well as the looming threat of further acts of terrorism, have only complicated issues and hardened outlooks. In addition, the adjacent history and present of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (especially after the 1967 Six-Day War) often finds resonance in the domestic context, through identifications to either Palestinians or Israelis. In this context, it is important to examine how Jews and Muslims, as well as their intergroup relations, are represented in the public sphere. In the media (consider, for example, the 2002 debate "Islam, le temps des polémiques" on France 3's *Culture et dépendence*), in political and polemical interventions, such as Lévy and Ménard (2009), Finkielkraut (2013), and Zemmour (2014), and even in novels by elite literary authors, such as Houellebecq (2015), Jewish-Muslim relations in France are

often approached through homogenized, mutually exclusive, and oppositional categories of Jewishness, Muslimness, and Frenchness, forming what Maud Mandel (2014) terms a narrative of polarization, which she contends obscures a more nuanced history and on-the-ground reality.

This thesis follows a large and growing body of work on Jews, Muslims, and France from various disciplines. Recent scholarly research has examined the creation and perpetuation of simplified and exclusive identity categories (Cesari 1994; Shepard 2006; Davidson 2012; Liogier 2012; Arkin 2014; Stein 2014). Additionally, in the broader Mediterranean and European context, a number of works have re-evaluated Jewish-Muslim relations from beyond mutually exclusive categories (Bahloul 1996; Gottreich 2006; Boum 2013; Renton and Gidley 2017). However, with the notable exceptions of Mandel (2014) and Katz (2015), few studies have examined interactions between Jews and Muslims in France and even fewer have examined representations of these interactions. My contribution to this growing body of research is a study of how, and under what specific conditions, the narrative of polarization that both Mandel and Katz highlight, continues to play out in the French public sphere, throughout various fields, as well as its effects on individual and communal interrelations since the beginning of the twenty-first century. Additionally, while this thesis follows, and is informed by, Mandel and Katz, I am, unlike them, primarily concerned with present-day Jewish-Muslim relations in France and, especially, how Jewish and Muslim interreligious dialogue activists and writers position themselves in relation to broader, dichotomous representations of Jewish-Muslim relations, such as those found in newspaper reporting.

The principal question this thesis seeks to answer is the following: to what extent are interreligious dialogue initiatives and novelistic writing affected by and respond to, or remain indifferent to, broader representations of these relations? In

sum, this thesis seeks to determine, first, to what extent Mandel and Katz's narrative of polarization remains a dominant force in newspaper representations of Jewish-Muslim relations and, secondly, explore how and to what extent French Jewish and Muslim writers and activists relate and respond to such a narrative consisting of dominant, reified binary definitions within the contemporary framework of difference-blind assimilationist republican universalism.

In the sections that follow, I examine the ethnoreligious and cultural categories of 'Jews' and 'Muslims' as well as distinguish between 'relations' and 'interactions,' with regards to these two groups. I also define the concept of universalism, as well as other related key concepts, and how they shape and frame both the expression of minority difference and debates concerning the integration of minorities. I specifically discuss the cases of Jewish integration in the nineteenth century and of Muslim integration in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Subsequently, I chart the history of relations between Jews and Muslims in France, beginning in the early twentieth century. Finally, I present the corpus to be studied as well as the methodology employed.

1.1. Terminology: Jews, Muslims, Relations, Interactions

Throughout this thesis, I refer to 'Muslims,' 'Jews,' and the 'relations' and 'interactions' between them. While the term 'Muslim' generally refers to a follower of the religion of Islam, I am not merely interested in religious, practising, or believing Muslims, but in individuals who either self-identify as Muslims—be it in a cultural or religious sense—or who tend to be read as 'Muslim' in contemporary France. Clearly not everyone who is perceived as Muslim in France is religious; many may even reject the identity category itself, but this does not change the fact that someone who is, say, an ex-Muslim atheist of Algerian heritage in France is *still* likely to be read by others

as a Muslim. The general public, as well as the media and political leaders, often have a specific group of individuals in mind when they use the term 'Muslim.' In general, they are referring to North African 'Arabs' and not, say, South and Central Asian Muslims, Black Muslims, or white Muslims from countries like Albania, or white French-European converts. This is why, for example, certain Algerian authors, such as Salim Bachi and Boualem Sansal, who do not wish to be read as 'Muslim' authors, have had to explicitly state that they do not identify as Muslim, even if they were born into the religion.

Racialization is "the extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice or group" (Omi and Winant 1986: 64). When religion is racialized, then, it is perceived as an innate trait or linked to a specific ethnicity or 'race.' In France, as in numerous other countries, for example 'Western' countries such as the United States, but also in non-'Western' countries such as Singapore and Malaysia, Islam and Muslims are racialized and associated with a particular ethnonational group. In such contexts, Islam and being Muslim almost cease being purely religious and become associated with phenotype, culture, and heredity. Research on the racialization of Islam and Muslims in Europe and North America suggests that the religion and its followers are racialized as being generally and abstractly non- 'white' and 'foreign' (Davidson 2012; Meer 2013; Moosavi 2014; Galonnier 2015). This is even the case when the Muslims in question are 'white' and natives. White French Muslim women who wear the hijab encounter racial slurs and are told to return to their country of origin, demonstrating both how Islam has been racialized as 'Arab,' which in turn mostly refers to 'North Africans,' and how the hijab in particular is a powerful gendered marker of racialized difference (Galonnier 2015).

Similarly, when I refer to 'Jews,' I am not solely—or even primarily—concerned with religious or practising Jews, but rather individuals who identify and who are

externally identified as such. In distinction to Muslimness, Jewishness has long had an ethnic component so that one could be a part of 'the Jewish people' without believing in Judaism as a religion. Even so, both Muslims and Jews have been consistently racialized, dehumanized, and demonized in Western Europe since at least the beginning of the Crusades. The beginning of the Crusades coincided with an increasing obsession with religious purity, the first large-scale mob massacres of Jews in Europe, and—perhaps not entirely unrelated—with the peak of medieval bestiaries. As the crusaders sought to 'liberate' the 'Holy Land' from the Muslims, the first victims were Jews living in the Rhineland. The Rhineland Massacres of 1096 were part of what could be called 'the domestic crusade,' which were carried out in Europe against non-Christian groups such as Jews, pagans, and Cathars. These groups were often depicted as bestial and under the influence of the devil. Similarly, twelve years before the Rhineland massacres, the Pope had declared that Christianity had "fallen under the scorn, not only of the Devil, but of Jews, Saracens, and pagans" (Lipton 2014: 413). By associating these groups with the Devil, thereby associating them with the symbol of absolute evil and non-humanness *par excellence*, the Pope had excluded them from the rest of humanity by denying their humanness. The Church might not have directly called for the massacres, but its century-long criticism of Judaism and its sanctioning of a more recent demonization and racialization of Jews certainly constructed Jews as legitimate targets of mass violence, providing a clear example of the power of imposed racialized constructs and discursive framing. In subsequent centuries, throughout the Early Modern Period, Jews and Muslims continued to be racialized with growing intensity and consistency in the Western European imaginary, foreshadowing modern concepts of antisemitism and the more recent Islamophobia or anti-Muslim racism.

Suffice it to say that this thesis primarily engages with Jews and Muslims in an ethnocultural sense and not as putative religious groups, as is too often the implicit assumption. Nevertheless, in this thesis, I often describe Jews and Muslims as ethnoreligious groups. This is not a contradiction, but rather a way to remind the reader that these groups *are* perceived, first, as homogenous groups, and, secondly, ethnically *and* religiously, even if the reality is often far more complex, as I demonstrate in subsequent chapters. In this way, 'Jews' and 'Muslims' ought to be understood as inadequate shorthand that does not capture the internal diversity of these categories—or even the groupness of 'Jews' and 'Muslims'—but reflect the common assumptions that underlie them. In using this shorthand, however, the intention is not to validate this way of thinking about 'Jews' and 'Muslims,' but to both acknowledge the reality of how they are perceived in contemporary France *and* to subsequently demonstrate the related processes of the racialization of religion and the religionization of 'race.'

With regards to the terms 'relations' and 'interactions,' it is crucial to note that these are not used synonymously in this thesis. Generally, when I use the expression 'Jewish-Muslim relations,' I am referring to what has become *the* accepted way of understanding relations between Jews and Muslims in France. When the expression 'Jewish-Muslim relations' is evoked, there are a particular set of unquestioned assumptions that come along with it. The overarching framework of 'Jewish-Muslim relations' first constructs two separate, distinct groups— 'Jews' and 'Muslims'—and places them in an oppositional binary. The 'relations' between the two 'groups' are assumed to be perpetually tense and conflictual. I return to this in Chapter Two, where I analyse newspaper reporting on 'Jewish-Muslim relations.' In contrast to the abstract and oppositional nature of the category of 'relations,' I use the term 'interactions' to refer to the on-the-ground, daily, lived, social interactions, that is to say the social

relationships, between individuals and groups of individuals. In essence, Jewish-Muslim relations is an overarching category replete with negative, dichotomous connotations, while Jewish-Muslim interactions is a term that encourages paying close attention to the concrete, interpersonal relations between individuals who identify or who are identified as Jewish or Muslim. By shifting between 'relations,' on the one hand, and 'interactions,' on the other hand, I seek to identify and examine the actual interactional dynamics that are often hidden by an abstract discourse of 'Jewish-Muslim relations.'

1.2. French Universalism and Difference

In this section, I focus on the political framework in which expressions of ethnoreligious difference and relations between ethnoreligious minorities play out. In particular, I discuss the concept of republican universalism—and its corollaries—in relation to the integration of Jews in the nineteenth century and of Muslims in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The principle of universalism is enshrined in the French constitution and legal system and states that all French citizens are equal and must not be distinguished by ethnic, religious, linguistic, or any other particular differences. It is a fundamental principle in France that the state must not make distinctions between its citizens on the basis of 'particularisms,' such as ethnicity, religion, class, or gender. In essence, it is a principle of neutrality and a declaration that no particular group is to be privileged over another by the state. This principle explains many particularities about France and its engagement with minority groups. The principle of republican universalism explains, for example, why the dominant model of social integration in France remains a difference-blind assimilationist one. The importance of the concept of *laïcité*, or secularism, which, in theory, ensures the religious neutrality of the public sphere, is another corollary of republican

universalism. Universalism continues to exert significant influence in the public sphere, including in the media, the arts, and in political discourse (Jennings 2011; Stovall 2015; McGonagle 2017).

Yet, the enduring paradox of universalism in France is that a moral and political philosophy that posits universal equality and humanity also serves as a barrier to non-whites seeking to concretely attain racial equality. One way to make sense of this apparent paradox or contradiction is to recall that the tradition of modern European liberal thought as a whole, despite its declarations of universal humanity, equality and freedom, is tied to both the development of the concept of 'race' and to the burgeoning imperialism that would use supposedly inherent racial differences to justify the eventual subjugation of the vast majority of the Earth's people to white European rule (see Mills 1997, Mehta 1999). By the time John Stuart Mill writes, in the mid-nineteenth century, that "it is, perhaps, hardly necessary to say that this doctrine is meant to apply only to human beings in the maturity of their faculties," adding that "despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians," universal rights and freedoms only properly concern those whom 'we' view as truly human in the first place (1859: 22). As Charles W. Mills states, "racism, racial self-identification, and race thinking are […] not in the least 'surprising,' 'anomalous,' 'puzzling,' incongruent with Enlightenment European humanism, but *required* […] as part of the terms for the European appropriation of the world" (1997: 122). Particularism has never been the opposite of universalism, but rather a necessary consequent construct of it. Universalism elevates one particularism (white Europeanness) to a position of universality and compels all other non-white particularisms to strive to assimilate to this white particularism in order to be counted as truly human. This is similar to what Zygmunt Bauman, in *Modernity and Ambivalence* (1991), has in mind when he describes modernity as an ordering, classifying impulse. Modernity, he suggests, makes sense

of the world by removing ambivalence through order and classification. As such, modernity conceives of the world as naturally chaotic, as in Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651), and requiring order. In doing so, in terms of human beings, it divides individuals into 'us' and 'them', civilized and uncivilized, enlightened and barbaric, universal and particular, white and Black. In this context, the experience of Jews and Muslims with universalism demonstrates how the integration of racialized minorities fundamentally relies on whether these minorities are deemed assimilable (or not) to the particularism of white Europeanness masquerading as universalism.

From the 1394 decree of expulsion till after the French revolution, Jews were in theory banned from the Kingdom of France. In practice, their continued presence was tolerated. At the time of the 1789 revolution, there remained approximately 40,000 Jews in France out of a total number of 28 million inhabitants. Between 20,000 and 25,000 lived in Alsace and Lorraine. In southwestern France, mainly in Bordeaux and Saint-Esprit-lès-Bayonne, there were 5,000 *conversos*, who, since the Renaissance, had gradually discarded their Catholic identities and lived openly as Sephardic Jews. Another 2,500 lived in Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin (Winock 2004: 11). The rest were dispersed in other parts of France, including Paris.

Jewish life in France was never unified nor shared a common institutional or organisational structure. In addition, the lived experiences and socio-economic conditions of Jews living in one region differed significantly from those living in another. While the Bordelais and Bayonnais *conversos*, who exercised professional occupations and benefited from a relatively comfortable socio-economic situation, were in general integrated into Franco-Christian society, Alsatian and Lorrainer Jews tended to be excluded, segregated, and despised by non-Jewish inhabitants (Winock 2004: 12). While many Enlightenment philosophers often displayed profoundly antisemitic thinking (Hertzberg 1968), by the second half of the eighteenth century, a

number of them considered the plight of Jews in France to be unacceptable (Winock 2004: 12). The Enlightenment concept of tolerance and freedom of and from religion, in particular, increasingly gained intellectual currency and led to the argument that this freedom ought to apply to Jews as well. Moreover, over time the writings of a number of Enlightenment thinkers, such as German writer Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and French priest and revolutionary Henri Grégoire, as well as efforts by Jewish intellectuals, did appear to have an influence on eighteenth-century intellectual and political life.

Despite their extremely small number—only 0.16 percent of the population at the time of the French Revolution—Jews were central to the eighteenth-century French imaginary. Ronald Schechter (2003) for example, argues that the fact that references to Jews were statistically prominent in eighteenth-century French writing, when compared to references to other ethnic or religious groups, demonstrates the centrality of Jews in French society. Maurice Samuels (2016) concurs and takes this claim a step further by arguing that, for the next two centuries, Jews, as imagined, internal others, would continue to remain central to French debates about universalism, citizenship, and minority integration. Indeed, in the late eighteenth century, political figures such as Mirabeau and Talleyrand took up the plight of Jews in France and argued in the post-1789 National Assembly that their supposed 'faults' and 'vices' resulted from the unfair treatment and persecution that they faced from mainstream gentile society (Winock 2004: 13-21).

The 'Jewish question' increasingly became a political question debated extensively in the National Assembly (Winock 2004: 16). The deputies who argued in favour of emancipating and integrating Jews were often met with harsh resistance from other deputies, mostly from the extreme right, such as Jean-Sifrein Maury, but also left-wing figures such as Jean-François Rewbell, the deputy for Alsace (Winock

2004: 19). An informal anti-Jewish lobby took form in the National Assembly and sought to obstruct the accordance of citizenship and equal rights to Jews (Winock 2004: 18-21). Despite the challenges from this vocal and significant segment of the political class, Jewish emancipation in France took place relatively early, compared to other European states, following the 1789 revolution. Thus, by September 1791, Jews had achieved for the first time in French history full equality before the law. Despite this, however, they remained socially marginalized, discriminated against by representatives of the state, and occasionally found themselves the targets of violent reprisals at the hands of fellow citizens. Simply put, the centuries of anti-Jewish attitudes in France did not disappear after legal emancipation. The long nineteenth century, however, was *both* a time when Jews were increasingly integrated and when modern antisemitism increasingly took root.

Following legal Jewish emancipation in 1791, Jewish life and identity in France underwent a series of major transformations, largely linked to Napoleon's convocation of a Jewish parliament of notables in 1806 and then, in 1807, of an assembly of rabbis that he called the Grand Sanhedrin, thereby drawing upon the symbolism of the original Sanhedrin in order to give its decisions a semblance of authority and legitimacy among French Jews. Napoleon asked them twelve questions—to which he attached his preferred answers—that aimed to determine Jewish desire for integration and whether Jewish practices were compatible with French laws and customs. The answers that the rabbis gave to these twelve questions largely confirmed both points (Cohen 2000: 91).

In the process, the rabbis took an old Talmudic principle—affirming that "the law of the land is the law"—in order to create a new distinction between civil and religious laws, thereby arguing that, in their private lives Jews would follow religious law, while in public they would adhere to civil law (Cohen 2000: 91). In doing so, these

rabbis were able to frame the republican duality of private and public life in a way that was intellectually acceptable—or even desirable—from a Jewish standpoint. From this moment, at least in theory, Jewish identity was 'religionized,' henceforth to be relegated to the private sphere, as the rabbis reinterpreted key elements of the Jewish tradition in a way that would affirm Jewish loyalty to France. For example, the concepts of the Jewish people and their return to Zion became more religious and spiritual than national, historical, and political. Furthermore, France was presented as the new "Promised Land" (Cohen 2000: 92). Even before the convocation of the Grand Sanhedrin, however, some Jews were already engaged in diffusing the potential political and national nature of certain Jewish concepts and aligning their Jewishness with loyalty to the burgeoning French nation. Thus, in 1792, the year following Jewish emancipation, a French Jew wrote in *La Chronique de Paris* that "[l]a France est notre Palestine, ses montagnes sont notre Sion" (Chouraqi 2004: 9). In 1852, the Grand Rabbi of Paris would declare that "[l]e peuple juif est mort, sa forme nationale est morte, mais ce qui n'est pas mort et ne mourra jamais, c'est l'esprit du judaïsme" (Chouraqi 2004: 9). In the intervening years, in addition to the religionization of Jewish identity and the reinterpretation of Jewish tradition in order to emphasize loyalty to the French nation, Jewish leaders increasingly sought to apply the revolutionary republican ideas of 'regeneration' and the 'new man' to themselves, thereby transforming themselves into "useful" and "productive" Jews that could be integrated into the new nation (Cohen 2000: 92). Even so, just as emancipation itself was an ambivalent process, so too was the idea of regeneration. In order to be emancipated, in order to be 'regenerated,' a Jew first had to shed their Jewishness. In order words, regeneration also implied that the Jew had to be fundamentally changed and assimilated in order to be integrated.

Jewish integration was therefore underpinned by three concurrent processes. First, the religionization of Jewish identity, which made it therefore possible to be included within the broader body politic as a religion to be practised in private and not, as previously perceived, as a separate nation. Secondly, the Frenchification of Jewish tradition (considering, for example, France to be the new promised land). Finally, the assimilation of republican values by French Jews. Nevertheless, these internal transformations do not sufficiently explain Jewish integration, in the social sense of the term, in nineteenth-century France. Rather, these changes could be considered as more the result of, rather than the cause of, Jewish integration. Successful integration depends, in large part, on both the settled population and its policy makers. Thus, changes within French society and its relations to Jews were just as important as internal changes (Cohen 2000: 94). Yet, because difference is built in to the idea of universalism itself, the perception that Jews were a separate nation persisted among state authorities—at the time, monarchic and catholic—throughout the nineteenth century.

Moreover, it was only under the Third Republic, with its laicisation laws, that the link between national identity and catholic identity was, at least in theory, undone, thereby possibly allowing for more pluralistic conceptions of national identity that led to the possibility of socio-economic Jewish integration (Cohen 2000: 93). Strikingly, this pluralization of national identity took place at the same time as the rise of the virulent nineteenth-century antisemitism that culminated with the Dreyfus Affair. That these seemingly paradoxical trends arose at the same time indicates that the construction of national identity is often complicated, non-uniform non-linear, and somewhat unstable. Moreover, they highlight that the acquisition of legal rights does not imply social acceptance or the end of discrimination or marginalization. Indeed, during the nineteenth century, French Jews were demonized, often in racially-charged

language, by both left-wing and right-wing antisemites. For some socialists, the Jews were to blame for the ills of capitalism, while, for some right-wingers, Jews were cast as a key part of revolutionary plots to destroy the nation from within. For both groups, Jews were 'rootless' aliens who sought to undermine the nation. Therefore, on the one hand, Jews achieved legal integration in the nineteenth century, but, on the other hand, strong social prejudice and antisemitism continued unabated and climaxed during the Dreyfus Affair precisely because Jews continued to be seen as a separate nation or race.

If Jewish integration was a complicated and non-linear process, so too was the way universalism was understood since the 1789 revolution. Maurice Samuels argues that, while contemporary actors often evoke universalism in the contemporary period as if it were an unchanging, inherent and vital part of the French Republic since the Revolution, the history of universalism reveals that it has always been an object of debate, negotiation, and compromise. Like the very nature of national identity, understandings of universalism in France have evolved over time as a result of these debates. *In The Right to Difference: French Universalism and the Jews* (2016), Maurice Samuels also notes how universalism has been, since the days of the Revolution, more accepting, or tolerant, of minority expressions of difference, and thus more pluralistic, than is often assumed today:

> Because of their very strangeness, their cultural and religious difference, their position on the literal and figurative margins of the nation, they became the symbol of what it would mean to conceive the nation as a primarily ideological entity. […] this was why the Jews' difference became actually valuable to the Revolution: rather than trying to assimilate it away through regeneration, they needed to prove how inclusive, how *universal* they could be (38-9, emphasis in the original).

In other words, integrating Jews as Jews was a way to prove the universality of the revolutionary project. The story of Jewish integration indicates that, even as virulent antisemitism took hold, nineteenth-century understandings of universalism were

sometimes able to accommodate minority difference. Jewishness, in particular, was not always perceived to inherently preclude Frenchness. Indeed, universalism and particularism have in the past gone "hand in hand, one reinforcing the other" (Samuels 2016: 5). In addition, Samuels provides numerous examples that indicate that broader French culture, as manifested through literature, theatre, and the arts, was often supportive of expressions of Jewish difference. At the same time, Jewishness was at times presented as inherently 'uninteresting,' as something to be transcended. Yet, given how the acceptance of particularism has been a part of universalism since the Revolution—essentially the argument made by Emile Zola and Léon Blum in defence of Dreyfus—how then did universalism come to be understood as properly—that is to say, predominantly—anti-particularist/pluralist in the contemporary period? Samuels argues that the revolutionaries heavily debated pluralist and assimilationist models of universalism. The dominant model following the Terror would be the assimilationist model, but pluralist views never completely disappeared and remained an important part of public debate.

By the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, amidst the Dreyfus Affair, assimilationist universalism gradually hardened and pluralist universalism increasingly receded. This was increasingly also the case as the object of integration shifted from French Jews to mostly Muslim former colonial subjects later in the twentieth century. Samuels' account is important because it challenges the notion of an unchanging and essentially *republican* universalism and shows that a pluralist version of universalism has coexisted with the more dominant assimilationist version. Thus, he challenges the binary between a presumably Anglo-American pluralist model and the French assimilationist model, by showing how universalism has previously been pluralist in French history. Nevertheless, this is mostly no longer the case in contemporary France. Despite this push-and-pull history

of pluralist universalism and assimilationist universalism, universalism has manifested itself somewhat differently in the contemporary period as the primary focus of integration of ethnoreligious minorities shifted principally from Jews to Muslims in France.

Indeed, while France has long been a country of immigrants rather than emigrants, it was only after the Second World War and after the Algerian War that massive numbers of mostly Muslim immigrants from North Africa arrived *and remained* in the metropole. Previous waves of mass migration to France from North Africa took place during the First World War in order to meet the increased factory and farming labour demands of wartime France, but these labourers would eventually be repatriated. With successive waves of immigration from North Africa, but also from sub-Saharan Africa and Turkey, in the forty-year period between 1960 and 2000, the Muslim population in France eventually grew from approximately a few hundred thousand to five million (Laurence and Vaïsse 2006: 7). In the absence of official statistics on the ethnic and religious background of citizens and immigrants, current estimates range from 5.7 million (Pew Research Center, Nov. 29, 2017) to 8.4 million (Héran 2017). Despite often being presented and spoken of monolithically by the media, politicians, administrators, and other shapers of public opinion (Hajjat and Mohammed 2013; Fredette 2014; Deltombe 2005; Liogier 2016), France's Muslims in reality constitute a diverse population in terms of ethnicity, national origin, class, religiosity, and geographical distribution, even if the vast majority of Muslims in France are of North African origin (Laurence and Vaïsse 2006: 17-22).

While a diverse population that defies facile generalizations, Muslims in France can increasingly be said to share a common "lived experience" linked to their experiences of exclusion and integration (Laurence and Vaïsse 2006: 16). As such, the ethnic differences between Algerians, Tunisians, and Moroccans—and indeed, Berber

nationalists notwithstanding, between 'Arabs' and 'Berbers' in France are increasingly become less salient than their shared experience of being read as 'Muslim' and treated as such, regardless of their actual religious beliefs or level of religiosity (Fredette 2011; Parvez 2013). A Muslim community in France only exists to the extent that its members are seen as part of an ethnoreligious community—due to the blurring of lines between 'Arabs' and Muslims in the French colonial North African imaginary—and see themselves as sharing a common experience of social marginalization and exclusion, due to the history of colonization and the more recent experiences of political, social, and economic discrimination in the metropole. This common experience and shared memory overrides other differences that might have otherwise been salient. Indeed, despite their differences, Muslims in France are more susceptible than other minority groups to encounter discrimination and unemployment, key factors in social exclusion.

In *Multi-Ethnic France* (2005), Alec Hargreaves provides representative examples of how certain groups were officially distinguished from 'white' French people in the recent past: "in census data from metropolitan France, immigrants from Algeria and other colonial possessions were customarily treated as if they were foreigners though they were juridically French nationals prior to independence" (192). Furthermore, the category of *Français musulmans* which was used in the 1968 census "reflected the perception that these were not normal members of the national community" (Hargreaves 2005: 193). The term itself, although disappearing from the 1975 census, would live on "in other official documents" (Hargreaves 2005: 193). Even officially, then, the State clearly made distinctions between its citizens that the (assimilationist) universalist model ought to have disallowed. Furthermore, these distinctions that were made between different types of French people were not made in line with the pluralist tradition of universalism. Being a particularistic (and not

pluralist) universalism, French universalism is ill-equipped to address the very real and structural inequalities that its theory of assimilationist universalism supposedly seeks to eradicate. Crucially, it also allows for racialist and racist politics to be played out under the cover of defending universalism and the Republic from a *communautarisme* (or ethnic factionalism) that is only ever used to castigate select problem minorities. The idea of *communautarisme*, however, which implies the creation of ethnic enclaves, is itself an inevitable construct of universalism since, without difference, there would be nothing to universalize. As Joan Wallach Scott writes, "if one has already been labelled different [...] it is difficult to find a way of arguing that one is or can be the same" (2007: 13). The term *communautariste* in France calls to mind a mythologized image of separate Muslim communities antithetical to abstract French values. But it is inherent to the ideology of universalism to seek out ethnic difference and label neighbourhoods and communities of racialized minorities as *communautariste*, whereas neighbourhoods and communities of whites are seen as unproblematic. The tension between the supposed goals of universalism and its failure to address concrete inequalities between French citizens and foreigners living in France has been the object of numerous analyses, which have tended to conclude that contemporary French republican universalism is either unable to address or, worse, exacerbates the ethnic or religious discriminations that it is supposed to protect against (Silverman 1992, 1995; Wieviorka 1997; Fysh and Wolfreys 2003; Schor 2001; Hargreaves 2005; Fredette 2014; Beaman 2017).

In *La Force du préjugé* (1987), Pierre-André Taguieff distinguishes between two main types of racism. The first is what he terms "heterophobic" racism, which essentially regroups varieties of pseudo-scientific biological racism. The second type of racism is "heterophilic," which replaces the focus on biological difference with an emphasis on essentialized cultural difference. With the rejection and delegitimization

of biological racism, Taguieff argues that far-right groups and parties increasingly adopt this second form of racism, articulated as a critique of multiculturalism. Michel Wieviorka also charts the gradual shift in public discourse from a physical, by which he means biological, racism to a cultural racism since the 1960s (2006: 154-156). He writes that "racism now is more and more analysed as a differentialist logic of action, in which the racist considers the other as irreducibly different because of cultural attributes that forbid him or her to find his or her way of integrating in the society where he or she lives" (1998: 70). Similarly, Peter Fysh and Jim Wolfreys (2003) identify two broad models for the integration of foreigners in France: an ethnocultural model and a republican model. The ethnocultural model, espoused by the likes of Jean-Marie Le Pen, the founder of the FN, and Alain Griotteray, a former member of the French Resistance and right-wing politician with close ties to the far right, posits that the successful integration of foreigners requires them to share the same culture and history: "They believe that foreigners who come into France should be as much like the [imagined homogenous ethnocultural community of] French [people] as possible; those who cannot achieve that should be rejected" (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 11). The republican model of citizenship, however, does not necessarily emphasize culture, but shared values "expressed by allegiance to a republic which offers citizenship to anyone who would accept the principles of fraternity, equality and political liberty" (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 11). There is, however, a practical overlap between the two models on the issue of cultural conformity: "the republican and ethno-cultural approaches do not exclude each other. The republican tradition has been around for so long that ethno-culturalists are able to claim it as part of French 'culture' while paying scant attention to its meaning" (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 12). This is especially the case since contemporary proponents of the republican model often entirely ignore the pluralist tradition of universalism that Samuels charts.

Similarly, Alec Hargreaves contrasts the long French tradition of emphasizing shared culture as the basis for citizenship with the equally long history of xenophobia and discrimination: "paradoxically, exclusionary reflexes among the French themselves have been tending to create in all but name racially constructed ethnic minorities of precisely the kind that cut across the much vaunted project of integration" (2005: 35)

There are numerous examples in recent French history that display how universalist ideals rarely translated into practice: for example, in 1933, the right to exercise the medical profession was limited to French nationals and eventually new citizens "were barred from applying for a job in the public sector" for a minimum of five years after naturalisation (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 21). While the post-WW2 era seemed at first to be more amenable to immigration, with Charles de Gaulle calling for "12 million beautiful babies" to reverse a century of demographic decline, there was an ethnic hierarchy of the type of immigrant preferred: "A proposal to give priority to 'Nordics' followed in order by 'Mediterraneans' and 'Slavs', with workers of 'other origins' relegated to the bottom of the list, was only narrowly prevented from being officially adopted in 1945 by the intervention of the Council of State, which pointed out its scant compatibility with republican values" (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 31-2). Despite having been recognized as illegal in principle, in practice a preferential ethnic hierarchy appeared to have been adopted by government administrators and employers alike (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 32).

Indeed, citing demographic studies, Alec Hargreaves shows how the French public, in the period just after the Second World War and in 1984, viewed immigrants "through the prism of a long-established ethnic hierarchy" (2005: 142). This ethnic hierarchy also "structured many important administrative practices" (Hargreaves 2005: 143). Indeed, access to work, education, and housing in the post-WW2 period were often based on this hierarchy (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 157-8). While ethnic

quotas are in theory illegal, "they have in practice been applied by housing authorities in many French cities […] and because the authorities are not obliged to make public their reasons for accepting or refusing individual housing applications," it is rare for complainants to have sufficient documentary evidence to bring to court (Hargreaves 2005: 186). In fact, discriminatory employment practices were only outlawed in 1972, "after a long campaign by the [anti-racist organisations] MRAP [Mouvement contre le racisme et pour l'amitié entre les peuples] and the LICRA [Ligue Internationale Contre le Racisme et l'Antisémitisme]" (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 37). Hargreaves suggests that it is systemic discriminations such as these that lead "immigrant-born youths" who are visible ethnic minorities to sometimes vent "their frustration in violent attacks on property and the representatives of the state, most notably the police," actions that in turn lead to accusations of "inadequate acculturation or ethnic separatism" (2005: 207).

Furthermore, the efforts of anti-racist movements have and continue to be met with scepticism and denial on the part of French political leaders, such as Prime Minister Jacques Chaban-Delmas who stated in 1971 that "we are without doubt one of the least racist countries in the world" and that campaigning against racism in France—which according to him does not exist—would be "counter-productive" (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 39). Justice Minister Jean Foyer claimed, just two years after the Paris massacre of Algerians on October 17, 1961, that France could "congratulate herself for the absence of acts of racial discrimination or segregation on her territory" (Fysh and Wolfreys 2003: 39). Several decades later, French government officials continue to deny the existence of systemic racism in France by drawing on post-racial universalist language. In June 2020, in the midst of protests in Paris marking the 2016 police killing of Adama Traoré (inspired by Black Lives Matter protests in the United States following the murder of George Floyd by police officers in Minneapolis)

focusing on the structural and systemic racial inequality perpetuated and maintained by French police and the judicial system, the chief of police in Paris Didier Lallement declared, "il n'y a pas de race dans la police" (Polloni 2020). It bears emphasizing that Lallement did not merely deny the prevalence of racism in the police, but the very concept of race. This longstanding political myopia, which, in constitutional terms, crystallized in 2018 when the French Assembly voted to remove the word 'race' from the constitution[1], can be explained by the fact that the abstract, universalist republican model of integration and citizenship, which ignores certain markers of identity, obscures (or allows for the—wilful or otherwise—obscuring of) concrete instances of racial discrimination and structural racial inequalities. As anti-racist writer and activist Rokhaya Diallo writes, "racism is not addressed in a structural way in France […] because race is not addressed as something tangible" (2018). In the end, even as it opposes the ethnocultural model of the far right—and the far-right-esque centre right—the republican universalist model, which emphasizes the abstract notion of shared values, is no less ethnocultural in practice.

Far from diminishing over the years, whether on the left, right, or centre of the political spectrum, the difference-blind, post-racial, universalist model, which erases differences in order to supposedly protect equality, continues to be an important system of exclusion for certain minorities, such as those perceived as 'Muslim,' even when many self-identifying and externally identified Muslims in France subscribe to values broadly defined as 'republican.' While often presented in the media and political discourse as a monolithic group that has failed to integrate, there is a wealth of research that demonstrates both the relative integration of French Muslims and the diversity of this population beyond simple clichés and media stereotypes (Laurence

[1] The debate over the term 'race' in the French constitution dates back at least to the late 1980s and early 1990s. A major milestone was a 1992 conference, held at the French Senate and the Sorbonne, on whether the word 'race' was "de trop" in the French constitution (see Bonnafous et al. 1992 for the conference proceedings).

and Vaïsse 2006; Davidson 2012; Fredette 2014; Beaman 2017). A common perception of Muslims in France, shared by politicians, commentators, and some academics, is that they do not wish to assimilate into French society and identify primarily with the religion of Islam, which is deemed to be incompatible with French values (Hargreaves 2005: 146). In this context, numerous studies (Bowen 2010; Schain 2011; Thomas 2011; Parvez 2017) have sought to examine a set of questions such as: 1) are Islam and French (republican and universalist) values compatible? and 2) can one be culturally French and Muslim? Despite such studies that privilege the religious frame in understanding Muslims in the West, other researchers, such as Fredette (2014) and Maxwell and Bleich (2014), recognize that religiosity is neither the only nor the most important force that shapes the identity and attitudes of Muslims. The fact that this is how Muslims are commonly perceived in French public discourse should not lead academics to focus solely on Muslims as a religious group. Most importantly, given the diversity of Muslims in France and the fact that there is no one French Muslim identity, why does mainstream discourse still persist in depicting Muslims as a homogenous group and why is the prevalent narrative in "political, media, and intellectual discourse in France since the 1980s" still one of "failed integration" (Fredette 2014: 7-8)?

One answer might be that 'polemical' stories about a Muslim crisis of integration sell more books and newspapers. But this cannot be the only explanation. Indeed, the answer lies not just in the demands of marketability, but also in the politics and framework of citizenship—beyond its legal manifestation—in France. While French Muslims may have the legal status of citizens, they face significant barriers in accessing equal civil and political, social, and economic rights, primarily in education, the job market, housing, the criminal justice system, and healthcare (see Jackson 2010, Beaman 2017). Concurring with Joan Scott (2007), Fredette argues that, in opposition to the 'Muslim,' "the deserving French citizen [is constructed] as a sexually liberal,

irreligious (indifferent or hostile to religion), culturally singular, abstract individual" (2014: 42). While many Muslims in France could be described by any one of these terms that define the "deserving French citizen," they are often perceived in discourses with the power to shape public perception as the very opposite, overdetermined by their 'Muslimness.' Citing other studies on universalism's historical exclusion of women, Jews, and colonial subjects, Fredette, too, recognizes that French universalism "is informed by a hidden particular" (2014: 42). Marshalling quantitative and qualitative data, drawn from political, media, and intellectual discourse, as well as juridical decisions and cases from her fieldwork, Fredette contends that "French elites [those with the power and resources to shape public opinion and discourse] today define the deserving French citizen in a way that excludes if not all Muslims, then many," and this is despite the many Muslim activists whose "political claims frequently hinge on the French republican triad of liberty, equality, and fraternity" (Fredette 2014: 46).

The persistence of "the Muslim question" (Farris 2014) and the challenging of the Frenchness of Muslims by opinion shapers in the public sphere are suggestive of France's "identity crises" (Kritzman 1995) and broader tensions in the French model of citizenship: "the universal model of French citizenship was not designed with Muslims in mind, and their presence worrisomely draws attention to the limits of that universality" (Fredette 2014: 171). Indeed, it draws attention to the hypocrisy of the presumed universality of French universalism. This worry was present throughout the colonial period as officials voiced concerns about the possibility of integrating certain colonial subjects into the "supposedly universal model of French citizenship" (Fredette 2014: 171). The idea of some revolutionaries that Jews could be used to prove the universality of the revolutionary project, as well as Charles de Gaulle's comment on the utility of having a few "yellow, black, and brown French people" to prove the

universality of the idea of France (Peyrefitte 2002), suggests that the concern has often been to protect the sanctity and validity of the concept of universalism, even if this came at the expense of the real, on-the-ground inequalities. Indeed, the related concepts of republican universalism and *laïcité* can be considered to be sacred objects in the French imaginary because of their positive association to the Enlightenment and the French revolution.

There are, of course reasons other than the republican tradition for refusing to recognize ethnic or 'racial' differences. Hargreaves highlights two other reasons: "the widespread fear of strengthening ethnocultural differences by giving state recognition and/or state funds to [certain] minority groups, thereby undermining national cohesion" and "painful memories associated with the Vichy regime, which […] used state-compiled registers listing Jews and other minorities to collaborate actively in Nazi Germany's extermination policies" (2005: 192). Yet, certain 'minority' groups, such as groups for women and feminists, the disabled, LGBT people, and the poor, do benefit from state recognition and funding. Given this, it is all the more significant that certain other 'minority' groups, in particular those racialized as Muslim, are excluded. In their preface to the third edition of *Racial Formation in the United States* (2015), sociologists Michael Omi and Howard Winant argue that "race has been a master category, a kind of template for patterns of inequality, marginalization, and difference [and that] no other social conflict—not class, not sex/gender, not colonialism or imperialism—can ever be understood independently of it" (viii). Omi and Winant's argument is based on their reading of American history, but it also applies to European history (and to world history, insofar as European and American imperialisms have long embedded themselves in every culture, society, and nation). If indeed, race is a master category and no other social conflict can be outstood without

it, then post-racial universalism in France must be seen as an ideological tool for the maintenance and perpetuation of inequal power relations.

The concepts of universalism and *laïcité* are powerful emblems of the shared cultural history and memory of the white French ethno-nation and therefore form the symbolic bases of white French nationhood. Thus, these concepts that have very real, concrete, and material consequences for the lives of French minorities are rarely challenged because they are sacred symbols of a particular vision of the Republic. As such, the response to the contemporary identity crises could only have been to implicate Muslims—and other minorities deemed problematic—for their alleged inability or unwillingness to integrate and not to question the universality and historicity of French universalism, for doing so would question the very bases of the French nation. This context of the sacredness and untouchability of a universalism behind which empirical and systemic inequalities hide have resulted in a particularly challenging minefield that minorities in France constantly find themselves having to carefully navigate.

Debates in France over race, racism, antisemitism, Islamophobia, and other related issues, occur within this hegemonic framework of post-racial universalism. This universalism is often thought to be the direct result of the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, although, as we have seen, it has always been unstable and contradictory. In theory, universalism is a noble ideal; after all, who would object to the universal humanity and rights of all individuals? In practice, as our discussion demonstrates, universalism often acts as a code for a particular, reified notion of Frenchness, rooted in whiteness. In this sense, universalism becomes a French ethno-nationalist particularism. The very term that Anglophone commentators often use, *French* universalism, suggests their acute awareness of the particularism that hides behind an abstract notion of universalism. This, in effect, has been the consensus

among Anglophone scholars of France for the past three decades—that French republican universalism is a particularistic and exclusionary ideology (Scott 2005; Graebner 2014; Samuels 2016). As such, thesis aims to study how contemporary French Jewish and Muslim writers and interreligious dialogue activists relate to and, possibly, challenge broader depictions of Jewish-Muslim relations within this contemporary framework of republican universalism. In doing so, this thesis also formulate an implicit critique of the ideology of French universalism.

1.3. Jewish-Muslim Relations in Twentieth-Century France

In twenty-first century France, it is nearly impossible to avoid discussing Jewish-Muslim relations without considering the dominance of the discourse of 'la nouvelle judéophobie'. Since the early 2000s, public intellectuals such as Raphaël Draï (2001), Pierre-André Taguieff (2002), Shmuel Trigano (2003), Alain Finkielkraut (2003), argue that there has been an emergence of a distinctly new form of antisemitism that represents a departure from 'traditional' European antisemitism. This new antisemitism is described as a conflagration caused by the convergence of anti-Zionism and an older tradition of Islamic antisemitism. They generally begin their analyses in the 1980s, a time when an entire generation of "beurs," who had grown up in the shadow of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, came of age and became politically active. Proponents of the new antisemitism hypothesis tend to make their case in four parts. First, in the new antisemitism, Jews are perceived through an unfairly demonized Israel. Taguieff, for example, states: "C'est à travers une représentation du « sionisme » comme incarnation du mal absolu que s'est constituée une vision antijuive dans la seconde moitié du XXe siècle" (2003: 12). Second, the new antisemitism is an alliance between the left/far-left and Muslims, sometimes called "islamo-gauchiste," a term that has been criticized as being based on the same logic

underlying the use of term "judeo-bolshevism" in the 1930s (Sand 2016). This is what Trigano has in mind when we denounces "le clan islamo-progressiste." (2003: 37-43) Third, and most importantly, the new antisemitism emanates principally from the Muslim population of France. Fourth, the French state has allowed this new antisemitism to fester through governmental inaction due to the fear of offending its Muslim minority. Indeed, the title of Trigano's *La démission de la République* (2003) or Georges Bensoussan's *Les Territoires perdus de la République* (2002), published under his pseudonym Emmanuel Brenner, both (dubiously) indict the French Republic for its supposedly laissez-faire approach to Islam in France.

The hypothesis of a new antisemitism was, however, the subject of a number of critiques by other French scholars and writers, such as Étienne Balibar (2003), Pascal Boniface (2003), Guillaume Weill-Raynal (2005), Ivan Segré (2009), and Alain Badiou and Éric Hazan (2011), who argue that the concept of the new antisemitism not only exaggerates the problem of antisemitic acts in France, but also purposely confuses antisemitism with anti-Zionism in order to discredit criticism of Israel. Furthermore, they deplore the unwillingness of the new antisemitism theorists to grapple with Islamophobia in France. Ironically, these critics display an unwillingness to grapple with antisemitism in contemporary France, suggesting that it pales in comparison to Islamophobia. Therefore, despite their differences, both sets of proponents and opponents of the new antisemitism hypothesis operate within the same parameters of contemporary, oppositional ethnoreligious conflict.

It is worth discussing Shmuel Trigano's *La démission de la République* (2003) in some detail because it is characteristic of the reading of Jewish-Muslim relations through the lenses of the phenomenon of the new antisemitism. In addition, Trigano, an emeritus professor of sociology at the Paris Nanterre University, has long been an influential figure in Jewish studies in France and continues to intervene regularly in

a variety of publications in France, Israel, and the United States, from *Le Figaro* to *Israel Hayom* to *Mosaic*, on the topics of antisemitism and Islam. More importantly, on these topics, he is read and cited widely outside of academia, as a quick search through the recent archives of any major French newspaper will demonstrate.

In *La demission de la République* (2003), Trigano argues that solidarity with Palestinians has become the ultimate test of humanity. This, he suggests, has led to a "diabolisation des Juifs" (2). This 'diabolisation', Trigano argues, causes Jews to be a target for antisemitic reprisals from Muslims, in particular. Additionally, because they are demonized due to their association with Israel and Zionism, Trigano argues that left-wing French intellectuals and the media explain away antisemitic violence by invoking Israeli apartheid and colonialism. It is for this reason, Trigano (falsely) claims, that the rise in antisemitic acts in the early 2000s was ignored by the state and the public. For Trigano, this clearly indicated that "la France avait choisi la communauté arabo-musulmane contre la communauté juive" (2003: 10). Having stated this as the main issue facing Jews in France at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Trigano positions his book as seeking to understand both the inaction of the state and the "enfièvrement pro-arabe des médias et de l'intelligentsia" (2003: 8-9).

In order to answer the question of how the French political elite ended up 'choosing' Muslims over Jews, Trigano's analysis essentially begins in the 1980s. Up till 1981, Trigano contends, "la gauche avait toujours été en opposition"—a claim that is only true if we only consider the history of the Fifth Republic. Trigano argues that, as a result, throughout successive right-wing governments, the left depicted itself as symbolically identified with 'culture' and 'hope', while characterizing the right as politically 'immoral'. Trigano then claims that when the left finally regained political power, its own political 'immorality' was revealed (2003: 19). As such, he

argues, this threatened the self-righteous image that the left had crafted for itself when it was in opposition. As a solution, Trigano claims that Mitterrand sought to "resuscitate" the antifascist front by inventing a fascist threat that according to Trigano did not exist. Trigano essentially claims that Mitterrand exaggerated the influence of Le Pen and the far-right, casting them as "l'Antéchriste de principe de l'humanisme" (2003: 20) The result was the mobilization under the banner of the newly created SOS Racisme against Le Pen and around the Socialist Party of masses of youths who would otherwise have been lost as potential voters. According to Trigano, Mitterrand's political manoeuvre, while potentially beneficial at the moment to both the Socialist Party and Jewish-Muslim relations (by designating a tangible external threat, i.e. Le Pen), had long-lasting consequences on the nature of antisemitism in France. As the previous section suggests, however, Trigano's claims are largely unsubstantiated.

For Trigano, the contemporary 'démission' of the Republic can be trace back to this moment. In his view, SOS Racisme facilitated the symbolic denationalisation of Jews as well as the emptying out of Jewish memory. Trigano highlights a particular SOS Racisme slogan as a case in point: Jews=Immigrants. By equating 'Jew' with 'immigrant', SOS Racisme sought to mobilize support for the plight of recent North African immigrants. Subscribing to a competitive model of memory, Trigano states that this meant that "la Shoah n'était dès lors plus convoquée que pour servir la cause des Arabo-musulmans, les « colonisés »" (2003: 23). Consequently, Trigano argues that antisemitism and the memory of the Shoah became universal symbols, divorced from their Jewish specificity, and eventually desubstantialized. In such a context, he claims that Jewish identity in the public sphere was reduced to either charges of "communautarisme" or negative associations to Israel and Sharon. Although Pierre-Andre Taguieff chose to use the

term Judeophobia over antisemitism because he considers anti-Jewish hatred in the new millennium to be fundamentally different from the racial antisemitism of the recent past, Trigano asserts Taguieff's word choice demonstrates that the terms antisemitism itself had become "interdit" (2003: 25).

With all this in mind, in Trigano's analysis, the necessary conditions for the minimization of antisemitism in France in the early 2000s emerges out of the Mitterrand government's inability and lack of desire to tackle the real problem facing France in 1980: the problem of immigration and integration of Muslims (2003: 27-30). Instead, he asserts, the government made use of an abstract and emptied-out Jewish identity to drum up support against the spectre of Le Pen. In doing so, Jews were equated with immigrants and therefore situated outside the nation. This, he claims, paved the way for conceptualizing future conflict between Jews and Muslims as being between two extra-national groups that does not properly concern the Republic. In Trigano's reading, this is how the narrative of an Israeli-Palestinian conflict imported onto French territory came into existence. Against this narrative, Trigano provocatively contends that there is no intergroup conflict between Jews and Muslims in France since conflict implies symmetry; rather, it is a case of antisemitic violence committed by Muslims against Jews.

While Mitterrand's alleged political ploy is a crucial component of Trigano's account, it is not the "démission" referenced in the title. The "démission de la République" refers to the what Trigano refers to "la discrimination positive" and "la politique de compassion," which has led the Republic to 'absolve' Muslims and Islam of any responsibility and to stigmatize Jews. What he refers to as "discrimination positive," as applied to Muslims in France, is described as absolving Muslims and Islam of any responsibility for their actions and placing blame on the Jewish community, "chargée de tous les péchés de la France" (2003: 34-5). The

politics of compassion is the process by which Muslims were identified as perpetual victims and Jews as perpetual aggressors. This model, he claims, is convenient "pour se libérer de la culpabilité de la Shoah et de la colonisation," especially since the equation Jews=Israel=colonialism+apartheid exonerates the guilt and responsibility that the French ought to have towards its Jewish population due to the nation's complicity in the Shoah. Additionally, Trigano states, Jews became an "object of fixation" as a way to avoid recognizing the challenges posed by Muslim immigration to national identity (2003: 71). Thus the demission of the Republic is really the state's abandonment of its Jews at a time when they were being targeted by Muslims.

It goes without saying that Trigano's account, despite its popularity, is fundamentally flawed. He consistently fails to provide any evidence for his claims; there are only a handful of footnotes or references in his book. He consistently describes Muslims in France as immigrants as opposed to Jews who are truly French, but, due to their symbolic association with Muslims in the 1980s, were subsequently 'denationalized'. Aside the contentious nature of his denationalization argument, Trigano is clearly incorrect in describing North African Muslims in France in the 1980s as entirely made up of recent foreigners as opposed to Jews who were truly French and ought not to have been identified with immigrants. This is to ignore the complex history and circumstances of the migration of North African Jews and Muslims to France. Additionally, his claims that the French state has favoured Muslims over Jews do not hold up to analysis. A reading of the history of Muslims and the French state, such as in the previous section, demonstrates that, from the beginning of the colonial project till the present, Muslims and Islam have been constructed by French politicians and elites as a problem for French society and values. Indeed, Trigano's account is undermined by the absence of the much longer history of Jews and Muslims in France and North Africa. Trigano does not

sufficiently address and analyse the transformations—not just related to the Arab-Israeli conflicts—in the very categories of Jews and Muslims that shaped the way these two communities perceived and interacted with each other. While his accounts, as well as the account of other theorists of the new antisemtism, has proved to be popular in contemporary France, it is much more productive to ask how the story of Jews and Muslims in France, who often emigrated from the same countries, during the same period and occasionally to the same neighbourhoods came to become so polarized.

In general, both the proponents and opponents of the new antisemitism framework in France have neglected to take into account how relations between Jews and Muslims in France have a history that begins well before the 1980s. Jewish-Muslim relations in France have always been a "triangular" (Katz 2015: 24-5) relationship determined, to a large extent, by the French state. In the colonial empire, this was perhaps most obvious, with stark differences in the juridical statuses occupied by Jews and Muslims. However, as Edward Said poignantly notes:

> Imperialism did not end, did not suddenly become 'past', once decolonization had set in motion the dismantling of the classical empires. A legacy of connections still binds countries like Algeria and India to France and Britain respectively (Said 1994: 362).

The term post-colonial is, in this sense, a misnomer. There is no real 'post' to the colonial period, despite decolonization. As I hope to demonstrate in this section, this "legacy of connections" in neo-colonial periods continued and continues to impact formerly colonized subjects and their descendants in significant ways.

Jewish presence in France stretches over multiple centuries, from at least late Antiquity (Benbassa 1998). Recent archaeological discoveries have also shown a Muslim presence in France—albeit far less sustained than the Jewish one—that dates back to the early Middle Ages and related to Arab-Muslim conquests of Hispania and Septimania (Gleize et al. 2016). Yet, because sustained Muslim presence in France has

historically been insignificant, there is no long history of interactions between Jews and Muslims in France as there has been in, say, Iraq. With limited exceptions, Jewish-Muslim relations in metropolitan France were therefore generally inexistent until the First World War. During the First World War, some 400,000 Muslims from France's North African colonies arrived in the metropole destined for either the battlefield or the labour force, constituting the majority of colonial soldiers and labourers (Katz 2015: 26). For the first time in French history, there were significant interactions between Jews and Muslims. While both Algerian Jews and Muslims occupied the lower rungs of France's colonial racial hierarchy, there were significant differences between the two groups (see Cole 2019: 21-33). The *Ordonnance royale* of July 22, 1834 formed the legal basis for the denial of full French citizenship to Jews and Muslims in Algeria due to the supposed incompatibility of Jewish and Muslim civil law and practices (Noiriel 2018: 428). Nevertheless, Algerian Jews became full French citizens as a result of the 1870 *décret Crémieux*, on the basis of the 1865 sénatus-consulte, while Muslims had to apply to "être admis à jouir des droits de citoyen française" on the condition that they renounce their "statut personnel" as Muslims (Ayoun 1988: 61; Shepard 2006: 26**)**. From 1865 to the end of the Second World War, Algerian Muslims were therefore considered French subjects, but not French citizens, unless they "renounced [their] rights and duties under Muslim law" (Brett 1988: 441). The vast majority of Muslims did not adhere to this condition, on the basis that doing so would constitute apostasy.

After the First World War, most Algerian Muslims were repatriated to Algeria. However, the strong economic growth of the 1920s at an annual rate of 4.43% (Dormois 2004: 31) led to the need for labourers to support industrial and agricultural production. As such, many of those repatriated Muslims returned to France as labourers as part of a new wave of North Africans. The economic decline of the 1930s

led many to return again to Algeria. Nevertheless, by the end of the 1930s roughly 140,000 Muslims lived in France, while sizeable Jewish immigration (mostly from Eastern Europe, but with around 35,000 from North Africa and the Levant) boosted France's Jewish population to around 300,000 (Katz 2013: 503). While Jews and Muslims lived across the country, the Paris and Marseille regions were the most important sites of Jewish and Muslim immigration.

Contrary to other historians (Hyman 1979; MacMaster 1997) who have characterized interwar Jewish and Muslim neighbourhoods in France as being separate and distinct, Ethan Katz argues that neighbourhoods such as Paris's "Jewish" Marais and Marseille's "Muslim" Porte d'Aix were in fact shared hybrid spaces and "sites of multi-layered Jewish-Muslim interaction" (2015: 65). At the same time, however, the unequal legal and social statuses of Jews and Muslims as well as broader societal debates such as those over the future of Algeria and the question of Palestine divided Jews and Muslims in France. In the public sphere, various Jewish and Muslim groups in France made speeches, wrote articles, and released statements and reports that "presented radically opposed versions of the violence in Algeria" (Katz 2013: 503). Furthermore, the question of Palestine, especially after the 1929 Arab-Jewish riots and the 1936-39 Arab Revolt, led to some Jews and Muslims speaking and writing about "the possibility of spill over, some seeking to inflame conflict and others to extinguish it" (Katz 2013: 504). In this period, Jewish-Muslim relations in France were being increasingly structured (and complicated) by transnational concerns around Algeria and Palestine. Jewish-Muslim confrontations in the political sphere had the potential to affect day-to-day, on-the-ground interactions in North African shared sociocultural spaces. In particular, responses to the 1934 Constantine riots by the colonial administration and certain Jewish and Muslim leaders ignored "Jews' and Muslims' complex allegiances and frequently overlapping identities in Algeria […] [and] Jewish

versus Muslim quickly became the dominant narrative frame" (Katz 2015: 86-7). Thus, while a number of neighbourhoods in the interwar period became shared North African spaces with a range of daily interactions, each group's differing relationship to the state, as well as political and transnational developments, which produced more rigid and oppositional categories, increasingly challenged and strained Jewish-Muslim relations. The rise of antisemitic political parties and their overtures to Muslims, life under German Occupation and Vichy rule, and the aftermath of the Shoah and the Second World War would further complicate Jewish-Muslim relations.

During the Nazi occupation and Vichy rule, the French colonial racial hierarchy that placed Jews above Muslims was reversed: "although nearly all […] Muslims in France still lacked citizenship, they now became defined by their racial status, superior to that of Jews and akin to Aryans" (Katz 2015: 113-4). The power dynamics that had previously structured Jewish-Muslim relations were completely reversed as Jews who previously had "the capacity to advocate, write or implement policies directly affecting the lives of thousands of Muslims […] became largely powerless to defend even their own interests," while Muslims, who previously occupied marginalized and unequal positions as colonial subjects, now "achieved new respect, both symbolic and material, from the French state" (Katz 2015: 114). Muslims suddenly found themselves courted by Nazi and Vichy authorities and collaborationist groups: "Both the occupiers and various collaborationist political parties heavily courted Muslim support, creating special Muslim sections. They often promised equal rights, religious autonomy, increased social benefits and generous salaries for the most active collaborators" (Katz 2012: 35).

Individual Muslims, like other people in France, made a number of different choices; most were either supportive or indifferent bystanders, while some actively collaborated and others actively resisted. Nevertheless, especially during the first two

years of the Occupation, many Muslims in France found themselves drawn in by German propaganda and displayed their support for Vichy and/or the Nazis (Ageron 1979). In most cases, Muslim support for the Nazis was linked to a desire to improve their collective and individual positions and a belief in the promises made by the Nazis and Vichy.

The case of Si Kaddour Benghabrit, the rector of the Grand Mosque of Paris provides an interesting example of the various, sometimes conflicting and situational, choices Muslims made and their implications. One way that some Jews, especially those from North Africa and the Middle East, sought to evade detection was to pass themselves off as Muslims. Benghabrit and other Muslim authorities were well-placed to either aid or hinder such efforts. Benghabrit, in particular, was an ambiguous figure, having both saved and denounced Jews to Vichy's Commissariat Général aux Questions Juives. While it is difficult to ascertain Benghabrit's motivations in saving some Jews and sending others to their almost certain deaths, his "efforts to disguise some North African Jews as Muslims expressed solidarity around shared cultural and religious heritage and minority status," but his denunciation of other Jews "also highlighted the lethal ethnic boundaries of the Occupation, and new power imbalances between Muslims and Jews created therein" (Katz 2012: 283).

The aftermath of the Second World War and, especially, struggles over how to remember the events of the war deeply altered the nature of Jewish-Muslim relations in France. First, even though some North African and Levantine Jews were able to pass themselves off as Muslims, sometimes with the help of actual Muslims, to evade persecution, the Nazi racial hierarchy and the choices made by many Muslims "largely obliterated the positive, shared components of Jews' and Muslims' colonial, religious, and transnational positions" (Katz 2015: 153). Secondly, Jews who had survived the Shoah rightly felt betrayed by France and increasingly publicly

supportive of Zionism, already perceived by Arab-Muslims as a colonial project. Thirdly, France's defeat in 1940 rendered the colonial masters less invincible and secure in the eyes of Muslims who began to see "new political possibilities on the horizon" (Katz 2015: 154). Finally, in making political claims about their immediate futures in postwar France, both Jews and Muslims drew on the memory of the war and the Shoah in competing manners. Indeed, war-time Nazi propaganda targeting Muslims and Muslim support/collaboration, post-war support for Zionism, anti-colonialism, and Arab nationalism, and opposing memories and experiences of the war, did at times combine to damaging and polarising effects.

While growing support for Zionism among French Jews (and gentiles) and growing support for Arab nationalism among French Muslims and non-Muslims were critical factors, the decolonization of North Africa and, most importantly, the Algerian War, further shaped Jewish-Muslim relations in France. The question of Algeria largely pitted Jews and Muslims on opposing sides, with "Jews and Muslims increasingly fram[ing] their political positions in a binary manner that either embraced or rejected notions of French Algeria, and many did so in terms that foregrounded religion or ethnicity" (Katz 2015: 202). From the very beginning, the Algerian nationalists who formed the Front de libération nationale (FLN) framed their independence struggle in Islamic terms, thereby essentially excluding non-Muslim Algerians. An FLN statement that accompanied the attacks that marked the start of the Algerian war demanded "the restoration of the Algerian state, sovereign, democratic and social, *within a framework provided by Islamic principles*" (Katz 2015: 169, my emphasis). The desire for an independent and Arab-Muslim Algeria as expressed by the FLN would eventually gain the support of the majority of Muslims in Algeria and in France (Katz 2015: 170).

As the Algerian war came to a close and independence loomed, "the state sought to redraw the contours of French nationhood in a way that would allow for the forgetting of the history of French Algeria" (Katz 2013: 507). In the face of mass immigration from Algeria in 1962, the government adopted different attitudes towards incoming Jews and Muslims. Essentially Algerian Jews retained French citizenship, while Algerian Muslims, who had acquired full French citizenship in 1958, were effectively stripped of their citizenship and henceforth required to apply for citizenship on a case-by-case basis (Noiriel 2007: 542-550). This requirement also allowed France to abandon the Algerian Muslims, known as *harkis*, who had fought for the French side during the Algerian War, to their deaths at the hands of the FLN or lynch mobs seeking revenge (Evans 2016). The *harkis* and their families who did manage to come to France also found themselves deprived of French citizenship. Thus, unlike incoming Algerian Jews, Algerian Muslims found themselves excluded from the French body politic (Shepard 2006: 169-173). Crucially, the French state "chose to forget that Algeria and its [Muslim] natives had ever been 'French,' or, more precisely, that France's republican mission had failed to *make them fully French*" (Katz 2015: 219, emphasis in original; Shepard 2006: 106-8). Meanwhile, Algerian Jews were assimilated into the broader "European" category. While Zionism and opposition to Zionism were already becoming factors that could potentially shape Jewish-Muslim relations, it was the Algerian War—and its aftermath—that came to define and radicalize the public terms of Jewish-Muslim relations in a binary and oppositional manner (Mandel 2014: 66-7).

The 1967 Arab-Israeli war represented another key moment for Jewish-Muslim relations in France. Following the war, both Jewish and Muslim activists and public figures and French politicians, such as Marseille's mayor Gaston Defferre, increasingly blurred the boundaries between the domestic and the international

(Mandel 2014: 81). Public expression of Jewishness and Muslimness became increasingly entangled with the expression of an ethnoreligious identity linked to developments in the Middle East. Despite the fact that on-the-ground relations in France between the two communities were rarely affected by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or the Algerian war, the differing contexts of Jewish and Muslim integration in France as well as the essentializing discourses of many activists and politicians meant that conflict was increasingly becoming the framework for understanding Jewish-Muslim relations in the wake of the 1967 war. On June 2, 1968, a dispute over a game of cards seemingly led to riots in Belleville, a neighbourhood in Paris where many Jews and Muslims lived. These riots were heavily mediatized and, at the time, portrayed as an inevitable consequence of Jewish-Muslim tension over the conflict in the Middle East. The riots serve as an illustration of how encounters between Jews and Muslims had already been politicized by this point. In a politically explosive context, many members of both ethnoreligious groups found their identities "tied by definition to political movements and entities potentially at odds with one another or with wider French politics and culture" (Katz 2015: 244).

Yet, the 1968 Belleville riots, seemingly sparked by the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, represented less a turning point for on-the-ground, daily Jewish-Muslim interactions than a "parenthesis," as Jews and Muslims living in various interethnic communities in France continued to live in relative harmony (Katz 2013: 509). Indeed, even as public Jewish and Muslim identities in France became "increasingly tied to the Israeli and Palestinian causes" by the mid-1970s and even as the 1973 Yom Kippur War heightened tensions between the two communities, actual clashes between ordinary Jews and Muslims remained limited (Katz 2015: 282, 296). Nevertheless, during this same period in which the categories of Jewishness and Muslimness were increasingly essentialized and less fluid than in the past, many interethnic neighbourhoods became

increasingly territorialized, with "Jews and Muslims [finding] that they had to offer, albeit carefully and semi-privately, outward indications and emblems that marked their ethnoreligious affiliation (Katz 2013: 509; Katz 2015: 241). At the same time, and a few years before the major anti-racist Jewish-Muslim alliances of the 1980s, a number of Jewish organizations grew openly sympathetic to Muslims at a time when the latter were increasingly the target of anti-Arab racism in France (Mandel 2014: 99; Katz 2015: 292). The election of François Mitterrand in 1981, his pledge for the "right to difference," and the passing of a law that facilitated the forming of associations led to the mainstreaming of minority associational life. The most significant development was the emergence of the *Beur* movement:

> Following the 1981 reforms, Beur activists founded hundreds of new associations dedicated to causes ranging from urban development to North African art or Music. The movement reached its peak in autumn 1983 when, in response to a wave of racial violence, hundreds of thousands of Beurs participated in the March for Equality and against Racism that began in Marseille and ended in Paris two months later, where President Mitterrand greeted the 100,000 marchers in the place de la République" (Katz 2015: 302).

Despite their "long-standing affinity" for left-wing "politics and anti-racism," many Jews were not sympathetic to the movement due to "the underlying tensions of the Arab-Israeli conflict," which led, for example, to some *Beurs* "wearing kaffiyehs and chanting 'Death to the Jews'" at rallies during the 1982 Lebanon War (Katz 2015: 302). Nevertheless, a new political solidarity between some Jews and Muslims emerged. This solidarity, for the most part, was no longer based on shared origins, as was the case for older generations of North Africans, but around the threat of the far right and racism. The Jewish-Muslim alliances that, at the start of the 1980s, heralded great hope began to fall apart by the end of the decade, as relations became increasingly politicized, polarized, and internationalized.

Furthermore, the Shoah remained a contested site of memory and consistently and frequently evoked to make particularistic claims linked to the Israeli-Palestinian

conflict. On the one hand, Jewish public figures would ground support for Israel in the fear of a second Shoah. Especially during and after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, Jewish communal discourse was "saturated with Holocaust imagery," resulting from a sense that some French Jews had that the Jewish community did "too little during the Second World War" (Katz 2015: 208-9). On the other hand, Muslim public figures would engage in Holocaust inversion and ground support for Palestine in the notion that Jews were now guilty of perpetrating a second Shoah. Thus, in 1969 the Association des étudiants musulmans nord-africains en France called Israel a "Nazi regime" (Katz 2015: 267). Throughout the 1970s, the already politicized Shoah memory would remain an important public metaphor (Katz 2015: 282). Two letters to the editor that appeared in *Le Monde* on February 27, 1979, illustrate the two sides of the competitive model of Shoah memory as it played out in the public sphere. Tahar Ben Jelloun's letter considered the Shoah to be the precursor of Israeli crimes, while Paul Giniewski considered Israel's continued success to be a triumph for the victims of the Shoah (Katz 2013: 300).

In spite of fears that the 1991 Gulf War would enflame tensions between Jews and Muslims in France "around opposing transnational allegiances, calm ultimately prevailed" (Katz 2015: 310). The 1997-1998 trial of Maurice Papon for his role in the deportation of Jews to concentration camps also opened up public discussion over Papon's role in the October 17, 1961 massacre of Algerians perpetrated by French police. This had the effect of suggesting a "historical continuity between the Holocaust and the atrocities of the Algerian War" (Katz 2015: 311). However, even in this context, the Shoah still remained a contested site of memory. Nevertheless, as subsequent chapters will demonstrate, in the twenty-first century and in response to various crises of Jewish-Muslim relations, a number of writers and activists would eschew this competitive model of memory in favour of a multidirectional model (Rothberg 2009)

and go on to ground the possibility of Jewish-Muslim solidarity in this continuity between their sufferings.

Ultimately, there is a longer history of Jewish-Muslim relations in France than the "narrative of polarization" suggests. Jews and Muslims did not always primarily relate to each other in ethnoreligious and oppositional terms. Similar to Ella Shohat's claims in her 1999 paper on the "Invention of the Mizrahim" in Israel, Mandel, for example, contends that French administrators, international Jewish organizations, and indigenous nationalist movements in North Africa constructed the category of "the North African Jew," "a discursive category to which no individual ascribed as such" (2015: 35). This category flattened the diversity of Algerian, Moroccan, and Tunisian Jews and placed them into a collective often understood to be in conflict with "North Africans," "Muslims," or "Arabs." The creation of the North African Jew can be understood to be an early stage in the hardening of binary identities pitting Jews and Muslims against each other in contemporary France. Referring to the latest stage in this transformation, Katz writes that "the categories of 'Jew' and 'Muslim' have only recently become leading public signifiers for large portions of the two populations in France" (Katz 2015: 325). In other words, Katz echoes part of Naomi Davidson's central argument in *Only Muslim* (2010) that Jews and Muslims, who never interacted with each other solely as a function of their religious difference, came to become perceived and essentialized as only Muslim or Jewish.

Whenever the Israeli-Palestinian conflict provoked clashes in France, these clashes were seldom only about Israel and Palestine and were often deeply connected to domestic politics. Alliances between Palestinian nationalists, French far leftists, and North African Muslim student activists, between 1968 and 1970, brought the issue of Palestine, previously "largely invisible in France," to the forefront of public concern and, crucially, *made* the Palestinian cause a central issue for Muslim activists (Mandel

2014: 105-111). Subsequently, Jewish and Muslim public discourses around Israel and Palestine in France increasingly blurred geographical distinctions, "blurring the lines between Israeli Zionist/Jew and Muslim/Palestinian/Arab/North African when referring to one another" (Mandel 2014: 118). Yet, interactions seemed to be rarely affected by the conflict (Katz 2014: 162). The contemporary sense of unavoidable conflict linked to Israel and Palestine is a result of three decades of the hardening of what it means to be Jewish or Muslim in public "around particularistic ethnoreligious categories" (Katz 2014: 312).

Read in this sense, the current situation of Jewish-Muslim relations in France is only one of many other possible trajectories to which specific moments in French history have led. It was not, as it were, an inevitable outcome. Interestingly, Katz, whose *Burdens of Brotherhood* challenges the oppositional framework of understanding Jewish-Muslim relations, considers his interviewees' speech acts, as well as various literary and cinematic works, as attempts at resisting the transformations of Jewish-Muslim relations over the past few decades:

> With their stories, these individuals seek to reclaim a more malleable coexistence not defined by fixed categories. They have not lost the capacity, then, to reimagine a complex history of Muslim-Jewish kinship, even brotherhood. In thinking their way out of the present, they remind us that the future, too, may yield an unexpected narrative (Katz 2015: 327).

In other words, Katz is suggesting that ordinary Jewish and Muslim citizens and various cultural representations have the capacity to challenge a more rigid and oppositional vision of intergroup relations that seemingly dominates the public sphere. Accordingly, this thesis examines the extent to which contemporary counter-discourses reimagine Jewish-Muslim relations beyond the binary, oppositional frame that has come to dominate renderings of these intergroup relations in France.

1.4. Methodology, Corpus, and Overview

The data analysed in this project is diverse and is drawn from newspapers, novels and interreligious dialogue initiatives from 2000 to the present. Different methods were therefore chosen based on their suitability to this varied corpus. For the newspaper articles, I employed a frame analysis, corpus analysis, and a critical discourse analysis in order to understand how Jewish-Muslim relations are framed in contemporary French newspaper discourse, that is to say how it is defined, constructed, and how this in turn might impact public perception. For the novels, I conducted a thematic analysis of three recent novels. Finally, my analysis of interreligious dialogue draws on semi-structured key informant interviews and participant observation. With the novels and interreligious dialogue, I focused mostly on understanding the ways in which this diverse set of actors navigate the complex and polarized contemporary French socio-political terrain as they enact and engage in Jewish-Muslim dialogue.

This thesis consists of three main chapters. In Chapter Two, through a systematic linguistic study of two mainstream newspapers, I demonstrate the extent to which twenty-first century media representations of Jewish-Muslim relations are still characterized by the narrative of polarization that Mandel (2014) and Katz (2015) chart throughout the twentieth century. In Chapter Three, I look at how contemporary Jewish and Muslim novelists formulate their visions of intergroup relations within this broader context of polarized representations. The novelists in this project have been included to the extent that their works can be read as—and often are explicitly stated by these authors to be—a set of political interventions on a contemporary issue. Indeed, since the turn of the century, there has been a proliferation of novels and other literary texts, especially by self-identifying Jewish and Muslim authors, dealing, in part or entirely, with Jewish-Muslim relations in a way that often attempts to reconstruct a nostalgic past or an idealized present/future of harmonious relations,

while attempting to understand what went wrong in more recent times. The common link between these texts is the authors' explicit emphasis on both the contemporary and the socio-political. Coming at the very moment where Jewish-Muslim relations are often presented as having taken a turn for the worse, these works are specifically a response to a situation in which identity differences have intensified around a set of polarizing, politicized symbols. Moreover, novelists in France, more so than in other countries, are very often considered legitimate public intellectuals and given a broad platform to voice their opinions on a broad range of topics beyond literature. In this context, these texts constitute an important set of expressions on an increasingly polemicized issue of intergroup relations.

In Chapter Four, I examine the efforts of interreligious dialogue activists. While novelists are often accorded a certain degree of prominence and legitimacy in France, grassroots activists are often invisible and unheard on the national and certainly international level, although they can have significant impact on the local level. This is one reason why this thesis also looks at local-level activist discourse and politics, highlighting till now unresearched or under-researched groups such as Coexister, Convivencia, and the Homosexuels Musulmans de France (HM2F), a now-defunct queer Muslim group that used to enjoy close ties to their LGBTQ Jewish counterparts Beit Haverim. The Jewish-Muslim solidarity between these two groups in particular, that is based on a shared 'queerness,' is particularly interesting to study because both groups operate in a space between the pressures of normative religious dogmatism *and* of secular political puritanism. Another reason for studying activist discourse and politics is that it is often cited in novels and literary texts. In fact, a number of Jewish and Muslim writers, such as Thierry Cohen and Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf, who have written novels on Jewish-Muslim relations are themselves activists. While I conceptualize their discourses as counter-narratives, the point is not to merely

counterbalance the dominant narrative of polarization, but to understand how this narrative constructs public Jewish and Muslim identities and shapes the terrain on which interactions between Jews and Muslims occur. Thus, this project takes an interdisciplinary approach in order to examine the discursive framing of Jewish-Muslim relations in the public sphere and its impacts on Jewish-Muslim life both among interreligious dialogue activists and in the discourse of a key set of novelists who often emphasize the socio-political nature of their writings.

Chapter Two: Jewish-Muslim Relations in Contemporary Newspaper Discourse

This thesis focuses on the relations between Jews and Muslims in contemporary France. Rather than a study of communal relations—that is to say between *a* Jewish community and *a* Muslim community, this thesis proceeds from the standpoint that there is not a singular Jewish community or a singular Muslim community in France. Furthermore, individuals and groups of individuals who identify to some extent with the identity categories 'Jew' or 'Muslim' do not necessarily relate to each other primarily as a function of their ethnoreligious categories. Indeed, as Mandel (2014) and Katz (2015) have convincingly demonstrated, throughout the twentieth century, Jews and Muslims in France never formed singular communities and never *solely* nor primarily interacted with each other as Jews or Muslims. Rather, their on-the-ground interactions often took place as a function of a variety of other identifications, solidarities, and experiences. The catch-all term 'Jewish-Muslim relations' risks obscuring the historical and present realities of on-the-ground interactions and, instead, suggests that Jews and Muslims in France form two disparate communities and that the complex and diverse interactions between them can be reduced to (troubled) binary relations. Individual Jews and Muslims in France may, of course, view themselves as part of either a singular Jewish or Muslim community, but these communities, like any community, are socially constructed, or "imagined" (Anderson 1983). In addition, media discourse plays a vital part in the construction and maintenance of identity categories. Accordingly, this chapter examines how Jewish-Muslim relations are discursively defined and constructed in the media, focusing on the national dailies *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* due to their considerable framing power in terms of "agenda-setting" (Kuhn 2011: 42). This chapter reveals the discursive patterns that emerge in articles on Jews, Muslims and their 'relations,' while also paying

attention to the differences and the similarities between the two dailies. In doing so, I make two main arguments about newspaper reporting on Jewish-Muslim relations in France: 1) with some exceptions, Jews and Muslims are constructed as two separate, homogenous *communities* and their relations presented as tense and problematic; 2) Jews tend to be presented as fully integrated and their representation is in general positive, while Muslims are more often presented as not fully integrated—or even as at odds with French society and its values—and their representation is, at best, ambiguous and, at worst, negative.

2.1. Methodology

In order to determine how newspapers frame Jewish-Muslim relations in France, I perform three levels of analysis. First, I isolate the salient frames[2] found in articles relating to Jews and Muslims in France from 2000 to 2017, obtained through consecutive sampling, from two major French daily newspapers, the centre-left *Le Monde* and the centre-right *Le Figaro*. *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* were chosen for analysis in this chapter because they represent the two most prominent national dailies in France on either side of the traditional left-right political divide. Despite the dawn of the digital era, newspapers remain powerful framers of events and debates. National dailies, such as *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* in particular, "are the dominant agenda-setters in the French press system" and "exercise a strong influence among key political and economic decision-makers, help set the agenda for other news media and act as a

[2] Individuals, groups, media sources, and politicians all use frames to make sense of the world ('meaning-making') *and* organize perceptions and communicate about things in the world. A frame is an "interpretative schema that simplifies and condenses the 'world out there' by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of action" (Snow and Benford 1988: 137). All forms of communication and all messages, from mundane, daily interactions to landmark political moments, are framed in particular ways. In terms of media research, framing encodes news events in ways that conform to the expectations of their readership, while also shaping their opinion.

major forum for the discussion of new ideas in social and cultural matters." (Kuhn 2011: 42).

When it comes to Jewish-Muslim relations in France, by virtue of the steady polarization described by Mandel (2014) and Katz (2015), the public has come to expect news reports that frame these relations as a tense set of oppositional relations between two separate groups. At the same time, however, the perpetuation of this oppositional frame continues to shape these public expectations. Isolating dominant frames applied to the topic at hand can reveal the doxic view of Jewish-Muslim relations in France. Using the Europresse database, I searched for newspaper articles from *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* that mentioned the terms 'juifs,' 'musulmans,' and 'France' published within the timeframe of January 1, 2000 and December 31, 2017. This initial search produced 2303 articles. Subsequently, I eliminated redundant articles (articles that were identical) and articles mentioning the key terms without actually being about relations between Jews and Muslims in France. Adopting an approach rooted in grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967), I then began coding the headlines and lead paragraphs of the remaining articles until achieving theoretical saturation, at which point no new codes were emerging from the data. The decision to only code headlines and lead paragraphs at this first stage of data collection follows a long established approach to newspaper analysis (Van Dijk 1988, Bell 1991). As David Champion and Simon Chapman explain, headlines and lead paragraphs […] contain the story's main trajectory, and encapsulate what the journalist and subeditor consider to be the most important, newsworthy or interesting aspect" (2005: 680). These initial codes were then grouped under 9 main themes that are discussed in detail in Section 2.4.1 and theoretical saturation occurred with a total of 299 articles. At this point, I was able to identify the key frames used by *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* for speaking about Jewish-Muslim relations in France.

In the second part of the analysis, I conduct a corpus linguistics analysis of this sample using the corpus analysis software *AntConc*. Corpus linguistics can be thought of as a set of methods for the computer-assisted study of large samples (or corpora) of machine-readable texts. Corpus analysis allows us to systematically identify broad patterns and unusual occurrences in relatively large samples of texts that might otherwise be overlooked in smaller qualitative studies. I begin with a keyword analysis, which is done by comparing the frequency lists of my 267,638-word study corpus (SC) and the 19,969,511-word reference corpus (RC). The RC comprises of French-language news articles from 2005-2008 from the Leipzig Corpora Collection (Eckart and Quasthoff 2013). This corpus was chosen because it is specifically a corpus of news articles—therefore comparable to the SC—and presumably large enough to represent all varieties of French-language news discourse. By comparing the two frequency lists, I determine the 'keyness,' or statistical significance, using the log-likelihood ratio score (Dunning 1993), of keywords in the SC. The log-likelihood test is particularly appropriate because it does not assume normal distribution of the data. Keywords, being the "nodes around which ideological battles are fought," (Stubbs 2001: 188) can reveal the 'aboutness' of the SC, whereby aboutness refers to what the corpus is *about*, i.e. its subject matter. I pay attention to both positive keywords (words that are statistically more significant in the SC than the RC) and negative keywords (words that are statistically less significant in the SC than the RC). Subsequently, I perform a concordance analysis, whereby a concordance refers to "a collection of the occurrences of a word-form, each in its own textual environment" (Sinclair 1991: 32). Essentially, concordances are line-by-line collections of key words in the context in which they occur in the text. In this part of the analysis, I look at the concordances of both my original search terms and the keywords identified through the previous keyword analysis. Next, I conduct a collocation analysis, whereby collocation refers

to the statistically significant occurrence of two terms in close proximity to each other. Through these three approaches for exploiting the corpus data, I seek to highlight patterns that readers of *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* frequently encounter in coverage on Jewish-Muslim relations. In other words, the analysis of the SC systematically demonstrates, in a quantifiable manner, the ways in which text producers (in this case, *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* journalists and other contributors) discursively, through consistent and repeated lexico-grammatical choices, elaborate the previously described frames that are applied to discourses on Jewish-Muslim relations in France.

Finally, I perform a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of a down-sampled set of 77 articles, selected for having a frequency of more than 15 hits for the relevant search terms 'juif' and 'musulman' (and their plural and feminine variants). Frequency of the relevant search terms was chosen as the criterion for down-sampling following the approach of Baker and Levon (2015) in a comparative study on representations of masculinity in the British press. They found that "down-sampling [based on frequency of occurrence of key search terms] produced a small set of salient articles where the particular identities [they were interested in] were likely to be foregrounded as a topic in themselves rather than mentioned 'in passing' (2015: 225). My discourse analysis consists of a lexical, verbal, and representational analysis. In the lexical analysis, I focus on overlexicalisation (Halliday 1978) or overwording (Fairclough 1989). Overlexicalisation refers to a "surfeit of repetitious, quasi-synonymous terms […] woven into the fabric of news discourse, giving rise to a sense of overcompletedness" (Teo 2000: 20). Overlexicalisation is generally a key indicator of the "preoccupation with certain aspects of reality, which may reveal an ideological struggle" (Pierce 2008: 293). In the verbal analysis, I examine how different groups of verbs are used to implicitly frame different groups of people and events. Finally, I analyse the various representational strategies uncovered in the texts, such as the

"ideological square" (Van Dijk 1993; 1998) and the relevant analytical categories of Van Leeuwen (1996): individualization/collectivization, personalization/impersonalization, and objectivation. The concept of the ideological square refers to the construction of structural oppositions between an 'us' and a 'them,' through the expression/emphasis of positive information about 'us,' the expression/emphasis of negative information about 'them,' the suppression/de-emphasis of positive information about 'them,' or the suppression/de-emphasis of negative information about 'us' (Van Dijk 1998: 267). The related processes of individualisation and assimilation refer to the extent to which social actors are presented as individuals or assimilated into a larger collective. Personalization and impersonalization refer to the extent to which social actors are presented as speaking on their own individual behalf or on behalf of a larger entity. Objectivation refers to the process by which individuals are represented through, which is to say reduced to, a particular feature. Through CDA, I aim to gain deeper insights into the linguistic strategies deployed by media professionals to frame Jewish-Muslim relations in particular ways.

While both corpus-based sociolinguistic analysis and CDA have their obvious strengths—for example, the former allows for the exploitation of far larger data sets and the possible uncovering of unusual patterns that might otherwise be overlooked and the latter allows for the identification of subtle ideological discursive strategies that are difficult to uncover through a quantitative approach—there are, nevertheless, several limitations to both corpus-based sociolinguistic analysis and CDA. One major weakness of corpus analysis is that its focus on lexical frequencies and collocates may lead the analyst to provide largely descriptive, rather than analytical, accounts of the patterns found in the corpus. Moreover, corpus analysis can sometimes seem to be simply confirming the obvious. The findings from the corpus analysis section in this

chapter, for example, are not very surprising. Yet, they are still useful precisely because they provide quantitative evidence. This is especially the case since, as of 2020, there are no existing studies, of any form, on media representations of Jewish-Muslim relations in contemporary France. For its part, CDA, like all qualitative approaches, is open to the critique of selection bias in choosing texts to analyse and of subjectivity in the analysis of these texts themselves. Paul Baker and Erez Levon suggest that employing both qualitative analysis and corpus analysis together "enhanc[es] their overall reliability and validity," since the empiricism of corpus linguistics helps ground the more subjective nature of qualitative analysis (2015: 233). Indeed, combining these two methodologies goes some way towards addressing these concerns, while providing systematic evidence for how common understandings of Jewish-Muslim relations in France are constructed through lexico-grammatical choices and discursive strategies in the media.

2.2. Contextualizing Le Figaro and Le Monde

2.2.1. Ethnoreligious Biases

Both *Le Figaro* and *Le Monde* have, to an extent, divergent histories in terms of their reporting on ethnoreligious minorities in France. At least since its criticism of the French state during the Algerian War, *Le Monde* has been more favourable in its reporting on Muslim minorities and immigrants than *Le Figaro*. Furthermore, compared to *Le Figaro*, from the mid to late 20th century, *Le Monde* has devoted more attention to immigration, and indeed the reporting of anti-immigrant and racist attacks, adopting a relatively favourable and progressive position on the subject. In the 1970s, for example, *Le Monde* reporter Jean Benoît's focus on the conditions of immigrants in *bidonvilles* did "more than any other journalist [to] [...] put the

humanitarian suffering of immigrant workers on the political agenda" (Benson 2014: 112).

Similarly, Philippe Juhem's (1999) study of newspaper representations of SOS Racisme in the 1980s demonstrates that *Le Monde*'s initial coverage of the anti-racist organization, while not as positive as *Libération*'s, whose editor Laurent Joffrin was closely linked to the organization, was far more positive than *Le Figaro*'s, which tended to be relatively sparse and negative. In the early 1980s, the election of François Mitterrand as president in May 1981 and the parliamentary majority achieved by the Parti socialiste a month later seemed to herald a new pluralist cultural politics opposed to assimilationist universalism. The term "droit à la différence," popularized by Mitterrand, came to signify the legitimacy of ethnic groups articulating political and social demands. The right to be different, as Judith Vichniac writes, means that "membership in the national political community does not preclude the maintenance of other cultural/ethnic/regional groups" (1991: 40). In a 1982 report, entitled *Démocratie culturelle et droit à la différence*, presented to Jack Lang, the then Minister of Culture, Henri Giordan stated that ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities cannnot be denied the "droit d'avoir, en commun, avec les membres de leur groupe, leur propre vie Culturelle" (1982: 16). Such a vision was also central to founding of SOS Racisme in 1984.

However, by the end of the 1980s, this pluralist model had clearly fallen out of favour with both the left-wing political class and media professionals. Two key factors explain this. The first factor was the far-right Front national's 1983 electoral breakthrough in Dreux and their ethno-nationalist appropriation of the "droit à la différence" slogan to argue that white French people had the right to maintain and protect their cultural differences from what they perceived to be foreign cultures. In 1984, a group of far-right activists founded an association called the Alliance générale

contre le racisme et pour le respect de l'identité française et chrétienne (AGRIF). AGRIF appropriated the language of anti-racism to mask their own racism under the guise of countering anti-French and anti-Christian 'racism', most prominently through litigation (see Camus and Monzat 1992: 377-81). The electoral successes of the far-right and the cultural rebranding of white supremacy under a discourse of "droit à la différence" led many left-wing academics (such as Pierre-André Taguieff), journalists (such as Laurent Joffrin), and politicians (such as Mitterrand himself) to distance themselves from the slogan's original multiculturalist ideal. The second factor, which officially marked the death of the legitimacy of "le droit à la différence) was the 1989 controversy over the wearing of headscarves in schools, a controversy that was the culmination of several decades of politicization and stigmatization of Islam and Muslims as religious fundamentalists, delinquents, deviants, and criminals. As a result, *Le Monde* grew less positive in its coverage of SOS Racisme and multicultural politics, in general. Rodney Benson notes that, partly because there were—and still are—very few minority journalists, "when the political winds turned against diversity politics and anti-racism, there was [...] no internal professional counterforce constraining (even slightly) the journalists from likewise shifting position" (2014: 114).

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, as the analysis in this chapter will demonstrate, *Le Figaro* has been relatively positive in its representations of Jews, but mostly to the extent that portraying Jews as innocent victims allows for the negative portrayal of Muslims. It's history in the twentieth-century, however, is more complex. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, *Le Figaro* became one of the first newspapers to criticize the closed court trial afforded Captain Alfred Dreyfus, brought up on politically motivated charges of treason. The newspaper, however, published both articles by anti-Dreyfusards and Dreyfusards and, at the beginning of

the affair, maintained a neutral position. However, in 1894, Fernand de Rodays, convinced that Dreyfus was innocent, became the editor-in-chief of *Le Figaro*. A year later, Zola began writing columns for *Le Figaro* denouncing the rampant antisemitism in French society, including his famous "Pour les Juifs," published on May 16, 1896. In addition, it was in the pages of the November 15, 1897 edition of *Le Figaro* that the captain's brother Mathieu Dreyfus accused Esterhazy of being the true author of the bordereau that lay at the centre of the accusation of treason against Dreyfus. This incensed *Le Figaro's* readership, who began a campaign of unsubscribing from the newspaper in protest. As a result, Rodays resigned and *Le Figaro* ceased publishing Zola's columns. Zola's campaign then shifted to the pages of *L'Aurore*, where his "J'accuse…!" would be published in 1898. Despite rolling back on its support for Dreyfus, *Le Figaro* was not able to immediately win back its core readership and, by 1901, both its number of subscribers and its daily circulation had plummeted.

Following the end of the First World War, noted antisemitic businessman and politician François Coty purchased a majority share of *Le Figaro* in 1922. Under Coty, the newspaper explicitly adopted an antisemitic, anti-communist, fascist, and populist stance. This, however, alienated many *Figaro* readers and, by Coty's departure in 1933, its circulation had drastically dropped. This might suggest that between the Dreyfus affair and Coty's acquisition of the newspaper, *Le Figaro's* readership had become less antisemitic. However, it is more likely that it was not Coty's antisemitism that posed a problem to the readership, but rather his unilateral decisions, his far-right populism, and his open admiration of foreign far-right figures such as Mussolini. Coty was not the last antisemite to own *Le Figaro*, despite the presumption that antisemitism had fallen into discredit after the Second World War. In 1975, *Le Figaro* was bought by Robert Hersant, who, during the war, was an avid Nazi-sympathizer, avowed antisemite, and collaborationist, which led *Le Canard enchaîné* to dub him "Herr Sant"

in the 1970s. The *Figaro* of the 1970s steadily lost between 11,000 to 12,000 readers per year, in part due to concerns over Hersant's past, his vast agglomeration of newspapers, and his ties to successive right-wing governments, all of which put into question *Le Figaro's* press freedom and editorial independence.

By the 1980s, however, due to both Mitterrand's election in 1981 and the newspaper's moderation of its tone and partisanship, it appeared that journalists and the public alike had come to accept Hersant's *Figaro*. The newspaper was once again prosperous and, heading towards the end of the twentieth century, firmly anchored, along with *Le Monde*, as one of the two main national dailies. *Le Monde* has been relatively more open to pluralist—or 'multicultural'—universalism, even if, in the end, it, like the mainstream media in general, remains assimilationist, especially since the end of the 1980s. Meanwhile, *Le Figaro* has been, at best, firmly assimilationist and, at worse, reactionary, all while adopting the acceptable veneer of universalism. Indeed, to an extent, both newspapers appear to have learnt from their recent histories that the expression of extreme views often leads to a decline in readership. This means that, in the contemporary period, any ethnic biases expressed by journalists are likely to be expressed obliquely and within the acceptable limits of a language of universalism.

2.2.2. Contemporary Standing

Since June 2004, *Le Figaro* has been owned by the Dassault group, of which Dassault Aviation, a manufacturer of military and business aircraft, is a subsidiary. Following Dassault Group CEO Serge Dassault's taking over of *Le Figaro*, numerous journalists made public their concerns over the future editorial independence of the newspaper. A number of previous statements by Dassault were foregrounded by his critics, including one from seven years prior in which he stated that his group needed "un

journal [...] pour exprimer son opinion" (Vulser 2001). Further adding to these concerns was the fact that Dassault became a *Union pour un mouvement populaire* (UMP) senator later in 2004. For Frédéric Martel, a journalist and former cultural attaché at the French consulate in Boston, *Le Figaro* became "la *Pravda* sarkozyste" following the take-over. Moreover, he notes that the newspaper "sert aussi les intérêts financiers de son propriétaire, le groupe Dassault, en manipulant l'information ou en censurant des articles, par exemple lorsqu'ils concernent les pays et les marchés de l'avion Rafale" (Martel 2012). Similarly, Raymond Kuhn notes that "it is not clear that *Le Figaro* can be relied on to cover in a balanced fashion the activities of the Dassault group with regard to the market for military aircraft sales" (2011: 69) Nevertheless, the very fact that the Dassault group chose to buy *Le Figaro* is indicative of the newspaper's influential position in the media field in France.

According to Yves Thréard, the deputy director of *Le Figaro's* editorial board, today's *Figaro* "ne roule pour personne." He clarifies that the newspaper is a "quotidien de conviction" and that if a journalist has left-wing convictions, they would not fit in well at *Le Figaro* (De Morel 2014). In addition to being firmly a right-wing, conservative "journal d'opinion," *Le Figaro* still emphasizes its literary nature, in particular with an on-going supplement called *Le Figaro littéraire*. With a long history of housing *les grandes plumes*, from Zola to Jean d'Ormesson, within their pages, *Le Figaro* could indeed be called—to cite d'Ormesson himself—"le journal des écrivains," by which he means a certain elite, 'highbrow' class of writers (d'Ormesson 2011). By the same virtue, however, *Le Figaro*, having welcomed over the years the writings of numerous far-right writers—from Charles Maurras to Éric Zemmour or Eugénie Bastié—could be called 'le journal des extrémistes de droite. Of course, the reality is somewhere in the middle, even if the newspaper has consistently demonstrated far-right potentialities throughout its history. Socially conservative and

economically liberal, *Le Figaro* remains the voice of mostly right or centre-right voting middle-class readers (Ifop 2014). With an average monthly circulation of 311,417 copies in 2016 (ACPM 2017), *Le Figaro*, along with rival centre-left *Le Monde*, also "exercise[s] a strong influence among key economic and political decision makers, as well as acting as a major forum for the discussion of new ideas in social and cultural matters" (Kuhn 2011: 42).

Despite welcoming a diversity of opinions within its columns, with a recent history of supporting centrist and centre-left political parties and candidates, but also having long been the preferred newspaper of intellectuals, executives, and upper-level government administrators, *Le Monde* remains today identified with a particular readership: 56% are men, 43% are executives, professionals, and entrepreneurs, and the largest age group is 50-64 years old (26.3%) followed closely by the 35-49 age group (23.5%) (Fottorino 2009). *Le Monde* is a relatively socially and economically liberal newspaper. Its readers tend to vote for left-wing candidates (51%), but a significant percentage (26%) also vote for right-wing or centre-right candidates (Ifop 2014). With an average monthly circulation of 260,294 copies in 2016, *Le Monde* is quantitatively a less popular national daily than *Le Figaro*, but qualitatively still maintains a reputation of being one of the two most respected and prestigious newspapers of record in France.

Thus, *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* represent the two most prominent and influential national dailies in France on either side of the left-right political divide. Holders of symbolic power, these newspapers have also been—and continue to be—closely tied to political and economic power. Despite the digitization, diversification, and democratization of media, and the concurrent decline of much of the written press, newspapers remain important framers of events and debates, especially on a national level. *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* "are […] dominant agenda-setters in the French press

system" (Kuhn 42). Thus, even amidst a decline in newspaper sales and despite the fact that the provincial newspaper sector is far larger than the national sector, it is the national dailies such as *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*, in particular, that enjoy a privileged position in French politics and society. Their prestige, as well as their continued "journalisme d'opinion," mean that these newspapers maintain considerable capacities in terms of framing relations between Jews and Muslims in contemporary France.

2.3. Historical and Socio-Political Contexts (1970-2018)

The findings that I present in the subsequent sections resonate all the more when placed into their broader historical and socio-political contexts. At least since the 1970s—and even more so during the 1980s and onwards—French politicians, journalists, and public opinion have been, to a large extent, preoccupied with immigration, mainly of Muslims, from North and West Africa and the integration or assimilation of these 'new,' 'different' immigrants and the threat of a *fracture sociale* they posed to French identity and society. Over the decades, debates over the integration of Muslim immigrants and their descendants took place in a politically-charged and volatile context of 1) anti-Arab racist attacks and killings carried out by both French law enforcement (the October 1961 massacre) and far-right agitators (the series of racist attacks in the summer and autumn of 1973), 2) antisemitic attacks and killings carried out by Middle East-linked terrorists (the 1980 rue Copernic synagogue bombing), neo-Nazis (the 1990 profanation of a Jewish cemetery in Carpentras), and banlieue youth (the 2006 torture and murder of Ilan Halimi), and Islamist terrorists (the 2012 Toulouse attacks and the 2015 kosher supermarket attack), 3) bombings and terrorist attacks, sometimes related to Middle Eastern conflicts, 4 the incremental electoral successes of the Front National, and 5) numerous legal interventions on (legal

and illegal) immigration, racial discrimination, and the wearing of religious symbols in public space (see Chronology, Table 1 in Appendix).

Following the Algerian War (1954-1962), *pieds-noirs*, *harkis*, and Muslim and Jewish Algerians arrived in France in large numbers. Within two decades, the Algerian population in France went from over 350,000 in 1962 to over 800,000 in 1982, while the Moroccan and Tunisian populations experienced even more rapid growth, despite the French government, like other European governments, suspending labour migration by non-European Community (EC) nationals in 1974. The increasingly visible North African minority—often collectively referred to as 'Arabs' or 'Muslims'—found itself the target of anti-Algerian, anti-Arab, and anti-Muslim bigotry and racism from the part of the state, far-right and neo-Nazi groups and individuals, and public opinion. This hostile climate frequently translated into acts of physical violence. From March to June 1971, nine Algerians were killed in racist attacks. Meanwhile, the government sought to both curb immigration (the 1972 Marcellin-Fontanet circulars) and criminalize racial defamation and incitement to racial discrimination, hatred, and violence (the 1972 Pleven law). The climate of post-Algerian War xenophobia and anti-Arab racism was further exacerbated by the 1973 oil crisis and rising unemployment. In the summer and autumn of 1973, these sentiments reached their peak and resulted in a series of racist attacks that left 50 dead and hundreds injured. Amidst this wave of attacks, the Algerian government suspended emigration to France and condemned the inaction of French authorities. The country would continue to experience periodic upsurges of racist attacks throughout the 1970s and the 1980s, particularly during the summer and autumn of 1983. During the same period, antisemitism was also on the rise. According to the Centre de documentation juive contemporaine (CDJC), there was a 31% increase in antisemitic violence between 1975 and 1980 (Mandel 2014: 227). Thus, even as the

country was forced to come to terms with its collaborationist past, partly due to the trial of Maurice Papon, Jews were once again targets for antisemitic violence. As with anti-Arab racism, these acts of violence were often the work of neo-Nazis, but also by Middle East-linked terrorist groups. Occasionally, neo-Nazi groups would attempt to implicate Jews as the perpetrators of terrorist attacks against Muslims in order to provoke tensions, such as during three attacks in the 1970s and the 1980s when neo-Nazis posed as an extremist Zionist group that they called the Mouvement d'Action et Défense Masada.

In addition to these domestic factors, broader international developments during this period also played a role in the perception and representation of Muslims and Jews in France. For example, the revolution in Iran and its religious nature provided French media with a 'return of the religious' or 'Islamic turn' template to understand the mostly non-religious grievances and protests of young *beurs*. The concrete difficulties faced by immigrants in France were supplanted by the spectre of Islam, a religion increasingly presented as incompatible with French culture and society. This was not only a media tendency, but also apparent in the political class. Interior Minister Gaston Defferre (whose problematic tenure as the mayor of Marseille is described in the introduction) accused automobile workers on strike for better work conditions of carrying out "des grèves saintes d'intégristes, de musulmans, de chiites" (Bancel 2016: 158). Given that the Shia branch of Islam was—and remains— relatively rare in France, Defferre's comments clearly demonstrate the influence the Iranian revolution had on the manner in which Muslims in France were perceived. Indeed, Defferre's comments, with which the then Prime Minister Pierre Mauroy concurred, demonstrate the poignancy of Edward Said's reflections on representing, being represented, and 'truth' in his landmark *Orientalism* (1978). In 'religionizing' North African immigrants and their descendants and reading their grievances through a

foreign lens of Islamic revolution, conflict, and jihad, xenophobia and racism found an acceptable expression through the critique of 'political Islam' and the threat of national disintegration posed by Muslims in France, who, like Jews before, were increasingly presented as a nation within a nation. This is not to say that Muslims had become the 'new Jews'. Indeed, then Prime Minister Raymond Barre's comments on TF1, a few hours after the 1980 rue Copernic synagogue attack, demonstrates the still-strong tendency to view Jews as separate from the French nation: "Cet attentat odieux qui voulait frapper les Israélites qui se rendaient à la synagogue et qui a frappé des Français innocents qui traversait la rue Copernic" (see Lanzmann 2007).

The consequences of this religious frame can be clearly perceived through the 1989 Creil headscarf affair, which marked the beginning of an enduring French obsession with the Islamic veil as a marker of 'communautarisme'—although this was not yet the ubiquitous term that it would soon become—and the symbol of the lack of integration of a part of the Muslim population in France. At this point, the influence of the Iranian revolution had not yet entirely receded. Indeed, the media often used the term 'tchador' to refer to the headscarves worn by the students in question, even if these were, strictly speaking, not chadors. The headscarf affair quickly became the terrain on which broader debates on the place of Muslims—still largely presented as foreign, even when many were by now French by birth—in France, their ability to be assimilated, and the threat they posed to the upholding of *laïcité* in the public sphere. It is in this context that the FN achieved a series of electoral breakthroughs, beginning with an FN candidate winning the 1989 legislative by-election in Dreux.

In addition, the racist and antisemitic attacks that flourished in the 1970s and 1980s continued into the 1990s, such as the desecration of a Jewish cemetery in Carpentras in May 1990, acts of police brutality leading to riots such as those in Vaulx-en-Velin in October 1990, and the murder of Imad Bouhoud in Le Havre in March

1994, both committed by neo-Nazis. These events, however, were presented differently in the media. The cemetery desecration was presented as committed against a community "parfaitement intégrée," as the presenter for *France 2*'s 8 o'clock news put it. Meanwhile, 19-year-old French-born Imad Bouhoud was situated, even in the relatively progressive newspaper *Libération*, outside the French nation, with emphasis on his Tunisian heritage, his unemployment, and his residence in a public housing project (*habitation à loyer modéré*).

By the end of the decade, Muslims in France were increasingly depicted as a community apart, defined in religious terms and connected to international understandings of Islam, such as through the Iranian revolution and, later, the Gulf War and the September 11 attacks. Thus, the concept of 'communautarisme' was applied to this community. In the French political context, communitarianism is both associated with Anglo-American 'multiculturalism'—and the formation of ethnic enclaves, even if these also exist in France—and juxtaposed with integration. The term was generally uncommon prior to the 2000s when it became ubiquitous in media and political discourse in a climate dominated by the various headscarf, face veil, and burkini affairs, the 2005 banlieue riots, and, more generally, the presumed failure of the integration of a part of the Muslim minority (see Dhume-Sonzogni 2016). To the spectre of communitarianism was added fears of a new antisemitism, crystallized in Pierre-André Taguieff's *La nouvelle judéophobie* (2002). Thus, in the new millennium, France's Muslim minority became a community accused of communitarianism, antisemitism, youth delinquency, and seen as a hotbed of, or at least as an incubator for, terrorism, which explains why, in 2013, an Ipsos poll found that 74% of French people considered Islam to be intolerant and incompatible with French values.

2.4. Analysis and Discussion

2.4.1. Frames

I identified 9 primary frames in the 299-article sample: religion (positive, negative, and neutral), Israel-Palestine, Muslim (or new) antisemitism, youth, school, memory (positive and negative), similarity, Jewish Islamophobia, and *communautarisme* (see Appendix, Table 2.1.). In addition, I found that virtually all articles in the sample exhibited "groupism" (Brubaker 2004) when portraying Jews and Muslims. Groupism refers to "the tendency to take discrete, sharply differentiated, internally homogeneous, and externally bounded groups as basic constituents of social life, chief protagonists of social conflicts" (Brubaker 2004: 164). Thus, rather than a frame in itself, groupism, here, can be considered to be the overarching framework of representing Jewish-Muslim relations in the media, since it structures discussions of these two 'groups' in every article in the sample. The common point of departure of all the sampled articles—even those that sought to be nuanced and depict Jewish-Muslim relations as not inherently oppositional—was the unsaid belief that these were two separate and homogenous groups, that, in a nutshell, there was *a* Jewish community and *a* Muslim community in France.

Appearing in 50.8% of articles, the Muslim new antisemitism frame was the most significant frame, which is unsurprising given the prominence of the new antisemitism hypothesis between the publication of Taguieff's *La nouvelle judéophobie* (2002) and the multi-author *Le nouvel antisémitisme* (2018). Articles that evoked Muslim new antisemitism mostly did so in order to explain the tension between Jews and Muslims in France. These articles also frequently employed the Israel-Palestine (45.8%) and youth (40.8%) frames, which were the next most significant frames. In contrast, used in only 3.3% of the sampled articles, the Jewish Islamophobia frame was the least frequent frame and was mostly employed when already citing Muslim

antisemitism as a source of tense Jewish-Muslim relations. Indeed, Jewish Islamophobia was not cited as a reason or a cause for tense intergroup relations, but rather as a consequence of Muslim antisemitism. This is significant for two reasons. First, Jewish Islamophobia is possibly considered to be a secondary issue that results from the primary issue of Muslim antisemitism. Secondly, Jewish Islamophobia is possibly seen as a (potentially justifiable) reaction to Muslim antisemitism. The *communautarisme* frame, while related to groupism, is not the same. The fourth most significant frame, the *communautarisme* (30.7%) frame depicts either group as increasingly closed unto itself and wary of outsiders. Nevertheless, the similarity (26.1%) frame, which highlighted the ethnocultural and historical similarities between Jews and Muslims, closely followed the *communautarisme* frame. The memory frame was relatively infrequent and used both in positive (9.0%) terms—to highlight past Jewish-Muslim entente in, for example, Andalusia or Algeria—and in negative (4.3%) terms—to highlight the persecution of Jews in Muslim-majority countries or to highlight the disparities in perspectives on, for example, the question of Algeria.

There were few significant differences in the distribution of frames between *Le Monde* articles and *Le Figaro* articles (see Tables 2.2. and 2.3. in the Appendix). In general, both dailies prioritized a similar set of dominant frames: Muslim antisemitism, Israel-Palestine, youth, and *communautarisme*. Yet, even if in both newspapers, the Muslim antisemitism frame was the most prominent, *Le Figaro* was more likely to prioritize this frame, with 58.2% of their articles displaying this frame compared to 46.3% of *Le Monde* articles. In addition, the youth frame was more prominent in *Le Figaro* articles than in *Le Monde* articles. The Israel-Palestine frame remained equally significant in both newspapers. Interestingly, *Le Figaro* was more likely than *Le Monde* to employ a negative religious frame to Jewish-Muslim relations by, for example, attributing Muslim antisemitism to religiosity. Nevertheless, *Le Figaro*

was also more likely than *Le Monde* to employ a positive religious frame by, for example, citing positive interreligious efforts by religious institutions and leaders. One key difference between the two newspapers relates to the similarity frame. In *Le Monde*, this frame was the fourth most significant frame and was employed in 30.5% of the articles. In *Le Figaro,* however, this percentage drops to 19.7% and to the sixth place.

A cursory glance at these frames already suggests that they are not necessarily in conflict with each other. Indeed, while a few articles only demonstrated one frame, most others used several, even if one or two were more pronounced. The frames identified here somewhat overlap with Katz's findings that, since the First World War, four elements have defined Jewish-Muslim relations, "namely the colonial, the religious, the transnational, and the racial" (Katz 2015: 25). Indeed, the religion frame corresponds to Katz' religious category, the Israel-Palestine frame to his transnational category, the Muslim antisemitism, Jewish Islamophobia, and *communautarisme* frames to his racial category, and the memory frame to his colonial category. This suggests a longer history to the frames that my analysis has uncovered as well as their continued importance in contemporary media representations of Jewish-Muslim relations in France.

The identification of key frames and their distribution provides an indication of how Jewish-Muslim relations tend to be portrayed by the two newspapers, but it does not tell us *how* these frames are, first, constructed through language and, secondly, the context of these frames. A corpus analysis of keywords, concordances, and collocates was employed subsequently in order to address these two points.

2.4.2. Corpus Analysis

Given that the articles in question were sampled on the basis of specifically featuring relations between Jews and Muslims in France, it is to be expected that almost all of the top keywords in the study corpus (SC) can all be classified as relating to ethnoreligious identity (See Table 3.1. in the Appendix). In addition, there were no significant differences between the keywords in the SC and in the *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* sub-corpora (see Tables 3.2. and 3.3. in the Appendix). The first few keywords—i.e. 'juifs,' 'musulmans,' 'antisémitisme,' and 'islam'—provide an insight into the manner in which the two newspapers present relations between Jews and Muslims in France: both (Muslim or new) antisemitism and the religion of Islam are presented as explanatory factors for tense relations between Jews and Muslims. The significance of the keyword 'Israël' further confirms the observation from the previous sub-section that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict plays an essential role in the framing of relations between Jews and Muslims in France. Likewise, the keyword 'communauté,' which frequently co-occurs with 'musulmane' and 'juive,' highlights the groupism present in these articles. Meanwhile, keywords such as 'mosquée,' 'religieux,' 'synagogue,' 'culte,' and 'religion,' demonstrate the prevalence of the religious frame in presenting Jewish-Muslim relations. Finally, the keyword 'crif,' which refers to the Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France, a federation of over sixty French Jewish associations, might reflect the desire to seek out representatives of *the* Jewish community and have them make pronouncements on behalf of French Jews, who would then be viewed as a homogenous group.

These keywords, first, indicate what the SC articles are about and, secondly, suggest *how* the subject matter is presented, for example through a religious frame or an antisemitism frame. However, keywords by themselves do not tell us how these words are used in the texts. For that, we must turn to an analysis of collocates and

concordance lines. Collocates are words that co-occur in close proximity to each other. For the purposes of this chapter, I have limited this distance to five words to the left and five words to the right of the search term. Given their importance as evidenced by the keyword list (See Table 3.1. in the Appendix), I have selected the following terms (and their various related forms) for collocational analysis: 'juif,' 'musulman,' 'islam,' 'judaïsme,' 'antisémitisme,' and 'jeunes.' In addition, I also look at the term 'islamophobie' whose absence from the keyword list may be of significance. In doing so, I build the collocational profile of each term, demonstrating how repeated word associations come to form a semantic web that may come to define perceptions of a particular term.

Interestingly, there are virtually no differences between the collocational profiles of Jews in either the *Le Monde* or the *Le Figaro* sub-corpus (See Tables 4.2. and 4.3. in the Appendix). The collocational profile of 'juif(s)' and 'juive(s)' suggests that Jews are frequently spoken of as being Jews of 'France' (Juifs de France), contrasted or equated with 'musulmans,' and as a 'communauté' with a particular set of Jewish 'institutions' (see Table 4.1. in the Appendix). In addition, the collocates 'crif' and 'responsables' echo the earlier observation that French newspapers tend to homogenize ethnic groups and call upon *their* institutions and *their* representatives to provide a clear understanding of what is framed as a communal issue that has a communal answer. The co-occurrence of the term 'chrétiens' with Jews indicates that Jews are often presented through a religious frame, which is to say one that would oppose them to Christians.

It is also worth considering the collocates 'jeunes' and 'enfants.' As previously noted, the youth frame is prominent in both newspapers, and especially in *Le Figaro*. Youth delinquency is, in particular, a recurrent theme that both newspapers use to explain tensions between Jews and Muslim in France, with the culprits more often

than not described as being Muslim, Arab, or Maghrebi. The frame of youth delinquency has a longer history in terms of media representations of Muslims in France. Anti-Arab racist attacks throughout the 1970s and the 1980s, mostly carried out by far-right and neo-Nazi groups, and incidences of police brutality led to protests and riots in various banlieues. Media coverage of these riots tended to privilege a youth delinquency and—especially in the context of several Islamist terrorist attacks in France during this period—a religious "jihad" frame, not unlike contemporary newspaper reporting on Muslims (Mandel 2014: 127). 'Enfants,' however, does not have the negative charge of 'jeunes.' It is, more often than not, a marker of victimhood. In particular, Jewish children are described as being targeted by Muslim terrorists like Merah and Muslim classmates at school. This is perhaps all the more revealing that the collocational profile of Muslims does not include the term 'enfant,' while 'jeunes' co-occurs more significantly with Muslims than it does with Jews (see Table 4 in the Appendix).

As expected, Muslims co-occur significantly with 'juifs,' 'france,' français,' and 'communauté' (see Table 5.1. in the Appendix) And, again, there are no significant differences between either sub-corpus (See Tables 5.2. and 5.3. in the Appendix). Thus, as before, Muslims appear to either be contrasted or equated to Jews, described as being of France ('musulmans de France'), and either as being French ('français') or contrasted to French people ('Français'). Like Jews, Muslims are also presented as a community and, despite the CFCM being absent from the above keyword list, as being represented by communal institutions and leaders, here represented by the co-occurrences of 'culte' and 'conseil,' which actually refer to the CFCM, and the term 'responsables.' The collocate 'arabo' is a clear indicator of how the term 'musulman' does not solely refer to a believer of the religion of Islam, but to an individual who is ethnically identifiable as 'arabe,' which, in turn, is more linked in common French

usage to those of North African descent than to other Arab populations due to the historical colonial context that blurred the definitional lines between North Africans, Arabs, and Muslims.

A look at the relevant concordance lines allows us to make three broad, but crucial observations about the way Jews and Muslims appear in relation to the terms 'français' and 'France' (see Table 6 in the Appendix). First, the concordances confirm the previous observation of a tendency to talk about Jews and Muslims as separate, singular groups ('musulmans de France,' 'juifs de France'), communities ('communauté musulmane de France,' 'communauté juive de France'), and, in the case of Muslims, populations ('population française musulmane'). Jews were also sometimes talked about through 'their' institutions ('institutions juives françaises'). Secondly, there is more variation in the way French Muslims are referred to as compared to French Jews. This provides us with the first suggestion of the overlexicalization of the representational category of Muslims, especially when compared to Jews. In other words, in contrast to Jews, Muslims are lexicalized in a broader variety of ways. This suggests both a particular preoccupation with Muslims and an uncertainty of how to describe them in contemporary French media discourse. Thirdly, French Muslims are marked both ethnically and as immigrants. This is evidenced by the use of 'd'origine musulmane,'[3] which suggests that being Muslim is akin to a nationality, and by the use of 'issus de l'immigration.' While French Jews also have a recent history of immigration, especially for the Sephardim among them, the term 'immigrés' is not used to describe them. Additionally, while there is more of a tradition within Judaism to consider Jewishness as an ethnicity, they are only

[3] Incidentally, during the Socialist Party's 2017 presidential primary, candidate Vincent Peillon referred to one of the soldiers who had been killed by Mohamed Merah in 2012 as being "d'origine musulmane," leading to a flurry of ironic tweets about a "Musulmanie" from which Muslims presumably originate. These ironic tweets notwithstanding, speaking of people of "Muslim origin" remains relatively common.

referred to in either cultural ('de culture juive') and religious ('de confession juive') terms.

The concordance analysis also shows that when Muslims are explicitly described as French, they are not referred to in religious terms. The only time that Muslims are described as 'de confession musulmane' is when nouns other than 'Français' were used. Even in conjunction with other nouns, however, 'de confession musulmane' was used relatively infrequently. Consider the concordances of the only ten occurrences of 'de confession musulmane' in the SC:

1. Pour que tous les citoyens de confession musulmane accèdent à la compréhension de cet enseignement
2. « l'opprobre sur nos concitoyens de confession musulmane ». Aujourd'hui, M. Valls préfère ne pas
3. entre 40 et 50 personnes se déclarant de confession musulmane, ce qui ne suffit pas si
4. antisémitisme et populations immigrées de confession musulmane en France est un thème difficile à
5. jeunes d'origine maghrébine ou de confession musulmane en général s'informent et commentent la
6. il vit en France depuis 1991. "De confession musulmane et pratiquant," il se dit "en colère"
7. un des trois soldats tués sont de confession musulmane. Mardi matin, le grand rabbin de France
8. l'enjeu premier pour les immigrés de confession musulmane n'est nullement l'antisémitisme mais bien
9. que la part des détenus de confession musulmane pouvait atteindre de 50 % à 80 % dans ce
10. détourner. C'est un professeur de confession musulmane, Soufiane Zitouni, qui ose aujourd'hui

Line 5 possibly provides a glimpse of why 'de confession musulmane' is a relatively infrequent descriptor for French Muslims. Line 5 is taken from a 2002 article entitled "Comment des jeunes de banlieue sont gagnés par la judéophobie," written by then *Le Monde* journalist Frédéric Chambon who goes to the commune of Trappes in the Ile-de-France region to speak to banlieue youths in order to understand their supposed propensity for antisemitism.[4] Chambon mostly refers to these youths as

[4] Chambon was not only the journalist in charge of the Banlieue - politique de la ville section, but also focused on crime, justice, and international terrorism, suggesting a structural editorial association between the banlieue and criminality and terrorism.

'jeunes de banlieue' or simply 'jeunes'. On one occasion, however, he clarifies what he means when he evokes the category 'jeunes,' by qualifying these banlieue youths as being 'd'origine maghrébine ou de confession musulmane,' thereby implying an equivalency between having North African ancestry and being Muslim (by religion). While conceptually these two categories are clearly not equivalent—after all, many French Jews have North African antecedents—it remains common in the French imaginary to closely associate Maghrebiness with Arabness with Muslimness. The locution 'arabo-musulman' is another case in point, demonstrating that, as noted in the introduction, Muslims in France are increasingly racialized as perceived as more of an ethnonational group than as a purely religious group. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that the term 'de confession musulmane' is falling into disuse. The SC comprises articles that deal with relations between Jews and Muslims and not about Muslims themselves. Thus, while in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* articles, Muslims, who are depicted, in one way or another, in relation to Jews, are presented in more ethnonational terms, it is possible that, in other corpora, 'de confession musulmane' is used more frequently.

When it comes to 'jeunes,' the term itself is often associated with negative values, i.e. 'agression,' 'désoeuvrés,' 'voilées,' 'antisémitisme,' and 'banlieue' (see Table 7 in the Appendix). 'Banlieue' revealingly only significantly co-occurs with 'jeunes' and 'parisiennes,' suggesting the prominence of a Paris-centric frame in presenting problems with youth in the banlieue. Unsurprisingly, 'jeunes' co-occurs most significantly with 'musulmans'. While the collocational profile of 'jeune' appears to mostly be Muslim, as evidenced by the collocates 'musulman,' 'issus,' 'banlieue,' 'immigration,' 'beurs,' 'maghrébine,' and 'voilée,' 'juif' is also a significant collocate. There are, however, stark differences between how 'jeune' is used to describe Muslims and Jews. Not only does 'jeune' co-occur more significantly with Muslims than with

Jews, but young Muslims are described with a far greater variety of terms than young Jews. Importantly, the terms used to describe Jews are largely neutral, while those used to describe Muslims mark them in a number of ways. First, young Muslims are associated with the banlieue and the 'cités,' which in contemporary French discourse is strongly associated with delinquency, criminality, and extremism. Secondly, they are marked as being of foreign origin ('d'origine immigrée,' 'd'origine arabo-musulmane,' d'origine musulmane,' etc.) Thirdly, they are presented as male. It is worth noting that, the term 'jeunes,' by itself and without any adjectives, is sometimes used to refer to Muslim youth in the corpus, thereby demonstrating the extent to which the term is associated with Muslims.

A look at these terms in context illustrates how 'jeune' is used differently in relation to Jews and to Muslims. For example, 'des jeunes issus de l'immigration arabo-musulmane' are described as increasingly antisemitic, while 'des jeunes des banlieue' have been won over by Judeophobia and demonstrate a 'forte hostilité envers les juifs.' 'La jeunesse de culture arabo-musulmane' is presented as largely anti-Zionist and supportive of antisemitic comedian Dieudonné. Meanwhile, antisemitism is described as being on the rise among 'les jeunes musulmans.' Such associations—of young Muslims to antisemitism, anti-Zionism, and violence—abound in the SC. In contrast, there are relatively few instances of positive representations of young Muslims and even these positive instances tend to be ambiguous at best (see Table 8 in the Appendix). One such example includes a French Jew who attended a pro-Palestine protest and noted that no one was hostile to him and, instead, "de jeunes musulmans viennent prendre des photos avec moi."[5] There are two aspects of this scenario, however, that prevent it from being read as a truly positive representation of young Muslims in relation to Jews. First, it suggests that, in order for Jews to not be

[5] Duportail, Judith, Jean-Marc Leclerc, and Service Infographie. "À Paris, manifestation propalestinienne sous haute surveillance," *Le Figaro*, July 23, 2014.

the target of (young) Muslims, they must be pro-Palestine. Secondly, the fact that young Muslims wanted to take photos with him suggests the rareness and novelty of the situation, thus making it an exception to the rule.

'Islam' appears to be associated with either negative or positive/neutral values (see Table 9.1. in the Appendix). Although, it appears to be most associated with negative values. Consider, for example, the collocates 'radical,' 'politique,' 'terrorisme,' and 'islamisme.' Additionally, the collocates 'laïcité 'and 'république' may indicate that 'islam' is frequently placed in opposition to these positively inflected terms. The collocate 'modéré' suggests the presentation of two types of Islam that are in a struggle with each other, one being radical and the other being moderate. The pronoun 'nous' suggests the possible presence of an us/them binary when it comes to how Islam is presented in newspapers. However, a contextual look at the co-occurrences of 'Islam' and 'nous' shows that the us-them binary is not necessarily a prominent feature, but there are, still, instances of the use of a seemingly 'neutral' 'us'—a presumably properly French 'nous'— that excludes an othered them:

1. Cet islam français, nous avons tous avantage, musulmans ou non, à le voir guidé par des religieux éclairés.
2. Nos concitoyens français ne peuvent pas lire le Coran. Pour eux, l'islam, c'est nous. Nous devons donner une image positive de l'islam.
3. Nous disons « stop » à l'intégrisme radical musulman. Ici nous voulons vivre l'islam citoyen, celui qui voit des imams risquer leur vie en dénonçant l'extrémisme afin de favoriser le « vivre ensemble ».
4. J'aurais préféré voir une personnalité musulmane à ce poste, car il s'agit de l'islam. Nous sommes les premiers concernés. Il faudrait nous faire confiance et que l'on arrête de nous suspecter.
5. Bien sûr, il ne s'agit pas de dire ce qu'est véritablement l'islam, l'islam idéal dont certains musulmans nous parlent.

In line 1, Muslims are included in a collective French 'nous,' in lines 2, 3, and 4, 'nous' is used self-referentially by Muslims, and finally, in line 5, the 'nous' is implied to be exclusive of Muslims. This exclusive use of 'nous,' constructed as a neutral, French (read: non-Muslim) collective, appears to be an exception, with far more examples of an inclusive 'nous,' such as in line 1. Moreover, in self-referential uses of 'nous' by

Muslims, there is in general an equivalence drawn between the 'nous' and the 'eux'. For example, in line 2, while 'eux' refers to non-Muslims and 'nous' to Muslims, the two pronouns are not necessarily opposed to each other, with their usage preceded by the use of the phrase 'nos concitoyens français,' thereby implying the shared Frenchness of 'us' and 'them.' Yet, as already suggested in line 5, when it comes to co-occurrences of 'musulmans' and 'nous,' the use of an exclusive 'nous' is more prominent. Consider the following examples:

1. Il faut que les religieux musulmans nous aident, qu'ils dénoncent eux-mêmes, ces actes comme l'a très bien fait le grand imam de la mosquée Al-Azhar au Caire.
2. Face aux figures neuves de la haine - islamophobie et judéophobie - proclamons : « Nous sommes tous des juifs musulmans ! »
3. « Pourquoi ne disons-nous rien des décapitations d'otages au nom de Dieu en Irak ? », s'interrogent des représentants musulmans. « Pourquoi restons-nous muets devant les attaques israéliennes tuant des familles palestiniennes ? », répondent en écho des rabbins.
4. Alors que certains s'offusquent de voir des restaurants Quick proposer uniquement de la nourriture halal, il semble que nous mangions déjà de la viande rituellement abattue sans même le savoir
5. Nous nous entendons très bien avec la communauté musulmane. Leur mosquée touche presque notre synagogue.
6. Finalement, nous sommes plus proches des musulmans que des catholiques, ce sont nos cousins, des monothéistes purs... Mais tous ceux qui ont fait confiance aux Palestiniens dans le processus de paix se sont pris une gifle monumentale !
7. Il conclut : « Ce que l'islam a perdu n'est en rien un paradis originel (...) Que les musulmans réfléchissent donc et ne nous impliquent pas dans leurs frustrations et leurs échecs : ce sont les leurs avant toute chose.

Despite clear differences, in almost each of the above lines, an us/them distinction is used in a groupist manner. In line 1, taken from an interview with Laurent Fabius, 'nous' excludes French Muslim religious representatives (although none are specifically cited in the article) and, by extension, presumably French Muslims themselves. It is not clear to whom Fabius's 'nous' precisely refers, but it is suggested to be the French government and, by extension, 'the French.' Line 2 demonstrates the use of an inclusive 'nous,' such as was common in the concordances of 'islam' and 'nous.' The fact, however, that line 2 is a call to arms of sorts, declaring the necessity

of an affirmation of solidarity between Jews and Muslims, ironically draws attention to the more dominant perception of troubled relations between Jews and Muslims. Line 3 provides an example of the groupism that pervades the SC, with two different 'nous,' one for Jews and the other for Muslims, being opposed to each other, even if the intention might have actually been to criticize the groupism inherent in communitarian discourse. In line 4, 'we' are informed that 'we' have been eating ritually slaughtered meat without knowing it. The assumption is that 'we' are neither Muslims nor Jews, but neutral, universal French citizens. This is, then, an exclusive 'nous' that constructs an ideal, unmarked, neutral—that is, white and of Catholic background—French citizen through the identification and exclusion of religiously and ethnically marked minorities. Like line 3, line 5 pits Jews against Muslims even as it notes that 'we,' i.e. Jews, get along well with 'them,' i.e. Muslims. It does so by, first, establishing a clean distinction between a Jewish 'us' and a 'Muslim' them and, secondly, by demarcating 'our' synagogue from 'their' mosque. In doing so, it also privileges a religious frame, as if Jews must have a synagogue and Muslims must have a mosque and that their interactions must take place from this basis. Similarly, line 6 also demonstrates how even a seemingly positive message can have the effect of perpetuating a groupist vision. Finally, line 7, taken from a positive review in *Le Figaro* of the recent French translation of Spanish Arabist Serafín Fanjul's book *Al Andalus, l'invention d'un mythe* (2017), represents possibly the clearest example of an us/them binary. Fanjul constructs a broad 'them,' into which he places all Muslims, and a broad 'us,' in which he seemingly places all non-Muslim Europeans, and essentially suggests that Muslims should deal with 'their' own problems and leave 'us' alone: "Que les musulmans réfléchissent donc et ne nous impliquent pas dans leurs frustrations et leurs échecs : ce sont les leurs avant toute chose."[6] This exclusive use of the first-person

[6] Paoli, Paul-François. "Contes, légendes, clichés et réalité d'une civilisation," *Le Figaro*, October 26, 2017, p. 6.

plural pronoun is another example of the particularism of French republican universalism described in Chapter One.

In the *Le Monde* sub-corpus, 'jeune' is a significant collocate of 'islam', while this is absent from the *Le Figaro* sub-corpus (see Tables 9.2. and 9.3. in the Appendix). Interestingly, there are simply far fewer significant collocates of 'islam' in the *Le Monde* sub-corpus than the *Le Figaro* sub-corpus. This suggests a stronger preoccupation with Islam as a perceptual lens for understanding Jewish-Muslim relations in *Le Figaro* as compared to *Le Monde*. Furthermore, while only one collocate, i.e. 'radical,' can be considered to have negative association in the *Le Monde* sub-corpus, the *Le Figaro* sub-corpus demonstrates numerous negative associations with 'islam,' such as 'radical,' 'politique,' 'islamisme,' and 'terrorisme.'[7] The collocate 'critique' also suggests that Le Figaro is concerned with providing a critique of Islam. A look at the context of the 'amalgame' collocate indicates that *Le Figaro* articles tend to implicitly and explicitly critique—with exceptions—the reflex to cry 'amalgame' whenever Islam is critiqued:

1. S'il faut éviter à tout prix de pratiquer l'amalgame entre islam et islamisme (ou entre islam et terrorisme), il convient tout autant de dénoncer l'amalgame entre Juifs, « sionistes » et « nazis » (ou « racistes »). Or, dans l'espace public, on n'entend guère de voix qui s'élèvent contre les amalgames polémiques visant les Juifs.
2. Juifs et musulmans dénoncent le risque d'amalgame entre islam et terrorisme
3. « J'ai peur que les choses ne se retournent contre les musulmans , confie Kamel Kabtane, le recteur de la grande mosquée de Lyon, en particulier quand on voit ce qui se passe en Corse. » Lui qui est allé avec d'autres musulmans à l'église le dimanche qui a suivi l'égorgement du père Hamel se félicite de la « fantastique mobilisation » d'alors contre « l'amalgame entretenu par certains entre islam et violence ».
4. Nous devons refuser que la peur de l'amalgame nous empêche de réfléchir. L'injonction « attention à l'amalgame ! », c'est aussi un super-amalgame : toute critique adressée à l'islam ne peut provenir que d'une détestation et sera prise pour telle. Il faut dépasser cet interdit et s'interroger sur ce qui, dans l'islam, peut nourrir le terrorisme.

[7] Not that the terms 'radical' and 'politique' are negative in themselves. Rather, they take on a negative meaning when used in conjunction with Islam, i.e. 'islam radical' and 'islam politique.'

When it comes to antisemitism, there is a strong association with, first, antisemitic 'actes,' 'agressions,' and 'violences'—and perhaps more minor manifestations such as antisemitic 'graffitis'—as well as with 'racisme' in general (see Table 10.1. in the Appendix). The collocates 'montée' and 'nouvel' suggest the significant presence of a discourse of rising antisemitism in France, linked to the new antisemitism hypothesis, which holds that contemporary antisemitism is mostly the work of young French Muslims (evidenced by the collocates 'jeunes' and 'musulmans') and no longer the preserve of the far right. The collocate 'antisionisme' also falls into the new antisemitism hypothesis, which posits that contemporary Muslim antisemitism often masquerades under the mask of anti-Zionism. The differences in the sub-corpora are somewhat counter-intuitive to the observer who notes that *Le Monde* is a centre-left publication, while *Le Figaro* is generally situated on the right of the political spectrum. Indeed, *Le Monde* appears to be more likely to explicitly associate antisemitism with Muslims and anti-Zionism, while *Le Figaro* appears to only indirectly do this through references to the new antisemitism hypothesis (see Tables 10.2 and 10.3. in the Appendix).

In stark contrast to the list of collocates for 'antisémite(s)' and 'antisémitisme,' the Muslim equivalent of the term, 'islamophobie,' co-occurs with far fewer terms (see Table 11 in the Appendix). The collocate 'antisémitisme' does suggest that, when 'islamophobia' is evoked, it is cited alongside antisemitism, which, as the collocational profile of the term suggests, is strongly linked to discourses of rising, new, Muslim antisemitism. Collocates such as 'france,' 'ccif' and 'collectif,' which both refer to the Collectif contre l'islamophobie en France, are relatively neutral and, the absence of other types of associations, such as those seen in the antisemitism list, suggest a lack of interest in 'islamophobia' in French newspapers, especially when compared to antisemitism. The most significant collocate, 'racisme,' itself co-occurs most

significantly with 'antisémitisme' (See Table 12 in the Appendix). Other significant collocates of 'racisme' include 'xénophobie,' 'islamophobie,' 'arabe,' but also 'blancs,' as in the expression "racisme anti-blancs," which is more frequently evoked in *Le Figaro* as a way of suggesting that, while antisemitism and islamophobia receive public and political attention, anti-white racism is downplayed. The notion of anti-white racism, of course, is itself a racist concept that seeks to appropriate and delegitimize anti-racism as racist itself. The notion of anti-white racism seeks to replace the focus on, say, anti-Black racism, Islamophobia, or antisemitism, and, thus, deny the structural power and systemic effects of racism. As such, the very notion of anti-white racism becomes anti-Black, Islamophobic, and antisemitic, depending on the context in which it is deployed.

2.4.3. Discourse Analysis

The earlier frame analysis demonstrated that the newspapers in question privileged the interpretative lenses of Muslim (new) antisemitism, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, youth delinquency, and *communautarisme*, within an overarching groupist perspective. The subsequent corpus analysis further confirmed the groupism inherent in most of the articles, while also revealing the significances, associations, and contexts of a set of key words relating to Jews and Muslims. This section looks at the discursive tools used to construct Jewish-Muslim relations, in a groupist perspective, as troubled and tense mostly because of Muslims. The discourse analysis revealed the recurrent use of the following discursive strategies: recourse to authority, vagueness, individualization/assimilation, and personalization/impersonalization. In addition, I noted a pattern of employing verbs and adjectives related to emotions, suggesting that the affective aspects of contemporary relations between Jews and Muslims are

foregrounded in newspaper reporting. In this section, I present these findings through a detailed discussion of a representative selection of articles in the sample.

The articles displayed both personal and impersonal authority legitimation (Van Leeuwen 2007), which is to say that the statements and arguments presented were occasionally justified through citing 'experts' or through oblique references to abstract values and ideals, such as 'la République' or 'la laïcité.' Often, 'experts' or 'community leaders' would be invited to write an op-ed, where they would 'explain' or 'confirm' what was really taking place. Consider the following examples where experts or other authority figures are cited:

1. L'actualité confirme nos craintes sur la liberté d'avoir un lieu de culte, explique le grand rabbin Marc Ben Soussan.[8]
2. Écoutons ce que déclarait Pierre Mendès France, figure unanimement admirée et modèle de modération, à la tribune de l'Assemblée nationale lors du débat relatif au traité de Rome : « Si le mouvement des capitaux et des biens peut à première vue ne pas paraître toucher aux concepts de nation et de patrie, il n'en est pas de même pour les migrations de populations. Il n'est pas indifférent pour l'avenir de la France ni que, pendant une période, les Italiens affluent en France, ni que, simultanément ou pendant une autre période, les Français du Languedoc, de l'Auvergne, ou de la Bretagne soient conduits à chercher de meilleures conditions de travail dans une Allemagne qui, en cours de développement rapide, offrirait des emplois à des travailleurs menacés par le chômage. » Il va sans dire que, à l'époque, ces propos n'ont pas déclenché la moindre réprobation.[9]

The first example is taken from a 2000 article by Jean-Pierre Laborde that reports on the revelation that the mayor of Nice made a couple of anti-Muslim statements in two letters dating from May 1999. At a time when the phenomenon new antisemitism ('nouvelle judéophobie') is increasingly debated, this *Le Monde* article cites the chief rabbi of Nice in order to suggest a religious Jewish-Muslim solidarity that emerges in opposition to a secular state (embodied by the mayor of Nice) that is presented as hostile to religious freedom. The author of the article notes that "depuis plusieurs

[8] Laborde, Jean-Pierre. "Des responsables religieux dénoncent les propos anti-musulmans du maire (RPR) de Nice." *Le Monde*, Sep. 15, 2000, p. 13.
[9] Bastié, Eugénie. "L'immigration massive, cause ou symptôme du malaise français?" *Le Figaro*, Sep. 5, 2017, p. 16.

années, catholiques, juifs et musulmans entretiennent, dans les Alpes-Maritimes, des relations étroites." He neither provides an exact time frame of these close relations nor does he provide evidence for his claim. Rather, he cites both the indignation of the chief rabbi and the bishop of Nice. Of course, the fact that Jewish and Christian religious leaders express their disapproval of a politician's anti-Muslim remarks does not necessarily mean that Catholics, Jews, and Muslims share "des relations étroites." Nevertheless, this is how the author of the article presents the situation. Again, this is indicative of the groupism that I have been highlighting throughout this chapter. In the line I have highlighted above, the words 'confirm' and 'explain' are particularly revealing of the way in which newspaper articles perceive the link between on-the-ground realities and the statements of authority figures. The recourse to communal and religious leaders, at the local, regional, and national levels, is a common occurrence in the subsample. Consider this other example:

> […] le grand rabbin de France, Joseph Sitruk, explique que « ce qui inquiète encore le plus la communauté, c'est le sentiment qu'autour de nous on banalise et on dédramatise ces incidents. »[10]

Like the chief rabbi of Nice, Joseph Sitruk's explanation of what worries the Jewish community (which his statement has coalesced into a singular national community) is presented to the reader as factual *because* it is coming from the chief rabbi of France. In this particular article, Xavier Ternisien also quotes other figures of authority, such as Roger Cukierman in order to argue that *the* Jewish community is increasingly anxious. Obtaining confirmation from communal and religious leaders appears to be the preferred method for taking the pulse of on-the-ground sentiments, rather than actually probing sentiments on the ground.

The second example is taken from an article on what is implied to be mainly Muslim 'mass immigration' written by Eugénie Bastié, a *Figaro* journalist sometimes

[10] Ternisien, Xavier. "La communauté juive s'inquiète d'une recrudescence des agressions antisémites." *Le Monde*, Dec. 3, 2001, p. 11.

compared to Eric Zemmour for her reactionary politics. Like many other contemporary reactionary or far-right figures in France, Bastié evokes Pierre Mendès-France, a figure who is decidedly not on the far right of the spectrum, in order to argue against what she perceives to be 'mass immigration.' In doing so, she is following the lead of the new generation of National Front leaders (Marine Le Pen, Louis Aliot, etc.) who, in seeking to rebrand the FN and to "de-demonize" the party, depart from overtly extremist language and adopt a more politically-acceptable rhetoric, albeit often with the same goals in mind. Other than the adoption of goals not traditionally associated with the party, such as "defence of public services, increases in modest incomes and pensions" (Stockemer and Amengay 2015) and environmental issues, animal rights, feminism, gay rights, these figures make less references to traditionally far-right thinkers and more references to 'republican' or 'universalist' thinkers. Similarly, Bastié appropriates the figure of Pierre Mendès-France, whom she describes as "[une] figure unanimement admirée et [un] modèle de modération," in order to support her anti-immigrant argument. Her words are carefully chosen in order to align the reader with her argument through citing this former Prime Minister ('président du conseil des ministres'). First, we are told to listen to Mendès-France whose words are described as a declaration ('écoutons ce que déclarait Pierre Mendès-France'). By using the first-person plural imperative, Bastié creates an 'us' that she is speaking to and places this 'us' and Pierre Mendès-France on the same 'side' against immigrants and immigration. Furthermore, to declare is not simply to make known or to communicate something; rather it is to proclaim with authority. The verb itself, in this context, primes the reader for a statement of truth from an authority figure. Imagine the difference had Bastié written: 'voici ce qu'a dit Pierre Mendès-France.' Secondly, Bastié qualifies Mendès-France as 'unanimement admirée' and states that 'il va sans dire que, à l'époque, ces propos n'ont pas déclenché la moindre

réprobation.' By using the adjective 'unanimement,' following on her construction of an 'us' that is aligned with Mendès-France, Bastié provides a veneer of universality to both Mendès-France and, now by extension, to her anti-immigrant arguments. By using the phrase 'il va sans dire,' she aims to pass off both Mendès-France's statement (taken out of context) and her own contemporary argument as commonsensical and obvious. By stating that, in 1957, Mendès-France's statement did not provoke disapproval from anyone, Bastié is implying that her own anti-immigrant stance ought not to be considered problematic today.

In addition to the referencing of vague, unclear, or undefined concepts, almost every article in the subsample used vague quantifiers ('beaucoup', 'certains', etc.) to give the sense that a particular phenomenon was widespread and to, perhaps, justify its mediatised prominence. Consider the following examples:

1. […] l'identification de certains jeunes musulmans en difficulté d'intégration en France avec les Palestiniens.[11]
2. Beaucoup de gens se plaignent d'être insultés et ne sont pas très rassurés.[12]
3. Elle reconnaît que sa relation avec certains jeunes musulmans a changé.[13]
4. Comme beaucoup, Farid, lui, évoque la "solidarité musulmane" à l'égard des "frères" palestiniens […].[14]
5. Beaucoup ont vécu ces événements comme "un choc", voire comme une remise en cause de leur appartenance à la nation.[15]
6. Mais parfois décrié dans sa communauté, ses détracteurs l'appellent "l'imam des Juifs." Soupçonner de trahison, Chalghoumi est mis à l'index dans certaines mosquées.[16]
7. Pas facile cependant dans certains quartiers où sur fond de conflit israélo-palestinien et de radicalisation de certains groupes les scènes de violence ne sont pas rares. D'autant que dans certains quartiers sensibles, juifs et musulmans vivent moins prêts les uns des autres que par le passé.[17]
8. Beaucoup de juifs se sont posés la question : s'il n'y avait eu que l'attentat de l'Hyper Cacher, y aurait-il eu 4 millions de personnes dans la rue ?

[11] Chambon, Frédéric. "A Garges-lès-Gonesse, le fragile équilibre entre juifs et musulmans." *Le Monde*, Oct. 14, 2000, p. 14.
[12] Chambon, Frédéric. "A Garges-lès-Gonesse, le fragile équilibre entre juifs et musulmans." *Le Monde*, Oct. 14, 2000, p. 14.
[13] Ternisien, Xavier. "On a crié 'Mort aux juifs' à Strasbourg." *Le Monde*, Nov. 7, 2000, p. 17.
[14] Chambon, Frédéric. "Comment des jeunes de banlieue sont gagné par la judéophobie." *Le Monde*, Apr. 12, 2002, p. 11.
[15] Broussard, Philippe. "Le malaise persistant des juifs de France." *Le Monde*, Sept. 20, 2003, p. 12.
[16] Gabizon, Cécilia. "L'imam de Drancy prône l'ouverture." *Le Monde*, Mar. 27, 2009, p. 16.
[17] Seres, Aude. "Week-end d'amitiés judéo-musulmanes." *Le Figaro*, Nov. 6, 2010, p. 11.

> On a beaucoup vu "je suis Charlie", on a beaucoup moins vu "je suis juif", il faut être honnête.[18]

In the examples above, the quantifiers used are either 'certain' or 'beaucoup' and refer to young Muslims, 'people' in general, mosques, neighbourhoods, groups, and Jews. The texts appear to be careful to not generalize from particular cases by referring to, for example, "certains jeunes musulmans" and not "jeunes musulmans" in general. However, when almost every article in the subsample uses the same quantifiers without explaining who are really being referred to, a contrary effect is produced. When 'some young Muslims' are described as being engaged in a certain behaviour or 'some mosques' are cited as being hostile to liberal imams, but the texts do not actually clarify who are the young Muslims or which are the mosques in question, the effect is actually that the statements made about a particular case are extended to the general because, in the end, when certain mosques or certain young Muslims are not identified, they could be any mosque or any young Muslim and thus every mosque or every young Muslim. Similarly, when 'beaucoup' is used, the articles do not clarify what the quantifier really means. Does 'beaucoup' mean at least more than half or more than three-quarters or some other fraction? 'Beaucoup' is simply used to assert a sense of completeness or generalizability. When some articles repeatedly refer to 'some' members of a particular group and other articles repeatedly refer to 'many' members of a particular group, the effect is a generalization of the group(s) in question. Thus, through the use of generalized vague quantifiers, the articles in the subsample reinforce the profile of, on the one hand, Muslims as young, delinquent, badly integrated, solidary with Palestinians and hostile to Israel (and by extension to Jews) and, on the other hand, Jews as worried, insecure, and increasingly the target of (Muslim) antisemitism and violence.

[18] Chambraud, Cécile. "Entretien. Joël Mergui: 'C'est à chaque citoyen de protéger la démocratie." *Le Monde*, Jan. 17, 2015, p. 8.

In the subsample, at times both Jewish and Muslim actors are personalized or impersonalized, albeit to different extents and at different frequencies. Actors are personalized or impersonalized through the usage of proper nouns, nouns, adjectives, or even verbs. Objectivation—reducing individuals metonymically to a facet of their identity—is an important form of impersonalization used in these articles. Consider the following examples where different individuals are either personalized (or humanized) or impersonalized (or dehumanized):

1. La secrétaire de la synagogue de Vincennes s'est fait intimider par deux Arabes qui étaient dans une voiture alors qu'elle fermait la porte de la synagogue[…].[19]
2. À la suite de ces incidents, deux jeunes couples ont décidé d'aller vivre en Israël avec leurs enfants.[20]
3. On ne peut pas juger des parents qui s'inquiètent pour leurs enfants. Quand un enfant a mal au ventre car il a peur d'aller à l'école, peur de mourir, qui ne serait pas bouleversé ?[21]
4. Il est important que la partie culturellement musulmane de notre société soit à l'unisson de la communauté nationale et dénonce l'islamisme radical. Si elle le dénonce de façon massive, il n'y aura pas d'amalgame, au contraire. Mais il faut que la dénonciation vienne de partout, pas seulement de quelques responsables qui ne sont pas forcément écoutés par les jeunes.[22]
5. Akim, jeune d'origine maghrébine qui habite la cité des peintres "depuis toujours," réfute cette thèse et plaide la modération. "Ici, il n'y a jamais eu de problèmes entre Juifs et Arabes. Quand vous voyez à la télévision un enfant palestinien qu'on tue, ça vous touche et vous vous sentez solidaires en tant qu'Arabe. Mais de là à mettre le feu à une synagogue… ça ne sert à rien," affirme Akim, venu prendre un café chez Yasmine, "Fast-food hallal," le QG des jeunes du quartier. Pourtant, Akim s'agace du discours de la communauté juive. "Les juifs, c'est toujours eux les victimes et c'est toujours les Arabes qu'on enfonce, là-bas et ici," martèle-t-il.[23]

The first example is perhaps one of the clearest in terms of the differing extents of personalization and impersonalization of Jews and Muslims in the subsample. We are

[19] Ternisien, Xavier. "La communauté juive s'inquiète d'une recrudescence des agressions antisémites." *Le Monde*, Dec. 3, 2001, p. 11.
[20] Sedar, Alice. "À Créteil, les actes de violence n'ont pas été oubliés." *Le Figaro*, Sep. 14, 2002, p. 8.
[21]Chambraud, Cécile. "Entretien. Joël Mergui: 'C'est à chaque citoyen de protéger la démocratie." *Le Monde*, Jan. 17, 2015, p. 8.
[22] Chambraud, Cécile. "Entretien. Joël Mergui: 'C'est à chaque citoyen de protéger la démocratie." *Le Monde*, Jan. 17, 2015, p. 8.
[23] Chambon, Frédéric. "A Garges-lès-Gonesse, le fragile équilibre entre juifs et musulmans." *Le Monde*, Oct. 14, 2000, p. 14.

told that the woman in question is a secretary of the Vincennes synagogue who was closing up before going home when she was 'intimidated' by 'two Arabs'. While all we are told about the assailants is that they are 'two Arabs', the victim is personalized through the mention of her job and workplace and, just as importantly, the fact that she was closing up just as any employee would do at the end of the day. In this way, she is personalized and humanized, while the two Arabs are impersonalized and remain two Arabs, therefore also objectified and genericized as emblematic of a larger social group, i.e. 'Arabs' in general. Similarly, in the second and third examples, Jewish individuals are personalized through the nouns 'couples', 'parents', and 'enfants' and the adjective 'jeunes'. As we have seen in previous sections, the term 'jeune' has a generally negative connotation in the newspaper corpus when either used on its own (which usually means it implicitly refers to Muslims) or explicitly applied to Muslims. When it is applied to Jews, however, the term can take on a more sympathetic connotation, as it does in the second example.

The contrast in both the differing usage of 'jeune' and the differing extents of personalization and impersonalization can be observed by looking at examples four and five. In example four, Muslims are assimilated into a large block described as "la partie culturellement musulmane de notre société" and called on to denounce 'radical islamism' as one entity. In general, it was common in the subsample for articles to genericize Muslims and individualize Jews. In example five, a Muslim individual is personalized to a large extent. First, he is identified by a proper noun; his name. Secondly, he is directly quoted. Thirdly, he is described as getting a cup of coffee, an act which allows an average observer to identify with him to the extent that getting a cup of coffee is a common everyday practice. At the same time, however, his personalization, unlike the personalization of Jewish actors as previously demonstrated, is conditional. First, Akim is immediately described as a "jeune

d'origine maghrébine," which may seem to be solely descriptive, but, as we have seen in the previous sections, is loaded with negative cultural connotations linked to delinquency and violence. Given the tendency of newspaper articles to generalize about 'jeunes', by categorizing Akim as a "jeune d'origine maghrébine," Akim is actually being presented as a generic type, which is to say that, despite being personalised by the use of his name and the description of him engaged in an ordinary and common practice, he is also genericized and, perhaps, impersonalized. The sense that Akim is a generic type, i.e. another Maghrebi youth, is further heightened by the fact that his café of choice is called "Fast-food hallal" and is described as the headquarters for the "jeunes du quartier." Furthermore, despite Akim's initial statement that there have never been problems between Jews and Muslims in his neighbourhood, he is also presented as irked by what is described as the Jewish community's 'victimary' posturing. Thus, despite being personalized, Akim is also subtly genericized as yet another Maghrebi youth and thereby impersonalized. This is fairly representative of personalization of Muslims in the subsample. Indeed, their personalization is rarely unconditional and is often undercut.

Interestingly, there is an abundance of (mostly) negative affective words in the subsample. As my discussion of Mandel's and Katz's historical analysis of Jewish-Muslim relations has shown, Jewish-Muslim relations have always been complex and not black-and-white. In general, newspaper articles do not reflect this complexity and, instead, often resort to a simpler, oppositional binary frame. In particular, this binary frame is lexically constructed through recourse to a negative affective language, thereby priming observers to adopt negative perceptive lenses when approaching Jewish-Muslim relations. Furthermore, since Jews are frequently described as victims and Muslims as their tormentors, this negative affective language is part of the ideological squaring that inclines observers to identify with Jews over Muslims.

In total, there were 83 occurrences of affective terms (See Table 13 in the Appendix). Except for the word 'amour,' which occurred once, all other affective terms had a negative value. Terms related to uneasiness (16 occurrences), fear (13 occurrences), and tension (9 occurrences) were the most recurrent in the subsample. A look at the context of these occurrences reveal that uneasiness and fear were associated with Jews, while tension was always used to describe relations between Jews and Muslims. In short, Jewish-Muslim relations are repeatedly described through affective language as tense and Jews are described as uneasy in contemporary French society and fearful of a perceived rising Muslim antisemitism. The end result is an ideological squaring and a priming of the reader to perceive the situation as emotionally charged and through negative lenses.

2.5. Conclusion

This chapter makes two main observations about French newspapers and their representation of Jews, Muslims, and their relations with one another. First, they construct 'Jews' and 'Muslims' as disparate, homogenous, and oppositional communities, while generally ignoring both the internal diversity of each category and the variety of ways that individual Jews and Muslims interact with each other on a daily basis in twenty-first-century France. Secondly, they tend to frame 'Jewish-Muslim relations' as tense, conflictual, and asymmetrical struggles between these constructed, homogenised communities. Both the corpus and discourse analyses demonstrate that, over the last two decades, France's two main broadsheet newspapers have consistently divided Jews and Muslims in two singular and separate groups and present individuals as acting in accordance to the normative logic of their group membership. Additionally, the newspapers often present relations and interactions between Jews and Muslims as an exclusive function of religion and race.

In the case of Muslims, their religiosity appears to be heavily racialised, while Jewishness is more likely to be described in cultural and religious terms. In addition, Muslims are more likely to be described as immigrants or descendants of immigrants than Jews. Finally, the figure of the violent, young, male, banlieue Muslim is put forth by both newspapers as the primary propagator of the new antisemitism. In contrast, French Jews are often described as defenceless victims. In this way, readers are primed to align themselves with the Jewish victim over the Muslim assailant. The discourse analysis, in particular, displays how the articles use authority figures, vagueness, and the strategies of individualization/assimilation and personalization/impersonalization to construct and maintain this particular representation of Jews, Muslims, and their relations. In this way, Jewish-Muslim relations are presented as inherently troubled, while Jews are generally presented positively and Muslims negatively.

Chapter Three: Jewish-Muslim Relations in Recent Novels

In this chapter, I focus on three twenty-first century French novels: Emilie Frèche's *Le sourire de l'ange* (2004), Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf's *Ce sont nos frères et leurs enfants sont nos enfants* (2016), and Thierry Cohen's *Avant la haine* (2015). I examine these novels in order to ascertain how French-language Jewish and Muslim authors negotiate Jewish and Muslim identities and the category of 'Jewish-Muslim relations' and broader, more dominant representations of these identities and relations. In doing so, I show how literary interventions into the question of Jewish-Muslim relations and their representations both challenge and reaffirm the trends identified in Chapter Two. Perhaps most significantly, these novels are steeped in pessimism (or grief), or at the very least a pessimistic optimism (or a grieving hopefulness), when it comes to perceiving Jewish-Muslim presents and futures. These conclusions are not meant to apply to all literary productions on Jewish-Muslim (or inter-ethnic/-religious) relations, but rather to be exploratory in nature, i.e. to understand how literature mediates and navigates intergroup relations that are presented as polarised and tense in broader media and political discourses.

The novels analysed in this chapter are all socio-politically inflected and make direct interventions in debates in French society. In addition, the very nature of the literary medium allows it to be a particularly potent vehicle for arguments about inter-ethnic/-religious relations. As Lucille Cairns notes:

> Literature explores and indeed often privileges the emotions. In simultaneously reflecting but also creating new forms of the emotions infusing that relationship, these literary texts offer a valuable aperture for understanding that is absent from most historical, philosophical, political and sociological studies (2015: 5).

Cairns' reflections on literature and emotions (or affect) come in the context of her analysis of the idea of Israel in Francophone Jewish literature, but they are also applicable to ideas and ideals of Jewish-Muslim relations. Indeed, just as Israel can be

an emotionally charged topic for many, so too is the topic of Jewish-Muslim relations. Indeed, it is partly because literary texts highlight human and affective aspects of a particular topic that they are particularly well suited to exploring the often emotionally charged topic of relations between Jews and Muslims. Accordingly, I understand the works in question to be products of individuals from specific socio-economic and political backgrounds, with specific socio-political opinions and positions, and with specific *individual* histories and experiences, all of which shape, to an extent, the works they produce. Furthermore, these individuals are themselves, to an extent, products of *collective* histories and realities. Thus, my approach in this chapter consists in connecting these novels with other texts in which the primary texts are embedded, i.e. the broader socio-political, 'real-world', and historical contexts in which that the primary 'literary' text is created, and the broader literary contexts.

3.1. Novels and Authors

In order to address the driving question of this chapter, I have selected three novels by three different authors, male and female, Jewish and Muslim. The authors (all of whom can be considered, in the French tradition, as *écrivains engagés*) are, more or less, from the same generation and either have a background in activism or significantly portray activists in their works. A Sephardi Jew born in Casablanca, Morocco in 1962, Thierry Cohen is primarily a novelist of romance novels and *Avant la haine* is quite unlike his usual work. In his afterword at the end of the novel, Cohen remarks that he is sure that the novel will surprise his regular readership, but that it represents "le plus personnel que j'ai jamais écrit [parce qu'il] touche à mon identité, révèle mon trouble et expose les multiples questions qui me hantent" (2015: 661). Cohen goes on to explain that he wrote the novel "out of necessity" in the contemporary context of polarization (661). In this way, the author presents his novel

as a form of socio-political commentary and openly displays its activist or "engagé" nature. Cohen's main characters in the novel also engage in various forms of activism and the novelist himself is the founder of an association called Noël ensemble, which is an initiative of Jews and Muslims who host a Christmas dinner for elderly people without family.

Born in Paris in 1976 to Tunisian parents, Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf also highlights the activist nature of her novel in an interview on TV5 Monde's Maghreb-Orient Express. Speaking with host Mohamed Kaci, Hathroubi-Safsaf, who is the editor-in-chief of the French magazine *Le Courrier de l'Atlas*, notes the role of the media in promoting a narrative of division between Jews and Muslims: "On avait cette fraternité-là et aujourd'hui [...] on aime bien montrer plutot les choses qui divisent [...] et moins les choses qui rapprochent." Instead, she suggests that the goal of her novel is to emphasize fraternity between Muslims and Jews through the retelling of Jewish-Muslim solidarity during the Second World War. Hathroubi-Safsaf, who is an elected member of the municipal council of Cergy, also incorporates significant representations of activism and activists in her novel.

Born in Neuilly-sur-Seine in 1976 to an Algerian Jewish father, Emilie Frèche is a novelist and screenwriter whose works have largely been first-person narratives anchored in time and space in contemporary France that deal with Jewish identity, intergroup relations, racism, antisemitism, and family life. Like the other two authors, there is an activist element in her work and life. She often takes part in anti-antisemitism activism. However, unlike the other authors, her literary representations of activism are mostly negative and focus on the antisemitism of anti-racist and pro-Palestinian activist groups in France.

The novels selected for analysis were drawn from a small pool of twenty-first century literary works on the specific topic of Jewish-Muslim relations in France. The

selection criteria for these literary works were three-fold: 1) the date of publication (all the novels were published in this century), 2) being written in French, and 3) explicitly addressing relations/interactions between Jews and Muslims. If the theme of Jewish-Muslim relations seemingly dominates political and social debates in the public sphere, and while literary productions representing Muslims abound, the same cannot be said about the representation of Jewish-Muslim relations in the literary medium. Apart from the three novels in this chapter, these literary works include Valérie Zenatti's *Une bouteille dans la mer de Gaza* (2005) and *Jacob, Jacob* (2014), Mohammed Aïssaoui's *L'étoile jaune et le croissant* (2012), Karine Tuil's *L'invention de nos vies* (2013), Louis Atangana's Une étoile dans le coeur (2013), Gérard de Cortanze's *L'an prochain à Grenade* (2014), and Eliette Abécassis's *Alyah* (2015). In reading the entire range of novels depicting Jewish-Muslim relations in contemporary France, a set of common themes emerge: 1) the Israel-Palestinian conflict, 2) the Shoah and the Second World War, 3) religion, 4) Maghrebiness (similarities between French Jews and Muslims rooted in their recent past in the Maghreb), 5) new antisemitism, 6) *communautarisme*, 7) terrorism, and 8) memory. These themes correspond approximately those identified in Chapter Two. The three works in question were selected in particular because they are the most representative of the entire range of themes found more broadly in twenty-first century literary writing on Jewish-Muslim relations.

Emilie Frèche's *Le Sourire de l'ange* (first published in 2004 by Ramsay and then republished in 2015 by Points) is a third-person narrative of an Israeli-Jewish boy who is sent to France to live with his French grandfather in a *cité* after his parents are killed in a terrorist attack in Israel. Thierry Cohen's *Avant la haine* (published in 2015 by Flammarion) is a first-person, autofiction narrative that is told from the perspective of two narrators, one Jewish and the other Muslim. The novel recounts the life stories of

the two narrators, from their arrival in France and their friendship to their rupture over the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Lastly, Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf's *Ce sont nos frères et leurs enfants sont nos enfants* (published in 2016 by Zellige) is a first-person, autofiction, historical narrative of Leïla, a French Muslim journalist, whose relationship with her Jewish best friend is threatened by disagreements over the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Hathroubi-Safsaf juxtaposes Jewish-Muslim solidarity during the Second World War with present discourses of tension over Israel and Palestine. Despite their differences, the three novels share a set of common themes (listed above) and a sense of pessimism over the present and future of Jewish-Muslim relations.

3.2. Existing Scholarship

In general, representations of Jewish-Muslim relations in French literature have received scant attention by academics. The representation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in French literature has been relatively better studied. Nathalie Debrauwere-Miller's edited volume *Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in the Francophone World* (2010) contains three chapters on literary representations. Lucille Cairns' *Francophone Jewish Writers* (2015) examines how 27 French-language Jewish writers have mediated the conflict, focusing on the role of affect in their work. To date, Rebekah Vince's unpublished PhD thesis *Negotiating Unsettling Memories: Contemporary Franco-Maghrebi Literature on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (2018) remains the only book-length study of representations of the conflict in French-language literature. *Negotiating Unsettling Memories* examines "how the legacies of colonialism, the Shoah, and the Nakba play out in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as portrayed in the works and circumstances of Francophone Arab and/or Jewish writers of North African descent" (Vince 2018: 9). Specifically, her study theorises the "space for dialogue

within literature, as [the writers whose works she analyses] stage encounters between Israelis and Palestinians, placing narratives of victimhood, anti-colonialism, and self-defence side by side" (Vince 2018: 69). Still, her study does not primarily deal with the representational category of Jewish-Muslim relations in France. Indeed, as of 2020, there is no academic literature on contemporary writers who have most significantly engaged with Jewish-Muslim relations in their work, such as Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf, Emilie Frèche, Mohammed Aïssaoui, and Thierry Cohen, while only four studies (Cairns 2011; Cairns 2015; Bharat 2018; Arenberg 2018) have analysed the works of Éliette Abécassis and Karine Tuil. With the exception of my previous study of Abécassis (Bharat 2018), which focuses on the depiction of Jews and Muslims in *Alyah*, all other studies of Éliette Abécassis and Karine Tuil have been focused on either the representation of gender and, in particular, the challenging of normative Jewish femininity and motherhood (Cairns 2011; Arenberg 2018) or the depiction of Israel (Cairns 2015). This is partly explained by the fact that most of Éliette Abécassis' pre-*Alyah* novels did not significantly represent Muslims and were mostly focused on (Jewish) religiosity, gender, the Ashkenazi-Sephardi divide, and the Sephardi Jewish experience in France and, historically, in North Africa.

Even earlier works, such as Romain Gary's *La vie devant soi* (1977) have not been analysed—apart from Ethan Katz's brief reading (2015: 279-282)—in terms of the social commentary embedded in the relationship between the Jewish and Muslim main characters, but either in terms of the representation of "North Africans" (Fouletier-Smith 1978) or as a way in which to "decline the stereotype" (Rosello 1998). Eric-Emmanuel Schmitt's *Monsieur Ibrahim et les fleurs du Coran* (2001) has also received scant scholarly attention, especially in terms of Jewish-Muslim relations. The exception to this is a recent paper by Marwa Ramadan (2016) that examines the friendship between the elderly Sufi Muslim Monsieur Ibrahim and the young Jewish

Momo in relation to Sufism in order to demonstrate how a Sufi-orientated approach to interreligious relations could be beneficial. Again, it is not the possible social commentary that Schmitt is making about Jewish-Muslim relations in France that is foregrounded in Ramadan's analysis; rather, she uses Schmitt's novel as a sounding board for Sufi values and their ability to foster interreligious understanding.

Sociologist Ewa Tartakowsky (2016) remains one of the few scholars to have analysed the theme of Jewish-Muslim relations in twentieth-century French-language literature. Focusing on a set of Maghrebi Jewish writers in the latter half of the twentieth century, Tartakowsky concludes that, when it comes to the theme of Jewish-Muslim relations, the literary production of these writers is structured around two primary representations of the past: "Le premier valorise l'image d'une vie harmonieuse et pacifique avec les musulmans […] le second se focalise sur les humiliations découlant de la *dhimma* imposée aux Juifs" (2017: 49). Some authors, Tartakowsky contends, depict "Edenic visions of Jewish-Muslim coexistence, [while] others insist that there was, in fact, no real exchange or dialogue between the two communities" (2017b: 18). Thus, Tartakowsky suggests that, depending on the author, twentieth-century French-language Maghrebi Jewish literature depicts pre-colonial and colonial relations between Jews and Muslims in the Maghreb as either "Edenic" or non-existent. This chapter, focusing on three twenty-first century French novels, suggests that contemporary novels generally depict Jewish-Muslim relations in the past to be Edenic and contemporary relations to be volatile, while rooting the point of rupture in relations in both the foundation of Israel and the context of decolonization.

In the field of French and Francophone film studies, the cinematic adaptions of *La vie devant soi* and *Monsieur Ibrahim et les fleurs du Coran* have also received limited academic analysis in terms of Jewish-Muslim relations. In general, this can be said about French and Francophone film studies as a whole. While there has been plenty

of work on the representation of Muslim ethnoreligious identity or Jewish ethnoreligious identity, there have been relatively few studies on Jews *and* Muslims. Perhaps, this is because there simply are not many films representing both Jews and Muslims. Indeed, in order to explain what he perceives as a decreasing visibility of Jewishness in French cinema, Serge Bokobza (2012: 895) argues that "French cinema has replaced the questioning of Jewish identity with the questioning of Muslim identity." However, as Dinah Assouline Stillman (2017) demonstrates, there has been a not insignificant number of films (from Moshe Mizrahi's 1977 adaptation of *La vie devant soi* to Roschdy Zems' 2006 *Mauvaise foi* and Ismaël Ferroukhi's 2011 *Les hommes libres*) that specifically and critically engage with the topic of Jewish-Muslim relations. These films, she notes, are "a response to a real need to explore the polarity between shared cultural roots and inter-confessional friendships on the one hand and emotionally charged political differences on the other. The more optimistic ones try to hold out the hope for the eventual triumph of good will" (2017: 240). Like the films she analyses, the novels analysed in the chapter are also a response to a polarized contemporary situation. Yet, as my analysis suggests, these three novels do not hold much hope for any possible triumph of good will.

One reason why relatively little attention has been devoted to the academic study of literary representations of Jewish-Muslim relations in France is simply that the majority of French novels published since 2000 evoke neither Judaism/Jewishness nor Islam/Muslimness. Indeed, while there were 77, 986 books published in France in 2016, the BnF catalogue shows that only 600 of these books deal directly with these themes. Of these 600, only a handful are novels, such as Karine Tuil's *L'Insouciance* and Fouad Laroui's *Ce vain combat que tu livres au monde*. Even this small number becomes infinitesimal if the search criteria are reduced to novels dealing with Jews *and* Muslims. Between 2006 and 2016, the number of books published yearly went

from 62,527 to 80,255, the average being 71,038. Over the same ten-year period, the proportion of published novels did not differ significantly from the 2016 statistics. Therefore, the minority status of contemporary novels evoking Jewish or Muslim themes (and certainly Jewish-Muslim relations) is confirmed when we consider that what is true for literary production in 2016 is also true for every year since at least 2006.

This suggests that, despite growing interest in the media and in the political sphere on the Muslim minority and its relations with the Jewish minority, novels have not been the primary means for discussions about these two communities in France. That said, there are two main reasons that justify our focus on novels and, in particular, literary narratives on the issue of relations between Jews and Muslims in France. First, despite the relatively small number of novels published each year, novels consistently represent the largest share of book sales in France. In addition, a number of novels that deal with contemporary civilizational and societal issues and debates end up selling particularly well, such as Michel Houellebecq's *Soumission* (2015). Second, when they do portray Jewish and/or Muslim characters or represent one aspect or another of Judaism/Jewishness or Islam/Muslimness, these literary texts tend to—*but not always*—do so in such as manner as to demonstrate a clear commitment with, in the case of the novels examined in this study, a critique of how these terms are deployed in other fields of the French social space, that is, in politics and the media.

Indeed, Chapter Two's analysis of the political uses of the terms 'Jew' and 'Muslim' suggests the inherent contradiction in the French republican ideal of universalism. As noted in Chapter One, this republican universalism configures an *a priori* universal French citizen, while in political and media discourse, Jews and Muslims are first and foremost defined by an ethnoreligious identity and only later

by identification with universal citizenship. With notable exceptions, this contradiction is sometimes subtly, sometimes explicitly emphasized by the writers in this study. In addition, it may not be a coincidence that literary texts that might form a kind of counter-discourse are structured into narratives. After all, narratives are a fundamental way in which people understand—and make sense of—themselves, others and the world around them. In addition, intergroup relations that have been increasingly problematized by various socio-political and historical factors possess a strong emotional aspect. It is for these reasons, then, that this chapter focuses on a set of literary narratives written by Jewish or Muslim writers in France and which engage in different ways with the question of Jewish-Muslim relations in France, a question which, outside the literary field, appears omnipresent and is often presented in oppositional terms.

3.3. Analysis and Discussion

In this section, I analyse the three novels separately and chronologically in order to examine how each novel begins with the identification of a 'problem' (in this case, of Jewish-Muslim conflict) and proceeds, through a linear narrative, to 'explain' how this problem emerged. As highlighted earlier, the main themes found in twenty-first century French-language novels, including the three analysed in this chapter, depicting Jewish-Muslim relations roughly map onto the frames uncovered in Chapter Two on newspaper discourse: 1) Israel-Palestine, 2) the Shoah and the Second World War, 3) religion, 4) Maghrebiness, 5) new antisemitism, 6) communautarisme, 7) terrorism, and 8) memory. The fact that these themes approximately correspond to the newspaper frames is significant and suggests that these themes/frames function widely within contemporary French culture and society. Nevertheless, there are differences in the way in which these themes are approached in the novels. For

example, while the newspaper articles tended to evoke the new antisemitism phenomenon or the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a way to explain troubled Jewish-Muslim relations, the novels, through the introduction of multiple voices and different perspectives, engaged with these themes in a more nuanced manner. In general—though with significant exceptions, as we shall observe—the novels demonstrated a desire to display the range of Jewish-Muslim *interactions* as opposed to the fixed, over-determined category of Jewish-Muslim *relations*. Yet, primarily because this desire is rooted in the past, it is not ultimately not brought to fruition.

3.3.1. Le sourire de l'ange

Emilie Frèche's *Le sourire de l'ange* is about an Israeli boy whose parents were killed in a terrorist attack during the Second Intifada in Tel Aviv and who was sent to live with his maternal grandfather in Mulhouse. Enrolled in a high school in a priority education zone (ZEP), the young Israeli, Joseph Vidal, discovers a France in which 'ordinary' antisemitism is widespread and rarely challenged. His grandfather, a survivor of the Shoah, does not want to have anything to do with Judaism, Jewishness and Israel, since these have never brought anything positive into his life. After being verbally abused by a group of youths because of his Israeli Jewish identity, Joseph's grandfather instructs him never to reveal his identity and origins to anyone ever again. Joseph thus adopts the name Pierre and hides the truth about his origins. The crux of the story is that Joseph falls in love with a Muslim girl, Leïla, and becomes close friends with her brother Mélik, until tensions over the Israeli-Palestinian conflict threaten their relationship. The book ends with Joseph on a plane to Israel after being physically assaulted by Mélik and Hassan, another character in the novel.

At the beginning of the novel, Joseph wonders how his mother had been able to leave her country of birth, France, to immigrate to her adopted—albeit ancestral—country Israel:

> Je me demande comment ma mère, elle, a bien pu faire pour quitter la France… Oui, comment a-t-elle pu faire ce choix-là, le choix si violent de se déraciner de son plein gré, de s'arracher à son appartement, sa famille, ses amis, alors qu'elle n'y était contrainte d'aucune manière. Peut-être avait-elle en permanence ce sentiment qui m'étreint ce soir d'être à jamais coupé des hommes, de ne plus pouvoir faire partie d'aucun groupe… (Frèche 2015: 23).

Joseph, who feels uprooted from his homeland, Israel, and out of place in what is now his adopted—albeit ancestral—country, France, is trying to understand why his mother made such a choice of her own free will when it is clear that he would not have done so if he had a choice. The last sentence of the passage above is of a somewhat ambiguous nature and can be read in two ways: 1) his mother always felt out of place in France and so decided to leave France and try her luck in Israel; 2) his mother, having left France, did not feel at home in Israel. These two readings could be simultaneously true, and it is possible that Joseph's mother never felt entirely at home in either country. Yet, what is more important, in this passage, is Joseph's expression of exile through his imagined perpetual exile of his mother. This perpetual state of exile, which is the enduring theme of the Jewish tradition, permeates the whole novel. It is significant that the novel opens with a lengthy reflection on exile, especially as this concept continues to significantly frame Joseph's experiences in France as the novel progresses.

Edward Said characterizes exile as an irrevocably painful condition, describing it as an "essential sadness" or as a "terminal loss" (2000: 173). On the one hand, Said is careful not to romanticize exile; instead he compels his reader to focus on "the uncountable masses for whom UN agencies have been created" (2000: 175). He emphasizes the "miserable loneliness" of the exilic experience for the countless individuals who have "no prospect of ever returning home" (2000: 175). On the other

hand, Said maintains a somewhat romantic perception of the possibilities accorded by exile: namely, that the position of the exile can be a useful vantage point from which to critically assess the world. He writes, "provided that the exile refuses to sit on the sidelines nursing a wound, there are things to be learned: he or she must cultivate a scrupulous (not indulgent or sulky) subjectivity" (2000: 184). Cultivating a scrupulous subjectivity entails the refusal to wallow in self-indulgent lamentations and the exercising of the full potential offered by the exilic condition to draw on multiple perspectives in order to critical apprehend the world. In doing so, the exile comes to reject the pressure to assimilate, while rooting their belonging in a transnational human(ist) community.

This form of exilic criticism and transnational humanism, however, is not available to Joseph, who, neither at the beginning of the novel nor by its end, never comes to cultivate a scrupulous subjectivity. Instead, Joseph experiences his condition of exile as an irredeemable alienation. In his words, he is "à jamais coupé des hommes." In contrast to Joseph, the Saidian exile draws on their lived experience in multiple places and cultures, not to assimilate into any one of these, but to remain ambivalent and critical of cultural and national norms. The Saidian exile draws on the trauma of loss, which comes with having to leave one's home, in order to inscribe themself into a broader constellation of human experience that transcends borders, nations, cultures, and norms. In order words, the condition of the exile ought to be the basis for an ethical, humanist universalism—as opposed to universalisms that are thinly veiled white European particularisms. Similarly, in *Diasporas of the Mind* (2013), Bryan Cheyette locates the experience of exile, which he describes in terms of diaspora, as "a state of creatively disruptive impurity which imagines emergent transnational and postethnic identities and cultures" (xiii). For this ideal theorized exile, it is the very disruption and 'uprootedness' that ought to sharpen their sense of

culture as "hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated, and unmonolithic" (Said 1994: xxxii). In theory, then, Joseph's experience of exile, characterized by his return to diasporic existence ought to engage critically with the cultural and national norms of his new environment, while constructing other forms of affective belonging. This is, however, not what occurs in the novel, thus providing a counter-example to Said's and Cheyette's optimistic theoretical appraisals of the potential—literary or otherwise—of the (ideal) exilic or diasporic condition.

Joseph is acutely aware of his difference from those around him in the French *banlieue* that he comes to inhabit and continuously attempts assimilate to his new cultural space. Noticing that Muslims dominate his new cultural environment—itself an observation that the novel passes off as neutral and non-ideological, but that indexes right-wing and far-right tropes of no-go zones ('zones de non-droit')—he eventually sheds his Jewishness and adopts a more 'neutral' French-American identity. In addition, he freely admits that his father was Algerian, without specifying that he was also Jewish. At first, it appears that, with this new identity, Joseph temporarily achieves assimilation, especially with the Algerian Muslim family of Leïla and Mélik, two friends from his new school, although the novel depicts this assimilation as entirely contingent on the falsehood of his adopted identity. Ultimately, his deception is uncovered and it is with a group of Orthodox Jews that he constructs a lasting bond. In a sense, Joseph's story is the story of an exile who perpetually searches for an ethno-religious community and a culture to belong to in order to put an end to his exilic condition. The first place he seeks community is with Leïla and Mélik and their Muslim family. He is initially able to fit in with them because of the similarities between some Jewish and Muslim religious practices (kosher and halal) and rituals (circumcision) and, perhaps, partly because he does not present himself as Jewish. Yet, the novel suggests that, in the end, Jews can only find

acceptance and community with other Jews. Any possible bond between Jews and Muslims are presented as perpetually threatened by Muslim antisemitism, expressed primarily through a language of anti-Zionism.

In the novel, the perception of Jews by Muslims and the impact of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict differs generationally, anticipating Aomar Boum's (2013) findings that the older generations of Moroccans who have generally lived with Jewish neighbours have a more positive impression of Jews than younger generations, who have generally had little to no interactions with Jews and tend to perceive them through the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. By portraying older generations of Muslims in France as having positive perceptions of Jews, the novel implicitly challenges the idea of an almost inherent Islamic Judeophobia, as argued, for example, by French historian Georges Bensoussan who stated in 2015 that "dans les familles arabes […] l'antisémitisme, on le tète avec le lait de la mère" ("Une « répliques » de trop" 2015).[24] Instead, in Frèche's novel, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is presented as one of the main initial reasons why Jews in contemporary France are facing a resurgence in antisemitism. While it is implied that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is at the root of this new antisemitism, the novel suggests that anti-Jewish hatred eventually takes a life of its own, drawing discursively on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. As such, the novel rejects the thesis of an 'importation' of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in France by "des militants d'extrême-gauche ou islamistes," as argued, for example, by the controversial French political scientist Frédéric Encel (2013). Rather, Frèche's novel's corresponds to Jean-Marc Dreyfus's and Jonathan Laurence's analysis that any conflict between Jews and Muslims in France is due to the "growing frustration of the economically disenfranchised *Maghrebin* (North African) youth," whose expression of discontent might draw on the imagery and language of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict,

[24] It is worth noting that Bensoussan's usage of the term 'arabe' conflates it with Muslim, reflecting the common usage of the term in France.

but ultimately has more to do with their lived experience with the political, social, and economic barriers they encounter in France (2002).

Joseph constantly has to navigate his Jewishness and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict with numerous Muslim characters in the novel. His first interaction with French Muslims is particularly traumatic. Seeing a new face in the neighbourhood, a group of young Muslims asks Joseph where he is from. Joseph answers naively, "Israel." The Muslim youths are dumbfounded and tell him to answer their question seriously. When Joseph answers that he is serious, there is a long silence until one of the youths asks him if he is a Jew ("feuj"). Verbal abuse ensues before an old woman arrives and yells at Joseph's harassers to leave. As Joseph enters his apartment building, one of the youngsters shouts to him "Israël, ça existe pas, c'est rien, c'est pas un pays ! Le seul pays qui soit, c'est la Palestine. LA PALESTINE, tu m'entends, espèce de gros bâtard ?!!!" (Frèche 2015: 31-32). This experience—that serves to show how the Israeli-Palestinian conflict might inflect interactions between Jews and Muslims in France—is the event that pushes Joseph to be, like his grandfather, a neo-Crypto-Jew, which implies hiding one's Jewishness in public. Urged by his grandfather, Joseph adopts a non-Jewish public persona in order to avoid similar incidents of antisemitism.

This is the first interaction that Joseph has with young French Muslims in the novel. In this way, it sets the tone for further interactions between Joseph and Muslims, while also drawing on two current trends in French political and media discourse. First, it suggests an equivalence between new (Muslim) antisemitism, 'old' (nationalist, supremacist, Nazi) antisemitism, and (Christian) Judeophobia, since it implicitly compares the present moment to earlier historical moments when Jews had to hide outward signs of their Jewishness for their safety and survival. Second, it foreshadows recent French Jewish debates on the wearing of the kippah and, by

extension, discretion in the public space (Katz 2018: 108-111). In January 2016, after an antisemitic attack on a Jewish teacher wearing the kippah, Zvi Ammar, the president of the Consistoire israélite de Marseille, suggested that Jews should avoid wearing the kippah in order to protect themselves ("Le Consistoire de Marseille" 2016). Ammar's comments was hotly contested by other prominent French Jews. In particular, the president of the Conseil Représentatif des Institutions juives de France (CRIF), Roger Cukierman, criticized Ammar, arguing that "un tel renoncement, c'est donner la victoire aux djihadistes" ("Enlever sa kippa?" 2016). Others, such as Michèle Teboul, the president of the Marseille branch of the CRIF, agreed in principle that Jews should not live in fear, but also acknowledged Ammar's concern with assuring "la sécurité des juifs" (Le Cain 2016). Most community leaders, however, such as Haïm Korsia and Joël Mergui, joined Cukierman in rejecting the notion that Jews ought to "be discreet" in order to be safe ("Enlever sa kippa?" 2016). These debates (like those around the hijab) certainly also take place within the contemporary French framework of Republican universalism, within which the kippah (like the hijab) can be perceived as a marker of ethnic factionalism (*communautarisme*) and a rejection of assimilation. The communal Jewish debates around the kippah and, more revealingly, the recent data that suggests that 40% of Jews in France have stopped wearing clothing that identifies them as Jewish indicates that discretion is increasingly prescribed and adopted by significant sections of the community as a solution to antisemitic hate crime in France (FRA 2018). Joseph's first encounter with antisemitism in France, which pushes him to dissimulate outward signs of Jewishness in public, provides the reader with an individualized account of ongoing contemporary debates on Jewish identity in the public space, while serving to ground his experience in a broader societal context of vulnerability.

This early encounter also introduces two aspects of trauma (its insidious, quotidian potential and its intergenerationality) that will traverse the entire narrative. Despite the significant differences in definition between the third (1980), fourth (1994) and the fifth (2013) editions of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM)[25], trauma is consistently defined as a function of a singular, traumatic event and its experience by an individual. In other words, trauma is the subjective experience of an objectively extremely stressful event. In all cases, trauma relates to a singular event *and* how individuals experience it, but is *not* located in that event; rather trauma is located in the experience or memory of that event.

However, in Joseph's case, it is important to move beyond an emphasis on singular traumatic events situated in the past and focus on continuous traumata in the present. This is "insidious trauma" (Brown 1991: 128), deeply rooted in the socio-political contexts of the present and not just in relation to a past traumatic event. This form of quotidian, repeated trauma relates to "the traumatogenic effects of oppression that are not necessarily overtly violent or threatening to bodily well-being at the given moment but that do violence to the soul and spirit" (Brown 1995: 107). As we shall see, Joseph's trauma stems both from past events (the Shoah) *and* from the contemporary moment (antisemitism). For Joseph, traumatic past and present are deeply connected. As in broader French media discourse, fears over a recrudescence of new antisemitism are expressed against the implicit backdrop of the Shoah. In this way, Emilie Frèche's novel depicts the fusion of past and present trauma, transmitted intergenerationally to a traumatized contemporary protagonist.

As Joseph enters his grandfather's apartment following this incident, Joseph resolves not to tell his grandfather. However, his face is marked by the experience: "le voyage jusqu'au quatorzième étage n'a pas suffi à me rendre mon visage, à la place je

[25] The DSM is published by the American Psychiatric Association and used by mental health professionals in the United States as the standard classification of mental disorders.

devais avoir un masque, un regard terrifié, bref, ça s'est lu noir sur blanc sur ma gueule qu'il venait de se passer quelque chose […]" (Frèche 2015: 33). Race-based traumatic stress is not the result of one single event; rather, it is cumulative in nature: "Race-based events that may be severe or moderate, and daily slights or microaggressions, can produce harm or injury when they have memorable impact or lasting effect or through cumulative or chronic exposure to the various types or classes of racism [racial discrimination[26], racial harassment[27], and discriminatory harassment[28]]" (Carter 2007: 88). Joseph's first interaction with Muslims in France represents a form of racial harassment. This might be his first direct experience of antisemitism in France, but Joseph does not experience it as a one-off incident. Rather, he experiences his racial harassment as connected to the history of the Shoah and the Palestinian terrorism that killed his parents in Israel. The presence of his grandfather, who survived the Shoah and bears a concentration camp identification tattoo on his arm, further emphasizes the intergenerational experiential transmission of trauma. Like Elie Wiesel in *La Nuit* (2007[1958]: 75), who testifies that "je l'avais vu, de mes yeux vu," Joseph's grandfather draws on his direct experience of the Shoah to draw parallels between Joseph's recent harassment and the discrimination and harassment of Jews that preceded extermination:

> J'ai vu l'autre jour un *sale juif* inscrit à la bombe sur un mur, je n'avais plus vu ça depuis la guerre, tu sais l'effet que ça m'a fait ? […] Je comprends ce que tu ressens… Tu sais, j'avais exactement ton âge quand les choses ont basculé pour moi aussi, alors je ne vais pas te dire que ça va aller. Pendant longtemps ça n'ira pas. Ce sera très dur. Mais il faudra bien que tu avances (Frèche 2015: 35-7).

[26] "Racial discrimination is defined as a class or type of avoidant racism that is reflected in behaviours, thoughts, policies, and strategies that have the intended or accidental purpose or effect of maintaining distance or minimizing contact between dominant racial group and nondominant racial group members" (Carter 2007: 76).
[27] "[Racial harassment] include[s] physical, interpersonal, and verbal assaults; assuming one is not to be trusted; treating people according to racial stereotypes (i.e., lazy, lacks ability); and assuming one is a criminal or is dangerous" (Carter 2007: 78).
[28] "Discriminatory harassment is a type or class of experiences or encounters with racism that are best defined as aversive hostile racism, which involves thoughts, behaviour, actions, feelings, or policies and procedures that have strong hostile elements intended to create distance among racial group members after a person of Color has gained entry into an environment from which he or she was once excluded" (Carter 2007: 79).

Joseph's experience of one particular antisemitic incident is therefore caught up in an affective, intergenerational, transhistorical, and collectively cumulative web of race-based trauma. The way in which he experiences and continues to experience racial discrimination and harassment is key to understanding his growing traumatic stress. It is also important to emphasize that the juxtaposition of his grandfather's experiences during the Second World War and Joseph's experience (in this early episode and throughout the novel) of antisemitism reflects the view of certain contemporary commentators that the new antisemitism, while driven by Muslims and anti-Zionism, draws on key antisemitic themes of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, such as ritual murder, blood libel, and political and economic domination (Taguieff 2015: 132). This early episode, and its linking of contemporary Muslim antisemitism with earlier European antisemitism, is the key to understanding why, ultimately, the novel presents a pessimistic view of present and future Jewish-Muslim relations in France.

Following this incident, Joseph chooses to go by an alternative name, Pierre, and new invented non-Jewish, French-American identity. In becoming Pierre, the French-American, Joseph sheds his previous racially-marked identity for a 'netural' or 'universal' one. This new non-Jewish identity allows him to get to know two classmates, siblings Leïla and Mélik, and subsequently to discover the similarities that he (and Jews and Israelis) share with them (and Muslims and Algerians). The first similarity is related to religious dietary restrictions.[29] When Leïla notices that Joseph is not eating during recess and suspects that it is because the food at school contains pork, she asks him if he is Muslim. Joseph is tempted to answer yes, since, according to him, they would have no reason not to believe him. After all, his father was Algerian

[29] The Jewish and Muslim restriction on the consumption of pork is certainly religious in origin and, for religious Jews and Muslims, in nature. However, it also has a cultural aspect that is evidenced in the fact that many non-religious Jews and Muslims (including atheists) continue to observe the restriction.

and his skin is as 'olive' as Leïla and Mélik's (Frèche 2015: 43). Ultimately, he chooses not to claim that he is Muslim, stating that he simply does not like pork. A similar situation arises soon after this when Mélik and Joseph leave to use the toilets together and Mélik notices Joseph's circumcised penis. Joseph carefully avoids revealing his Jewishness at this stage and instead says that he was circumcised because new-borns are routinely circumcised in the United States (Frèche 2015: 44-45). Later, speaking to a group of students of immigrant background, Mélik uses the pronoun "we," thus incorporating Joseph into this group. Joseph then wonders if this was "juste une formule ou m'incluait-il réellement parce qu'avec ma peau mate, mon goût du soleil et mes rudiments d'arabe, il considérait que je faisais partie des siens ?" (Frèche 2015: 57). Through the cumulative effect of these three moments, Joseph increasingly displays an awareness that he—and possibly other Jews—share dietary restrictions and physical similarities, rooted in religion, with Maghrebi Muslims. Frèche's narrative presents this gradually. Joseph is apparently initially unaware of the similarities between Jews and Muslims and 'discovers' them through his increasing familiarity with Leïla and Mélik. This awareness, which begins with two sets of similarities, perhaps trivial, intensifies as the novel progresses, and goes from the phenotypical to the affective.

When Joseph is invited to Leïla and Mélik's home for a celebration, he feels a deep connection between him—and his family in Israel—and the Algerian Muslims around him:

> En une seconde, j'ai alors eu l'impression qu'on venait de me téléporter à Ashdod chez la sœur aînée de mon père, où nous allions chaque année fêter le nouvel an. […] D'ailleurs, je n'entendais plus personne. Je flottais au milieu des gens, focalisé sur mon palais qui, bouchée après bouchée, avait ce pouvoir miraculeux de me ramener à mon passé et à un moment donné, je me suis même demandé si je n'allais pas voir mes parents apparaître. Il y avait tant de liens *sensibles* entre eux et ces gens chez qui j'étais que cela ne me paraissait pas impossible (Frèche 2015: 69).

This passage encapsulates Joseph's immediate, affective response to his surroundings. This sensory and affective response bypasses preconceived barriers between Jewishness and Muslimness. Through his physical senses, the narrative of polarization that habitually separates Jews from Muslims temporarily breaks down. In other words, Joseph, having previously reflected upon the phenotypical similarities between himself and Leïla and Mélik, is now taken in by "liens sensibles" between his family members in Ashdod and the Algerian Muslims at Leïla and Mélik's home. These "liens sensibles," or affective ties, are premised, first, on smells and foods and, secondly, on the felt similarity of the people present. This is evidenced by the prominence of olfactory and gustatory language in the passage. Like a Proustian *madeleine*, the food he smells ands eats at Leïla and Mélik's home transports him back to his familial home in Israel, to a past that no longer exists. Implicitly, Joseph is reflecting on a cultural affinity between (Maghrebi) Jews and Muslims. Beyond food, however, Joseph's Algerian heritage, which, unlike his Jewishness, he does not conceal, further grounds this sense of affinity in genealogy. This is highlighted by Leïla and Mélik's mother, whose first question to Joseph is about his father and his Algerian roots: "Alors comme ça il paraît que ton père est originaire d'Algérie ? Comme nous ?" (Frèche 2015: 69). In this way, Joseph's increased interactions and affective ties with a particular group of Muslims allow him to draw on tangible physical and cultural likenesses to expel, at least temporarily, the acquired prejudice of the Muslim Other premised on the absence of that Other.

Yet, Joseph's relationships with younger Muslims remain inflected by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. For instance, his interactions with Hassan, a friend of Mélik's who seems to suspect that Joseph is Jewish, always take place in relation to the conflict:

> La dernière fois, Hassan encensait donc un certain Mathlouthi, entendu sur Radio Méditerranée qui est devenu sa fréquence préférée, et dont il rapportait,

> stricto sensu, les propos. Ce gentil monsieur disait donc : « Ce monstre de crimes sionistes qu'est l'entité israélienne… et puis l'État d'Israël est appelé à disparaître, c'est un fait historique et indiscutable. » Et quand il rapportait ces mots, il me regardait droit dans les yeux. Il ne me lâchait pas. […] À la fin, il a dit : « À mort Israël ! À mort les juifs ! » (Frèche 2015: 81-82).

In a footnote, Frèche states that Mathlouthi is a real individual who did actually say these words on radio. The very inclusion of footnotes, in which the author speaks, in a novel where the primary voice is that of the narrator-character Joseph, is striking. Such footnotes form what Genette (1987) terms paratext, which refers to any text (title, author's name and biography, dedications/acknowledgments, etc.) that lies beyond the main text. While many forms of paratext are common in fiction, the use of footnotes (that are extra-diegetic) is much rarer. Frèche's frequent footnotes have several possible effects. First, it disrupts Joseph's first-person narrative, breaking the fourth wall, as it were. First-person narratives draw the reader into the world of the narrator-character. Such narratives create and maintain the illusion that the reader is privy to the innermost thoughts of the narrator-character. An extra-diegetic footnote disrupts this illusion and possibly reminds the reader of the artificiality of their experience; they are, after all, reading a novel and not a history book. At the same time, the content of the footnotes, which tend to draw links between the novel and real-world events, might indicate to the reader that this novel may be a work of fiction, but it is no less artificial and constitutes a reflection on the reality of antisemitism in contemporary France. In this way, the inclusion of footnotes is a way for Frèche to link her novel and her extra-literary writings and commentary, which frequently make a four-part case that 1) Muslim antisemitism in France has dramatically risen in the last two decades, 2) the French state and society have reneged on the values of the Enlightenment and the Republic, and 3) Jews are increasingly faced with leaving for Israel for their safety, 4) but the ideal solution would be for Jews to stay in France on

the condition that the country is able to return to a culture of Enlightenment and Republicanism.

The novel, however, mostly depicts young Muslims as opposed to the values of the Enlightenment and the Republic. For Hassan, Israel and Jews, wherever they may be, are inextricably linked. Therefore, his hatred of Israel is also a hatred of Jews. This fundamental amalgam permeates the entire novel, with constant references (in footnotes) to antisemitic incidents in France that took place following specific events in Israel, suggesting that Hassan's linking of Jews in France to Israeli policy and actions is not an exception (Frèche 2015: 83-85). The novel emphasizes that antisemitism in France is inflected by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but also rejects the notion that antisemitism is simply the result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Such a notion, taken to the extreme, would suggest that if Israel ceased to exist, antisemitism too would no longer exist. Against this notion, the novel suggests that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has given a new vitality to antisemitism, but is neither the necessary condition nor the only reason for its persistence (Frèche 2015: 84-85).

The novel's depiction of antisemitism in Joseph's school reflects contemporary debates over the preponderance of antisemitism in schools with a high concentration of Muslim students. The novel insinuates that not every student at the school is antisemitic, but implies that antisemitic discourse benefits from a majoritarian status. Joseph notes, for example, that "certains élèves ont tenté de nous défendre, mais les insultes de nos détracteurs les en ont vite dissuadés" (Frèche 2015: 126). Crucially, virtually every young Muslim character in the novel is depicted as antisemitic. This is essentially the argument made by Georges Bensoussan who contends that antisemitic threats and attacks by Muslim students represent a deeply entrenched problem in the French public school system and, moreover, constitute such an important part of *banlieue* culture that even non-Muslims are compelled to adopt

antisemitic discourse in order to fit in (Brenner 2002). In a recent interview, Bensoussan argues that Muslim-dominated *banlieues* now constitute a separate nation where a different model of integration exists: " Adopter ces clichés et ce langage, c'est se donner plus de chances d'être intégré dans l'économie sociale des banlieues. Et pour parler comme la banlieue, il faut parler «anti-feuj»" (Devecchio 2015). The problem of antisemitism in French schools, especially in a *zone d'éducation prioritaire* (socially disadvantaged school zones), is indeed an attested problem. Michel Wieviorka's (2007) rigorous and detailed study of antisemitism in contemporary France, based on extensive fieldwork, acknowledges the reality of antisemitism in schools, but also refutes Bensoussan's account, based on anecdotes, that depicts the problem as systematic and widespread. Rather, Wieviorka finds that, while the problem exists, it is "a minority one" (2007: 21, 376–389). More broadly, Wieviorka's study provides a more nuanced account of Muslim antisemitism in general, demonstrating that "contemporary anti-Semitism is fragmented; its sources do not all merge into a single, unique stream" (2007: 421). In other words, the common depiction of contemporary antisemitism being overwhelmingly driven by Muslims is more mythology than reality. Thus, the image in this novel of French public schools overrun by Muslim antisemitism is not representative of a social reality, but indicative of a prominent and unfounded charge articulated by figures such as Bensoussan.

Why does Frèche incorporate this particular image of rampant antisemitism in public schools? Given that descriptions of antisemitic Muslim youths are contrasted with the openness of older Muslims, Frèche's novel appears to suggest that despite past harmonious Jewish–Muslim relations, the future is pessimistic, which is why, by the end of the novel, Joseph returns to Israel. Joseph's experiences lead him to believe that antisemitism become acceptable in contemporary France. He believes that one major reason is that France has changed and is no longer troubled by its

collaborationist and antisemitic past. Joseph later suggests that antisemitism is no longer seen as an ignominious act, but as just another opinion (Frèche 2015: 128). However, it is not simply that antisemitism has come to be perceived differently over time; according to Joseph, the Shoah was set aside in collective memory to make way for the memory of Algerian war and this had an impact on the perception of Jews in French society. Joseph's, and possibly Frèche's, account is factually incorrect as, for decades, the memory of the Algerian war was repressed in French media and political discourse, in large part due to what historian Benjamin Stora has characterized as the French state's amnesia (1999: 135). Even as the turn of the last century brought about increased discussion and visibility, the memory of the Algerian war in France remains fragmented and contested, explaining its relative absence from public space in terms of monuments and school curricula and textbooks. This aside, Joseph's contention that the memory of the Algerian war has obfuscated that of the Shoah follows a competitive model of collective memory. According to this perspective, there are different competing memories in the public sphere and emphasizing one equates to de-emphasizing another. Joseph also appears to link particular memories with particular groups. Thus, memories compete through competing identity groups. In this understanding of memory, the memory and history of an event are considered 'pure' and unaffected by those of another. For example, this understanding would consider that the memory of the Shoah is wholly unrelated to the memory of colonization, for example.

The model of competitive memory in recent years has been criticized by a number of academics, such as Michael Rothberg. Rothberg proposes a memory model that explains "the productive interplay of disparate acts of remembrance" (2009: 309). Indeed, memory is not a zero-sum game and is often in dialogue with other memories and other histories: "Memories are mobile; histories are implicated in each other [and]

understanding political conflict entails understanding the interlacing of memories in the force field of public space" (Rothberg 2009: 313). In other words, Rothberg is suggesting that histories of conflict and violence are often entangled with each other and, thus, attempting to understand different histories separately, and not comparatively, will always only produce partial understandings. However, this is not how Joseph understands national and collective memory. In the passage above, Joseph (and perhaps Frèche) reveals his own oppositional binary thinking: Jews have their own memory (the Shoah) and the Arabs have their own memory (the Algerian war) and the two groups are competing in order to place their memory and their history over those of the other group in "the force field of public space." In this way, despite the search throughout the novel for points of convergence between Jews and Muslims and despite the apparent embedded criticisms of the narrative of perpetual conflict and polarization, the novel succumbs to the same oppositional binary thinking that underlies this narrative.

Despite the different ways of defining Jewishness (i.e., religiously, ethnically, and culturally), at first glance, *Le sourire de l'ange* seems to opt for a purely religious definition of what it means to be a Jew. Indeed, the narrator, who does not himself believe in God, but still appears to observe kashrut or at least abstains from eating pork, notes with some surprise that his grandfather eats pork (Frèche 2015: 17). A Jew, in the logic of the novel, it would seem, ought not to eat pork, even if they do not practise Judaism. But, as the story progresses, and in particular during some of the last scenes of the novel, when Joseph begins to go to the synagogue, Frèche clearly highlights the cultural aspects of practices and rituals beyond the question of religious belief. These practices and rituals, suggests the novel, can become secularized and serve, not to venerate God, but to cement the community bonds of living individuals. Going to the synagogue becomes less a religious act than an act of community life and

solidarity, especially in the face of external threats. In the same way, wearing a kippa in a local environment steeped in antisemitism may not be a sign of piety, but an act of resistance and solidarity. Indeed, the Judaism expressed by the main character is ultimately not linked to religious belief, but to a feeling of a shared social condition.

Consequently, Joseph increasingly identifies with the other outsiders he meets: orthodox Jews. One day, he sees a father and his two children wearing *tallitot* (prayer shawls). Joseph's first thought is that he now shares a similar position in France with these orthodox Jews, whom he avoided in Tel Aviv: "Ces hommes-là m'étaient bien plus étrangers que tous ceux que j'avais rencontrés depuis mon arrivée, et pourtant le sentiment qui dominait en moi ce matin-là était que nous étions dans le même sac" (Frèche 2015: 137). Joseph follows them into synagogue, where he is slightly surprised to note that the main prayer hall only accommodates men, while the women are upstairs. His surprise is due to his recollection that, in Israel, the synagogue is "a liberal institution" (Frèche 2015: 139). This is a peculiar claim since the rabbinical institution in Israel is far from liberal**.** Indeed, the Chief Rabbinate of Israel, a government department that is legally designated as the supreme authority on Judaism in Israel, is fundamentally patriarchal and conservative and historically discriminatory against Jews of colour—in the case, for example, of the Ethiopian Beta Israel and the Indian Bene Israel—and even today does not recognize marriage between Jews and non-Jews (Kaplan 1988, Rebhun and Waxman 2004, Weiss and Gross-Horowitz 2012, Hodes 2014).

In any case, Joseph's interest in the synagogue has little to do with religion, but rather about the feeling of belonging to a community:

> J'avais beau ne pas me sentir juif, c'était quand même ici, dans cette synagogue, que je retrouvais la paix… Je ne croyais pas en l'Éternel que nous louions, mais en ces hommes autour de moi, implorant Sa miséricorde. J'étais là parmi eux, une kippa sur la tête, un livre entre les mains, et cela suffisait à faire de moi un de leurs semblables. Nul besoin de me présenter, de dire mon nom, mon âge, mon identité, mes goûts, mes passe-temps favoris ; quiconque entrait ici était

> membre de la communauté. Pourquoi, au lycée, les choses étaient-elles différentes ? Pourquoi un juif finissait-il toujours par ressembler à un autre juif, un arabe à un autre arabe, un noir à un autre noir, mais jamais un homme à un autre homme ? (Frèche 2015: 140)

Joseph now finds peace, security and, above all, a sense of community among the orthodox Jews he once avoided. With just a kippah on his head and a prayer book in his hand, he finds himself accepted into their fold and now belongs to a larger social group. Joseph contrasts this with his experience of school, where he considers that people are solely reduced to a facet of their identity: "juif," "arabe," "noir." Yet, the synagogue, in this case, also functions as a site of exclusion, but Joseph is not aware of it because this time it is not he who is excluded. In a way, Joseph has simply exchanged one site of exclusion for another, while convincing himself that he has now found a site of inclusion, because he is not the one who is being excluded. The contradiction is not apparent to him simply because having been 'read' as Jewish, he blends in with the others in the synagogue.

Bolstered by this experience, Joseph mocks the universalist humanistic ideal of the French Republic, which he calls "un réceptacle vide," which is to say, something that may look attractive, but which lacks concrete meaning and substance. Instead, Joseph, falsely empowered by his experience in the synagogue, evokes other religious sites of exclusion as being the only real possibilities of in-group solidarity: "les juifs, les chrétiens, les musulmans, tous bien réels et chacun dans leurs paroisses, donnaient au mot solidarité tout son sens, un sens concret" (Frèche 2015: 142). In Joseph's new perspective, Jews, Christians, and Muslims give concrete meaning to solidarity when they are in their own places of worship, among their own. In this way, Joseph comes to reject the assimilationist ethos of the French Republic. His negative experience after coming out to others as Israeli and Jewish is what seemingly pushed him to adopting a *communautariste* posture in order to feel safe and accepted by a larger social group.

Generational differences, however, remain highlighted throughout the novel. When Joseph's Israeli and Jewish origins are revealed and provoke a series of hostile reactions among his peers at school, Leïla and Mélik's mother bumps into him at a grocery store. She takes this opportunity to tell him about the peaceful and harmonious relations she had with Algerian Jews before independence:

> Avec ce qui se passe là-bas, m'a-t-elle dit, tu sais, les gens deviennent fous, alors qu'en Algérie, on vivait ensemble, et ça se passait bien. Mieux qu'avec les chrétiens. Ma mère travaillait chez des juifs, c'était notre famille. […] Tu verras, mon fils, quand Mélik sortira, plus personne ne t'embêtera. Tu reviendras manger le couscous à la maison (Frèche 2015: 135-136).

The mother's position contrasts sharply with that of the younger Muslim characters (with the exception of Leïla). Instead of this nostalgic image of harmonious Jewish-Muslim relations, though tainted by the FLN, young Muslims in France are, in the novel, depicted as openly hateful of Joseph because of his Jewish and Israeli background. The generational difference between older and younger characters in the novel is similar to that in Boum's study, where "members of the older generation express nostalgic sadness about the absence of Jews from Morocco, [while] younger subjects use humour, jokes, hearsay, and mockery to protest, ostracize, demonize, and resist Israelis and Jews in general, whom they see as their political and social enemies" (2013: 4). Soon after this chance meeting in the grocery store, Mélik and Hassan brutally attack Joseph and cut the corners of his mouth, leaving him with a scar in the shape of a smile. After recovering from the assault in a hospital, Joseph decides to leave for Israel. The ending of the novel therefore suggests that despite individual interactions between Jews and Muslims in France, the systemic problems between the two communities make meaningful rapprochement and progress impossible, especially for young people.

Despite his gradual loss of faith in the promise of universalism, by the end of the novel, Joseph places his hope in the eventual triumph of "[la France] des Lumières,

[…] la grande et belle France rayonnante, juste parmi les Nations" over today's antisemitic France (Frèche 2015: 164). Indeed, the entire novel demonstrates the failure of the Republican model of integration and universalism, displaying how Joseph's Jewishness and the Muslimness of other characters render them less French, less universal than unmarked white French people. Still, despite previously voicing his lack of faith in the Republic's capacity to universalize its citizens, Joseph optimistically returns to universalism as the last hope for France. In this way, the ending echoes Laura Berlant's central argument in *Cruel Optimism* (2011) that "despite an awareness that the normative political sphere appears as a shrunken, broken, or distant place of activity among elites, members of the body politic return periodically to its recommitment ceremonies and scenes" (227). Berlant's concept of cruel optimism describes how, in a contemporary political climate dominated by affect, optimism (or hope) is weaponized to quell dissenting ideologies and defer the possibility of change. Instead of striving towards an embodied solidarity that would involve dialogic interactions between Jews and Muslims and commitments to each other based on similar societal and historical positions, *Le sourire de l'ange* ultimately falls under the rubric of normative, polarized Jewish-Muslim relations, where Jewish and Muslim identities are only legible in opposition to each other and, therefore, where the only hope lies in the abstract, assimilationist promise of Republican universalism, even as the narrative depicts this promise as illusionary.

3.3.2. Ce sont nos frères et leurs enfants sont nos enfants

Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel *Ce sont nos frères et leurs enfants sont nos enfants* is the story of two best friends, one Muslim (Leïla) and the other Jewish (Anne), who find their relationship challenged by their differing perspectives on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but also find common ground based on the fact that their family histories are

linked by the shared experiences and memories of the Second World War and the Shoah. The main thread of the novel seeks to balance the impact of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by highlighting cultural, social, historical, and sensorial similarities between Jews and Muslims (especially those of North African heritage) and their interpersonal relationships. There are two narratives in this novel. The first is told from Leïla's perspective and recounts her childhood friendship with Anne, the recent strain placed on it by their differing views on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and her search for more nuanced perspectives on the conflict and on relations between Jews and Muslims. The second is told from the perspective of Leïla's grandfather and takes the form of letters written to his sister during the Second World War. At the end of the novel, Leïla manages to convince Anne of the problematic nature of the Israeli government. However, the very final page of the novel reveals that a Palestinian acquaintance of Leïla's (one of only two Palestinian characters in the novel) is about to commit a suicide bombing.

The main text is preceded by two quotes in the novel's epigraph. The first is from the Qur'an and the second from the Talmud. Both quotes suggest that killing one innocent person is like killing all people on earth and that saving one person is like saving everyone on earth. The quote from the Qur'an, reads as follows: "*Voici, qui tue quelqu'un qui n'a tué personne ni semé de violence sur terre est comme s'il avait tué tous les hommes. Et qui en sauve un est comme s'il avait sauvé tous les hommes.*" The quote from the Talmud is as follows : "*Celui qui sauve une vie sauve l'humanité tout entière*" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 7). The fact that the author chose to precede her novel with these two quotes is significant for a number of reasons. First, Hathroubi-Safsaf highlights the similarity between Islam and Judaism to be one foundation upon which to build Jewish-Muslim solidarity. Beyond these two quotes from the Qur'an and Talmud, Islam and Judaism share many common aspects, including the concept of the

oneness of god, which religious Muslims proclaim five times a day during their daily prayers and religious Jews proclaim twice a day (Shema Yisrael). Second, by taking these quotations out of context and by giving them a contemporary resonance, the author highlights the importance, not of historical or exegetical precision, but of (selectively) re-reading the past in order to write a more convivial future. Third, the author foregrounds a religious definition of what it means to be Jewish or Muslim. Indeed, throughout the novel, she always places "juif" and "musulman" in lowercase (which is customary when referring to members of a religion) instead of in uppercase (which is customary when referring to members of an ethnic group).

The novel begins *in medias res* with the protagonist Leïla, a young French-Muslim journalist, in Gaza in March 2009 caught in the middle of an Israeli assault. As the literary critic Jerome McGann explains, the literary device of *in medias res* is often used to frame a narrative in terms of an explanation:

> *In medias res* […] establishes the need for an explicatory context [because it] puts the reader in suspense, not about what will happen, but about how and why the present state of affairs came to be. *In media res* enforces the desire to understand events in terms of an orderliness that springs from causes and natural consequences (1976: 100).

Thus, the beginning of the novel sets up the expectation that the narrated sequence of events to follow will explain this first scene. In other words, Hathroubi-Safsaf's use of *in media res* underscores the centrality of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict within the world of her novel, thus implicitly suggesting that narratives to come are consequences of this conflict.

Following this beginning, the novel shifts into a flashback in order to explain the immediate context of Leïla's presence in Gaza. During this flashback, Leïla and Anne are in the middle of an intense argument over the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, in which Anne claims that Israeli assaults on Gaza are acts of self-defence:

> « Israël ne fait que se défendre. Pourquoi ne veux-tu pas l'admettre ? Pourquoi refuses-tu de reconnaître que les pays arabes ne souhaitent qu'une seule chose :

> l'anéantissement d'Israël ? Derrière tous tes discours sur le bien-vivre ensemble, tu n'es finalement qu'une hypocrite comme les autres » (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 15).

Anne's arguments are significantly framed by an accusatory tone, an accumulations of rhetorical questions, and superlative devices. Faced with Anne's accusations, Leïla walks out on her friend. Having already placed Israel and Palestine on opposite positions on the moral plane, Anne is now represented in the novel as having a caricatured position on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Being the only Zionist in the entire novel, Anne could be considered representative, in the logic of the novel, of Zionism in general, which is therefore presented as a completely immoral position. For most of the novel, Anne is consistently presented as articulating very fixed pro-Israel positions that she often expresses aggressively and without nuance.

Her argument with Anne appears to be the final push she needed to travel to Israel and Palestine herself. The reader soon discovers that Leïla arrives in the middle of an Israeli assault on Gaza from Ramallah and Jerusalem, where she had been interviewing Israeli and Palestinian women on either side of the West Bank barrier. She had managed to get into Gaza through a Médecins Sans Frontières contact of hers. Leïla recounts that a chance meeting in France with a group of Israeli women, *Women in Black* ("Nashim BeShahor"), and a member of the group in particular, Ruth, a survivor of the Shoah, inspired her project of interviewing Israeli and Palestinian women. In her words, the project consists of "donner la parole à des femmes israéliennes et palestiniennes pour leur permettre de s'exprimer sur ce qui les rapproche" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 16-17). Leïla suspects that, by documenting the lived experiences of women, she might find a different, potentially conciliatory, representation of the conflict. However, as the novel progresses, it becomes clear that Leïla's project is, in large part, motivated by the increasing tension that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has seemingly placed on her friendship with Anne.

Anne is the only character throughout the novel who is Zionist. As such, the sole Zionist character is consistently depicted as violent, aggressive, uncritical, immoral, and unreasonable, at least until the novel's denouement. The bulk of Anne's appearance in the novel, where she is characterized in this manner, directly precedes the second part of the novel, which presents the story of their grandparents, Salah and Charles, during the Second World War, primarily through Salah's letters to his sister. The novel contrasts Anne with her grandfather, Charles, a survivor of the Shoah who disavows Israel. The first part of the novel thus painstakingly represents Anne as a heartless, selfish and immoral Zionist before contrasting this image with that of Charles, her grandfather who survived the Shoah and who is warm, selfless, and morally just, and who opposed the foundation of the state of Israel after the Second World War. At the same time, however, the fact that Leïla and Anne's grandparents knew each other during the Second World War might be an allegory for the shared genealogy and heritage of North African Jews and Muslims.

Leïla knows very little about her grandfather's life. What she knows is limited to the fact that he had participated in the demonstrations in Paris for the independence of Algeria on October 17, 1961, and never returned, probably being one of the hundreds killed by police that day. Discovering that her family and Anne's family have been linked for so long because of a shared wartime history, Leïla decides that she needs to find out exactly what her grandfather did during the Second World War. Unfortunately, Anne's grandfather, Charles, now lives in a retirement home and is no longer in possession of all his faculties. (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 44). Leïla thinks that uncovering this shared history between her grandfather and Anne's grandfather could be a complementary project to her project involving Israeli and Palestinian women: "Je préfère réfléchir à ce qui rapproche les gens plutôt qu'à ce qui les sépare. Je trouve que c'est une belle histoire à raconter…" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 45). Indeed,

Leïla uses similar language to describe both her Israeli-Palestinian project and her investigation of Salah and Charles' wartime experiences, emphasizing "ce qui rapproche." In this respect, Leïla's project also clearly maps onto the author Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf's own, broader project of highlighting shared Jewish-Muslim pasts in order to provide a counter-narrative to contemporary narratives of tension and polarization between Jews and Muslims. When I met with Hathroubi-Safsaf in Paris in October 2019, she told me, in a nutshell, that she wrote this novel because she was wanted to challenge "ce raccourci intellectuel qui consiste à dire que en France l'antisémitisme est essentiellement le fait de Maghrébins et de musulmans." In other words, her novel is a way to complexify and de-essentialize this dominant image of Jewish-Muslim conflict as due to Muslims in France being the primary vector of contemporary antisemitism.

Leïla's discovery of her grandfather Salah's "carnets de guerre," kept by Leïla's grandmother and consisting primarily of a series of letters to his sister Khadija in Algeria, allows her to retrace her grandfather's activities during the Second World War. In his first letter to his sister after leaving for France, Salah expresses how he misses his hometown by references to smells: "les odeurs de chez nous me manquent, celles des figues juteuses ramassées au petit matin, celle de la kesra chaude que je trempais dans l'huile d'olive" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 51). Indeed, food and smells are powerful vehicles of memory and identity formation (Waskul et al. 2009, Ayora-Diaz 2012). When Salah discovers his boss, Charles, is an Algerian Jew, they reminisce together at length about Algeria and, crucially, the only details recorded in his letter about this conversation concerns tastes and smells: "Il se souvenait en particulier des beignets pleins d'huile et de sucre qu'on pouvait acheter chez les vendeurs ambulants du port, les sardines fraîches que les pêcheurs grillaient sur place avec une pincée de sel et de cumin" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 62). These descriptions do not only provide

a visual imagery of Salah and Charles' memories of Algeria, but also a multi-sensorial vision through a gustatory and olfactory language of shared origins. As Wenying Xu writes in *Eating Identities* (2008), "a community's cuisine [is] a daily and visceral experience through which people imagine themselves as belonging to a unified and homogenous community, be it a nation, village, ethnicity, class, or religion" (3). Thus, the emphasis that the two men appear to place on their memories of tastes and smells in Algeria allows them to construct, in France, an immigrant community of belonging. In merging their gustatory and olfactory memories of Algeria, Salah and Charles interact not as Jew and Muslim, but as Algerians.

Indeed, having grounded their shared origins in their sensorial memories of Algeria, their Jewishness and Muslimness almost appear to be irrelevant to each other. The relevance of their Jewishness and Muslimness comes up once in these early descriptions: they are both marginalized groups in French society. This and their Algerian origins firmly bind them together as compatriots and not members of two different social or religious groups. In another letter to Khadija, Salah notes another common bond between the two of them: they are both communists. These initial descriptions of Salah and Charles serve to underline that, beyond Muslims (or Arabs or Algerians) and Jews, there are often other markers of identity which, depending on circumstances, exceed the importance of singular categories of 'Muslim' and 'Jew'. Implicitly, by highlighting the multiplicity of identifications between Salah and Charles, Hathroubi-Safsaf is interrogating the contemporary over-determination of fixed categories of Jewishness and Muslimness.

When Salah meets Charles' sister, Simone, he notices that she is wearing a hand of Fatma. Interestingly, in his letter to his sister, Salah describes his surprise at seeing Simone wear "ce genre de bijoux," adding that "elle me faisait penser aux femmes de chez nous" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 70). Salah's reaction is revealing for two reasons.

First, Salah immediately associates Simone with women from "chez nous" because of her hand of Fatma. Second, he perceives her nonetheless as different from these women. At first glance, it seems that Salah considers Simone, like Charles, as above all an Algerian and, perhaps, only secondarily as a Jew. Yet, the very fact that he finds it "tellement étonnant" to see her wearing a hand of Fatma seems to indicate that he does not see her as truly Algerian, even though the hand of Fatma is also part of Sephardic Jewish iconography. But it is perhaps not the fact that Simone is Jewish that causes Salah to be surprised that she is wearing a hand of Fatma, but that, in Salah's eyes, she appears more French than Algerian, having left Algeria at a very young age and having grown up mainly in France. Thus, this scene suggests that Salah might initially see Simone (and others like her) as different, but he is also able to equate her with the women of his hometown. In fact, Simone and Salah grow increasingly close and eventually become a couple and end up getting engaged. Importantly, the first two Jewish characters Salah encounters are not defined primarily by their Jewishness, but by their similarity to Salah and Algerian Muslims in terms of shared marginalized positions in society, shared memories, and shared iconography and symbols.

It bears emphasizing the obvious: Salah's letters from the Second World War, in the world of the novel, are filtered through Leïla's eyes and, most importantly, written by the author Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf in twenty-first-century France. This is to say that the author is writing in a contemporary socio-political context that emphasizes tension and conflict between Jews and Muslims and a certain incongruity between divergent experiences, memories, and understandings of historical events such as colonization, the Shoah, the founding of Israel, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Algerian War, and so on. History is articulated through memory; the past is always articulated in the present. The modalities for this articulation, however, varies. While, Emilie Frèche's novel, as we have seen, adheres to such a competitive model of

memory, Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel, through Salah's letters, seeks to highlight how these memories, like identities, can be more hybrid. In other words, Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel's rendering of memory is transcultural. Especially in the current age of globalization, Astrid Erll argues that "memory is fundamentally transcultural [as] *no* version of the past and *no* product in the archive will ever belong to just one community or place" (2014: 178). Transcultural memory, as defined by Lucy Bond and Jessica Rapson, describes two different contemporary dynamics: "first, the travelling of memory *within* and *between* national, ethnic, and religious collectives; secondly, forums of remembrance that aim to move *beyond* the idea of political, ethnic, linguistic, or religious borders as containers for our understanding of the past" (2014: 19). Within this framework, Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel, through Salah's letters, represents a stark rejection of contemporary discourses of competitive memory that depict struggle, in the arena of collective remembrance, between a Jewish memory of the Shoah against a Muslim memory of colonial and neo-colonial violence.

Following German occupation of Paris in June 1940, Salah writes to his sister deploring how little resistance there seemed to be towards the first German ruling, which required all Jews to be registered and all Jewish businesses to display a sign with the words "entreprise juive" in French and German (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 99-101). Pétain, Salah writes, announced that he was entering "dans la voie de la collaboration" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 103). Shortly after, there is a first roundup (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 110). On May 29, all Jews over the age of six are required to wear a yellow star. This, like all previous developments, deeply affects Salah: "Les voilà marqués comme du bétail. Cela me fend le cœur […] Je ne comprends pas pourquoi le peuple français ne se soulève pas" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 115). This and subsequent letters are particularly marked by Salah's description of his emotional state. Crucially, Salah's letters contrast his increasing sense of horror with the relative

inaction and complicity of 'the French'. Indeed, the nationalist myth, dubbed '*résistancialisme*' by historian Henry Rousso, of a resistance movement that was widely supported by the French population has been thoroughly debunked (Paxton 1972; Rousso 1987; Gildea 2015). The affective language used in this letter and in subsequent letters form a semantic field of horror, devastation, and compassion. Salah's previous letters, prior to the German occupation of Paris, serve to root his sense of shared belonging with his Jewish friends in terms of a common ancestral past and political present or, in other words, a lived experience. These subsequent letters further ground this sense of belonging in felt experience. Again, it is important to keep in mind that these letters are being read by Leïla who, in turn, is created and rendered on the page by the author. Hathroubi-Safsaf's representation of the intersecting lived and felt experiences of her Jewish and Muslim characters is her attempt to write and imagine shared belonging against the grain of contemporary polarizations. Belonging, as Laura Berlant argues, is not "a synonym for being in social worlds" (2016: 394-5). In other words, belonging is not simply inhabiting the same spaces as others. Instead, Berlant argues that "belonging is a specific genre of affect, history and political mediation" (2016: 395). This form of belonging ties Salah and his friends together; in the novel, their story is not a Jewish or a Muslim story, but a Jewish-Muslim story based on affective ties, shared history, and political affinities, constructed by Hathroubi-Safsaf as a contemporary counter-narrative.

In the timeline of the letters, two years later in 1942, the Vel' d'Hiv Roundup carried out by French police, along with all other recent events, pushes Salah to print a leaflet in Kabyle and in French:

> Hier, à l'aube, les juifs de Paris ont été arrêtés, les vieillards, les femmes, comme les enfants, en exil comme nous, ouvriers comme nous, ce sont nos frères et leurs enfants sont nos enfants. Si quelqu'un d'entre vous rencontre un de ces enfants, il doit lui donner asile et protection, le temps que le malheur passe. Enfant de Kabylie, ton cœur est grand (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 117).

Thus, the wording of the leaflet provides an explanation for the title of Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel, reflecting her belief, rooted in this historical moment of solidarity, in the inherent physical, human, and cultural bond between Jews and Muslims. In Salah's context, these words represent a powerful defiance of the lethal racial divisions between Jews and Muslims drawn by the Nazis. In the contemporary context of Hathroubi-Safsaf, the title of the novel is, similarly, a rejection of the polarized categorization and separation of Jews and Muslims. Moreover, what the novel presents as a leaflet written by Salah is an actual historical hand-written document in Kabyle that was recovered in Paris in 2004 that historian Ethan Katz suggests was "crafted and disseminated among the capital's Algerian laborers" (2015: 143). The wording of this original document and the text in the novel appears to be, apart from minor details, identical. In both cases, the text is a plea to fellow Algerian Muslims to act in solidarity with Jews in France. As in all of Salah's letters to his sister, this solidarity is partly premised on the similar positions occupied by Jews and Algerian Muslims in France: "en exil comme nous, ouvriers comme nous." In other words, the text links Jews and Muslims together in terms of class solidarity as well as their exilic condition. Both of these elements were already introduced in the very first encounter between Salah and Charles, when they bonded over their memories of Algeria (premised on the fact that they were both now distanced from their homeland) and their shared political positions as communists. These details are yet another indication of how the author inscribes Jews and Muslims within the memory of the Second World War as a way to challenge competitive models of remembering.

Again, Salah's motivation is described in affective terms. He is deeply moved when printing the leaflets and "hanté par les images de ces enfants, de ces vieillards bousculés et embarqués de force par des policiers français" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 117). Reading this particular letter in the present, Leïla too becomes emotional,

immediately thinking of another bloodied link between Jews, Muslims, and the French police. She recalls that, after the war, the Vélodrome d'Hiver was used to detain "les Musulmans français d'Algérie" in August 1958 under the orders of Maurice Papon. She wonders if her grandfather was one of those detainees (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 121). She does not, however, mention that Papon was not only responsible for the detention of Algerians in 1958, but also for the deportation of Jews during the Second World War and for the Paris massacre of 1961, during which French police killed hundreds of pro-FLN Algerians, including her grandfather. Still, Leïla's reflections on Papon (and the historical similarities shared between Jews during the Second World War and Algerian Muslims during the Algerian war) represent yet another basis on which contemporary Jewish-Muslim solidarity might be built, emphasizing shared positions of vulnerability and imbricated lived and felt experiences. Leïla's reaction to reading this letter suggests how a transcultural, multi-directional approach to memory and history might have positive direct and indirect consequences for the possibility of contemporary movements of Jewish-Muslim solidarity.

In another letter to his sister, Salah writes that the increasingly dangerous situation for Jews in the occupied zone leads him to bring them to the Grand Mosque of Paris where he discovers that entire families are being sheltered by the rector (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 124-125). From Derri Berkani's documentary *Une résistance oubliée* (1991) to Karen Ruelle and Deborah DeSaix's children's book *The Grand Mosque of Paris* (2009) to Ismaël Ferroukhi's film *Les hommes libres* (2011), the figure of Si Kaddour Benghabrit, the founder and rector of the Grand Mosque of Paris is currently enjoying resurgence in contemporary French popular culture. When Berkani's documentary was first released in 1991, it gathered little attention. However, by the early 2000s, "in the context of renewed violence in the Middle East, and France's own

widely perceived Muslim-Jewish crisis, the story of the mosque became increasingly tantalizing to the historical and political imagination" (Katz 2012: 258). Indeed, the figure of a Muslim rector saving Jews has re-emerged in the current climate of seemingly strained relations between Jews and Muslims in France precisely because it offers the possibility of a historical counter-narrative. Both in other cultural representations and in Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel, the rector and the mosque represent yet another form of transcultural memory that emphasizes a point of solidarity between Jews and Muslims facing a political class and a society that is hostile to them. Yet, historians have been sceptical of the historicity of these accounts (Laloum 2012; Katz 2012, 2015). In particular, Ethan Katz suggests that the historical evidences depicts a more complex portrait of Benghabrit's legacy. Katz notes that the rector likely both saved some Jews and denounced others, thus condemning them to certain death. Katz writes that his actions were the result of Benghabrit "weigh[ing] the protection of his community and himself against the ethical imperatives of the moment" (2015: 125). This darker and more complex image is generally absent from recent cultural representations of the rector, thus highlighting how contemporary dynamics of transcultural memory are better understood as reflections of the contemporary moment and the types of solidarities that individuals and groups seek to emphasize, rather than as accurate reflections of historical events.

Ultimately, in Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel, due to lack of space at the mosque, Salah, Charles, Simone, and Ida, are turned away by the rector. This may be the author's way of gesturing towards the more complicated legacy of the rector without entirely jettisoning the episode's potential value for reimagining Jewish-Muslim relations in the present. In the novel, having been turned away by the rector, the group devises a new plan. With the help of a smuggler, they attempt to cross the line of

demarcation and head for Switzerland. In his next letter to his sister, however, Salah writes that the plan failed:

> Je n'ose te l'écrire, ce serait accepter l'ignoble réalité de cette terrible nouvelle. Simone et Ida ont été arrêtées il y a quelques jours. Nous étions si proches de notre but, de cette fameuse ligne de démarcation. Ils auraient pu trouver refuge en Suisse. Je pense que nous avons été trahis par le passeur (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 130).

Having been betrayed and having lost Simone and Ida, Charles and Salah manage to escape and find refuge with François, a friend of Salah's. They manage to find the camp where Simone and Ida are being held, but they are powerless to free them. Simone, Ida, Charles, and Salah see each other through barbed wire. Soon, Simone and Ida are transported with other prisoners to Auschwitz. Salah stops writing letters until after the liberation of Paris.

More than a year later, Salah finally writes another letter to her sister. Despite the scenes of jubilation in Paris, Salah describes himself as without much joy for three reasons. First, he is still devastated by the potential fate of Simone and Ida. Second, Charles de Gaulle had complied with the Americans' request to not allow the *tirailleurs africains* to march on the Champs-Élysées at the Liberation of Paris in 1944. Third, Salah learned that, on the same day in May 1945 that Germany surrendered, French soldiers fired on protesters in Sétif and Guelma. Both Salah's second and third reasons correspond to actual historical events. On June 18, 1940, Charles de Gaulle declared from London that France had not lost the war yet because "elle a un vaste Empire derrière elle" (de Gaulle 1940). Indeed, as Annette K. Joseph-Gabriel writes, "the colonized subjects whom France had supposedly set out to civilize entered the war to save a crumbling Europe from itself" (2019: 8). Yet, subsequently, de Gaulle insisted on a white-only victory parade along the Champs-Élysées in Paris in 1944. Black soldiers drawn from France's colonial empire, who made up the majority of the Forces françaises libres, found themselves side-lined in 1944 due to a desire to portray

the liberation of Paris as a white victory. In addition, in May 1945, French soldiers and settler militias massacred an estimated 20,000 to 30,000 Algerians over the course of several days (Planche 2006: 309). As Joshua Cole notes, the Sétif and Guelma massacre "has often been portrayed as the true beginning of the war for Algerian independence" (2010: 109). Accordingly, the sense of betrayal that Salah feels in relation to these two events is later implied to be at the root of his anti-colonial consciousness. In essence, Salah realizes that despite their sacrifices, he, like other Algerian and African subjects, will never be more than mere "indigènes" to French eyes (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 136-137).

In his final letter to his sister, he reveals that Ida survived, but not Simone:

> Ida est revenue. Seule. Dès que je l'ai aperçue, j'ai cherché à ses côtés la silhouette de son inséparable amie. Puis, quand enfin nos regards se sont croisés, j'ai compris que Simone n'était plus là. J'ai ressenti comme un poids énorme qui me descendait sur les épaules. À ma demande, elle ne m'a épargné aucun détail. J'étais hypnotisé par son récit et envahi d'un sentiment de dégoût pour l'humanité entière. Elle m'a appris un secret que Simone lui avait prié de me dévoiler. Rien ne pouvait me faire plus mal que de l'apprendre (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 137-138).

Salah's words are striking. His final letter progresses from an analytical processing ("j'ai compris") of the meaning of Ida's solitary return to his visceral reaction ("j'ai ressenti") to Simone's absence. His letter is marked by superlatives of unbearable burden and horror. Reading these lines, Leïla too is moved. She resolves to travel once again to Jerusalem to meet with Ida, who had moved there after the war, in order to uncover the secret alluded to in Salah's final letter.

A week later, Leïla finds herself face to face with Ida in her apartment in Jerusalem. Ida tells Leïla that, after the war, Salah became involved in the anti-colonial struggle and, as a result, they had "des échanges très vifs au sujet de la création d'Israël" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 145). According to Salah, Israel had stolen Palestinian land. Ida admits that Salah was right, but that the context of the Shoah was important: "nous les juifs d'Europe étions terrorisés, la Shoah pouvait se reproduire.

On cherchait un abri" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 145). Interestingly, despite her insistence on the context of the creation of Israel, Ida nonetheless agrees that Israel was built on land stolen from Palestinians and, thus, an unethical project from the beginning. Ida is only one of two survivors of the Shoah depicted in the novel, the other being Ruth from the Women in Black group. Without being anti-Zionists *per se*, Ida and Ruth are critical of both the context of the foundation of Israel (i.e., the Nakba) and the ongoing context of occupation. Similarly, the only other living Jewish characters depicted in the novel (Anne's parents) are anti-Zionist Jews. This means that Anne's unflinching Zionism is all the more important within the novel. Implicitly, the novel suggests that the rupture between Leïla and Anne is not abstractly due to some hypothesized spill-over of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict into French society, but Anne's uncritical defence of Israeli continued dispossession of Palestinian land and lives.

During their conversation, Ida also reveals the secret alluded to in Salah's letter: Simone was carrying Salah's child. In this way, Salah's letters, which gradually construct a shared Jewish-Muslim belonging, culminate in the embodiment of Jewish-Muslim belonging: their unborn Jewish-Muslim child who, like its mother, dies in Auschwitz. There is a peculiar semantic coincidence here between an unborn child who is as much Jewish as Muslim who dies in Auschwitz and prisoners who were called 'Muselmanner' by guards and prisoners alike. In a number of survivors' testimonies, from Primo Levi's *Se questo è un uomo* (1947) to Elie Wiesel's *La nuit* (1958), the term 'Muselmann' is described as referring to a prisoner who has grown extremely weak and close to death. Levi writes that the term "was used by the old ones of the camp to describe the weak, the inept, those doomed to selection" (1959: 103). By placing an unborn Muslim in Auschwitz, the novel compels the reader the confront the historical coincidence of Jewish 'Muselmanner' in Auschwitz. How did some Jews

become Muslim in the camps? In *The Jew, the Arab* (2003), Gil Anidjar argues that the fact that 'Muslim' could become a signifier for 'Jew' in the camps suggests a certain interchangeability in the European intellectual tradition between the Semites, as a racial category constructed by Europeans in distinction to Aryans (138-149). Thus, Simone's secret, which doubly devastates Salah, also serves to place Jews and Muslims, as racialized Semites, within a shared history.

Finally, Leïla and Ida's conversation highlights transcultural, multidirectional memory as a crucial foundation for contemporary Jewish-Muslim relations. Ida emphasizes the importance of educating younger generations about the intersecting nature of Jewish and Muslim histories during the Second World War. She also tells Leïla that, after the Second World War, she decided to never return to France due to its collaborationist past and what she perceived to be widespread denialism and minimization of the Shoah. She reveals, nevertheless, that she made an exception for the Maurice Papon trial because he had "à la fois le sang des Juifs et celui des Algériens de 1961 sur les mains" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 167-168). In this way, from embodied Jewish-Muslim solidarity during the Second World War to the figure of Maurice Papon, the novel further articulates the basis for contemporary solidarity and understanding in shared memories of the past. Indeed, when Leïla leaves Ida, she is deep in thought, not about the Shoah or her grandfather, but about her increasingly strained relationship with Anne, which symbolises more broadly Jewish-Muslim relations in contemporary France. Thus, a new theme—that was latent throughout—emerges to forefront in the novel: entangled pasts and shared genealogy. Salah and Charles' granddaughters now emerge as inheritors of their solidarity, trauma, and loss. As such, the novel seemingly depicts their granddaughters and, by extension, younger generations of Jews and Muslims as avenues for hope to reach beyond polarization. Leïla makes a mental note to herself to introduce Anne to Ida in the hope

that Ida will be able to convince her friend that her relationship with Younès, her French Muslim boyfriend, is not, contrary to what Anne thinks, destined to fail (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 169). Leïla hopes that, by sharing this remarkable story of solidarity, she might salvage both her friendship and Anne's relationship with Younès. In this way, the novel provides us with a hopeful allegory for the future of Jewish-Muslim relations based on the affective ties and embodied solidarity of a recent past. In her reading of Salah's letters and during her conversation with Ida, Leïla engages with the memory of the Shoah and of the brutality of colonialism in a decidedly multidirectional manner, which is to say neither competitively nor reductively. She places the Shoah and colonialism beside each other—not to engage in comparative oppression Olympics or to reduce the historical and empirical difference between the two—but rather as an expression of what Michael Rothberg terms "differentiated solidarity" (2011: 526). Rothberg suggests that "a radically democratic politics of memory needs to include a differentiated empirical history, moral solidarity with victims of diverse injustices, and an ethic of comparison that coordinates the asymmetrical claims of those victims" (2011: 526). This is precisely the politics of memory implicitly adopted by Leïla after discovering her grandfather's letters. If the novel ended here, this would have been a narrative of hope based on the political possibilities of the present offered by a multidirectional model of memory.

However, this is not where the novel ends. Towards the end, Anne is depicted as rethinking her staunch defence of Israel after witnessing a group of North Africans being denied entry into Israel at Ben Gurion airport. Anne, having been the only avidly pro-Zionist character of the novel, comes to recognize her error of judgment. Leïla, for her part, is described as pleased that her friend "ouvr[e] enfin les yeux" (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 171). Thus, in part, the novel suggests that, for Jews and Muslims to rediscover their shared past and relaunch harmonious relations in the

present, Jews must first "open their eyes" and reject Israel. This is the only conceivable conclusion after the entire novel opposes two groups of Jews against each other, Anne (the staunch Jewish Zionist), on the one hand, and other Jewish characters (Jewish anti-Zionists or, at least, Jews who are critical of Israel), on the other hand, before Anne finally comes to rethink her pro-Israel commitments at the end of the novel. Yet, the centrality of Israel for contemporary Jewry suggests that the novel's prescription for the present is doomed to fail from the start, regardless of its lengthy depiction of the past.

The last few lines of the novel further complicates the hopeful promise of differentiated solidarity:

> Elle [Leïla] se demanda ce qu'il [Zied] faisait là. Depuis l'endroit où elle se trouvait, elle n'arrivait pas à voir quelle était sa destination. Elle se faufila parmi les nombreux voyageurs qui se pressaient pour rentrer chez eux. La gare serait fermée demain. Elle cria son prénom, parcourut la dizaine de mètres qui les séparaient. Il eut un mouvement de recul en l'apercevant. Un sourire narquois se dessina sur ses lèvres. « Il porte un blouson bien épais pour la saison », pensa Leïla (Hathroubi-Safsaf 2016: 171).

Thus, the novel ends with Zied, a Palestinian acquaintance of Leïla, about to commit a suicide bombing at a train station. The ending leaves the reader with a question: how will Anne react to news that Zied, someone Leïla knows, has bombed a train station? Will Anne's new critical outlook on Israel survive this attack? Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel carefully depicts an imbricated Jewish-Muslim past as a way to ease the tensions of the present, but it also implies that one major condition for present and future relations is the disavowal of Israel. The ending of the novel, in part, suggests that this might not be possible. As such, the reader is brought right back to the beginning of the novel, right back to the seemingly unavoidable centrality of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

3.3.3. *Avant la haine*

Thierry Cohen's novel consists of the life stories of Raphaël and Mounir, two Moroccans—one Muslim, the other Jewish—who immigrate to France with their families in the 1960s. Cohen carefully describes how the two boys come to be close friends through their shared Moroccan origin in a France that is openly distrusting and hostile to North Africans, before a set of more recent socio-political circumstances drive a wedge between them and contemporary antisemitism lead a fifty-something year old Raphaël to leave France for Israel with his family. From seeing each other primarily as Moroccans and natural allies in the fight against racism in France, Raphaël and Mounir eventually find themselves pitted against each other as "Jew" and "Muslim." The relationship between Raphaël and Mounir can be read as an allegory for Jewish-Muslim relations in France, although, as the author himself points out in the afterword to his novel, it is not necessarily representative of French Muslims and Jews (Cohen 2015: 662). Indeed, the novel is not representative of the diversity of Jewish and Muslim identities and the entire range of possible interactions between Jews and Muslims in France from the 1960s to the present. However, it charts the broad contours of how a particular vision of Jewish-Muslim *relations* comes to define Jewish-Muslim *interactions* primarily through divergent ethnoreligious and transnational political identifications, when interactions in the past were often defined by other more fluid, complex, and intersecting identifications. In this way, Cohen's novel represents a chronological literary exploration of the shifting dynamics and politics of Jewish and Muslim identities in the second half of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Cohen's novel is based on the notion that the most effective corrective to contemporary polarization lies in meaningful daily interactions. Indeed, by situating the rupture between Raphaël and Mounir at the moment when they gradually ceased

to interact meaningfully with each other, Cohen is, like Boum, suggesting the importance of daily interactions (Boum 2013: 166). Cohen writes in his afterword that:

> Le propos de ce roman n'est donc pas « d'expliquer » la haine, mais de montrer comment elle grandit quand on ne se comprend plus. […] La nature humaine conduit souvent les individus à s'apprécier à travers ce qu'ils ont en commun. Et ne plus se parler revient à céder la place à l'incompréhension, à laisser gagner l'ignorance. Or l'ignorance est le fondement même de la haine (2015: 663).

Suggesting that hatred stems from a lack of understanding due to of a lack of sustained interactions ("ne plus se parler"), Cohen's novel seemingly prescribes dialogue as the panacea for ethnic conflict. According to Cohen, this rupture of Jewish-Muslim interactions is what has led to "le retour de la haine," expressed in, on the one hand, antisemitic acts and attacks and, on the other hand, increasing Jewish alignment with right-wing politics, in the past two decades in France.

Cohen's afterword specifically contrasts the polarization of contemporary Jewish and Muslim identities with his childhood and adolescent memories, which according to him, reflect a time of meaningful, sustained, and convivial Jewish-Muslim interactions:

> Nous venions des mêmes pays, partagions des traditions, des mots, des doutes et l'ambition commune de devenir français. Plus tard, notre volonté de lutter ensemble contre le racisme d'extrême droite resserra nos liens. Puis il y eut les guerres au Moyen-Orient, et nos relations se distendirent avant… de devenir compliquées (2015: 662).

This passage brings up several key elements that structure the novel's treatment of Jewish-Muslim relations in France. The French Jewish-Muslim story, as told by Thierry Cohen, is a three-part series. First, the story of Jewish-Muslim relations begins with a nostalgic memory of a time when Jews and Muslims shared amicable relations based on shared national origin, traditions, language, and their minority status and outsider position in the metropole. Then, the threat of the far-right further united Jews and Muslims (in the 1980s) as anti-racist activists. Finally, however, the Arab-Israeli conflict caused Jewish-Muslim relations to wane and finally disintegrate. In telling

this three-part story through the eyes of Raphaël and Mounir, Cohen is crafting a narrative that seeks to make sense of the complex personal and collective histories of Jews and Muslims in France. His afterword makes it clear that this is the primary motivation behind the novel and that he chose the narrative form of a novel because it is his preferred mode of communication: "je ne sais parler de ce qui me touche qu'à travers des personnages" (2015: 662). When we met in Lyon in 2019, Cohen reiterated what he states in his afterword, namely that his memories and lived experience of Jewish-Muslim interactions form part of the basis of this novel. According to him, most of Raphaël's character is built on himself, while Mounir is the personification of a number of Muslim friends and acquaintances and supplemented by recent interviews that he conducted. By consolidating his memories and interviews into two characters whose lives serve as an allegory for Jewish-Muslim relations, Cohen novel aims to place the messiness of lived and felt experience into the coherence of a chronological narrative.

On the topic of chronological, narrative life stories, Laura Berlant argues that "the story of having a 'life' itself coasts on a normative notion of human biocontinuity" (2011: 181). Life stories often implicitly position life as the sum of chronological experiences: I am who I am because x, y, and z happened to me in that order. Such stories represent narratives that we construct in order to make sense of multitude of random, circumstantial, and sometimes inexplicable events and happenings that we experience over a lifetime. In other words, life stories take messy, sometimes random dots, which, if traced together, would form squiggles, and straighten them out in clear, linear trajectories. In the act of straightening these squiggles, we endow particular moments in our lives with deep meaning. Indeed, a life story is not a compendium of everything that ever occurred in our lives, but a linear narrative of what we think are the most important and meaningful events. Such narratives form an essential part of

our identity (who we see ourselves to be, who we aspire to be). Crucially, as recent research in developmental psychology has suggested, the identity narratives that we construct are, in part, shaped by broader cultural and national narratives (McAdams and McLean 2013). With this in mind, the division of the novel into six chronological chapters is revealing. The first and second chapters are simply titled "l'enfance" and "l'adolescence," while the remaining four are more descriptively titled "l'origine de la haine," "le doute," "désillusions," and "la haine" (Cohen 2015: 667-671). Each chapter recounts the experiences of Raphaël and Mounir by decade. The first two chapters cover the 1960s till 1981. The third chapter covers the 1980s, which Cohen categorizes as "l'origine de la haine," while the fourth chapter, "le doute," covers the 1990s. The final two chapters cover the 2000s and the 2010s, which are respectively the years of "désillusions" and "haine." The experiences of Raphaël and Mounir are thus categorized throughout six decades in such a way that makes sense of their eventual rupture: they go from being childhood and adolescent friends to experiencing doubts, becoming disillusioned, and, finally, succumbing to hatred.

Raphaël and Mounir's childhood in the novel is situated in the 1960s and early 1970s, a period that Ethan Katz describes as "a moment [...] of transition and deep uncertainty [when] [...] for many Jews and Muslims, complex and multiple allegiances existed" (2015: 2-3). Like Katz, who writes that "Jews and Muslims could understand themselves and one another in myriad ways" (2015: 3), Cohen's memories—memories translated into Raphaël and Mounir's life-stories—suggest a past diversity of interactions between Jews and Muslims in France. Even if he does not explicitly state this in the passage above, Cohen does not merely consider the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, on its own, as the explanation for contemporary tensions, but demonstrates, through the progression of his novel, how "global dynamics, both in the Middle East and in French North Africa, *came together* with national and even local factors to shape

Muslim-Jewish relations in postcolonial France" (Mandel 2014: 3), while stressing the "triangular" (Katz 2015: 24-5) nature of Jewish-Muslim relations, due to the importance the French state played, right from the outset, in defining the terms of interactions between Jews and Muslims.

The novel begins with a prologue situated in the present, alternating between the perspective of Raphaël and Mounir. Both are middle-aged men and are reflecting on Raphaël's impending departure to Israel, following an antisemitic attack on Raphaël's son by a group of Muslim youths. Both men are filled with regret and attempt to understand what went wrong in their friendship and, by extension, Jewish-Muslim relations as a whole. Mounir, in particular, ponders the period when interactions between individuals who happened to be Jewish and Muslim did not always take place as a function of those ethnoreligious labels:

> Alors, que faire maintenant? Tenter de le rattraper, lui parler, le ramener ici ? Trop tard. Il doit déjà être dans un avion. Et que lui aurais-je dit ? Que je regrettais l'époque où nous étions des enfants, des amis, des étrangers en France avant d'être juifs et musulmans ? Que nous pouvions renouer avec cette amitié sur laquelle nous nous étions construits ? (Cohen 2015: 17)

The proliferation of rhetorical questions indicate internal, intellectual, and emotional conflicts that will structure the rest of the novel. In part, Mounir's evocation of a period when "we" did not interact as Jews and Muslim, but rather on the basis of other identities and affiliations reflects a broader societal discourse of Jewish-Muslim reconciliation that has emerged precisely in response to the dominant discourse of Jewish-Muslim polarization, premised on a new Muslim antisemitism. Soon after Pierre-André Taguieff published *La nouvelle judéophobie* in 2002, others published accounts of Jewish-Muslim entente and solidarity, often evoking mythologized images of Andalusia or more recent shared histories in North Africa and the Middle East. The novels of Thierry Cohen and Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf certainly fall into this category, as do films like *Les hommes libres* or edited collections like *Une enfance juive*

en Méditerranée musulmane. This nostalgia-driven counter-narrative is often also expressed through a republican language of universal citizenship. A particularly prominent example is the recent work of French senator and public historian Esther Benbassa. Since 2000, a significant proportion of her publications has essentially served to provide a counter-narrative to the claims of proponents of new antisemitism and their representation of Jewish-Muslim conflict. Indeed, from her book *La République face à ses minorités: Les Juifs hier, les musulmans aujourd'hui* (2004) to her co-edited collection *Juifs et musulmans: Retissions les liens!* (2015), Benbassa often challenges narratives of Jewish-Muslim polarization through recourse to republicanism. Introducing the authors in the latter collection, the editors write, "tous ont un point commun : ils sont citoyens de ce pays, et c'est en citoyens qu'ils entendent poser et contribuer à résoudre le problème d'une coexistence désormais mise à mal, d'une coexistence pourtant attestée, avec ses hauts et ses bas bien sûr, pendant des siècles de présence juive en terre d'Islam" (Benbassa and Attias 2015: 6). Similarly, Mounir's reflections in the prologue construct an early period—in this case, France in the 1960s and 1970s—when Jews and Muslim were supposedly not entirely encapsulated by the political meanings with which the contemporary period would infuse the categories of 'Jew' and 'Muslim'. Implicitly, by highlighting that recently arrived North African Jews and Muslims were both foreigners in France, he is also rooting their sometimes banal, sometimes solidary lived experiences in both their status as foreigners (even if Algerian Jews arrived in France as citizens) and their aspirations towards citizenship and Frenchness.

The prologue highlights both the idea that Jews and Muslims in France once interacted with each other in "myriad ways" *and* the regret (or grief) that Raphaël and Mounir feel about a lost past. Both of them consider reaching out to the other, but, in the end, neither do. Raphaël perhaps best expresses the reason for this: "Mais tant de

choses nous séparent maintenant de ceux que nous fumes" (Cohen 2015: 20). Uncovering what this "tant de choses" refers to is precisely Cohen's project, which begins with each character chronologically retracing their individual life stories, which alternate with each other in the novel.

The first part of the novel is dedicated to Raphaël and Mounir's childhood and begins with their first day at school. Raphaël's memory of this day begins with him writing, following his grandfather's instructions, the following words, described as "une formule magique censée éloigner les voleurs," on his school books:

> *Ce livre est à moi*
> *Comme le Maroc est au roi*
> *Celui qui le prendra*
> *Le diable l'emportera* (Cohen 2015: 25).

Raphaël notes that he is beginning his story with this anecdote because, first, this particular memory has remained vivid, second, it came flooding back on the day of his departure for Israel, and last, because "c'est un bon début pour cette histoire" (Cohen 2015: 25). What happens next explains why this memory has remained vivid and why it makes for an apt beginning for Raphaël's story. Moments after having finished writing his grandfather's words on his school books, Raphaël's mother walks in and is horrified to see what her father has done:

> Comment as-tu pu faire ça ? Tu te rends compte ? Ce sont ses livres d'école ! Que pensera sa maîtresse ? Tu veux qu'il se fasse remarquer dès les premiers jours, qu'elle le prenne pour un petit Marocain ? Nous ne sommes plus là-bas, papa, et tu ne travailles plus sur le port de Casa. Nous avons quitté le pays depuis trois ans ! Et le roi n'est plus notre roi ! (Cohen 2015: 27)

Raphaël's mother's main concern here is to ensure that her son fits in and is not perceived as "un petit Marocain." This scene underscores both the assimilationist promise of republican education, but the fact that assimilation functions selectively. It is a catch-22 whereby one can only be assimilated if one is assimilable, which is precisely why Raphaël's mother is adamant that Raphaël, as far as possible, does not draw attention to his North African origins. This preoccupation with fitting in is one

of the major themes of the 'childhood' part of the novel and permeates both Raphaël and Mounir's recollections.

The fact that both Raphaël and Mounir, as Moroccans, do not entirely fit in is the basis on which their friendship will be built. However, even before the two of them meet, it becomes clear that there is a significant difference in the way that their difference from the white 'universal' norm is lived and experienced in France. Contrasting two early scenes in the novel elucidates how Raphaël and Mounir are differentially assimilable. When Raphaël's mother takes him to buy a new outfit for school, Raphaël chooses not to speak, out of fear that his accent would mark him as North African in the eyes of the salesperson attending to them. His anxiety during this interaction is revealing :

> Elle [his mother] aimerait que j'ouvre la bouche et m'exprime comme l'un de ces enfants vus à la télévision, dans les publicités ou les films. Une phrase bien sentie, prononcée d'un ton de petit génie en herbe. J'aimerais lui faire plaisir, mais je sais que les « r » se mettraient à se battre avec les « p », les « on » avec les « en » et que je finirais par lui faire honte. Alors, comme d'habitude, je souris. (Cohen 2015: 33)

In response to Raphaël's silent smile, the salesperson remarks that he is a "pétit écolier modèle" (Cohen 2015: 33). Even if the salesperson's priority is to sell shoes, and thus it is to her advantage to flatter her customers, this exchange suggests that Raphaël's difference is one that can become invisible. With his light complexion, Raphaël is aware that as long as he does not speak and does not let his accent betray his Moroccan origins, he can pass as white and French. Being able to pass as white affords him a privilege that he is aware can be taken away from him if his true ethnicity is uncovered. In other words, Raphaël's hesitation to speak in this scene reflects the contingency of his white privilege, which is to say the privilege of being protected from racial discrimination and bias *and* institutional racism. The memory that Mounir chooses to begin his story, however, displays his (and his family's) complete inability

to pass as white, which opens them up to the constant possibility of racial discrimination and violence at both an individual and institutional level:

> Nous venons de débarquer à Marseille. Papa a fébrillement regroupé les bagages près de nous. […] Un porteur s'approche. […]
> — Tu veux de l'aide ?
> On sent qu'il n'aime pas nous poser cette question. C'est pour ça qu'il tutoie mon père. […]
> — Non, merci. C'est très gentil.
> A-t-il compris qu'il s'agit d'un porteur? Qu'il ne propose pas sa gentillesse mais des services tarifés ? Papa ! […]
> — Putain, c'est pas avec des mendiants comme ça qu'on va travailler nous ! Sale Arabe ! (Cohen 2015: 28-30)

These two early encounters clearly highlight that Raphaël's difference can be of an invisible nature at times, while Mounir is always visibly recognizable as an Arab/Muslim. The incongruity between Mounir's and Raphaël's earliest interactions with white French people serve as a wider metaphor for divergent expectations and perceptions of North African Jews and Muslims in France.

When Raphaël and Mounir first meet, however, they immediately read each other as Moroccan. Yet, at school, they soon realize that they are sometimes treated differently. For example, Raphaël, unlike Mounir, is relatively quickly welcomed into the fold of a group of French children:

> J'avais facilement intégré un groupe de petits Français. Mounir, lui, en était exclu. […] J'avais pensé que nous étions semblables, deux taches sombres sur un tissu blanc. Mais mon physique presque européen et mon prénom servaient de sauf-conduits ; j'avais rapidement été invité par mes camarades à participer à leurs jeux. Pas lui (Cohen 2015: 51).

The relative ease at which Raphaël is able to adopt a white mask, constituted of his "almost" European physique and his European first name, is the result of a century of differential, triangular relations between the French state and Jews and Muslims in French North Africa. For Algerians, this hierarchical dynamic is rooted in the 1870 Crémieux decree that granted French citizenship to the majority of Jews in French Algeria. The decree offered an automatic path to citizenship and Frenchness to Algerian Jews, while excluding Muslims. The impacts of the automatic naturalization

of Algerian Jews were far-reaching and long-lasting, in terms of education and socio-economic class (see introduction). For Algerian Jews, their ethnoreligious specificity became the basis for their Frenchness. In contrast, for Algerian Muslims, their ethnoreligious specificity was the basis for their non-Frenchness. However, in Morocco—the ancestral land of Cohen and his two main characters—and Tunisia, no equivalent decree was ever passed and, thus, "Jewishness did not provide an exclusive legal path to [citizenship and] Frenchness in either [colony]" (Arkin 2014: 43). Still, the ethnoreligious specificity of Jews in Morocco and Tunisia provided them "access to agents of Frenchification (or Europeanization) [and thus contributed to] the perception of shared European sensibilities" (Arkin 2014: 43). These agents of Frenchification included the protégé system—that an elite minority of Moroccan and Tunisian Jews benefited from—and the Alliance israélite universelle (AIU) that was "extremely successful in promoting its vision of Jews as particularly well suited to European civilization and thus as potential colonial allies," in particular through the establishment of AIU schools (Arkin 2014: 47). In these AIU schools, the curriculum was modelled on those of the Jewish schools in France and, thus, was removed from local contexts; an AIU education was an entirely European education with Ashkenazi inflections (see Annie Goldmann 1979). Indeed, Ammiel Alcalay characterizes these schools as important agents of the "civilizing mission [which sought to] ally certain classes within Middle Eastern Jewish communities to the movement of European expansion and detach them from the concerns of the local populations with and among whom they lived" (2003: 90). While the AIU long pushed for a similar decree in Tunisia and Morocco to the Crémieux Decree, they ultimately failed. Nevertheless, for the Moroccan and Tunisian Jews who chose to immigrate to France following decolonization, the AIU's activities successfully distinguished these Jews from their Muslim compatriots and associated their ethnoreligious specificity as the basis for

their eventual Frenchness. All of this means that "Jews had greater opportunities to acculturate to European social and cultural norms than the Muslim populations amidst which they lived" (Mandel 2014: 3) and that they grew increasingly alienated from their non-Jewish counterparts. Additionally, in this context, for non-Jewish North Africans, "Jewishness became a sign of economic inequality and differential access to the privileges of French citizenship" (Arkin 2014: 223). Therefore, North African Jews, especially the Algerians among them who were French citizens, were separated from their Muslim counterparts in either politico-legal terms or socio-cultural terms by virtue of their Jewishness. Yet, even if their Jewishness was the basis for arguing (as did the AIU) for their proximity to the French, it was also, inherently, a mark of separation from the French.

Thus, the Frenchness of North African Jews was never stable and was always contingent. Raphaël, in his childhood in late 1960s France, recognizes this when he describes his "physique presque européen," with the adverb "presque" being the operative word here. Raphaël's specific phrasing calls to mind Homi Bhabha's theoretical exploration of the ambivalence of mimicry, which he defines as "'almost the same, but not quite" (1984: 127). This ambivalence, rooted in the space between the almost and the not quite, produces "slippage," "excess," and "difference" (Bhabha 1984: 126). Bhabha's concept of mimicry refers to the social, cultural, and political imitation of colonizers by the colonized or, in neo-colonial/post-colonial contexts, of former colonizers (and their descendants) by the formerly colonized (and their descendants). On the one hand, the slippage that occurs in the "almost, but not quite" maintains the difference between colonizer and colonized and is thus crucial to the colonial project. This is a phenomenon that Frantz Fanon broadly examines in *Peau noire, masques blancs (1952)* in terms of the collective and individual neuroses that colonization has produced in the colonized. Fanon's account of colonial imitation

examines the limitations and effects of upward social mobility premised on the ability to wear 'white masks' (by imitating the colonizer's language, dress, culture, manners, etc.). On the other hand, in Bhabha's reading, mimicry is not merely the imperfect, submissive assimilation of the norms of the colonizers. For Bhabha, mimicry is also a form of subversion: "the menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (1984: 129). In other words, because mimicry's slippage only produces imitations (or, alternatively, mockeries) of the colonizers, it also subverts their power by magnifying the contradictions inherent in colonial and post-colonial relations. In this sense, the later violently antisemitic encounters that Raphaël experiences illustrate precisely how troubling his mimicry can be to white supremacy. Raphaël's position is precarious. At times, his 'white' mask protects him, but at other times, when the mask starts to drop and reveals his 'black' skin, his almost-but-not-quite/white condition exposes him to the regulatory violence of whiteness. This liminality, as expressed by one Algerian Jew in mid-twentieth century France, is like "sitting between two chairs" (Sussman 2002: 87, cited in Arkin 2014: 43)—or, even more poignantly, to quote Salman Rushdie, like "fall[ing] between two stools" (Rushdie 1982: 19).

It is this liminal position occupied by North African Jews—regardless of the relative advantages procured by being designated, in colonial discourse, as "more 'assimilable'" (Mandel 2014: 3)—that allows for a rapprochement with their Muslim counterparts, as Mounir recognizes at several points in the novel.[30] Like Raphaël who recognizes his liminality with the adverb "presque," Mounir also recognizes the common liminality of the Jewish and Muslim experience in France in the same way:

[30] European colonists perceived native Jews and Muslims in this hierarchical manner—based on their perceived proximity to Europeanness—from the very beginning of European dominance in Morocco (and other parts of North Africa). For example, the first secretary of the French Legation in Tangiers wrote the following in 1866 about Moroccan Jews: "Ce sont des courtiers habiles, des intermédiares indispensables entre Européens et indigènes. […] Instruits, ils ont une supériorité incontestable sur les Maures ignorants" (Kenbib 2016: 51).

> C'est précisément ce « presque » qui les rend proches de nous : il contient toutes les failles culturelles et les habitudes traditionnelles ou religieuses qui ne manquent jamais de les trahir. […] Nous parlons la même langue, écoutons les mêmes musiques, possédons les mêmes traditions culinaires. Nos relations sont donc assez paradoxales, faites d'affection et de crainte, de respect et de défiance. Mais ce qui nous rassemble est plus fort que le reste. En l'occurrence, qu'ils habitent le quartier est une excellente nouvelle (Cohen 2015: 34).

As in the other novels, cultural similarities are evoked here in order to emphasize the proximity between Maghrebi Jews and Muslims. Yet, Mounir describes relations between Jews and Muslims as paradoxical (and affective), alluding to "affection" and "fear," "respect" and "defiance." Thus, North African Jewish and Muslim immigrants to France, particularly of the first-generation, shared a common heritage and culture and, perhaps more importantly, were similarly racialized as immigrants, often lived in the same spaces, and patronized the same establishments and services, such as halal or kosher butchers (Silverstein 2010: 144-145).[31] Yet, despite all of this, Mounir's evocation of "fear" and "defiance" highlights the "affective difference" in the way Jews and Muslims relate to memories of "colonial and wartime Algeria" and later the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Silverstein 2010: 145).

However, for Mounir and Raphaël, at the start of the novel, in France of the mid-to-late 1960s, their shared racialized, 'othered' position is more important than either the differential memories of colonial North Africa and decolonization or the differential attitudes to Israel and Palestine. This is crystalized in their solidarity in the face of Alexandre, a racist bully at school, and a racist school administration that punishes them without punishing Alexandre:

> Nous avons dorénavant un ennemi en commun. Nous en aurons d'autres dans les années à venir. D'autres Alexandre, d'autres cons, d'autres racistes, d'autres idiots, petits frimeurs sans envergure, grandes gueules sans courage (Cohen 2015: 76).

[31] A point that Cohen emphasizes in his novel by placing Raphael and Mounir's families in the same neighbourhood upon their arrival in France. Mounir's uncle also makes it a point to mention to Mounir's parents that there is a Kosher butcher nearby: "Vous voyez, là-bas, c'est la boucherie. Elle est cachère, alors pas de problème. Cachère, halal… c'est kif-kif!" (2015: 35).

For Raphaël and Mounir, the prevalence of an "enemy in common," which is to say white supremacy, in their day-to-day life primes over any other consideration that might drive a wedge between them. As children, this common enemy is personified by Alexandre and other racist individuals—students and teachers alike. As young adults, their common enemy is racism and antisemitism in general, sometimes expressed by random individuals in random interactions they have, sometimes by far-right provocateurs, sometimes by the police, and sometimes by political figures. Raphaël and Mounir are joined by other Jews and Muslims:

> Autour de nous gravitait une petite bande dans laquelle musulmans et juifs s'entendaient à merveille. […] Nous, c'étaient les « étrangers », ceux qui possédaient une histoire nourrie d'ailleurs. Juifs et Arabes parlaient la même langue. Un français parsemé d'expressions de là-bas (Cohen 2015: 193).

In other words, this youthful Jewish-Muslim solidarity is not solely based on a shared history "nourrie d'ailleurs," but also on a transcultural practice of anti-racism and anti-antisemitism that subscribes to Rothberg's notion of multidirectional memory. Indeed, like Leïla in Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel, Raphaël and Mounir express an embodied, differentiated solidarity that does not flatten differences, but emphasizes them as necessary points of convergence. Mounir, after standing up to a teacher's revisionism and denialism, describes how he felt personally affected, even if before this incident he did not think the Shoah as part of "his" history:

> Les propos de cette prof m'avaient giflé, je m'étais senti concerné. Car sa bêtise me menaçait également. J'étais devenu juif quelques instants puis citoyen d'un monde dans lequel j'avais mon mot à dire, où je voulais grandir. J'avais découvert ma conscience d'homme (Cohen 2015: 229).

By taking a stand against his teacher, Mounir is embodying solidarity with Jews, which is to say that he is translating his anti-antisemitic beliefs into praxis. Raphaël, for his part, in the context of *ratonnades* (widespread extrajudicial, racially motivated assaults and killings by law enforcement officials and white supremacists of North Africans or those perceived as such; the equivalent of Paki-bashings in the United

Kingdom), "s'etait battu contre des skins casseurs d'Arabes" (Cohen 2015: 229-30). Both Raphaël and Mounir feel an obligation to embody their anti-racist beliefs by directly combatting antisemitism and Islamophobia—as expressions of white supremacy—because they feel similarly marginalized as ethnoreligious, non-white minorities, and immigrants in France.

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict does not significantly affect their interpersonal relations precisely because Raphaël and Mounir maintain an embodied solidarity against white supremacy, in part based on their ongoing comparisons and juxtapositions of the memory of the Shoah and of colonial violence. However, in the 1980s, Mounir and Raphaël begin to feel the effects of conflict in the Middle East. In particular, the 1982 Lebanon War, which began with Israel's invasion of Southern Lebanon, marks the first, lasting dispute between the two friends. They begin to argue with each other, taking oppositional positions on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in general and the Lebanon War in particular. Mounir and Raphaël manage, however, to have a reasoned conversation about the conflict. Both of them agree that it is *unsound* ("pas sain") of them to each take the defence of one or the other side based on their ethnoreligious identifications. Mounir notes, "ce n'est pas la religion qui devrait guider notre engagement. […] Nous devrions réagir en tant que Français" (Cohen 2015: 365). Mounir is arguing that the duo ought to interact with each other within a republican, universal framework in which they are both French citizens, undistinguished by their particularities. Engaging with each other as universal French citizens would be to act in accordance to reason, while engaging as a function of their particular Jewish and Muslim identifications would be to act in accordance to unreason. Implicitly, then, despite their shared anti-racist values, Mounir positions reason as the preserve of the unmarked, universal French and unreason as the preserve of the ethnoreligiously marked, particular Jew and Muslim. Raphaël agrees

in principle, but contends that they became friends, not because they were French, but precisely because their Frenchness was always contingent due to their Jewishness and Muslimness. Raphaël is implying that they cannot react "en tant que Français" because of the specificity of their ethnoreligious identifications. He is also implying that the reason they become friends in the first place was the similar, marginalized position occupied by Jews and Muslims in the French imaginary. It is because the duo was unable to entirely pass as universal French citizens—i.e. white French citizens—that they developed bonds of solidarity based on their shared liminality. However, Mounir counters that this was not entirely true and that their shared liminality was not due to their Jewishness and Muslimness, but their Moroccan heritage: "Tu réécris l'histoire, Raphaël. Nous sommes devenus amis parce que nous étions marocains. Deux Marocains […] perdus et apeurés au milieu d'une classe de Français" (Cohen 2015: 365). Thus, on the one hand, Raphaël ascribes the foundation of their friendship to the proximity of Jewish and Muslim experience in French colonial and postcolonial history and present, while Mounir ascribes it to their common experience of discrimination as Moroccans in France, regardless of their ethnoreligious affiliations. Either way, Raphaël reminds Mounir that they were othered because they were Jewish, Muslim, Moroccan, and immigrants. The "goys," he says, referring to white French people (and not including Muslims), are not only incapable of differentiating Algerians from Moroccans from Iranians, but also Jews from Muslims: "certains nous disaient que pour eux juifs et arabes, c'était pareil" (Cohen 2015: 366). Mounir agrees, adding that "toi et moi le pensions aussi, parfois" (Cohen 2015: 366). Mounir's remark acknowledges, first, the significant similarities between the figure of the 'Jew' and that of the 'Muslim' in European imaginaries in the past and present (see Anidjar 2003)—and the convergence of the 'sale arabe' and the 'sale juif' in white supremacy—and, secondly, the cultural affinities shared by Sephardi Jews and North African Muslims.

Mounir ends their conversation with sentiments of complicity and solidarity: "nous échangeons un regard complice, empli d'images et d'éclats de vie" (Cohen 2015: 366). Indeed, despite their differences on Middle East conflict, which are implied to reflect those of 'their' respective communities, the similar position occupied by Jews and Muslims as ethnoreligious and more or less racialized minorities, allows for the designation of a "common enemy" in the rising Front National. As such, this common enemy and the recognition that "pour eux juifs et arabes, c'est pareil" allows Raphaël and Mounir to defer any possible conflict over their growing political differences regarding Israel and Palestine.

Mounir recounts the formation of SOS Racisme as a pluralist, multicultural, anti-racist movement that brought together various racialized minority groups:

> Un mouvement structuré, ambitieux, revendicatif, aux accents agressifs est né : SOS Racisme. Où beurs, feujs, Blacks s'unirent contre leur ennemi commun, oubliant les problèmes qui, hier, les séparaient. Nous allions repenser les banlieues, créer une nouvelle société, loin des discriminations, forte de nos différences (Cohen 2015: 429).

The creation of SOS Racisme, in which the Union des étudiants juifs de France was a key collaborator, following the election of François Mitterrand in 1981 and the March for Equality and Against Racism in 1983, dubbed "la Marche des beurs" by the French press, represented the peak of solidarity between Jewish and Muslim anti-racist activists. This solidarity, however, waned towards the end of the decade due to several factors. First, the electoral breakthrough of the Front National normalized a xenophobic, anti-immigrant platform that was adopted by other more mainstream parties. Second, the outbreak of the First Intifada further heightened divisions and polarized perspectives between Jews and Muslims in France. Third, the *affaire du foulard* further stigmatized Muslims as the problematic, unassimilated ethnoreligious minority, *par excellence* (Katz 2014: 305-7). In this context, the anti-racist Jewish-Muslim solidarity that found its peak expression through Jewish and Muslim collaboration

within SOS Racisme broke down as Muslim activists increasingly emphasized the particular, structural and institutional violence and biases faced by Muslims, while Jewish activists increasingly emphasized the long history and assimilated nature of French Jews.

The breakdown of Jewish-Muslim anti-racist mobilization, marked by the high-profile disaffiliation of the Union des étudiants juifs de France (UEJF) from SOS Racisme, is reflected in Cohen's novel by the gradual distance between Mounir and Raphaël throughout the 1980s. Eventually, without consciously intending to, the pair cease to have any contact with each other, as Raphaël becomes increasingly active in French Zionist organisations and Mounir in Maghrebi and pro-Palestine movements. At the end of the 1980s, Raphaël marries a Jewish woman named Ghislaine whom he meets at a dinner organized by the Mouvement de l'Alya de France. He quickly falls in love with her, noting his surprise since he had never before dated a Jewish woman. He does not, however, invite Mounir because "il n'appartenait plus à mon univers" (Cohen 2015: 387). A year after Raphaël's wedding, Mounir marries Fadila, whom he met a few years prior at the "Marche des Beurs," and who is active in (and initiates Mounir into) Palestinian solidarity movements. Mounir, too, does not invite Raphaël, not without some sadness:

> Des connaissances communes m'avaient rapporté qu'il militait dans une organisation sioniste, était devenu pratiquant. Il avait changé et je n'étais pas certain d'apprécier sa nouvelle personnalité. Lycéens, nous avions un jour évoqué nos mariages, et ri en imaginant la scène. « Un juif témoin du mariage de son ami musulman, ça aurait de la gueule, non ? » s'était esclaffé Raphaël. C'était il y a longtemps. Et nous étions alors différents (Cohen 2015 : 448-9).

The disintegration of Mounir and Raphaël's friendship, which was based on their pluralist commitments, is due to their particularist identifications, linked in part to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Raphaël's activism within Zionist organisations and Mounir's affiliation with pro-Palestinian groups render their interactions impossible. The end of their friendship is a metaphor for the disintegration of the alliance between

SOS Racisme and the UEJF. Like the Jewish-Muslim solidarity symbolized by the union between SOS Racisme and UEJF, Mounir and Raphaël's childhood in the early to mid-1970s, their adolescence in the late 1970s, and young adulthood in the 1980s tell the story of a friendship between two Jewish and Muslim outsiders that is increasingly challenged by domestic and international political developments. In Cohen's narrative, following the disintegration of Mounir and Raphaël's friendship, major domestic and international political events of the 1990s, 2000s, and 2010s further polarize Jewish and Muslim identities. While the pair enjoy relative professional success and start families of their own, the decades that follow the end of their friendship are marked by the political and social anxieties they experience. Throughout these decades, Mounir and Raphaël interpret and experience these events—such as the 1990 Gulf War, the 1995 series of terrorist attacks in France, the Second Intifada, 9/11, new antisemitism, Islamophobia, the 2003 Iraq War, Dieudonné, the 2005 Danish Cartoons affair, the 2006 murder of Ilan Halimi, the 2012 Toulouse school shooting, the rise of the Islamic State, and the 2014 Gaza war—in divergent manners, as a function of their ethnoreligious identifications.

While Cohen's narrative presents relations between Jews and Muslims (and Mounir and Raphaël's friendship) as increasingly uncertain throughout the mid to late 1980s and the 1990s, it is the post-2000 period that marks an important, and deadly, turning point. Raphaël, in particular, is strongly affected by the statistical rise of antisemitic attacks since 2000, high profile murders (Ilan Halimi in 2006) and terrorist attacks (Toulouse in 2012), as well as the antisemitic nature of some anti-Israel protests in France during the 2014 Gaza war. Increasingly worried about the safety of his family in a France that he now understands to be openly and violently antisemitic, Raphaël finally takes the decision to leave France for Israel when a group of Muslim youths attack his son who is wearing a Star of David. When his wife cries out, "regarde

ce qui'ils ont fait à notre fils," it is unclear whether she is referring to the four individuals who attacked their son or to Muslims in general (Cohen 2015: 650).

When Mounir hears of the attack, he decides that, whatever their differences, he cannot remain indifferent and must offer his sympathy and solidarity to his erstwhile friend (Cohen 2015: 652). Despite Mounir's good intentions, Raphaël does not take kindly to his former friend's gesture:

> — Tu ne comprends plus quoi ? Qu'aujourd'hui les musulmans veulent tuer des juifs ? Que les islamistes rêvent de terminer le boulot commencé par les nazis ? Demande à ta femme ce qu'elle en pense ! Elle milite toujours pour les pauvres Palestiniens qui sont contre les méchants Israéliens ? Et toi, tu défiles encore aux côtés de ceux qui soutiennent les terroristes du Hamas ? Tu portes peut-être même le drapeau de l'État islamique dans ces manifs qui appellent au meurtre des juifs (Cohen 2015 : 654-655) !

In his shock and anger at his son's aggression, Raphaël ceases to see Mounir as Mounir, but as one of 'them'. The aforementioned domestic and international events of the past three decades and, more importantly, the media frames applied to them have polarized Jewish and Muslims identities as fixed, oppositional categories. In this context, Raphaël no longer sees Mounir, his childhood Moroccan friend and fellow outsider in postcolonial, 'white' Christian France, but only Mounir, a Muslim like the youths who attacked his son. In this way, Raphaël comes to adopt the reductive, binary understanding shared by the four young Muslims who attacked his son because they noticed his Star of David. His attackers, who tied their pro-Palestinianism to their Muslimness, treated Raphaël's son visible Jewishness as a marker of Zionism, support for the Israeli government and military, and Western neo-imperialism. Ironically, when he castigates Mounir, Raphaël adopts a similarly narrow and dangerous definition of these ethnoreligious labels.

Thus, Cohen's novel charts the life stories of Mounir and Raphaël against the backdrop of decades of social and political developments affecting understandings of Jewish and Muslim ethnoreligious identifications and relations. As children, they

grew close due to their shared otherness as Jewish and Muslim Moroccans in France. As teenagers, they increasingly identified as Jewish and Muslim, respectively, in a France that repeatedly excluded them. They experienced antisemitism and Islamophobia as interrelated expressions of white supremacy against which they based their embodied solidarity. As adults, however, the meanings of their Jewishness and Muslimness hardened and diverged. 'Jew' and 'Muslim' became fixed categories of a set of oppositional stereotypes. Cohen's account of Mounir and Raphaël's eventually doomed friendship is also an account of how the diversity of individual experience and the hybridity of identities can be overshadowed by privileging relations between large groups of people solely through categories of "Jews" and "Muslims" that have come to acquire a set of political meanings beyond the purely ethnoreligious.

3.6. Conclusion

Literature, and the arts in general, have the potential to interrogate the past, critically engage the present, and reimagine the future. In the context of reimagining Jewish-Muslim relations, Joan Sfar's graphic novel *Le chat du rabbin*, Farid Boudjellal's series of *Juif-Arabe* bande-dessinées, and the stand-up comedy of Younès and Bambi all perform conviviality by highlighting the imbrication of Jewishness and Muslimness, while interrogating the identity categories of 'Jew' and 'Muslim'.[32] For the most part, this critical engagement with identity categories and relations is absent from Frèche's and Hathroubi-Safsaf's novels. Both novels reproduce these categories and the binary vision of contemporary Jewish-Muslim relations as oppositional and tense. Cohen's

[32] See Kandiyoti 2017 for an analysis of *Le chat du rabbin* in terms of Jewish-Muslim conviviality. See Bourget 2010: 50-57 for an analysis of *Juif-Arabe* as an alternative model of Jewish-Muslim coexistence. See Bharat 2020 for an analysis of the stand-up comedy routine of Younès and Bambi in terms of challenging the normative binary of Jewish-Muslim relations.

novel does this as well, but also carefully charts how the hardening of these categories and of relations came to be.

Romain Gary's 1975 novel *La vie devant soi* offers an interesting contrast to the novels studied in this chapter. Gary's novel acknowledges the polarized nature of Jewish-Muslim relations as a product of a particular set of histories, but also ventures beyond the paradigm of Jewish-Muslim relations. Ethan Katz aptly captures the crux of the novel's representation of Jewish-Muslim relations:

> [*La vie devant soi*] captures many of the possibilities, tensions, and complexities of French republicanism and Jewish-Muslim relations at a particular historical moment […]. Despite its persistent attention to group-based identity, suffering, and memory, the book appears optimistic ultimately that France can negotiate the challenge of republican universalism and public difference that pressed itself anew in the 1970s, and therein preserve peaceful coexistence between its Jews and Muslims (2015: 280-1).

La vie devant soi does not naively place hope in some abstract republican promise that will ensure the harmonious coexistence of Jews and Muslims. Instead, it recognizes the manifold pitfalls of "group-based identity" and conflict, while emphasizing the reality of individual interactions that often take place beyond solely Jewish and Muslim identifications and as a function of a plurality of identifications. The novels studied in this chapter also capture the "possibilities, tensions, and complexities" of republican universalism and Jewish-Muslim relations in contemporary France. However, while Gary's novel remains "optimistic […] that France can negotiate the challenge of republican universalism and public difference" and "preserve peaceful coexistence" because it also emphasizes the plurality of identity, the novels in this chapter display a complete lack of faith in republican universalism (and the French state), while, generally, uncritically engaging with the identity categories of "Jew" and "Muslim". The novels also display—beyond merely a narrative of polarization—a fatalistic narrative of Jewish-Muslim relations. The exception to this is Thierry Cohen's *Avant la haine*, which does the most to historicize and contextualize the polarization of

Jewish and Muslim identities, while offering past examples of positive and non-reductive interactions between individuals who happen to be Jewish or Muslim in France.

Each novel is critical of the republican difference-blind assimilationist model of integration. Emilie Frèche's *Le sourire de l'ange* carefully depicts the exclusion of Jewish and Muslim characters from the French body politic by virtue of their ethnoreligious differences from the unmarked, universal (white) French citizen. Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel similarly emphasizes the limits of universalism through a depiction of the common position as racialized ethnoreligious minorities shared by Jews and Muslims in France in relation to the Christian-heritage white majority. Thierry Cohen's *Avant la haine* also highlights Jewish-Muslim solidarity in the face of similar discriminations and prejudice and the blind spots of universalism. Yet, despite this embedded critique of universalism, each novel eventually returns to the promise of universalism. Laura Berlant's (2011) concept of cruel optimism helps us make sense of this apparent contradiction. Berlant argues that "an optimistic attachment is cruel when the object/scene of desire is itself an obstacle to fulfilling the very wants that bring people to it" (2011: 227). Lauren Berlant's understanding of cruel optimism is based on her analysis of the attachment that citizens of contemporary post-industrial societies maintain to the promises of neo-liberal capitalism, subsumed, in the United States, by the term 'the American dream'. Berlant's indictment of the weaponization of hope to stifle anti-capitalist consciousness is premised on the observation that, even as citizens of developed nations increasingly understand themselves to be oppressed (economically and politically) by the demands of capitalist production, they still aspire to the increasingly unattainable dreams offered by this politico-economic model. As such, even as it becomes increasingly clear that neo-liberal capitalist societies are unable to fulfil these dreams, citizens maintain their aspirations within a

structure that continues to disadvantage them. In the case of the novels, the hope that is being weaponized, in the disinterest of the protagonists, is universalism. The characters in the novels appear to recognize the failure of universalism to universalize, but still continue to return to its illusionary promise. The concept of cruel optimism helps us understand the protagonists' persistent attachment to universalism even as they express a certain level of disillusion with it. In these novels, there is an alternative to the cruel optimism of universalism that is occasionally explored. This alternative emerges precisely at those moments when some individuals are most vulnerable and when others, drawing on a politics of differentiated, embodied solidarity rooted in a perspective of transcultural and multidirectional memory. Yet, the possibility of a contemporary praxis of embodied solidarity ebbs and flows throughout each novel, before eventually being extinguished under the weight of polarized identities.

In Frèche's novel, the individual interactions between people who happen to be Jewish and Muslim are presented as inescapably determined by the normative category of Jewish-Muslim relations, itself overdetermined by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Hathroubi-Safsaf's novel and Cohen's novel more clearly represent complex histories and presents that are often obfuscated by the essentializing, politically-charged category of Jewish-Muslim relations. In this way, these two novels call to mind the multidirectional potential of memories and histories. In *Multidirectional Memory* (2009), Michael Rothberg emphasizes "that coming to terms with the past always happens in comparative contexts and via the circulation of memories linked to what are only apparently separate histories and national or ethnic constituencies" (272). As this chapter has demonstrated, Emilie Frèche's novel does not adopt a multidirectional approach to memory, but rather a competitive model. In contrast, Rothberg's model of multidirectional memory is clearly reflected in the productive co-remembering that Thierry Cohen and Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf appear to propose as

an ideal model for Jewish-Muslim relations. Yet, both this ideal model is never brought to fruition in the present. While, both novels highlight Jewish-Muslim entente and solidarity at various historical junctures, they appear unable to articulate any alternative to contemporary polarization.

Indeed, while both Hathroubi-Safsaf's and Cohen's novels suggest the polarization of identity and relations is the result of a particular history, counter-examples from the present are not provided, thereby suggesting the futility of contemporary relations. Cohen's novel, however, does carefully explores the history of this polarization and thus implicitly argues that the current state of relations is neither of an inescapable nor inherent nature. *Avant la haine*, unlike the other two novels, places the protagonist's friendship and their rupture in the context of several decades of the politicization and polarization of Jewish and Muslim identities and relations. Despite their differences, Frèche, Hathroubi-Safsaf, and Cohen provide, in their own ways, a reading of how the danger of negating the hybrid nature of interactions between individuals and the complex nature of identity. Moreover, unlike Gary's novel, these novels begin and end with a sense of pessimism about the future of Jewish and Muslim interactions and relations. This sense of pessimism, which is representative of contemporary French novels that depict Jewish-Muslim relations, suggests the difficulty of articulating counter-narratives in a contemporary context that consistently emphasizes Jewish-Muslim polarization, overdetermined by theories of a new Muslim antisemitism and an importation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The brief flickers of optimism in Hathroubi-Safsaf's and Cohen's novels lie in those moments when Jewish and Muslim characters engage in embodied solidarity, organizing themselves and taking direct action against racist discourses and actions.

Chapter Four: Jewish-Muslim Interreligious and Intercultural Initiatives

"Je ne suis pas juif," Salim announced to the fourteen or so other individuals in a small meeting room on the premises of the Parisian LGBT Jewish association Beit Haverim.[33] Like Salim and the others in attendance, I was there that evening attending a talk on "[Jewish] orthodoxies and homosexualities" organized by Beit Haverim. Being a relatively small group, the speakers asked us to introduce ourselves and our interest in the topic. As it turned out, we were quite a motley crew: three researchers (including myself), several Beit Haverim members (including their co-founder from the 1970s), one non-Jewish white Frenchman… and Salim.

I introduced myself as a doctoral researcher with interests in gender, sexuality, and the sociology of religion, explaining that I was there at the invitation of Beit Haverim's current president, who was moderating the evening's talk.[34] The other two researchers—one an American woman, the other a Frenchman—introduced themselves similarly, while the Beit Haverim members situated themselves personally in relation to their interest in the possibility of a progressive and inclusive orthodox Judaism. Salim, for his part, explained that, while he was not Jewish, he was there because he felt that he could not find similar spaces in Paris for the discussion of homosexuality in Islam.

I was instantly reminded of instances of North African Muslims in early twentieth-century France going to kosher butchers because of a lack of halal butchers in their neighbourhood (Katz 2015: 52). Like those Muslims who turned to kosher butchers due to the long established understanding of many observant Muslims that

[33] The research for this chapter received a favourable ethical opinion from the University Research Ethics Committee 3 on July 19, 2019.
[34] The president had invited me to attend after I had reached out to him on Facebook to discuss the ties between his association and the now-defunct Homosexuels musulmans de France (HM2F).

kosher meat conforms to Islamic dietary laws, Salim's decision to take part in a discussion on sexuality in (orthodox) Judaism in a queer Jewish space underlines the religious and theological similarities between, on the one hand, Judaism and Islam and, on the other hand, the socio-cultural similarities between Jewishness and Muslimness in France. Indeed, as the evening progressed, the speakers and audience made several comparisons between the Islamic and Jewish traditions on the topic of sexuality. I began to wonder if I was observing Jewish-Muslim dialogue taking place in a space that was not explicitly about nor tailored towards Jewish-Muslim dialogue. Unlike in some other spaces where Jewish-Muslim dialogue is explicitly performed, was I witnessing that evening an implicit Jewish-Muslim dialogue?

There is a danger, of course, in characterizing Salim's participation in Beit Haverim's event as an example of Jewish-Muslim dialogue or even of 'good' Jewish-Muslim relations. It is tempting to see instances of interactions between Jews and Muslims as examples of interreligious/intercultural dialogue or relations. However, such a tendency reduces individuals to one single facet of their identity. Salim is Muslim, but he is not *only* Muslim. Similarly, the Jews at the event were, presumably, Jewish, but they were not *only* Jewish. For one, Salim and the others are also, broadly speaking, LGBT. They are also French, mostly middle-class professionals, and mostly male. While one might see the participation of a Muslim man in a Jewish event as an example of Jewish-Muslim dialogue or relations, it could just as easily be understood in purely pragmatic terms, i.e. Salim, a gay Muslim, cannot locate LGBT-affirming Muslim spaces and so seeks out a prominent LGBT-affirming space that happens to cater to Jews. Yet, it is precisely so tempting to read any form of interaction between individuals who happen to be Jewish and Muslim as examples of Jewish-Muslim relations or Jewish-Muslim dialogue because interreligious dialogue initiatives in contemporary France often take the existence and salience of religious and identity

categories for granted. It is important to acknowledge this reality in order to not replicate this logic when analysing such initiatives.

As a whole, this thesis seeks to understand how novelists and interreligious dialogue activists navigate a contemporary socio-political context that equates Jewish-Muslim relations with tension and polarization. In Chapter One, I placed the question of Jewish-Muslim relations in conversation with a longer history of selective understandings of universalism and integration in France. In Chapter Two, I demonstrated how this polarized image of Jewish-Muslim relations continues to play out in news reporting. In Chapter Three, I examined three novels that both respond to and are affected by this dominant discourse of oppositional Jewish-Muslim relations. Finally, in this chapter, I examine Jewish-Muslim dialogue initiatives by a variety of non-profit interreligious and intercultural associations, museums and cultural institutes, private individuals, and several, past and present, Jewish, Muslim, and Maghrebi LGBT associations in Paris. Drawing on semi-structured key informant interviews and participant observation over two months, I examine the ways in which this diverse set of actors navigate, like the novelists I discuss in Chapter Three, the complex and polarized contemporary French socio-political terrain as they enact and engage in Jewish-Muslim dialogue.

I begin by providing a brief, working definition of "dialogue" and "interreligious," beyond the more conventional understandings of interreligious dialogue. Then, I retrace the history of interreligious dialogue in France, from its Christian-Jewish and Christian-Muslim iterations to its Christian-Muslim-Jewish iterations. Next, I discuss the contemporary situation of interreligious dialogue in France, focusing on Jewish-Muslim dialogue in particular. I present several key national, regional, and local grassroots actors, while discussing the role of the French state in interreligious dialogue. I also discuss the possible intersection of the

securitization of Muslims in contemporary France with interreligious dialogue initiatives.[35] Following this, I present my methodology and theoretical frameworks, while examining my own positionality. Subsequently, I present, first, an analysis of initiatives by associations dedicated to interreligious and intercultural dialogue, secondly, a discussion of a recent and ongoing collaboration between the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire du Judaïsme (mahJ) and the Institut du Monde Arabe (IMA), and, thirdly, a study of unexpected forms of dialogue between Jewish and Muslim LGBT associations in Paris. Finally, I present my conclusions about the nature of Jewish-Muslim interreligious and intercultural dialogue in France and the particular challenges any type of Jewish-Muslim dialogue in France faces, given the broader political contexts surrounding Jewish-Muslim relations in contemporary France. The central argument of this chapter is that the interreligious dialogue initiatives that are most suited to effectively challenging the dominant discourse of Jewish-Muslim polarization (as laid out in previous chapters) are those that emphasize the hybridity of identity and shared histories, build solidarities based on intersecting experiences of exclusion and marginalization, and, crucially, adopt a politically-conscious and socially-engaged approach.

4.1. Defining Interreligious and Intercultural Dialogue

Dialogue, in its most basic definition refers to an exchange between two or more individuals or groups through speech. Aside from dialogue as a literary form, the term dialogue is commonly evoked, especially in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, as an egalitarian form of conversation between individuals or groups. Disagreement, misunderstanding, conflict, or any other such term characterizing a breakdown in relationships is what dialogue is often invoked to address. In his short essay *I and Thou*

[35] See Cesari 2012 for a broader discussion of the securitization of Islam in Europe

(1937), the Austrian philosopher Martin Buber argues that human existence finds meaning through relationships with others (and through these relationships, one ultimately finds God). Buber contends that there are two particular ways in which people engage in relationships. He describes the first as an I-It relationship and the second as an I-Thou relationship. I-It relationships are relationships that we have with objects or objectified subjects. For example, when I tabulate my expenditures from a research trip, my relationship with, say, the receipts I have retained, my online bank statement, and the computer that is allowing me to access and visualize this information, is an I-It relationship; it is strictly utilitarian. However, other I-It relationships are diminished versions of relationships that have the potential to be more meaningful, but are not. For example, in certain interactions, the I in the equation might be interacting with a friend, family member, or colleague without being entirely present. The I in that interaction is, say, closed off, distant, or afraid and thus talking at an objectified subject, an It, rather than talking with another I. In contrast, I-Thou relationships, according to Buber, represent a "genuine dialogue" between two or more Is, which is to say between two or more individuals who are entirely present, connecting with and embracing each other as their entire selves. This is essential to Buber who argues that the I only truly exists in relation to other Is. Thus, for Buber, genuine, I-Thou dialogue is not only a means to navigate interpersonal or intergroup conflicts, but also central to individual and collective meaning-making.

Another way of considering (and nuancing) Buber's I-It and I-Thou relationships is through the insights of the Indian-Spanish Catholic priest, philosopher, and practitioner of interreligious dialogue Raimon Panikkar who, in *The Intra-religious Dialogue* (1978), distinguishes between dialectical dialogue and dialogical dialogue. Panikkar considers dialectical dialogue to be dialogue about

objects, which is to say about ideas, opinions, and facts, while dialogical dialogue is about the people involved in the dialogue:

> The dialectical dialogue is a dialogue about objects that, interestingly enough, the English language calls 'subject matters'. The dialogical dialogue, on the other hand, is a dialogue among subjects aiming at being a dialogue about subjects. They want to dialogue not about something, but about themselves: They dialogue themselves. In short, if all thinking is dialogue, not all dialogue is dialogical. The dialogical dialogue is not so much about opinions [...] as about those who have such opinions, and eventually not about you, but about me to you (1978: 29-30).

Panikkar cautions, however, that the dialectical and dialogical are intertwined in dialogue; "there is no pure dialectical dialogue [and] there is no dialogical dialogue alone" (1978: 30). Even in a discussion about ideas that seeks to be 'objective', the personal, with its multiplicity of subject positions, will invariably emerge and influence, to some degree, the interaction. Similarly, even in an encounter between two individuals who are primarily seeking to know each other in order to better know themselves, the dialectical concern with objects is unavoidable; after all, they must talk about something. Therefore, dialectical dialogue and dialogical dialogue are necessarily complementary.

This complementarity is central to the effective functioning of any type of dialogue, and certainly interreligious dialogue. When this complementarity is ignored, dialogue can be stifled. On the one hand, to emphasize dialectical dialogue at the expense of dialogical dialogue is to reduce the dialogue to fixed identities and value judgements, without accounting for possible power differentials. This would run the risk of interlocutors talking at each other or engaging in two more or less separate monologues rather than talking with each other in a genuine dialogue, in the Buberian sense of the term. On the other hand, to emphasize dialogical dialogue at the expense of dialectical dialogue is to foreclose the possibility for solidarity and cooperative action on real-life, on-the-ground, socio-political matters, even if the

interlocutors manage to know each other (and, thus, themselves) on a profoundly personal level.

A genuine dialogue is then about specific topics, but mediated through an approach that is rooted in a desire to *know* one's interlocutor in order to *know* oneself. This does not, however, imply entering into dialogue as a function of more or less essentialized, homogenized identity categories. In Buberian and Panikkarian terms, a genuine dialogue departs from the basis of an I-Thou relationship and balances the dialectical and the dialogical. In a Jewish-Muslim context, this genuine dialogue would then be a dialogue on specific topics of actual shared concern between individuals who happen to be Jewish and Muslim and not a dialogue between fixed Jewish and Muslim subject positions. As subsequent analysis will show, several of my respondents indicated their adherence to a similar approach of balanced dialectical and dialogical I-Thou dialogue. Conversely, several others appeared to indicate a preference for either a dialectical or a dialogical approach to dialogue.

4.2. History of Interreligious Dialogue Initiatives in France

As Samuel Everett notes, in the nineteenth century, "interfaith [dialogue] in France has been largely a Christian-Jewish affair" (2018: 442). Indeed, the first formally organized interreligious dialogue initiatives in France took place in the 1930s with a Christian-Jewish focus. Literary figures, journalists, philosophers, theologians, clergy, and laity organized meetings, discussions, talks, and other events around a variety of social, political, theological, and philosophical themes relating to Christians and Jews and Christianity and Judaism (Lamine 2004: 17–20). In a context of endemic antisemitism, these dialogue initiatives were very often structured around anti-antisemitism.

Following the Second World War and the Shoah, the number and scope of Christian-Jewish dialogue initiatives increased. Post-war Christian-Jewish dialogue, in part, developed as a way to grapple with the legacies of the Shoah, the collaboration of the French state, the passiveness (at best) and the outright collaboration (at worst) of the Catholic church with the Nazis, and the long-standing tradition of Christian anti-Judaism. In 1948, the Amitié judéo-chrétienne (AJC) was created in Aix-en-Provence with the explicit goal of replacing the "traditions d'hostilité entre chrétiens et juifs" with "le respect, amitié et la comprehension mutuelle […] et de travailler à réparer les iniquités dont Israël [referring to the Jewish people], depuis tant de siècles, a été victimes et à en éviter le retour" (Lamine 2004: 21). Additionally, in the 1950s, the AJC began to organize a small number of events in relation to Islam and Muslims. For example, in 1956, André Chouraqui gave a talk to the AJC in Aix-en-Provence on the long history of Jewish-Muslim relations (Dussert-Galinat 2013: 68).

However, it was only in the 1960s and the 1970s, with significant migratory waves of North African Muslims and Jews to France, that organized dialogue initiatives with Muslims—mostly a Christian-Muslim affair—emerged in France (Dussert-Galinat 2013: 115). With the end of the Algerian war of independence and decolonization, as well as the arrival of North African Muslims and Jews, two main forms of interreligious associations emerged: multilateral (Jewish-Muslim-Christian) and bilateral (Muslim-Christian) (Lamine 2004: 28). For example, the Fraternité d'Abraham, founded in 1967 in the midst of the Arab-Israel Six-Day War and still in existence today, focuses on dialogue between Christianity, Islam, and Judaism, while the Amitié islamo-chrétienne, founded in 1966 as the first Christian-Muslim association in France, sought to promote dialogue between Christians and Muslims through the organisation of monthly bilateral talks (given by a Christian and a Muslim speaker) on theological topics in Christianity and Islam. In addition to these types of

associations that were mainly led and dominated by writers, intellectuals, and theologians, smaller local associations were also created during this period (Lamine 2004: 28-31). It was within these smaller associations that specifically Jewish-Muslim dialogue took place. Yet, these smaller associations, due to their size and lack of resources, often proved short-lived.

The period between the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran and the 1989 Islamic headscarf affair (l'affaire du foulard islamique) marked an increasing obsession with Islam and with the integration of Muslims in political and media debates in France. This had a profound impact on interreligious dialogue and solidarity. In particular, churches gradually stopped allowing Muslims the use of their spaces for prayers. The Catholic Church in France's Secrétariat pour les Relations avec l'Islam, founded in 1974 to promote relations between Catholicism and Islam, sent out a memo in 1983 to French bishops reminding them that "les chrétiens n'ont pas à mener une action destinée à faire progresser l'islam" (Lamine 2004: 38). This worry about "faire progresser l'islam" is an antecedent to discourses of 'islamisation' or 'grand remplacement' that, in the 2000s, would gain critical mass as a source of preoccupation in media and political discourse in France and, more broadly, in Europe.

In spite of such developments, or rather partially in response to them, several hundred smaller, local interreligious associations emerged by the end of the 1980s and throughout the 1990s. While earlier associations were large structures (often with several hundred members) led by an intellectual elite (writers, academics, professionals), focused on debates, talks, and conferences on specific topics on religion and philosophy, and dominated by Christians, these newer associations were more focused on local, on-the-ground initiatives and more plural in the make-up of their adherents. The socio-political context of the 1990s partly helps to explain this. By the end of the 1980s, in particular through the symbol of the veil and the *banlieue* as a

signifier for an unassimilated Muslim minority that posed a threat, Muslims were more often than not represented in media and political discourse as separate from the rest of French society and associated with, on the one hand, social issues in disadvantaged urban areas, and on the other hand, the still-present spectre of the Iranian revolution and, later, the 1991 Gulf War, the 2000 Second Intifada, and the 2001 September 11 attacks. Thus, as Muslims were increasingly targeted as a security issue and as individual Muslims encountered systemic discrimination in the workplace, housing, and access to social services, interreligious dialogue initiatives multiplied and diversified beyond the previous models in order to address and overcome these issues through a faith-based approach to civil society (Lamine 2004: 49-50). It is also during this period that interreligious dialogue gradually becomes "un dialogue citoyen entre des personnes de religions différentes, à la faveur d'un échange plus culturel que religieux," in part due to the fundamentally socio-political and cultural (and not purely religious) issues facing Muslims in France (Dussert-Galinat 2013: 298).

As we shall see in this chapter, interreligious dialogue in France in the 2010s remains more socio-political and cultural than purely religious. Many of my interlocuters stressed the secular (*laïc*) nature of their dialogue, which they characterized as being between citizens of different beliefs. Indeed, the association Coexister no longer uses the term interreligious, instead opting for the broader, less common term *interconvictionnel*. Coexister leaders and members explained to me that the term *interconvictionnel* highlights that the association seeks to promote dialogue between individuals of all religious, political, and other ideological persuasions (i.e., 'convictions'). In addition to being a more flexible and thus more inclusive term (it does not conjure up images of relations between organized religions, but of dialogue between individuals), *interconvictionnel* also allows individuals to present themselves

as more secular, and thus more acceptably French, by eliding religiosity. In a contemporary French context where republican secularism considers religion and religiosity in the public sphere, especially if Islamic, already suspect, the preference of the term *interconvictionnel* allows Coexister to align its dialogue initiatives with the dominant republican ideology of universalism and secularism, increasingly perceived in France, and elsewhere in Europe, as at odds with Islam.

4.3. Contemporary Jewish-Muslim Dialogue Initiatives

4.3.1. Overview of Contemporary Actors

The contemporary field of Jewish-Muslim interreligious dialogue associations and initiatives in France is vast and diverse. Providing a detailed catalogue of the entire range of interreligious dialogue associations and initiatives throughout France is beyond the scope of this chapter. Instead, I provide here a sample of national, regional, and local associations and initiatives in order to highlight the variety of approaches and activities undertaken within the category of interreligious dialogue in contemporary France. In doing so, I indicate how the individuals I interview and the associations I discuss, who attempt to negotiate ethnoreligious identities within the republican project, are part of a broader field of interreligious dialogue with long historical antecedents.

There are four main types of interreligious dialogue initiatives in France. First, there are religious institutions that have outreach services to maintain relations with other religious communities. For example, most large Catholic dioceses have, at the very least, a delegate or, more often, a committee or service dedicated to relations with either Islam or Judaism and occasionally other religions. Secondly, there are faith-based non-profit associations and initiatives that promote interreligious dialogue with a particular, though non-exclusive, focus on religion. This type of associations include

the Amitié Judéo-Chrétienne, the Amitié Judéo-Musulmane, the Fraternité d'Abraham, the Maison Islamo-Chrétienne, and the Taizé community. Thirdly, there are non-religious or nominally religious non-profit associations and initiatives that promote interreligious dialogue through cultural and academic events and activities. While members and even leaders of these initiatives may be, in some cases, religious themselves, the explicit focus of their activities are not rooted in religious belief or practice. Examples of such associations and initiatives include Coexister, CIEUX, Parler en Paix, InterFaith Tour, Groupe de recherches islamo-chrétien, Noël Ensemble, Convivencia-La Maison du Bonheur, and the Centre Dalâla. With the exception of the Groupe de recherches islamo-chrétiennes, created in 1976, these associations and initiatives are relative newcomers to the field of interreligious dialogue. Parler en Paix was founded in 2004, CIEUX in 2005, Coexister in 2009, Noël Ensemble in 2012, InterFaith Tour in 2013, and the Centre Dalâla in 2019. This category of associations is one of two examined in this chapter. Finally, there are non-profit associations, initiatives, and other institutions that do not focus on interreligious dialogue, but have and continue to be implicitly involved in this dialogue. These include SOS Racisme, Shams, Beit Haverim, Homosexuels Musulmans de France (HM2F), the Conférence des Associations LGBT, Européennes et Musulmanes (CALEM), David et Jonathan, the Institut du Monde Arabe (IMA), and the Musée d'art et d'histoire du Judaïsme (mahJ). For example, SOS Racisme launched in 2018 an initiative seeking to promote dialogue between Jews and Muslims in France called Salam, Shalom, Salut, while LGBT Jewish, Muslim, and Christian associations Shams, Beit Haverim, HM2F, CALEM, and David et Jonathan have organized interreligious dialogue events over the past decade. Finally, the IMA and the mahJ have been collaborating on a range of programmes seeking to promote mutual understanding between Jews and Muslims

for the past few years. This is the second main category of associations and initiatives analysed in this chapter.

It is no coincidence that interreligious dialogue associations and initiatives, particularly those of the third and fourth categories outlined above, have proliferated in the 2000s and 2010s since this period has also been significantly marked by debates over the integration of Muslims, concerns over Islamist extremism and terrorism, and the new antisemitism, as well as the emergence and predominance of a "nouvelle laïcité" in the public sphere. As Samuel Everett suggests, "progressively since 9/11 and then again since the murders of schoolchildren at the Jewish Ozar HaTorah school in Toulouse in 2012, interfaith [dialogue] has become more visible to the public sphere in France, made somewhat fragile by fears around Islamic extremism" (Everett 2018: 443). While post-2015 France can increasingly be characterized in terms of an "aggressive state secularism," this period has been equally marked by "a significant re-engagement at the level of faith-based civil society initiatives, that tend to be dialogical and educative, both to reach out to other communities and learn about each other" (Everett 2018: 448). Indeed, the associations I contacted during my fieldwork in France all pinpointed 2015 as a turning point in broad interest from the general public, the media, and, most importantly, state institutions, in interreligious dialogue. This increasing interest in and visibility of interreligious dialogue in the French public sphere extends beyond the four categories described above. Indeed, universities have begun offering training programmes (Sciences Po's Emouna programme[36] for religious leaders and practitioners of interreligious dialogue) and creating academic positions (for example, the Université catholique de l'Ouest's chair in the Faculty of Theology dedicated to "la recherche de la paix," that relate to interreligious dialogue.[37]

[36] See the Emouna Programme's webpage: https://www.sciencespo.fr/emouna/

[37] See the Faculty of Theology's webpage: https://www.uco.fr/fr/faculte-theologie

The associations, institutions, and groups with which my interviewees are affiliated, and thus that are the focus of this chapter, are as follows: Coexister, Convivencia – La Maison du Bonheur, SOS Racisme (in particular their Salam, Shalom, Salut project), Shams, Noël Ensemble, Homosexuels Musulmans de France, Institut du Monde Arabe, Parler en Paix, David et Jonathan, Musée d'Art et d'Histoire du Judaïsme, Shams France, and the Centre Culturel Dalâla. In Section 4.4.2., I discuss the selection process for interviewees from these particular associations.

4.3.2. Interreligious Dialogue and the State

With the exception of the Institut du Monde Arabe, which is a foundation declared to be of public utility (*reconnue d'utilité publique*) by the French government, the associations, institutions, and groups that form the basis of this chapter are all *associations loi 1901*. The Musée d'Art et d'Histoire du Judaïsme, while organized as an *association loi 1901*, is a public museum categorized as a Musée de France by the Ministry of Culture and funded mostly by the Ministry and the City of Paris. Associations are an extremely common and important part of French civil society. In general, it is uncomplicated to start and legally form an association under the 1901 law. As of 2016, there were 1.3 million associations in France ("Les associations en France" 2016). All that is needed to create an association in France (except in Alsace-Moselle where the law is slightly different) is two founding members, of any nationality, who are at least 16 years of age and an address in France. In addition, the association must be non-profit. To formally declare an *association loi 1901*, the founders have to send the written statutes of the association and the minutes of the first, constitutive general assembly to the relevant prefecture who will then approve the request and publish the association in the *Journal officiel*, thus rendering the association officially declared.

One major reason people form associations is to be eligible to seek public funds from the state and its institutions. Funding can be requested for particular projects and activities or for the general maintenance of the association. Associations that are solely religious in nature, however, are not eligible to receive public funds. These associations, described as *associations cultuelles* (religious associations) by the 1905 law on the *séparation des Églises et de l'État*, are exclusively devoted to religious activities and are generally places of worship. However, juridically speaking, they remain associations by the 1901 law, but with certain limitations, such as being ineligible for public funding, being limited to activities defined as purely religious (any activities deemed political are not allowed), having a minimum number of members, and being liable to police surveillance "dans l'intérêt de l'ordre public" (see article 25 of the 1905 law). This is a crucial point, which implies that religious activity in France is inherently somewhat suspect. My interviewees' frequent insistence on being secular is, in this context, likely to be a way to mitigate the state's perception of their ethnoreligious identifications as possibly dangerous to republican stability. While no one stated so explicitly, the frequent, unsolicited insistence on the secular nature of their associations and initiatives reveals a possible fear of being stigmatized, especially if Muslim, as *communautariste*.

Indeed, some associations that are not officially designated as *cultuelles* might be still perceived as such. During my interview with the president and co-founder of Shams-France, an association "LGBTQI des personnes maghrébines et moyen-orientales vivant en France," emphasized the difference between his secular association and the now defunct Homosexuels Musulmans de France (HM2F), which he characterized, with a hint of disapproval in his tone, as "une association religieuse," despite the practical similarities between the two associations. After all, both associations were first and foremost social and cultural associations focused on social

action, mutual aid, and cultural activities. Yet, HM2F, despite not being an *association cultuelle*, was often perceived as a religious association, leading to its relative exclusion by other actors in the LGBT associational arena (see Zahed 2016: 162-66). The limitations placed on *associations cultuelles* explain why several of the associations I discuss in this chapter explicitly emphasize their secular nature. Moreover, most of my respondents highlighted several times to me that their associations were completely "laïques." The pressure to avoid seeming too religious is something that recurred, often implicitly and obliquely, in many of my conversations and interviews with members and leaders of interreligious and intercultural associations.

In addition to the implicit risk of appearing too religious, several of my respondents were keenly aware of the possibility of being co-opted by a security framework and, accordingly, specifically sought to critique more established, traditional forms of interreligious dialogue. These respondents tended to be involved in recent, grassroots interreligious initiatives. The traditional forms of interreligious dialogue have been more performative and largely dominated by male Jewish and Muslim communal and institutional leaders. Interreligious dialogue within this framework is often not a genuine dialogue. Rather, it involves putting together two separate monologues by, more often than not, an Imam and a Rabbi who are assumed to represent Muslims and Jews in France. When a dialogue does emerge in these contexts, it is top-down and proceeds on the basis of reified Jewish and Muslim identities. In contrast, newer forms of grassroots interreligious dialogue are less performative and more action-based, in that dialogue is structured around social action and cultural activities. An example is Thierry Cohen's Noël ensemble which brings together Jews, Muslims, and other people who do not celebrate Christmas to support neglected, elderly Christians. Another example is Convivencia in Marseille which brings together its members, many of whom self-identify as Jewish or Muslim,

but not exclusively, around their shared passion for Mediterranean music. Convivencia's president, in particular, told me that her goal was to engage not only with but also operate from outside the framework of Jewish-Muslim relations, but also operate beyond it, and music, for her, was one way to do so.

The recent emergence of a bottom-up, grassroots interreligious movement certainly suggests that the landscape of interreligious dialogue in France is changing. This newer wave of associations is generally critical of state-led initiatives, even while adopting a more or less 'official' terminology of secularism. These associations, while emphasizing their secular nature, often, like Convivencia in Marseille, proudly affirm their lack of state funding and affiliation, while still seeking to emphasize their inscription within a republican framework. In addition, these initiatives are critical of the older, patriarchal model of interreligious dialogue and take a more socially active focus in their work. Their approach to dialogue, to paraphrase Panikkar, seeks a complementarity between the dialogical and dialectical. At the same time, many respondents who are part of this new wave highlighted that their associations had a steep learning curve. Learning how to do, rather than perform, interreligious dialogue, especially without state funding, without any form of institutional support, and without a pre-existing established formal network of associations to provide guidance, has meant that each association and initiative has developed somewhat in isolation. Several leaders I spoke to mentioned their concerns of the sustainability of their initiatives, mostly due to their economic situation.

The interreligious dialogue initiatives examined in this chapter relate to categories three and four of the previous section. These initiatives are led by associations and individuals who are, broadly speaking, part of civil society. According to Edward Shils, civil society is "a part of society which has a life of its own, which is distinctly different from the state, and which is largely in autonomy from it.

Civil society lies beyond the boundaries of the family and beyond the locality; it lies short of the state" (Shils 1991: 3). This is a useful, albeit basic, working definition for civil society. While conceptually distinct from the state, civil society is, at the very least, perpetually in dialogue with the state. Elements of civil society may at time work with the state, against the state, or in ambivalence, but "even the most 'post-state' conceptions of civil society rely to some extent on freedoms that can only be guaranteed by a state" (Chambers and Kopstein 2008: 378).

It has long been established in French political doctrine that the most appropriate way to deal with ethnic and religious difference and discrimination on these counts is through the adoption of a difference-blind assimilationist model of integration in parallel with the separation of church, or religion in general, and state, which forms part of the constitutional principle of *laïcité*). As seen previously, there is a wealth of research showing how this universalist model has been applied selectively to minority groups throughout modern and contemporary French history. Aside from the state's approach of non-differentiation based on ethnic and religious difference, civil society, in particular through non-profit associations, has played an important role in advocating against ethnic and religious discrimination by foregrounding particular identities. Joseph Downing notes that these associations "represent a significant force within French society" today, pointing out that there are "over one million such associations currently operating, with over 16 million members (Downing 2016: 457). These associations have mobilized around demands for "the recognition for minorities from the French state by acting as interlocutors between the French state and religious groups" and "around notions of race and ethnicity to facilitate recognition from the central state" (Downing 2016: 457). Downing argues that despite the continued importance of such associations "in promoting difference-orientated policies in France," their work and durability remain "very much

contested" and fragile, due to their varying dependence on the state for "funding and access to the public sphere" (Downing 2016: 465-66).

In the twenty-first century, the French state certainly plays an important role in structuring interreligious dialogue initiatives, especially those involving or targeting Muslims and Islam. One major way in which state priorities may directly or indirectly impact the way dialogue initiatives are undertaken relates to the state funding available to civil society. Since 2015, the amount of money available for dialogue initiatives between religious communities has been dwarfed by the amount of money funnelled into anti-radicalization programmes. In some instances, this has led some civil society actors "to target these funds by demonstrating their ability to 'outreach' to Muslim communities or to promote dialogue" (Everett 2018: 443). In this context, there is a clear potential for the convergence of interreligious dialogue initiatives with state securitization of Islam and Muslims within the framework of an ongoing 'War on Terror'. The socio-political context of the securitization of Muslims can colour, if not shape, to some extent, the dialogue between individual actors and the social work carried out.

The state's priority on de-radicalization, counter-terrorism, and security programmes that disproportionately target Muslims also impacts faith-based civil society in more direct ways. As Sami Everett highlights, "after the November [2015] attacks, the state encouraged French civil society and particularly the extremely broad and locally well-connected nexus of *associations* to centre their resources on security-conscious measures to 'de-radicalise' Muslims" (Everett 2018: 444). Following these attacks, the state's priority for civil society clearly and urgently shifted from *vivre ensemble* to security and surveillance.[38] In the later sections of this chapter, my analysis

[38] *Le vivre ensemble* is a neologism increasingly used by French politicians, especially since the beginning of the twenty-first century, to refer to social togetherness or peaceful coexistence between different ethnic, cultural, and religious communities in France. The term is, however, often used synonymously

of individual and associational actors involved in interreligious dialogue takes into explicit consideration the intersection of the state's priorities, in terms of securitization within a global and national War on Terror framework, and interreligious dialogue at the national, regional, and local levels. The account I provide demonstrates the salience of the security and War on Terror framework in interreligious dialogue, but also suggests that this dialogue cannot be reduced solely to security issues.

In some ways, a central question of this chapter is to what extent is it possible, in France, for civil society to function "short of the state." Indeed, on the whole, my analysis in this chapter suggests that this is not really possible in France. In practical terms, public life in France, more so than in, say, the United Kingdom or the United States, depends in large part on the state. Associations, museums, and theatres in France certainly rely to a larger extent on state funding and support than in other countries. Even more important than this material dependence, however, is the political philosophy behind the structuring of the public sphere in France. As discussed in Chapter One, despite being the object of debate and negotiation throughout the nineteenth century, the dominant paradigm of republican universalism, as a set of principles that guarantee the political rights of 'universal' citizens and essentially relegate to the private sphere the social, cultural, and ethnic aspects of citizenship, has fundamentally shaped political discourses and laws in modern and contemporary France. In this context, civil society, already more dependent on the state than in other countries, is, in some ways, constrained by the need to emphasize a 'universal' discourse of French citizenship. Faith-based or ethnic associations, in particular, are, then, caught in this republican double-bind, whereby they simultaneously reject and foreground particular ethnic or religious identities,

for *intégration* and disproportionately applied to Muslims as the unintegrated minority community, *par excellence*.

perceived as 'communautariste' in the logic of republicanism. This paradox often proved to be at the heart of the discussions I had with my interlocutors.

4.4. Methodology

4.4.1. Fleeting Interactions and Thin Description

The two key elements of my fieldwork were interviews and the observation of and participation in the events and meetings of a number of associations. I began by contacting numerous interreligious dialogue associations asking them to forward my call for participants among their members. Eventually a number of individuals reached out and we scheduled mutually convenient times to meet, often in public spaces like cafes, parks, bars, but also, at times, in their homes or on the premises of their association. Often, my initial respondents would put me in touch with people they knew who were also involved in, broadly speaking, interreligious dialogue. In addition, I would often meet individuals at events who would speak to me about interreligious dialogue in an unplanned, off-the-cuff, and ultimately fleeting manner. The fleeting nature of such kinds of interaction has also been noted by the anthropologist Yulia Egorova in her ethnographic study of Jews and Muslims in South Asia. She writes that this "probably reflects well the processual and multifaceted nature of what one might try to capture under the rubric of Jewish-Muslim relations" (Egorova 2018: 28). While she is writing about the category of 'Jewish-Muslim relations,' Egorova's reflections are also applicable to the range of activities that we attempt to capture with the more specific category of 'Jewish-Muslim (interreligious) dialogue'.

How does one take stock of, let alone make sense of, the radical diversity and changing and fleeting nature of instances of interreligious dialogue between Jews and Muslims in contemporary France? For Clifford Geertz, by far the most influential

cultural anthropologist of the last century, one would aim to provide a "thick description" of the object of study. A thick description, according to Geertz, is about capturing and rendering symbolic elements of culture in their entire context:

> [...] ethnography is thick description. What the ethnographer is in fact faced with – except when (as, of course, he must do) he is pursuing the more automatized routines of data collection – is a multiplicity of complex conceptual structures, many of them superimposed upon or knotted into one another, which are at once strange, irregular, and inexplicit, and which he must contrive somehow first to grasp and then to render. And this is true at the most down-to-earth, jungle field work levels of his activity (Geertz 1973: 10-11).

In his ground-breaking ethnography of the African Hebrew Israelites of Jerusalem, John L. Jackson (2013) critiques the contemporary deployment of the methodological model of "thick description" championed by Clifford Geertz (1973). Jackson contends that one problem with ethnography is its seductive, totalizing approach to knowing others crystallized in the overconfidence of a thick description that supposedly gives ethnographers the ability to comprehensively know and interpret a previously unknown *other* and *their* culture. In contrast, Jackson argues for a thin description, "where you slice into a world from different perspectives, scales, registers, and angles—all distinctly useful, valid, and worthy of consideration" (Jackson 2013: 16-17).

Following Jackson, the discussion and analysis in the following sections proceed from a thin description approach, alternatively described by Yulia Egorova as "doing anthropology out of the corner of one's eye," which is to say to study "a phenomenon that unravels on the periphery of what the ethnographers see in front of them but that at the same time allows us to explore issues of considerable importance from multiple perspectives, all worthy of attention" (Egorova 2018: 29). This is a particularly useful approach for studying the diverse and complex field of interreligious and intercultural dialogue initiatives in France.

4.4.2. Recruiting Participants and the Interview Process

I first began recruiting potential participants towards the end of the summer of 2017 by contacting 24 associations and groups that explicitly presented themselves or, at least, a part of their activities as relating to, broadly speaking, Jewish-Muslim dialogue. Some of these associations, like Coexister, I had already heard of. Others, like Parler en Paix, I only discovered through scouring through search engine results and social media searches. Yet others, like Convivencia, were first introduced to me by my initial respondents. Once I had established a relatively long list of associations in France, I proceeded to contact them via email or telephone (see Appendix, Document 1 for the initial contact emails I sent; for the phone calls, I conveyed this same information verbally).

My emails and telephone calls essentially introduced me and described my project, while asking the associations to circulate my email along with the attached information sheet and participant consent form to their members (see Appendix, Documents 2 and 3). If the first contact was made over the telephone, I would then ask for an email address to send over the same information in writing. In general, potential participants would then contact me by email (or, in one case, on Twitter) to set up an interview. At first, only a couple of people contacted me. This initial lack of participants led me to ask my initial respondents if they could also put me in touch with other people who might be interested in taking part. This form of snowball sampling (Goodman 1961) allowed me to sufficiently enlarge my sample of participants. However, because snowball sampling is a form of nonprobability sampling, its main limitation relates to representativeness. Since it is a non-random, respondent-driven method of sampling, the sample risks becoming skewed towards one or more characteristics (i.e. ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic background, etc.).

Indeed, all of my respondents are university-educated, middle-income professionals, a socio-economic category that John and Barbara Ehrenreich (1977) describe as the Professional-Managerial class. This is an important factor to retain, since it likely inflects their understandings and practices of interreligious dialogue. In any case, the dominance of a well-educated, middle-class within my sample is broadly representative of, more generally, ethnic and faith-based civil society in France (Wenden and Leveau 2001). Indeed, across different types of associations in France, with the exception of sports associations, sustained voluntary participation is more frequent among the most highly educated and those above the age of 45 (Prouteau 2018). Despite this relative homogeneity, I found snowball sampling to be very useful, not only because it helped me to increase my sample size, but also because it allowed me to locate and gain access to what appeared to be an informal social network of interreligious and intercultural dialogue associations and practitioners. Thus, the findings in this chapter should not be seen as generalizable to a category as broad as "Jewish-Muslim interreligious dialogue," but may be taken to be fairly representative of a relatively connected (though not always supportive) nexus of recently formed interreligious and intercultural groups and initiatives.

The interviews themselves were semi-structured and purposefully conversational in nature. While I had a set of general questions, these questions were designed to facilitate a broader conversation about the respondents, their motivations for taking part in interreligious/intercultural dialogue, and the associations they are involved in (see the Appendix for a list of general questions). The danger in conducting field research on a topic as polarized and polemical as "Jewish-Muslim relations" is that respondents might end up engaging with the topic solely in terms of what they deem to be a "Jewish" or a "Muslim" perspective, rather than speaking more personally as individuals. One way I sought to mitigate this was to treat the

interview as a more or less personal conversation between two relatively equal interlocutors. Thus, I systematically began the interviews introducing myself, which allowed my respondents to ask more questions about me, before easing into the "actual" interview. In doing so, from my perspective, the interviews never felt like a unidirectional series of questions and answers, but more like a naturally-occurring conversation. This allowed my respondents to speak to me from *their* personal perspective, without feeling like they had to adopt one "side" or the other of what is increasingly depicted in media and political discourse as a zero-sum binary relation between Jews and Muslims in France.

4.4.3. Thematic Analysis

In total, I interviewed 19 individuals (including one person twice), representing 12 associations, institutions, and groups, and attended and observed six relevant events (see Table 14 in the Appendix). The names of all of my interviewees have been replaced by pseudonyms except for Ludovic-Mohamed Zahed, Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf, and Thierry Cohen who are relatively well-known public figures in France. Hathroubi-Safsaf and Cohen are also novelists whose most recent novels were analysed in Chapter Three. All three provided consent for their real names to be used. While most of my interviewees engage in interreligious dialogue through larger structures, one individual (Edouard), whom I will discuss later in this chapter, does so in his own name.

Despite the relative homogeneity of the sample in terms of socioeconomic status, the sample was diverse in terms of ethnicity, national origin, religious affiliation, gender, and sexual orientation. Unsurprisingly, given the legacies of French colonialism in North Africa and number of people in France (or whose ancestors) hail originally from that region, most of my respondents were of Moroccan,

Algerian, and Tunisian descent. Equally, given the nature of the groups I contacted, they were also either Jewish or Muslim; 13 identified some degree of North African heritage, while seven identified as Jewish and eight as Muslim, with varying degrees of belief and practice. Most of my Jewish respondents identified as Arab Jews or Maghrebi Jews ("juif arabe", juif maghrébin"), with one interviewee with a Biblical first name and a typically "Arab" last name remarking that "je porte ma judéité et mon arabité dans mon nom." Other respondents were of Iranian, Egyptian, and Western European backgrounds.

In addition, other religious identifications included Baha'i, Christian, atheist, and agnostic. These interviews and observation of events took place in Paris (14 interviews and four events), Marseille (three interviews and two events), Aix-en-Provence (one interview), and Lyon (one interview). Generally speaking, the focus on major urban centres here is representative of where such associations and initiatives tend to be based. In addition, beyond the field of interreligious and intercultural initiatives, associations in France are more likely to be based in urban centres (Prouteau 2018).

Each interview was audio recorded with the explicit verbal and written consent of the interviewee. Following the end of the last interview, I listened to each audio recording once. Next, I fully transcribed the audio recordings. I then conducted a thematic analysis of the transcripts. The transcripts were read several times in order to maximize familiarity with the overall sample before being coded line by line. The first level of coding involved identifying salient broad concepts and ideas that recurred in the sample and ascribing descriptive labels to them. The second level of coding involved grouping overlapping labels into themes. Upon identifying recurring patterns, descriptive labels were assigned which were then grouped into themes. Where there was overlap, sub-themes were merged into larger themes. While the

ways in which each topic emerged differed from interlocutor to interlocutor, there appeared to be an implicit consensus that, when it came to the question of Jewish-Muslim relations or Jewish-Muslim dialogue, there are a set of inescapable themes: media and power, diverging affiliations (on the topic of Israel and Palestine), and intersecting affiliations (on the topic of historical and/or present shared marginalizations and oppressions). The analysis of these themes suggests that there has been a recent emergence of a new model of Jewish-Muslim dialogue initiatives. Generally critical of the role of the media and the state, these initiatives aim to challenge the dominant image of Jewish-Muslim tension and polarization through an approach rooted in mutual aid and social action, while drawing on a historically- and politically-conscious language of shared, intersecting oppressions and solidarities.

4.5. Analysis and Discussion

My interviewees in this chapter make use of a set of themes in order to present the importance of their activities. These themes are as follows: media and power, diverging affiliations, and intersecting affiliations. Following a discussion of these themes, I then focus on two specific cases (the collaboration between the mahJ and l'IMA and between HM2F and Beit Haverim). Within the three themes, the topic of Israel and Palestine, in particular, was often brought up as *the* inescapable topic that everyone tries to avoid, but fails, when talking about Jewish-Muslim relations or dialogue. Other topics, such as the Shoah and colonization and Islamophobia and antisemitism, were essentially brought up to promote Jewish-Muslim dialogue and solidarity as a necessity for two minorities with similar histories of persecution and present-day experiences of being othered. In contrast to promoting dialogue and solidarity because of similarly marginalized positions, the Maghreb was sometimes evoked to foreground Jewish-Muslim *rapprochement* as rooted in the shared North

African heritage of many Jews and Muslims in France. Other topics, such as extremism and fundamentalism, proved more difficult to talk about, especially given the context of securitization described earlier. An equally challenging topic was that of *laïcité*, or secularism. All but one respondent acknowledged the importance of the principle of secularism for ensuring the equality of people and their beliefs, while also noting that the concept itself has been increasingly weaponized towards Islamophobic ends.

4.5.1. Diverging and Intersecting Affliations and Identifications

The initiatives of most of my interviewees sought to promote Jewish-Muslim dialogue on egalitarian grounds, while rooting discussions of Jewish-Muslim relations in the past and present in longer histories. For Convivencia, this involves organizing cultural events that foreground the North African and Mediterranean commonalities of many Jews and Muslims (among other communities) in France. According to Miriam, this is all about emphasizing the "socles communs" that Jews, Muslim, Christians, and other groups of people, including gender and sexual minorities, share with each other. On a purely semantic level, Miriam's "socles communs" resembles the republican concept of *vivre ensemble* and other empty signifiers such as *métissage* or *lien social*. However, whereas *vivre ensemble, métissage,* and *lien social* are top-down contemporary political euphemisms for *intégration* or *assimilation*, Miriam's use of *socles communs* appears to be more in line with Paul Gilroy's use of the term "conviviality" to denote "the processes of cohabitation and interaction that have made multiculture an ordinary feature of social life in Britain's urban areas and in postcolonial cities elsewhere" (2004: xv). Multiculture, in Gilroy's perspective, is not premised on the absence of public difference, as in the republican ideal. Rather, in the multiculture, difference is "unruly" (2004: xiv), "unremarkable," and "insignificant" (2004: 105).

Moreover, as Farhad, an Iranian-Baha'i member of Convivencia stated, the association purposely goes well beyond a strictly Jewish-Muslim focus: "L'association tend vers l'optique de la Méditerranée. Donc, c'est une association qui a une couleur locale extrêmement prononcée." This is not the erasure of cultural difference, but the multiplication of it. Similarly, Rachida of Coexister explained to me that, while Jewish-Muslim dialogue is of particular importance to the association, it is always approached as part of a broader context of intersecting affiliations and identities. In these cases, the fact of engaging Jewish-Muslim dialogue, while decentring the 'Jewish' and 'Muslim' terms of that dialogue, allows participants to avoid being trapped by polarizing media and political discourses around these identities. More importantly, this de facto intersectional approach does not, unlike Edouard and Serfaty, lose sight of the structural changes that are required by focusing only on the individual.

As in the novels discussed previously, most of my interviewees emphasized the historical and contemporary marginalization and oppression of Jews and Muslims as, first, an important context for contemporary discussions of Jewish-Muslim relations and, secondly, an important basis for Jewish-Muslim solidarity in the present and future. Interestingly, most placed this Jewish-Muslim solidarity within a broader framework of anti-racist and anti-colonial solidarity, which is to say beyond a strictly Jewish-Muslim dynamic. Miriam, for example, advances that there is an "espèce de proximité" between slavery, colonization, pogroms, and the Shoah. She clarifies that this proximity lies in each of these persecutions being based on dehumanization. This is not to say that slavery, colonization, and the Shoah are reducible to each other—something that Miriam disavowed—but rather that they shared certain epistemological commonalities. Indeed, for Jews, Muslims, Black people, and, in fact, other descendants of colonized and dispossessed people, these histories of

persecutions continue to shape their experience of marginalization in the present. For my other interviewees who shared this perspective, the promise of Jewish-Muslim solidarity lies in the avowal of the shared historical and contemporary vulnerability of Jews, Muslims, and other minoritized groups.

When Miriam told me that, as a Jew in France, she is often unsure whether certain negative encounters were the result of antisemitism, I immediately understood what she meant. Racism does not always manifest itself in swastikas or outright slurs; it is often more insidious. In Chapter Three, I introduced the concept of insidious trauma to refer to the psychological effect of the accumulation of not overtly violent daily, repeated aggressions—that some commonly term 'micro-aggressions—that are a function of broader systemic oppressions. Racialized minorities often wonder whether, for example, unpleasant encounters are the result of racial prejudices. When I told Miriam that I am often uncertain whether it is because of racism that, for example, a colleague, or even a complete stranger, is overtly disrespectful to me or if it is simply because they are just an unpleasant person by nature, Miriam immediately related this to her experience as a Jew. Without describing it as such, Miriam had put her finger on the concept of insidious trauma. The point does not lie in deciding whether or not this or that encounter is due to, for instance, racism, but in realizing that every negative encounter *could* be due to racism. Recognizing this to be a shared aspect of Jewish, Muslim, Black, brown, and other minoritized lives, Miriam remarked that she feels a sense of closeness with other minoritized groups whose very existence is perpetually troubled by violence on the basis of unchangeable characteristics that mark them as different from majoritized groups. Similarly, the founder of the queer Muslim association HM2F, Ludovic-Mohamed Zahed, revealed that his recognition of the overlapping logics of antisemitism, Islamophobia, misogyny, and homophobia

drove him to organize intersectional movements and activities (see Zahed 2019: 11-16 for further reflections on his own motivations).

Many of my interviews also pinpointed specific instances of overlap between the marginalization and oppression of Jews and Muslims in recent French history, in particular through the figure of Maurice Papon, who was responsible for both the deportation of Jews during the Second World War and the massacre of Algerians in Paris in 1961. Others spoke more generally about the history of antisemitism in Europe and their fears of increasing Islamophobia in the contemporary period. Ahmed, another member of Coexister, describes his two pathways into interreligious dialogue: doubting Islam and discovering the Shoah. In his younger days, Ahmed lost his faith and explored other religions. When he eventually came back to Islam, however, he maintained his interest in other religions and beliefs, which eventually led him to seek out opportunities for interreligious dialogue. When he first learnt about the Shoah in school, he could not stop asking himself how "une telle chose" could have happened. In particular, he could not understand why ordinary people, at best, did nothing and, at worst, actively supported the systematic extermination of Jews. He felt factors that led to the Shoah were not explored in his education. Later, when he independently read about the Shoah and its antecedents, he better understood how the millennia-long history of anti-Judaism and antisemitism in Europe culminated in the twentieth-century extermination of Jews.

Like Mounir in Thierry Cohen's *Avant la haine*, Ahmed felt that the Shoah was deeply relevant to him. Learning about the Shoah and the antisemitism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Ahmed instinctively connected these Jewish histories and memories to Muslim histories and memories. At Coexister, Ahmed and my other interlocutors explained, highlighting the central similarities within the inner mechanisms of discrimination, persecution, and oppression is an important

component of the activities organized. Ahmed disclosed one of his main motivations for joining the association: "A Coexister, on essaye de déconstruire les discours de haine de manière générale à l'encontre de n'importe quel type de religion, de croyance, ou de groupe, tout simplement."

In a postcolonial context, the approaches of associations like Convivencia and Coexister and initiatives like SOS Racisme's Salam, Shalom, Salut project are noteworthy because they take an intersectional, anti-racist approach to embodied solidarity and conviviality. Interestingly, these groups have a tendency to universalize the groups that they discuss, i.e. Jews, Muslims, etc. But they appear to do so in a way that does not, contrary to the doctrine of republican universalism, seek to invisibilize these groups. Rather, they seek to enlarge the range of human experience and solidarity by highlighting the intersections between a variety of oppressions in the past and present.

Indeed, most of my interviewees highlighted a variety of intersecting affiliations, identifications, and marginalizations in the past and present as a way to both contextualize Jewish-Muslim relations and to propose a basis for contemporary and future Jewish-Muslim solidarity in France. One revealing exception was Edouard. A French-Israeli former banker who now runs a conflict resolution consultancy, while also organizing Jewish-Muslim interreligious dialogue activities, Edouard sees the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to be the primary obstacle to Jewish-Muslim relations in France. His interreligious dialogue, often in collaboration with an Imam based in a north-eastern suburb of Paris, occasionally takes place under the auspices of an association called Union des Peuples pour la Paix (UPP). While the UPP exists officially as an association, registered in the *Journal officiel*, it appears to have never really been active, instead simply providing a name for some of the broad activities carried out by Edouard and his collaborators.

Since at least 2012, Edouard has been organizing trips for French Imams and young Muslims to visit Israel. When I asked him what he thought about the state of Jewish-Muslim relations in France, he told me that where there even were relations, they are bad, but in most cases, there are no relations at all. He understands this to be the consequence of two factors: one, the supposedly increasing trend among young people to define themselves primarily by their ethnicity or religion (as opposed to belonging to the French republic) and, two, the impact of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Edouard believes that, while Jewish-Muslim relations cannot be reduced to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, "une grande partie du conflit est malheureusement importée en Europe." To combat the influence of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on French Jewish-Muslim relations, Edouard told me that he organizes trips to Israel for young French and Belgian Muslims to assess the situation in Israel for themselves ("voir la réalité de leurs propres yeux"). These trips include meetings with members of the Israeli government, Yad Vashem, and various holy sites in Jerusalem. Edouard argues that these young Muslims, after seeing for themselves, come back to France understanding that the situation is not as bad as they thought. These young Muslims are then taken on a tour of France and Belgium as "ambassadeurs de la paix" in order to "expliquer ce qu'ils ont vu." The one-sided nature of the trips – there are no visits to the West Bank or meetings with Palestinians living under occupation – suggests that it would be more accurate to understand the trip as a form of pro-Israel advocacy rather than a genuine interreligious dialogue initiative.

Edouard's concern about the polarization of identity is shared by most of my other respondents. However, while the others primarily see this as the result of state interactions with Jews and Muslims over a period of more than a century, as well as reductive news reporting, Edouard sees this as a set of personal choices, related to a broader phenomenon of an alleged "retour du religieux" (Gauchet 1985; Kepel 1991).

In place of what he perceives as the growing importance of the public display of religion, Edouard pinpoints *laïcité* as the precondition for 'good' Jewish-Muslim relations. Since the issue is personal, rather than systemic or structural, his approach is to target the group that he perceives to be the 'problem' in the Jewish-Muslim binary, i.e. young Muslims, and 'educate' them.

Edouard's focus on the individual, rather than broader structures, is similar to that of Rabbi Michel Serfaty and his Amitié Judéo-Musulmane de France (AJMF). The AJMF is essentially a one-man show run by Serfaty, occasionally funded by various state bodies (see, for example Ville de Ris-Orangis 2017), who travels to Muslim communities (which he terms "les brasiers") across France to "open people's eyes" (Sauvaget 2012). His characterization of Muslim communities as "les brasiers" reveals his belief, shared by conservative politicians and writers like Philippe de Villiers (2006, 2016), Alain Finkielkraut (2003, 2013) and Georges Bensoussan (see Brenner 2002, 2004) that areas populated by Muslims are violent and dangerous. Moreover, his use of the term "brasiers" is not anodyne. Linguist Sophie Moirand notes that newspaper articles on the banlieue are replete with "l'image du 'brasier' et les mots qui en rendent compte (embrasement, flambée, incendie, etc.)" (2010: 50). With this in mind, Serfaty's initiative is not so much a form of dialogue than an attempt to address the problem of Muslim antisemitism in these "brasiers" by meeting Muslims and disabusing them of the stereotypes and prejudices that they presumably have.

Like Edouard, Serfaty decontextualizes the question of Jewish-Muslim relations and antisemitism – while entirely ignoring Islamophobia – and thus concludes that Jewish-Muslim relations are problematic today because of the supposedly inherent antisemitism of individual Muslims linked to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Such an understanding naturally leads to one-sided, security-focused initiatives focused on individual Muslims who are, from the outset, presumed

to be antisemitic. In addition, one main difference between Edouard and Serfaty's initiatives and those of, say Convivencia and Coexister is that the former are entirely focused on Jewish-Muslim relations in a vacuum, while the latter focus on contextualizing relations and interactions between Jews and Muslim in France, North Africa, and the Mediterranean in general.

4.5.2. The State, Media, and Politicians

The role that the French state has played, since the nineteenth century, in structuring Jewish-Muslim relations was also an important topic that my interviewees discussed, to varying degrees. In addition, respondents often brought up, in negative terms, the role of the media in shaping the terms of debates relating to Jewish-Muslim relations. In contrast to such negative perceptions of the media, some respondents suggested that literature, music, film, and the arts in general could serve as a corrective to the more polarizing images of Jews, Muslims, and their relations that are found in news reporting.

Many of my interviewees expressed a strong distrust of authority and power, in particular in reference to media professionals and politicians. Early in our conversation at a café in Aix-en-Provence, Yasmina, a Tunisian-born French woman and the founder of Convivencia pinpointed the media and the state as key components in any discussion of Jewish-Muslim relations:

> Je pense que les médias ont une grande responsabilité. Je pense que l'état aussi a une responsabilité. […] En tout cas, par exemple, pour ce qui concerne mon histoire à moi, je sais que le colonialisme a beaucoup favorisé la séparation entre les juifs et les musulmans en Tunisie.

Like my emphasis throughout this thesis on seeing Jewish-Muslim relations as not a binary relationship between Jews and Muslims, but a three-way relationship whose most important element is the French state, Yasmina and, indeed, the majority of my

respondents also consider the state and the media to have played a major role in defining Jewish-Muslim relations.

In terms of the role of the state, she brings up the differential treatment of Jews and Muslims in Tunisia, while, later on, comparing the Tunisian case to the Moroccan and Algerian cases. She argues, much like in the introduction to this thesis, that the starkly different ways in which Jews and Muslims were juridically treated in the French colonial empire had—and continues to have—important consequences for North African Jews and Muslims in post-colonial France. Similarly, David, an SOS Racisme employee involved in their Salam, Shalom, Salut project, suggests that contemporary politicians use Jews and Muslims in a divide-and-conquer approach: "Je pense qu'ils [Jews and Muslims] sont utilisés à des fins électorales. […] Il y a aussi l'instrumentalisation de la peur d'une communauté pour cibler une autre communauté." The instrumentalization of fear, especially by the right and the far right, to pit Jews and Muslims against each other is not a new phenomenon. Ethan Katz (2015) and Joshua Cole (2019) have demonstrated how, at various junctures since at least the 1930s, politicians in France and colonial Algeria constructed both groups as distinct from the rest of the French population, while seeking to pit them against each other for strategic gain. Over more than a century, this has been aided by the dominance of republican ideology and the abstract emphasis on assimilation in opposition to an equally abstract threat of *communautarisme*, which allows any non-white ethnicity to be constructed as potentially dangerous to republican social order.

As for the media, Yasmina contends that media professionals are responsible for giving free rein to "les discours de haine" and "des choses fausses." Miriam, a member of Convivencia, points out that the media is more inclined to tell a story of polarization than of good relations: "Dans les relations que les médias veulent faire sortir, ça ne sera pas des associations qui veulent oeuvrer dans le bon sens." In other

words, stories about 'bad' Jewish-Muslim relations sell better than stories about 'good' Jewish-Muslim relations. Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf, herself a journalist and a novelist (and an elected official in Cergy), argues that the media portrays Muslims in France as if they were all antisemites, while being less attentive to far-right or right-wing antisemitism. Thierry Cohen identified the media and politicians as having a "grosse part de culpabilité dans ce qui se passe aujourd'hui entre les deux communautés." He presented his novel *Avant la haine* as his way to provide a counter-narrative of Jewish-Muslim relations. Similarly, Hathroubi-Safsaf describes her novel *Ce sont nos frères et leurs enfants sont nos enfants* as an attempt to tell a more complex story of Jewish-Muslim relations than the reductive one that dominates media representations.

In addition to attempting to provide a more nuanced account (even if that account, as I suggest in the previous chapter, has its own limitations) through her fiction, Hathroubi-Safsaf also envisages taking a more 'direct' approach to challenging polarizing media representations. A regular polymath, when we first met in Paris in October 2019, she had just begun a PhD in sociology on the topic of the representation of Muslim women in French media. She explained that, after a career of twenty years as a journalist, she has decided to pursue a PhD in order to eventually teach sociology and journalism at the university level:

> Si je fais un doctorat en sociologie, c'est parce qu'en fait je voudrais enseigner la sociologie des médias. Je veux aller ensuite dans les écoles de journalisme et dans les universités françaises pour travailler sur les représentations… et sur les représentations de la banlieue, notamment dans les médias, et faire changer le regard qu'on a sur les médias. Donc, c'est très militant comme projet. C'est justement pour former les journalistes… à comment mieux parler de l'islam, et à comment mieux parler de banlieue, à comment mieux parler de… Enfin, à arrêter toutes ces représentations négatives, en fait.

Hathroubi-Safsaf conceives of herself (and, more broadly, the world that she belongs to) as in opposition to what she perceives to be widespread negative representations. Noting that the way journalists often talk about Muslims in France might have to do with the relative lack of Muslim or Maghrebi-origin lecturers in journalism schools,

Hathroubi-Safsaf has taken it upon herself to try to impact the next generation of French journalists. In particular, she wants journalists and key decision makers to reflect more carefully on who they choose to give space to. She contends that one way to understand negative stereotypes of Islam in the French media is "intellectual laziness" on the part of journalists. According to Hathroubi-Safsaf, it is easier to "interroger toujours les mêmes personnes [she later cites Eric Zemmour, Renaud Camus, and Alain Finkielkraut as examples] qui occupent l'espace médiatique" than to accurately obtain the pulse of on-the-ground sentiments or to interview local community leaders and activists. It is true that the same set of 'experts' tend to be interviewed or invited to comment on issues involving Islam in France. It is also true that delegating the journalistic duty of informing the public on key issues to a more or less willing group of self-proclaimed experts takes up less time and money than conducting in-depth investigative journalism and diversifying interview sources.

However, it is not just a question of ease, as Hathroubi-Safsaf implies. There are, at least, three other reasons. First, and this might be an obvious point, it is important to remember that journalists are not (usually) scholars. Journalists are generally not experts in any professional domain, but seek to rapidly communicate information to a public. Second, and more importantly, Muslims make up a vanishingly small minority of journalists in France, making Muslims "plutôt des 'objets' que des 'sujets' médiatiques" (Hajjat and Mohammed 2013: 117). Third, and this is the most important point, there is a large market for polemical and biased reporting on Islam and Muslims in France and the West, more generally speaking. There is an abundance of research demonstrating the longevity and extent of Islamophobia in the media in Europe and the US, its impact on the public, and its financial incentives (Said 1981; Poole 2002; Deltombe 2005; Brown 2006; Powell 2011; Lean 2012; Baker et al. 2013; Hajjat and Mohammed 2013; Ogan et al. 2014; Mondon

2015; Wolfreys 2018). As Edward Said notes in his 1997 introduction to *Covering Islam* (1981), "the market for representations of a monolithic, enraged, threatening, and conspirationally spreading Islam is much greater, more useful, and capable of generating more excitement, whether for purposes of entertainment or of mobilizing passions against a new foreign devil" than more nuanced, scholarly accounts (xxviii). As I demonstrated in Chapter Two, this Islamophobic representation includes the depiction of Muslims, taken to be a homogeneous group, as inherently antisemitic.

Like Hathroubi-Safsaf and several other respondents, Yasmina also specifically mentions polemicist Eric Zemmour as an example of a media personality who is accorded too much visibility and legitimacy:

> Il y a certaines personnes, comme Eric Zemmour, qui prônent totalement un discours de haine. C'est des gens comme ça qui sont dangereux parce qu'en plus ils se présentent comme des intellectuels. C'est très grave… Et on les écoute.

Eric Zemmour is the epitome of the journalist without any professional expertise who has risen to fame through his writings on the dangers of Islam in the West. Long affiliated with *Le Figaro*, Zemmour has been given a prominent platform by a variety of mainstream media outlets like *France 2*, RTL, and Canal+'s *CNews* (formerly called *i>Télé*). The son of Algerian Jews, Eric Zemmour's neo-republican brand of racism, Islamophobia, anti-immigration, anti-feminism, and anti-LGBT rights has endeared him to the French far right, while also captivating a broad public with his best-selling essays published by major, influential presses like Grasset, Fayard, and Albin Michel. French historian Gérard Noiriel (2019), in closely analysing Zemmour's writings in comparison to those of noted antisemite and anti-Dreyfusard Edouard Drumont, argues that the twenty-first century Islamophobic writer and the nineteenth-century antisemitic writer share a common set of discursive tropes and conceptual frameworks. Like my interlocutors, Noiriel writes that the media outlets that give Zemmour the space to promote his views "joue[nt] avec le feu" (2019b).

In contrast to the polarized images of Jewish-Muslim relations that abound in the media, Yasmina tells me that she thinks that the reality is far more banal:

> Je pense que quand on va par exemple dans des quartiers… si on va à Noailles [a district in Marseille] par exemple, on va voir que les gens sont mélangés. Il y a des musulmans, il y a des juifs. […] Les Séfarades sont d'origine maghrébine donc forcément on a la même culture. On a beaucoup de traditions qui se ressemblent, etc. Donc, on se retrouve ici. On se côtoient. C'est des amis. Je pense qu'il n'y a pas de problème dans la population en elle-même.

Highlighting the quotidian and unproblematic nature of the vast majority of interactions between Jews and Muslims in Marseille (that do not, however, necessarily constitute Jewish-Muslim relations, per se), Yasmina nevertheless acknowledges that there can be challenges. In particular, she fears that, especially with younger generations, the divisive discourses circulating in the media may end up having a long-term impact. While convinced that on-the-ground interactions are not as catastrophic as media representations of Jewish-Muslim relations, Yasmina posits that there might be a generational gap that can be exploited by media and political discourse:

> Je pense qu'en France, ça dépend des générations… Peut-être chez les jeunes dans certains quartiers, peut-être... La nouvelle génération, peut-être eux, ils sont plus ignorants sur la question et donc du coup ils se laissent manipuler par les discours des haines. Mais, je pense qu'il y a autant de gens qui n'ont aucun souci que de gens qui veulent créer des soucis. Et c'est pour ça qu'il faut créer justement comme une sorte de contre-pouvoir pour contrer tout ça. Sinon on va se laisser happer dans la haine, dans les discours qui séparent.

Like Hathroubi-Safsaf, David, and Ahmed, Yasmina identifies polarizing media and political discourse on Jews and Muslims, with a particular emphasis on prominent figures like Zemmour, as a key challenge to contemporary Jewish-Muslim dialogue. Convivencia, the association founded by Yasmina in October 2018 and that now counts 70-80 members in Marseille and Aix-en-Provence, is precisely envisaged by its founder and members to be a form of cultural "contre-pouvoir."

The term 'convivencia' refers to a hypothesized period of coexistence and cultural interplay between Christians, Jews, and Muslims in Muslim-controlled Al-

Andalus on the Iberian Peninsula from the beginning of the Umayyad conquest in 711 to the end of the Reconquista and the Alhambra Decree in 1492. Some scholars have argued that this period was, above all, marked by tolerance, diversity, and, most importantly, the fruitful cross-fertilization of culture and ideas between the three religions (Carroll 2001; Menocal 2002; Dodds et al. 2009). Yet, the historicity of the concept has been called into question, with other historians contending that this view of Convivencia is supported by historical source, but rather politically motivated and shaped by a desire to respond to negative contemporary portrayals of Islam with a more positive historical image (Cohen 1995; Nirenberg 1996; Hughes 2012). Indeed, in a contemporary political context where Islam is often depicted as antithetical to so-called 'Western values,' the terminology of Convivencia has seeped into public usage, especially among interreligious movements. As the scholar of Islamic studies and Jewish studies, Aaron W. Hughes writes, such conceptions of Convivencia are not "based on historical research, but on a romantic wistfulness: Muslim Spain created, for a brief period, a culture of tolerance that was subsequently lost. We, in the present, can and must learn from it" (2012: 137). While it is true that the characterization of the interactions between Christians, Jews, and Muslims on the Iberian Peninsula in the medieval period as inherently tolerant through the prism of Convivencia is reductive from the perspective of historiographical scholarship, there is value to the repurposing of the term in contemporary interreligious dialogue movements by individuals who are not engaging in scholarship, but in community-driven activities.

However, other scholars have noted that the term 'convivencia' has often been used by state-sponsored or elite-oriented interfaith dialogue initiatives, for example in Morocco and Israel, to promote a positive image of governments and leaders (Stein 2008, Boum 2012, 2013). Boum, in particular, argues that, in the absence of state initiatives, "the task of responding to stereotypes about Jews is left to a few

individuals" (2013: 161). These individuals, whom Boum calls "artisans" or "traders" of peace, draw on the myth of *convivencia* in medieval al-Andalus in order to promote dialogue and reconciliation through, for example, international music festivals. Boum, however, is sceptical about such initiatives, arguing that "despite [their] message of tolerance and understanding […] they remain simply moments of reification of imagined communities of tolerance" (2013: 161). In the worst cases, such activities are essentially part of a government's or corporation's image management. Such sporadic "performances" (as Boum calls them) of interreligious dialogue are incapable of addressing—let alone preventing—the media-driven, negative perception of Jews, influenced by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, held by younger generations in the context of the absence of daily Jewish-Muslim interaction and a breakdown in transmission of memories of North African Jewish history.

Indeed, Yasmina summarizes the main goal of Convivencia as "la résistance par l'amour," which certainly falls under what Hughes describes as "a romantic wistfulness," but it is important to keep in mind that Yasmina is not writing a history of medieval Iberia. Rather, she is drawing on a—certainly imagined—shared past in order to provide a counter-discourse to the "discours de haine" that she argues dominates contemporary political and media discourse. Yasmina's use of the term 'convivencia' shows that, while the term has been used for broader governmental agendas, local groups are able to effectively deploy the imagery of Convivencia in less problematic, politically motivated ways.

Yasmina explains that her "contre-pouvoir" entails creating spaces of solidarity and conviviality through music, food, and the arts in general because, according to her, the arts have a great potential to touch people and bring people together: "Je pense que la musique et tout ça, ça touche tout le monde. C'est puissant, c'est viscéral." Indeed, the most regular event at Convivencia is their "Mediterranean choir." While

it might initially sound like she is naively idealizing music and the arts—after all, there are plenty of examples of exclusionary and racist music and artwork—there is something particular about music (and food) that can bring people together. Research in neuroscience has not only indicated that listening to music that individuals find pleasing causes dopamine to be released in the brain, but that performing music together results in an endorphin release that may promote a sense of social cohesion or bonding, explaining why music has long been a central component of human societies and civilization (Loersch and Arbuckle 2013, Weinstein et al. 2016, Kang et al. 2018). Thus, while Hathroubi-Safsaf seeks to bring a pedagogical approach to the problem of negative, binary representations, Yasmina and her association have opted for an approach primarily rooted in music.

With a few exceptions, like Edouard, most of my interlocutors, whether leaders and members of grassroots associations like Convivencia, more established associations like Coexister or SOS Racisme, or institutions like the mahJ or the Institut du Monde Arabe, expressed varying degrees of distrust of authority, as embodied by key right-wing media personalities and politicians. Unsurprisingly, this was more clearly expressed by the associations than by the museums.

4.5.3. Le mahJ et l'IMA

The collaboration between the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire du Judaïsme (mahJ) and the Institut du Monde Arabe (IMA), which takes a pedagogical, or rather didactical, approach to intercultural relations, provides an interesting counterexample to Convivencia, Coexister, and SOS Racisme. The mahJ, located in Paris's Marais district – a centre of Jewish culture since the nineteenth century (and of LGBT life since the 1980s) – was opened in 1988 after more than a decade of planning. Officially an *association loi 1901*, the museum defines its mission as "retracer l'histoire des

communautés juives à travers leurs différentes formes d'expression artistique, leur patrimoine culturel et leurs traditions." In addition, the museum sees itself as "une institution, reconnue pour son active politique culturelle et éducative, qui contribue à la diffusion de la connaissance du judaïsme mais aussi, plus largement, au vivre ensemble" ("Projet scientifique et culturel" 2015). While the mahJ is designated a musée de France, the IMA was founded in the 5th arrondissement of Paris in 1980 (but only fully constructed and opened to the public in 1987) by a number of members of the Arab League and France. Officially a foundation "reconnue d'utilité publique," the IMA describes its mission as "établir des liens forts et durables entre les cultures pour ainsi cultiver un véritable dialogue entre le monde arabe, la France et l'Europe" ("Missions"). Since 2004 or 2005, the education departments of the mahJ and the IMA have collaborated together to offer school children and the general public a series of guided tours and workshops around the theme of the shared history of Jews and Muslims. I attended one of these guided tours for the public (by this point, in October 2019, the school visits and workshops had long been organized under the banner of *Cultures en partage* and the public guided tours began in 2018 under the banner of *Juifs et musulmans, une histoire partagée*) and interviewed three past and present mahJ and IMA employees, Emilie, Sara, and Michel, who were directly involved in this collaborative project.

Speaking to Michel, who left the mahJ in 2017 to lead the education department of the Musée National de l'Histoire de l'Immigration in Paris, was very helpful in terms of placing the *Culture en partage* and *Juifs et musulmans, une histoire partagée* initiatives in a broader context. Michel was keen to lay out, in great detail, the history of this initiative between the mahJ and the IMA. This information, which I cross-referenced, was key to understanding the motivations of both institutions in collaborating together on an educational project with a specifically Jewish and Muslim

theme. Michel identified Régis Debray's 2002 report to Jack Lang, who was at the time the Minister of National Education, on "l'enseignement du fait religieux dans l'École laïque" as a primary contextual element explaining the eventual collaboration between the mahJ and the IMA:

> Le rapport […] a abouti à plusieurs initiatives. D'abord, la création de l'Institut Européen des Sciences des Religions pour former les enseignants sur le fait religieux et puis aussi des initiatives dans le champ culturel. Donc, il y a eu, par exemple, une grande exposition à la Bibliothèque nationale [BnF] sur Torah, Bible, Coran, un peu plus tard, en 2005. Il y a eu vraiment, au début des années 2000, un regain d'intérêt pour l'enseignement des faits religieux.

The BnF exposition, which ran from November 2005 to April 2006 and including workshops and guided visits for middle-to-high school students, teachers, and members of the public, sought to highlight the intimate links between Judaism, Christianity, and Islam through a focus on religious texts and images. When I asked Michel if he thought that the initiatives that followed in the wake of Debray's report also had anything to do with the broader socio-political contexts of the early 2000s (a context that I detail in Chapters One and Two), he immediately referenced "la seconde Intifada et les effets entre 2002 et 2005 sur la société française, notamment en milieu scolaire." When I spoke to Emilie and Sara, both of them also specifically referenced the second Intifada as a key factor for the collaboration between the IMA and the mahJ. Interestingly, the organizers of the BnF exposition saw it necessary to explicitly state that their exposition was not "commandée par l'actualité." Michel, however, believed that both the report and the initial initiatives that sprung up between 2002 and 2005 were, at least in part, due to the perception of rising tensions in French society and, in particular, in the public-school system, crystalized by the discourse of a new antisemitism and linked to the outbreak of the second Intifada.

One of these initiatives emerged in 2004 as an exhibition at the Parc de la Villette called *Musulmanes, musulmans*, which, Michel explained, directly led to the 'Cultures en partage' initiative. *Musulmanes, musulmans*, which was an exhibition that

drew primarily on photographs and collected Muslim testimonies on their relation to religion, focused on contemporary Muslim communities in five cities: Cairo, Tehran, Istanbul, Paris, and Dakar. The Villette education department got in touch with the mahJ in December 2003 to solicit the development of a "parcours scolaire" as part of the broader exposition. The mahJ then came up with the concept for a series of workshops for school children on the shared cultures of Jews and Muslims. The mahJ then solicited the participation of the IMA and the programme they came up with would eventually be called Cultures en partages: Juifs et musulmans/Musulmans et juifs." Following the end of the exposition in November 2004, the mahJ and the IMA continued to offer their workshops outside of the Villette framework, broadening the scope to Abrahamic religions in general. In addition to these workshops, which are still offered by the mahJ and the IMA, the two institutions began in 2018 to offer guided tours (Juifs et musulmans, une histoire partagée) of their collections designed for a general public. These tours take place at the mahJ and the IMA and were led by two guides, staff members from each institution.

My visit on October 2, 2019, I was later informed, was just the fourth visit organized by the two institutions (two more have taken place since, in February 2020). The visit began with a look at a large map of the "monde arabe," essentially the 22 countries of the Arab League. The IMA guide, Emilie, acknowledged the somewhat artificial construct of the "Arab world," but suggested that the "Arabness" of the Arab world is primarily linguistic, i.e. what makes the Arab world "Arab" is the predominance of Arabic, despite the variation of dialects. Emilie then invited Sara, the mahJ guide, to talk about "les Juifs qui se sont installés dans le monde arabe." Sara began by stating that "les juifs y vivaient," thus suggesting that Jews no longer live in the Arab world or that their presence is no longer significant. She also emphasized that Jews lived in the region before Muslims. Sara then explained the quasi-absence of

Jews in the Arab world by very briefly referring to colonization and the creation of the state of Israel. Subsequently, Sara discussed contemporary demographics of Israel, pointing out, in particular, that "Arabs" constitute 20% of the Israeli population, even if, as she put it, there is "très peu de mixité dans des villes ou villages arabes en Israël." Without much transition, Sara then affirmed the European and French nature of the mahJ: "le mahJ est un musée européen... et français. On représente la France." Pausing momentarily and glancing at Emilie, she then added, "je ne sais pas si c'est le cas de l'IMA…" Taking her cue, Emilie acknowledged that "l'IMA, c'est un cas spécial," explaining that the institute was founded by France and the Arab League. She added, however, that "ça [the IMA] reste un projet français."

All of the above took place within the first twenty minutes of the visit and revealed how both institutions conceived of and framed their initiative in response to, or in the context of, broader societal discourses. A document I was later shown described *Juifs et musulmans, une histoire partagée* as seeking to "montrer la richesse des cultures juives et musulmanes et de leurs échanges mutuels afin de sortir des images stéréotypées de l'affrontement de ces deux cultures, liées aux douloureux conflits politiques contemporains." In other words, the stated objective of the initiative is to deconstruct stereotypes of Jews and Muslims, by placing them in a longer history that demonstrates the deeply-rooted historical and socio-cultural interplay between communities of Jews and Muslims in the so-called Arab world. The attempt to provide a nuanced definition of the term Arab as it relates to the Arab world, which culminated in Sara's statement that the Arabness of the Arab world is primarily linguistic, appears to be related to the general conflation of the terms Arab and Muslim in France. Given that this Jewish-Muslim initiative is organized by the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire du *Judaïsme* and the Institut du Monde *Arabe*, the initial focus on terminology, during the first twenty minutes of the visit, calls attention to the central

paradox of the construction of the Arab and the Jew as necessarily separate identities. Perhaps, by ascribing a solely linguistic criterion to Arabness—which would, nevertheless, be a thoroughly incomplete definition—Emilie was suggesting the possible Arabness of Jews or, at least, that Jews are an unavoidable reality in the history and present of any rendering of the so-called Arab world. Perhaps, even, like Edward Said (1974: 4), she was suggesting that there was a "felt correspondence" between Jews and Arabs. Sara's subsequent discussion of Arabs in Israel—despite her peculiar emphasis on the lack of "mixité" of Israel's Arab citizens, calling to mind criticisms of French Muslims as being communitarian—certainly fits in with this.

Following this brief discussion of terminology, Emilie and Sara then addressed the proverbial elephants in the room: colonization, Israel, and, interestingly, the status of the mahJ and the IMA. It is undebatable that there was an exodus of Jews from Muslim majority North African and Middle Eastern countries after 1948. The reasons for the successive waves of departure are, however, more complex. When Sara evoked European colonization and the creation of the state of Israel as explanatory factors for this massive departure, she pinpointed two fundamental contextual elements. Yet, for some reason, she chose not to discuss either in any detail. The absent presence of colonial history and the creation of Israel lingered throughout the visit. Her comments about the status of the mahJ ("un musée européen… et français," "on représente la France") and Emilie's insistence that, despite the involvement of the Arab League, the IMA remained "un projet français," might help make sense of this.

Their insistence on the Frenchness of their institutions is a way to dispel the idea that the mahJ and the IMA are either communitarian institutions or run by, in the case of the mahJ, Israel or, in the case of the IMA, the Arab League. The mahJ is in no shape or form associated with Israel, but the ease with which discourse about Jews and Judaism slips into discourse about Israel and Zionism means that Jewish people

and institutions sometimes feel that they have to ward off any suspicion of dual allegiances—itself a deeply antisemitic notion—especially to Israel, in order to avoid the politicization of their identities and discourses.[39] The IMA, however, *is* institutionally linked to—and partly funded by— the Arab League. This institutional link, which, in Emilie's words, renders it "un cas spécial," certainly makes the IMA even more susceptible to the perception of being a vessel of foreign states.

The emphasis on the Frenchness of the mahJ and the IMA, as well as the claim that "on représente la France," might also explain why the context of colonization was almost entirely absent from the visit. After all, if the mahJ and the IMA are French museums that represent France, it is unsurprising that the important impacts of colonial history on Jews and Muslims would be left unaddressed since it highlights an aspect of French history that is not, to say the least, flattering. In the case of the mahJ, a close inspection of the permanent collections reveals a lack of artefacts permitting the discussion of anything less than favourable to the image of the French Republic. Vichy, for example, is almost entirely absent from the museum.

The rest of the visit focuses on a variety of images, texts, sculptures, and artwork from antiquity to the late medieval period, with a couple of brief, verbal references to the nineteenth century as a possible turning point. This "turning point," however is never explored, possibly for the reasons mentioned above. Instead, both Sara and Emilie present and discuss a selection of artefacts in order to suggest, essentially, the theological and cultural similarities between Judaism and Islam and Jews and Muslims. As Michel, who worked at the mahJ for nearly thirteen years and was a key contributor to the project, summarizes the approach succinctly:

[39] Sara almost certainly would have had in mind the debates about the place of Israel within Jewish institutions in Europe following Peter Schäfer's resignation in June 2019 as the director of the Jewish Museum of Berlin over a tweet that was deemed to be in favour of the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement that seeks to apply international pressure to Israel to compel it to withdraw from the occupied territories, dismantle the separation wall in the West bank, and to respect the Palestinian right of return. See Magid 2019 for a detailed contextualization of both the resignation and the ensuing debates.

> C'est une visite qui est quand même beaucoup sur la thématique du dialogue interculturel et qui se place beaucoup sur des questions de pratiques, de rituels, ou de croyances, mais on est peu dans la dimension historique.

Indeed, the visit can be described as a two-way discussion of a random selection of de-historicized objects with the goal of emphasizing the embeddedness of Islam and Judaism as a way to counter the kind of contemporary discourses of oppositional Jewish-Muslim relations charted throughout this thesis. Yet, simply pointing out that Islam and Judaism are similar will do little to counter the contemporary polarization of Jewish and Muslim identities. Instead, what might be more helpful in terms of de-essentializing Jewish and Muslim identities—which is precisely absent from these guided tours at the mahJ and the IMA—is an understanding of the importance of colonial history in separating and instituting a hierarchy of identities, which directly impacted relations between Jews and Muslims *and* shaped modern and contemporary oppositional discourses.

When I put this to both Sara and Emilie, they told me that the visits take place as a function of the objects that the museums have and, as it happens, the objects at the IMA and the mahJ are "plutôt d'époque ancienne ou médiévale." It is, however, difficult to believe that two institutions that have been working on a public-facing project for more than a decade would be constrained by existing collections and unable to acquire, permanently or temporarily, more recent artefacts that would allow the guided tours to take a more comprehensive approach to the topic of Jewish-Muslim history. It is somewhat convenient to be constrained by existing collections. Certainly, neither Sara nor Emilie are in the position of acquiring objects for their respective institutions—that would be the job of their conservators—but the acquisition of objects or archival material from the nineteenth or twentieth centuries is possible and the repeated discourse of being constrained by existing collections is

likely an indicator of the unwillingness at an institutional level to deal with histories that cast a negative light on the French republic. After all, *on représente la France*.

4.5.4. Queering Jewish-Muslim Relations? HM2F and Beit Haverim

In a way, the historical collaborations between LGBT associations Homosexuels Musulmans de France (HM2F) and Beit Haverim also reveal the inherent difficulties in attempting to de-essentialize identities through de-contextualized interreligious or intercultural dialogue. Interestingly, faith-based associations are among the oldest LGBT associations in France. Indeed, a Christian LGBT association, David et Jonathan (founded in 1972) is France's oldest LGBT association. In addition, the founding of Beit Haverim, an LGBT Jewish association, just five years later mean that two of France's very first LGBT associations affirm specific (ethno-)religious identities in addition to non-normative/counter-normative sexual and gender identities. Since the founding of Beit Haverim, the two associations have enjoyed close ties with each other. Nearly three decades after the founding of David et Jonathan, in 2010, an LGBT Muslim association would also be founded and all three associations collaborated closely for a brief period (David et Jonathan 2008; Zahed 2012, 2016; Racimor and Beit 2017). All of this is noteworthy in a French political culture that emphasizes the 'universality' of its citizens and aims to maintain the 'neutrality' of the public space.

The Homosexuels Musulmans de France (HM2F) was founded in 2010 by Ludovic-Mohamed Zahed, a gay French-Algerian doctoral student in Paris who had been previously welcomed into David et Jonathan's Abu Nuwas group, a group created within the Christian association for individuals with an interest in Arabic and Middle Eastern languages, histories, and societies. Thereafter, the three associations worked together closely, organizing several joint events in France, and, eventually, culminating in a joint "pilgrimage" to Israel and Palestine in November 2011. To what

extent was their joint trip an embodiment of a queer approach to interreligious/intercultural dialogue? What could be learnt from such a collaboration that might possibly help other practitioners of interreligious/intercultural dialogue to *queer* normative categories of identity and relations?

The early relationship between David et Jonathan, Beit Haverim, and HM2F, which is based on a shared queer positionality, is particularly interesting because the three groups found themselves having to navigate a narrow space between the pressures of normative religious dogmatism and secular, republican dogmatism. Nevertheless, the drastic differences in each group's level of success (for example, David et Jonathan is still thriving, while HM2F has now officially ceased its activities) in navigating these pressures reveals the normative or *doxic* understandings of—and the varying limits placed on public expressions of—queerness, Christianness, Jewishness, and Muslimness in contemporary French society. In the end, studying the evolution of the relationship between the three associations—and, in particular, the relationship between Beit Haverim and HM2F—reveals the challenge of homonationalism (Puar 2007), which is to say the mobilization of LGBT rights towards nationalist ends, and the limits of intersectionality with regards to the possibility of *queering* Jewish-Muslim relations.

Throughout this thesis, I have been suggesting that there is little that is actually Jewish or Muslim about Jewish-Muslim relations, at least in the way that it is constructed in French public discourse. Instead, the oppositional category of Jewish-Muslim relations, which in public discourse is characterized by tension tells us more about how Islamophobia functions in contemporary France than the range of actual interactions between individuals who identify to some extent as Jewish or Muslim. Indeed, the demonization of Muslims in contemporary France and Europe functions by positioning them (and their presumed religion) as inherently hostile to Jews,

homosexuals, women, apostates, and, generally, progressives. An intersectional and queer approach, in this context, might offer a less problematic alternative. Indeed, triangulating Jewishness and Muslimness with queerness could allow us to bypass this Jewish-Muslim conundrum. Queer, not as an identity category, but as an analytical framework or critical approach, as "resistance to regimes of the normal," might provide an alternative epistemology of Jewish-Muslim relations (Warner 1991: 16). Yet, despite its promise, the relationship between HM2F and Beit Haverim rapidly faltered in the wake of their 2011 trip to Israel and Palestine.

For a brief moment, both associations drew upon a more nuanced history of Jewish-Muslim interactions and constructed a space for socio-cultural conviviality based on religious affinities, shared histories, and intersecting oppressions, expressed both through Jewishness and Muslimness, as well as queerness. Ultimately, this nascent queer solidarity appeared to be limited by political issues related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and homonationalism (Puar 2007). What does this episode tell us about what it means to think *queerly* about Jewish-Muslim relations? More importantly, what does their eventual failure reveal about the (im)possibility of going beyond fixed, overdetermined categories of Jews and Muslims and Jewish-Muslim relations?

First, I must clarify what I mean by queer. On the one hand, queer (as a noun) is an identity meta-category of non-normative sexual and gender identities. In this case, queer is more inclusive than, say, LGBT, because it neither privileges nor excludes any particular sexual or gender identity category or sub-category. Furthermore, contemporary uses of queer as an identity meta-category are fluid and flexible, unlike lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. On the other hand, queer (as a verb, adjective, or adverb) is a critique of fixed categories of sexual and gender identities. More broadly, insights from queer theory have been applied beyond the

realm of gender and sexuality in order to provide critiques of identity and normativity (Cohen 1997, 2019; Muñoz 1999; Ferguson 2003; Giffney 2004). Indeed, in *The Trouble with Normal* (1999), Michael Warner provides an example of queer theory that is not just a critique of heterosexuality or heteronormativity, but, more fundamentally, of normalized, exclusionary political and economic systems.

To think queerly is to think against the norm (or "regimes of the normal," as Warner puts it). But it is also much more than that. Certainly, all political ideologies, such as republicanism, present themselves as against other norms (for instance, in the case of republicanism, against the norms of monarchical governance, sectarianism, and so on). Is republican ideology, as a way of thinking against, say sectarianism, queer? This line of questioning is ultimately misguided because it mistakes queer for simply opposition to or critique of anything. To think queerly is not to simply present oneself as against a particular ideology, but to, fundamentally, be critical of 1) identity categories themselves and 2) the normalization of oppressions, especially under the veneer of progressivism, of individuals subsumed under such identity categories. In other words, to be queer is to be suspicious of normalization itself and not just norms. Republican ideology is, in our context, the normalization of an assimilationist and supposedly colour-blind doctrine that impedes the practical access to the legal rights that are guaranteed by the Republic, while constructing a hierarchy between the good 'universal' citizen and the bad 'particular' citizen. To think queerly in this context is to not be fooled by this ideology that normalizes marginalization through a vague language of universalism, much like the obligation to renounce one's *statut personnel* as a Muslim to effectively access full legal citizenship in French Algeria, while constructing the Muslim as fundamentally unassimilable. And so, when I first heard of the collaboration between HM2F and Beit Haverim, I instantly wondered about the

possibility of an embodied queer critique of the discourse of Jewish-Muslim relations in France. As it turns out, this did not come to pass.

In part, HM2F and Beit Haverim's past interreligious work does provide us with unexpected narratives that attempt to engage critically with contemporary French republican, universal ideals and normative understandings of Jews, Muslims and their relations, in order to reconfigure Jewish-Muslim relations beyond polarization. The documentary that was co-produced by HM2F, Beit Haverim, and David et Jonathan after the trip and the reports they published in the wake of the trip demonstrate two patterns.[40] First, there is an abundance of performative I- and We-statements that affirm the hybridity of the identities of most of the participants of this trip. In other words, the participants were never *only* Muslim or *only* Jewish. Secondly, there is a diversity of discourses (for example, French universalist, Maghrebi-Muslim, and Maghrebi/Sephardi-Jewish) that allows the participants precisely to work on and against normative renderings of what it means to be French, Muslim, and Jewish from within these discourses.

In one of HM2F's reports of the trip to Israel and Palestine in 2011 described it as "une démarche LGBT pour la paix et pour la libération de toutes forme d'extrémisme ou d'homonationalisme." In other words, they affirmed that theirs was an LGBT approach and not an approach led by LGBT individuals. Initially, and because the term queer is still relatively unused in France, I understood this as akin to the model of queer critique I describe above. I thought that this indicated that the organizers saw something inherently queer in their project. They emphasize that they, as Jews and Muslims in France, are doubly discriminated on the basis of their sexuality and their ethnoreligious affiliation. They also highlight that this double discrimination

[40] While the Beit Haverim reports are still accessible on their website, the now-defunct HM2F's website is no longer online and, thus, their reports are no longer publicly accessible. Several years ago, however, I downloaded the HM2F reports. I do not discuss these reports in detail here, but rather present the broad themes within them.

is a driving motivation behind the project. The groups involved stated that their two main goals were, first, to see the on-the-ground realities in Israel and Palestine, while showing solidarity to their LGBT Israeli and Palestinian counterparts, while being specifically attuned to the ongoing occupation, and, secondly, to strengthen the ties between all three LGBT religious associations, which is to say to further anchor their on-going interreligious work in what is considered to be the Holy Land.

Throughout the documentary and the reports, some of the participants appeared to anchor their solidarity by emphasizing, in general, their common North African heritage, through references to language, cultural values, music and food and smells. It might seem like a minor point, but, as in Chapter Three, smells and tastes are important because they are affective gestures to the shared cultural pasts and presents of Mediterranean Jews and Muslims. By highlighting that 'we'—and the very prominence of an inclusive, declarative 'we' throughout the documentary and reports is of importance—had the same foods and the same smells is a way to insist that, despite the difficulties of the present, Jewish–Muslim relations are not always already doomed.

Throughout the reports, references to religion are also prominent. In Chapter Two, I noted that religion was a key element when it came to framing Jewish-Muslim relations. The difference here is that in my newspaper sample, this was in general a negative frame, which is to say that religion—and more precisely religious conflict and misunderstanding—was often cited as the reason why Jewish-Muslim relations were so troubled. In the reports and documentary, however, religion (and in particular the affinities between religions) is presented as a point of solidarity. Indeed, discussions between participants and locals during the trip that carefully and dynamically engages with Jewish, Christian, and Islamic scriptures are foregrounded

in the documentary and reports. Furthermore, during the trip, religious participants would pray together, seemingly blending all three Abrahamic practices.

Furthermore, the participants also gestured towards intersectionality, explicitly discussing the interconnected marginalizations involving gender, race, religion, and sexuality together. The very verses that are chosen for their combined prayers are interpreted or reinterpreted and presented in a way that both affirms the sexual and gender identities and the religious identities of the participants. The participants, then, drew on broad discourses on gender, sexuality, race, and religion in order to recognize the interconnectedness of discriminations through which a different platform for Jewish-Muslim relations in France can emerge. Beit Haverim's report of the trip concluded that the groups drew on their shared position as LGBTs "pour montrer que nous pouvons être à l'avant-garde et faire avancer la compréhension de l'autre pour un mieux vivre ensemble" ("Témoignages de retour du voyage arc-en-ciel" 2011). Implicitly, the associations appeared to be arguing that a true universalism must be intersectional and that this intersectional universalism, a version of the pluralist tradition of universalism described in the introduction to this thesis, can be the basis for a different narrative of Jewish-Muslim relations.

When the participants returned to France at the end of November 2011, however, they were immediately faced with a series of challenges that would eventually spell the end of this queer Jewish-Muslim experiment. HM2F suddenly found themselves accused of participating in the pinkwashing of Israel and boycotted by a series of Arab LGBT associations, including Al-Qaws, a grassroots Palestinian LGBT organization, and Imaan, a London-based LGBT support group. Al-Qaws accused HM2F of "supporting the apartheid state" and deemed the initiative "a new form of imperialism" (Maikey 2011). HM2F, which had sought to join the informal network of queer Arab and Muslim associations across the world, was now

disavowed by a large section of these groups. At the time, HM2F and Beit Haverim insisted that the joint trip was "apolitical" in nature and, first and foremost, a dialogue "entre les spiritualités." In early November 2011, a joint press release announcing the trip stated that "les trois associations revendiquent une démarche indépendante des partis politiques (en France comme en Israël et en Palestine), des autorités religieuses, de toute subvention publique ou privée, de toute forme d'idéologie" (Beit Haverim et al. 2011).

Clearly, the associations sought to present the trip as apolitical and purely spiritual or cultural. When I asked Zahed why they sought to do this, he told me that they were aware of the potential criticisms that HM2F and Beit Haverim could respectively face as a Muslim group travelling to Israel and as a Jewish group travelling to Palestine. Yet, such a trip could never have been truly apolitical, given the historical and socio-political context of Palestine and Israel. Furthermore, the itinerary of the trip, which included meetings with the French consul in Jerusalem, the French ambassador in Tel-Aviv, and a member of the Knesset—which was followed by a tour of the Knesset—was in clear contradiction with the avowed apolitical designation. Nevertheless, the documentary and the reports repeatedly stress the apolitical and spiritual nature of the trip. Zahed emphasized to me how crucial it was to project an apolitical front: "On était préparés qu'il fallait gérer les choses de manière le plus apolitique possible. On s'était dit avant de partir, 'pas de politique.' La politique, dès qu'on l'introduit, ça complique tout."

There are several ways to explain the disconnect between a clearly political trip and the repeated insistence on apoliticalness. It could simply be a case of exuberant naivety. Perhaps, caught up in trying to be at the avant-garde of Queer-Jewish-Muslim dialogue, the organizers and participants lost sight of the complex realities of the terrain into which they had entered. Or perhaps, it may have been that HM2F and Beit

Haverim were hyper-aware of the complex realities and sought to de-contextualize their trip through an affirmation of apoliticalness. Indeed, this might also explain the de-contextualized collaboration between the mahJ and the IMA. When the identity categories of "Jew" and "Muslim" are constructed in opposition to each other and overdetermined by the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, in addition to an entire range of other politicized binaries, de-contextualization and emphasizing one's "apolitical" nature might be perceived as a way to mitigate the pressures of binary Jewishness and Muslimness. In practice, of course, this was not realistic. No matter the intentions, their initiative, like any other, was always already likely to be overdetermined (and recuperated) by broader political discourses on Israel and Palestine.

Beit Haverim and HM2F did briefly provide an unexpectedly queer narrative of Jewish-Muslim relations in France, from outside of France. They drew attention to the interconnectedness of racism, sexism, homophobia, and transphobia. They affirmed their sexuality and their Jewish and Muslim identities in relation to, on the one hand, normative understandings of Judaism and Islam and of Jewish-Muslim relations and, on the other hand, inclusive re-imaginings of these traditions, identities and relations. Yet, on their return to France, and, perhaps, precisely because they sought to de-contextualize their trip, they were faced with accusations of pinkwashing and, in some ways, forced to react to these accusations as French Jews and Muslims, with all the assumptions underpinning these fixed identity categories. Soon after, the relationship between the two groups disintegrated. Ultimately, we are left with both a queer promise of solidarity *and* the rupture caused by the seemingly inevitable eruption of both the constraints of French republicanism and the spectre of Israel and Palestine.

4.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, I analysed my interviews with contemporary interreligious dialogue practitioners. Focusing on the primary themes that emerged from these interviews, i.e. media and power, diverging affiliations, and intersecting affiliations, I also analysed the ongoing collaboration between the mahJ and the IMA as well as the past collaboration between the now defunct HM2F and Beit Haverim. In doing so, I detailed several key findings. First, many of my interviewees believed it to be important for contemporary dialogue initiatives to emphasize the intersection between the historical and contemporary marginalizations of Jews and Muslims in France. They saw this as both an important context for understanding contemporary Jewish-Muslim relations and as a basis on which future solidarities can be constructed. Secondly, many interviewees, most notably from Convivencia and SOS Racisme expressed a distrust of media professionals and politicians when it came to the way that this influential group of actors represented Jews and Muslims. Third, associations like Convivencia, Coexister, and SOS Racisme engage with the dominant republican framework in such a way to renew understandings of universalism, beyond assimilation and the invisibilization of minority difference.

Yet, my discussion of Edouard's initiatives, as well as the collaborations between the mahJ and the IMA and between HM2F and Beit Haverim, demonstrate that, despite good will, traditional understandings of interreligious dialogue might not be best suited to the task of articulating rich, complex, and multiple identities without being caught in the contradictions of republicanism. What is often taken for granted in the endeavour of interreligious dialogue is that the principal objective is to – pardon the clichés – bring people together or bridge divides. In other words, interreligious dialogue presumes the existence– and the vital importance – of discrete, homogenous (ethno-)religious identity categories. The objective, then, would be to use

dialogue to overcome the apparent differences between these identity categories. Paradoxically, as I have been suggesting throughout this chapter, interreligious dialogue, when de-contextualized, appears to reinforce these differences.

Essentially, this chapter demonstrates that, in the past couple of years, a new politically conscious and intersectional model for doing Jewish-Muslim dialogue has emerged in contrast to older models of mostly theological interreligious dialogue. Each chapter of this thesis demonstrates that Jewish and Muslim identity categories in contemporary France are heavily politicized and polarized. Nevertheless, this chapter argues that de-contextualized interreligious dialogue is ill-equipped to navigate this polarization because, by neglecting to take into account the role of the state and its dominant republican ideology in shaping these polarized identities, it constructs religion or ethnicity as the problem. While the most egregious examples of this highlighted in this chapter are Edouard's and Michel Serfaty's initiatives, de-contextualized, "apolitical" dialogue has derailed or undermined other initiatives, such as the collaboration between HM2F and Beit Haverim, as well as that of the mahJ and the IMA.

In contrast, Convivencia, Coexister, and SOS Racisme's *Salam, Shalom, Salut* project explicitly contextualize and historicize their dialogue initiatives. Instead of limiting themselves to a set of de-contextualized affirmations of the religious or cultural similarities of Islam and Judaism, they actively de-essentialize Jewish and Muslim identities by not avoiding, for example, the role of colonization in the hardening of Jewish and Muslim identities. Just as importantly, they ground their initiatives in concrete social action and mutual aid. Despite the challenges of sustainability that they face, it is clear that a newer generation is diversifying the landscape of interreligious dialogue. In conclusion, by examining how a variety of social actors engage with and navigate the category of Jewish-Muslim relations and

interreligious dialogue, we get a glimpse of the power of the discourse of identity and relations and the trap of binary, republican secularist frameworks, *but* also the potential for individuals to reach beyond and find solidarity beyond polarized images through a politically-conscious approach rooted in social action.

Chapter Five: Conclusions

This thesis, based on several years of research on news reporting, novels, and interreligious dialogue initiatives, has shown that, in the twenty-first century, Jewishness and Muslimness in France continue to be consistently constructed and represented discursively as mutually exclusive and oppositional identity categories. This binary rendering of Jewishness and Muslimness is so influential and dominant that well-intentioned, organized attempts at developing counter-discourses face significant challenges that sometimes prove to be insurmountable. As such, this thesis has been less about Jewish-Muslim relations per se and more about the supposed insurmountability of Jewish-Muslim tensions. This thesis was guided by two central, driving questions: First, how do dominant discourses on Jewish-Muslim relations construct Jews and Muslims as mutually exclusive, oppositional groups? Secondly, how are these dominant discourses reflected in interreligious dialogue initiatives and novelistic writing?

Precisely because of the type of questions I sought to address, I adopted a decidedly interdisciplinary approach, rooted at the intersection of cultural studies, literary criticism, applied linguistics, and sociology. My interdisciplinary approach examined a varied corpus of newspaper articles (Chapter Two), novels (Chapter Three), and interreligious dialogue initiatives (Chapter Four). Focusing on the post-second Intifada period (2000–present), marked by increasing polarization of Jewish and Muslim identities, I adopted a diverse set of methodological tools to examine this corpus: frame analysis, corpus linguistics, discourse analysis, thematic analysis, semi-structured key informant interviews, and participant observation. While Chapter Two demonstrates, through a detailed, systematic analysis of *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro* articles about Jews and Muslims from 2000 to 2017, that the narrative of polarization carefully charted in the twentieth century by historians Maud Mandel (2014) and

Ethan Katz (2015) remains a dominant structuring force in twenty-first century French society, Chapters Three and Four revealed the ways in which contemporary French Jewish and Muslim writers and interreligious activists navigate this narrative of polarization *and* the demands of republican universalism, as they attempt to enact and engage in Jewish-Muslim dialogue beyond polarization.

In the course of this thesis, it has become evident that answering the above questions goes beyond solely focusing on Jews and Muslims in France. Indeed, my emphasis on minority representation and experience—in this thesis and elsewhere—is grounded in my belief that focusing on the particular cases of minority groups enables us to better understand structural societal issues and deeply-held social norms. Thus, in focusing on the ways in which a dominant narrative of inherently tense and troubled Jewish-Muslim relations is defined and constructed by media professionals and on the ways in which contemporary novelists and interreligious activists formulate their visions of intergroup relations against this backdrop, this thesis, building on the work of scholars such as Max Silverman (1992), Alec Hargreaves (2005), Jennifer Fredette (2014), and Jean Beaman (2017), also uncovers the central blind spots and contradictions of French republican universalism.

As Chapter One displays, debates over the public display of difference in France take place within the dominant socio-political framework of assimilationist republican universalism. As discussed, at its most basic definition, universalism in France refers to the state's obligation to treat all French citizens equally, regardless of their particular differences. Over time, however, and especially in the twenty-first century, universalism has gradually been reframed by polemical and political figures in more overtly nationalist terms. An inherently abstract concept, republican universalism has become a cover for French nationalism. It holds visible ethnic and religious minorities, especially Muslims, to a higher standard than it does their white,

Catholic-background counterparts (see Silverman 1992, 2007; Downing 2019) . Within such a context, visible minorities perpetually run the risk of being labelled *communautariste*. The ever-present spectre of *communautarisme* therefore colours, and complicates, both the work of Jewish and Muslim novelists and the dialogue initiatives of Jewish and Muslim activists. By examining how novelists and activists relate to a normative, oppositional category of "Jewish-Muslim relations," within a republican universalist context, this thesis demonstrates, first, how this dominant narrative helps determine Jewish and Muslim identities in the public sphere and, secondly, shapes the terrain on which interactions between Jews and Muslims occur.

Chapter One draws on several historical studies on Jews and Muslims in North Africa and France to establish the fact that Jewish-Muslim relations in France have never actually been a binary affair. Rather, it has always been a "triangular" relationship (Katz 2015: 24-25). In other words, Jewish-Muslim relations in France, from the onset of colonization, have been significantly structured through interactions with the French state, from the *ordonnance royale* of 1834, which formed the legal basis for the exclusion of Jews and Muslims, as *indigènes*, from full French citizenship to the 1865 *sénatus-consulte*, which opened a pathway (that almost no one would take) to citizenship, requiring Jews and Muslims to renounce their "statut personnel" as Jews and Muslims, which is to say their particular religious identities, to the 1870 *décret Crémieux*, which automatically accorded Algerian Jews full French citizenship (that they would nonetheless be stripped of by the Vichy regime in 1940), whether they wanted it or not, while still maintaining Algerian Muslims in a subordinate position where they continued to be subjects unless they renounced their "statut personnel" as Muslims, a subordination and exclusion that would be codified by the *Code de l'indigénat*.

This historical context shows how the two populations were affected by colonization in strikingly different ways. Numerous historians have also documented the ways in which other ethnic colonised groups throughout colonial empires were strategically differentiated and separated by colonial apparatuses. In the case of Jews and Muslims in North Africa and France, this initial separation, codified in the nineteenth century, would continue to be imbued with distinct meanings throughout the twentieth century, in relation to, among other factors, the Algerian war of independence, the question of Palestine, and international and domestic terrorism. This two-century-long history of the codification of Jewish and Muslim separation and the progressive crystallization of Jewishness and Muslimness as separate identities as a function of domestic and international politics is often neglected in French print media discourse on Jewish-Muslim relations, as shown in Chapter Two. Instead, the dominant discourse in newspaper reporting on Jews and Muslims is one of inherent polarization and tension.

As Chapter One demonstrates, there is a longer story to this narrative of polarization. Especially since the 1960s and 1970s, the immigration of Muslims from North and sub-Saharan Africa, as well as their supposed lack of integration into French society, has provoked much debate in French politics and media. Such continuing debates take place in the inflamed contemporary context, whereby distinctions between domestic and international spheres are elided, of anti-Muslim and anti-Jewish discourse and acts of violence, bombings and terrorist attacks, sometimes related to Middle Eastern conflicts; the growing electoral success of the far-right political party Front National; and a series of legislations and rulings on legal and illegal immigration, racial discrimination, and the public display of religious symbols mostly targeting Muslim women who veil. During the same period, relations between Jews and Muslims in France have consequently been increasingly depicted

in binary and conflictual terms. Over several decades in the mid-twentieth century, Jewish and Muslim activists and communal leaders as well as, more importantly, French authorities and media professionals, blurred the lines between domestic Jewish-Muslim interactions and international conflicts, thus encouraging an interpretative lens that identified North African Jews and Muslims with Israel and Palestine, respectively (Mandel 2014: 80-124; Katz 2015: 242-78). As a result, polarization, tension, and conflict became the fundamental framework for understanding and representing Jewish-Muslim relations, in particular following the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. This narrative of polarization continues to obscure a more nuanced history and reality of the actual range of interactions between Jews and Muslims in France and North Africa.

Jews and Muslims in France have never formed singular communities and never interacted with each other solely as Jews and Muslims, which is to say as the sole function of a set of more or less rigid ethnoreligious identity categories. Instead, on-the-ground interactions between individual Jews and Muslims often take place as a function of a variety of other identifications, solidarities, and experiences. In other words, there is no one Jewish community, no one Muslim community, and no inherent, easily discernible set of Jewish-Muslim relations. Indeed, this entire thesis began from the perspective that individuals who self-identify in any way as Jews or Muslims relate to each other neither primarily nor solely on the basis of these ethnoreligious categories. Nevertheless, media discourse has consistently constructed Jews and Muslims as two separate, homogeneous communities whose relations are necessarily oppositional and tense.

Thus, in Chapter Two, focusing on the representation of Jews and Muslims in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*, I examined news reporting by employing frame analysis, corpus linguistics, and discourse analysis. My analysis identified 9 primary frames:

religion, Israel-Palestine, new antisemitism, youth, school, memory, similarity, Jewish Islamophobia, and *communautarisme*, all within a broader groupist perspective. The articles employed a set of discursive strategies (recourse to authority, vagueness, individualization/assimilation, and personalisation/impersonalization), intersecting with these frames, to construct a narrative blaming Muslims for tense Jewish-Muslim relations. Crucially, there was little difference between the newspapers, which implicitly constructed 'Jews' and 'Muslims' as separate oppositional communities, whose members act in accordance to the normative logic of their group membership and interact with each other (i.e. Jews with Muslims and Muslims with Jews) exclusively as a function of religion and race. In other words, in newspaper reporting, Jews and Muslims are constructed singular communities whose relations are inherently tense and problematic. Regardless of a supposedly left-right political divide that would oppose *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*, Chapter Two shows how the two newspapers share a similar interpretative lens when it comes to Jewish-Muslim relations, thus evidencing the dominant, widespread nature of this manner of understanding relations between Jews and Muslims.

Most importantly, Jewish-Muslim relations, in news reporting, are portrayed as asymmetrical and overdetermined by the antisemitism and violence of French Muslims against French Jews, the latter often depicted as defenceless, passive victims in need of saving by the French state. Furthermore, Jews are more likely to be represented in positive terms, especially as an integrated minority, while Muslims are more likely to be represented in negative terms, in particular as, at best, not fully integrated or, at worst, having (Islamic) values that are at odds with French society and republican values. As a result, consumers of such one-sided reporting are primed to identify with one 'side' over the other, in this case the (Jewish) victim over the (Muslim) aggressor. In this way, even without necessarily being about Jewish-Muslim

relations, such reporting portrays relations between Jews and Muslims as inherently troubled in post-2000 France.

In Chapter Three, I turned to literary representations to examine how authors make use of fiction to mediate the polarized narratives of Jewish-Muslim relations found more broadly in the French public sphere. I focused on three contemporary novels: Emilie Frèche's *Le sourire de l'ange*, Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf's *Ce sont nos frères et leurs enfants sont nos enfants*, and Thierry Cohen's *Avant la haine*. I found that the main themes in the three novels reflected those of the newspaper articles in Chapter Two: 1) Israel-Palestine, 2) the Shoah and the Second World War, 3) religion, 4) Maghrebiness, 5) new antisemitism, 6) communautarisme, 7) terrorism, and 8) memory. While this suggests that these themes exist more broadly in contemporary France, the novels engaged with them in different ways to the newspapers. For instance, the newspaper articles generally evoke the antisemitism or anti-Zionism of Muslims to explain why Jewish-Muslim relations are so troubled. In contrast, the novels use multiple characters and tell their stories from a variety of perspectives in order to engage with the question of Jewish-Muslim relations from a more complex and nuanced standpoint. Moreover, and somewhat counter-intuitively, these works of fiction are perhaps more realistic than relatively short newspaper articles on Jews and Muslims in the daily press. More importantly, the novels attempt, to differing degrees, to highlight the fluidity and diversity of interactions between Jews and Muslims instead of the relatively fixed and over-determined category of Jewish-Muslim relations. Yet, contrasting these recent novels with Joann Sfar's graphic novel *Le Chat du rabbin*, Farid Boudjellal's *Juif-Arabe* bande-dessinées, the stand-up comedy of Younès and Bambi, as well as Romain Gary's 1975 novel *La Vie devant soi*, I argued that the three contemporary novels do not display a critical engagement with identity categories and, moreover, end up reproducing, to a large extent, the contemporary

image of fixed Jewish and Muslim identities and tense relations. Cohen's novel does, it is true, provide the historical contextualization underpinning the gradual hardening of identities and relations. Indeed the very title—*Avant la haine*—suggests a longer history that explains the development of a contemporary "haine" between Jews and Muslims. Cohen's novel, certainly more so than Frèche's or Hathroubi-Safsaf's, provides a novelistic account, through the perspective of the two protagonists, of how domestic and international politics intersected throughout the colonial and post-colonial period to polarizing effects. Yet, all three novels choose not to articulate a present or a future of meaningful, positive, or even neutral interactions between Jews and Muslims. As a result, despite their promise, these novels are not merely narratives of polarization, but narratives of fatalism. Indeed, as Joseph Ford (forthcoming 2021) suggests in his study of French-language Algerian literature on the Algerian Civil War, literature is not always emancipatory and can instead reflect and reproduce the polarized discourses that are a part of the socio-political context of their conception and that contributed to 'real-life' conflict in the first place.

Finally, in Chapter Four, I examined contemporary interreligious dialogue initiatives in France, drawing on a set of key-informant interviews. These interviews revealed a set of common topics that I grouped under the themes of media and power, diverging affiliations, and intersecting affiliations. Focusing on these themes, I went on to analyse a set of collaborations between, first, two museum-institutions, the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire du Judaïsme (mahJ) and the Institut du Monde Arabe (IMA) and, second, two LGBT associations, the now defunct Homosexuels musulmans de France (HM2F) and Beit Haverim. I found that, for many of my interviewees, interreligious dialogue was a moral imperative. Several of them sought to emphasize the shared marginalizations of Jews and Muslims in modern and contemporary France. This was presented as an important contextual element to contemporary

Jewish-Muslim relations. Moreover, some of my interviewees saw this shared history as the basis for building solidarity between Jews and Muslims today. Many interviewees also revealed their deep distrust of media and politicians, in particular in relation to their representation of Jews and Muslims. Against this, they sought to emphasize the shared position of Jews and Muslims in historical and contemporary French society. Most importantly, some of the associations I examined, such as Convivencia and Coexister demonstrated a critical, pluralist engagement with the dominant republican framework in France, moving beyond its normative impulses of universalism, assimilation, and the invisibilization of minority ethnic difference.

At the same time, however, the examples of the mahJ, IMA, HM2F, and Beit Haverim, where dialogue is de-contextualized and de-politicized, suggest the significant challenges that conventional forms of interreligious dialogue face. Interreligious dialogue, at its core, presumes both the existence and salience of separate religious identity categories. Taking these categories as basic building blocks of social life, practitioners then promote interreligious dialogue as a way to overcome the supposed differences between identity categories. However, when interreligious dialogue is de-contextualized and de-politicized, these homogenous identity categories are hardened and the supposed differences between them are not mitigated, but reinforced. Chapter Four's main thrust is that two main models of interreligious dialogues currently exist in contemporary France: first, a relatively new politically conscious model and, secondly, an older, mostly theological, de-contextualized, and de-politicized model. The other chapters in this thesis show that Jewishness and Muslimness in contemporary France are increasingly polarized identity categories. Chapter Four argues that de-contextualized and de-politicized dialogue initiatives face additional barriers when it comes to challenging this polarization precisely because they do not account for the state's role in shaping these

polarized identities through its republican ideology. Thus, such initiatives implicitly construct religion and ethnicity as the most important problem facing a so-called *vivre ensemble*. In short, Chapter Four demonstrates both the continued dominance of the discourse of identity and universalist, secularist frameworks, but also the tenuous promise of finding solidarity beyond polarization through a contextualized and politically-conscious approach.

While this thesis sought to answer the two questions stated above, it really stems from an even simpler one, albeit deceptively so: "what are Jewish-Muslim relations?" As I have shown, media professionals, politicians, and others in France have often taken the very existence of the category of Jewish-Muslim relations for granted. Yet, as I have been arguing implicitly, such a thing may not really exist. After all, what ends up being classed as Jewish-Muslim relations and what does not? When an individual who happens to be Muslim buys bread from their local bakery, whose owner happens to be Jewish, is this an example of Jewish-Muslim relations? When colleagues who happen to be Jewish and Muslim work together on a project, is that Jewish-Muslim relations too? Or do interactions only count as Jewish-Muslim relations when they are explicitly framed as such, and especially when they fit a particular model of tension and polarization?

An anecdote from Yulia Egorova's (2018) recent ethnography of Jews and Muslims in South Asia can help us make sense of this. Upon witnessing several Muslim weddings taking place in the courtyard of a synagogue in a particular Indian city, an American traveller she met tells Egorova that this was an amazing occurrence that certainly would not happen back home. When Egorova put this to an Indian Jewish friend familiar with the neighbourhood of the synagogue, he replied in purely pragmatic terms: "There are a lot of Muslims living in this area and that courtyard is a good place for a wedding. Why not use it?" (2018: 89). What was an exceptional

occurrence for Egorova's American interlocutor was simply a set of practical interactions for her Indian Jewish friend.

The reason why the Muslim weddings in the synagogue could appear to be remarkable, amazing, or improbable to an American observer is because there exists in Europe and North America, especially, but also beyond, a dominant image, perceptible in media and political discourse, of Jewish-Muslim relations. And the Muslim weddings in the synagogue do not cohere with that image, which is one of polarization and conflict overdetermined by geopolitical issues, especially involving Israel and Palestine. In the French context, this thesis has argued that, despite the diversity and fluidity of interactions between Jews and Muslims in France throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, politicians and media professionals have consistently blurred the national and the international spheres and perceived Jewish and Muslim minorities through an essentialist, transnational, geopolitical lens.

At a fundamental level, the problem with the discourse of Jewish-Muslim relations or intercommunal relations in general is that they only work as concepts for understanding interpersonal and intergroup relationships if people solely or primarily interact with each other as a function of specific communal identities. This is, however, neither always nor even mostly the case (see Brubaker 2004; Sen 2006). When the diversity of possible and actual interactions between people who happen to be Jewish or Muslim is subsumed into a nebulous category of Jewish-Muslim relations, especially when this category is, in the French context and beyond, heavily politicized, we lose sight of lived experience with all its varied perspectives, registers, and contingencies. In light of this, my findings also suggests that the category of Jewish-Muslim relations may reveal more about how Islamophobia functions in contemporary France than the range of actual interactions between individuals who identify to some extent as Jewish or Muslim.

In the end, this thesis argues that the category of Jewish-Muslim relations in France does not reflect actual interactions between Jews and Muslim, but rather the construction of symbolic 'Jews' and 'Muslims'. As this thesis has established, in France, Jews and Muslims are constructed in popular and political discourse as separate and in opposition, in part due to how Islamophobia functions in France and beyond. The category of Jewish-Muslim relations (often reduced to an asymmetric relation between antisemitic, aggressive Muslims and passive, victimized Jews) is one of several nodal points in the discursive network of contemporary Islamophobia, along with others such as Muslim misogyny, homophobia, intolerance, and, generally, illiberalism. Against this conception of Jewish-Muslim relations, this thesis has sought to emphasize the complex, diverse and contingent nature of interactions, relations, solidarities, and conflicts between Jews and Muslims in contemporary France. At the same time, however, my research shows how interpersonal interactions can be significantly affected by the broader, more dominant image of Jewish-Muslim relations as defined by conflict and polarization. By looking at how media professionals, novelists, and interreligious dialogue practitioners, as well as other interested parties, engage with and navigate the category of Jewish-Muslim relations, this thesis documents its discursive power, but also emphasises the potential for individuals to reach beyond and find solidarity beyond polarized notions. As a whole, this thesis demonstrates, first, how the dominant discourse of Jewish-Muslim relations is constructed and, secondly, how novelists and interreligious dialogue practitioners might navigate and attempt to—or fail to—go beyond this discourse. More broadly, I hope that this research will contribute to wider discussions of the politics of identity and the crystallization and marginalization of others as *others* both in contemporary France and beyond.

As such, my future research will incorporate detailed, ethnographic analyses of contemporary on-the-ground interactions between Jews and Muslims in France. In doing so, I hope to build on the findings of this thesis in order to further understand how representations and lived experiences work as co-constitutive processes in the context of interethnic and interreligious relations. In future research, I also hope to analyse a larger sample that is more representative of media, in general. In addition, while this thesis has partly focused on novelists in terms of cultural representations, future research should also consider how other media represent Jewish-Muslim relations. For example, I have recently begun to consider how stand-up comedy might function as a particularly potent form of socio-political commentary on Jewish-Muslim relations (see Bharat 2020). What might make stand-up comedy—or humour, more broadly—a more trenchant form of critique than novels when it comes to Jewish-Muslim relations? This is a question that I hope to answer more comprehensively in my future research.

I have also suggested that Jewish-Muslim relations in contemporary France, as a category, is not useful for understanding interactions between people who happen to be Jewish or Muslim. Instead, I have argued that Jewish-Muslim relations, overdetermined by the supposedly inherent antisemitism of Muslims, is one of several components of contemporary Islamophobia. As such, I hope to expand on this idea by exploring each of these components of Islamophobia in more detail, by focusing on how Muslims are represented as fundamentally dangerous to Jews, LGBT people, women, atheists, secularists, and, more generally, liberals and what impact this has on daily life. Ultimately, 'Jewish-Muslim relations' is implicated more than just interactions between Jews and Muslims.

Bibliography

"Enlever sa kippa? Le conseil du consistoire de Marseille fait débat," *L'Express*, January 12, 2016. https://www.lexpress.fr/actualite/societe/le-consistoire-de-marseille-incite-les-juifs-de-la-ville-a-ne-pas-porter-la-kippa_1752902.html Last accessed June 9, 2020.

"Islam, le temps des polémiques," *Culture et dépendance*, France 3, May 15, 2002.

"La communauté juive prône aussi l'ouverture," *Le Parisien*, November 9, 2004. www.leparisien.fr/essonne-91/la-communaute-juive-prone-aussi-l-ouverture-09-11-2004-2005440959.php Last accessed March 24, 2020.

"Le Consistoire de Marseille 'incite' les juifs à enlever la kippa," *Europe1*, January 12, 2016. www.europe1.fr/societe/le-consistoire-de-marseille-incite-les-juifs-a-enlever-la-kippa-2649127 Last accessed June 9, 2020.

"Les associations en France," *associations.gouv.fr*. https://www.associations.gouv.fr/les-associations-en-france.html Last modified October 3, 2016. Last accessed March 7, 2020.

"Missions," *imarabe.org*. https://www.imarabe.org/fr/missions-fonctionnement/missions Last accessed March 7, 2020.

"Projet scientifique et culturel," *mahj.org*, October 4, 2017. https://www.mahj.org/fr/decouvrir-qui-sommes-nous/projet-scientifique-et-culturel Last accessed March 7, 2020.

"Témoignages de retour du voyage arc-en-ciel en Israël et Palestine," *Beit-Haverim.com*, December 28, 2011. https://beit-haverim.com/temoignages-de-retour-du-voyage-arc-en-ciel-en-israel-et-palestine-2011/ Last accessed March 7, 2020.

"Une « répliques » de trop," *Médiapart*, October 13, 2015. https://blogs.mediapart.fr/edition/les-invites-de-mediapart/article/131015/une-repliques-de-trop Last accessed June 9, 2020.

"Voyage Israël / Palestine en novembre 2011," *Beit-Haverim.com*, March 3, 2011. https://beit-haverim.com/voyage-israelpalestine-en-novembre-2011/ Last accessed March 7, 2020.

ACPM. "Nombre de tirages print par mois du quotidien français Le Figaro en France en 2016." *Statista - The Statistics Portal, Statista*, fr.statista.com/statistiques/534124/le-figaro-journal-tirages-print-mensuels-France Last accessed August 10, 2018.

Ageron, Charles-Robert. *Histoire de l'Algérie contemporaine, 1871-1954*. Presses Universitaires de France, 1979.

Alcalay, Ammiel. "Intellectual Life," *The Jews of the Middle East and North Africa in Modern Times*, edited by Reeva Spector Simon, Michael Menachem Laskier, and Sara Reguer. Columbia University Press, 2003.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 1983.

Anidjar, Gil. *The Jew, the Arab: A History of the Enemy*. Stanford University Press, 2003.

Arenberg, Nancy. "Silence and anguish: Muting the feminine voice in Éliette Abécassis's *La Répudiée*," *French Cultural Studies*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2018, pp. 244-253.

Arkin, Kimberly. *Rhinestones, Religion, and the Republic: Fashioning Jewishness in France*, Stanford University Press, 2014.

Ayora-Diaz, Steffan Igor. *Foodscapes, Foodfields, and Identities in the Yucatán. Berghahn*, 2012.

Attal, Sylvain. *La Plaie : enquête sur le nouvel antisémitisme*. Denoël, 2004.

Ayoun, Richard. "Le décret Crémieux et l'insurrection de 1871 en Algérie," *Revue d'Histoire Moderne & Contemporaine*, vol. 35, no.1, 1988, pp. 61-87.

Badiou, Alain and Eric Hazan. *L'Antisémitisme partout: Aujourd'hui en France.* La Fabrique, 2011.

Bahloul, Joëlle. *The Architecture of Memory*, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Baker, Paul and Erez Levon. "Picking the right cherries? A comparison of corpus-based and qualitative analyses of news articles about masculinity," *Discourse & Communication*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2015, pp. 221-236.

Baker, Paul, Costas Gabrielatos, and Tony McEnery (Editors). *Discourse analysis and media attitudes: the representation of Islam in the British press*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Balibar, Etienne. "Un nouvel antisémitisme ?" *Antisémitisme: L'intolérable chantage*, edited by Étienne Balibar, Rony Brauman, Judith Butler, Sylvain Cypel, Éric Hazan, Daniel Lindenberg, Marc Saint-Upéry, Denis Sieffert, and Michel Warschawski. La découverte, 2003, pp. 89-96.

Bancel, Nicolas. "L'ethnicisation des discours politiques," *Vers la guerre des identités ? De la fracture coloniale à la révolution ultranationale*, edited by Pascal

Blanchard, Dominic Thomas, and Nicolas Bancel. La Découverte, 2016, pp. 155-169.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cornell University Press, 1991.

Bastié, Eugénie. "L'immigration massive, cause ou symptôme du malaise français?" *Le Figaro*, Sep. 5, 2017, p. 16.

Beaman, Jean. *Citizen Outsider: Children of North African Immigrants in France*, University of California Press, 2017.

Beit Haverim, David et Jonathan, and HM2F. "Trois associations LGBT à caractère culturel et spirituel – juive, chrétienne, musulmane – se réunissent pour un voyage de rencontre et de dialogue en Israël et Palestine." Press release. November 4, 2011. https://www.davidetjonathan.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Israel_Palestine_Rencontre_Spiritualite_LGBT_20111106.pdf Last accessed May 31, 2020.

Bell, Allan. *The Language of News Media*. John Wiley & Sons, 1991.

Benbassa, Esther. *Histoire des Juifs de France: de l'Antiquité à nos jours.* Seuil, 1998.

Benson, Rodney. *Shaping Immigration News: A French-American Comparison.* Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Berkani, Derri. *Une résistance oubliée: La Mosquée de Paris de 40 à 44*, 1991. Documentary.

Berlant, Laura and Jay Prosser. "Life Writing and Intimate Publics: A Conversation with Lauren Berlant," *Biography*, vol. 34, no. 1, 2011, pp. 180-187.

Berlant, Laura. *Cruel Optimism*. Duke University Press, 2011.

Berlant, Lauren. "The commons: Infrastructures for troubling times," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2016, pp. 393-419.

Bhabha, Homi. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," *October*, vol. 28, 1984, pp. 125–133.

Bharat, Adi S. "Next year in Jerusalem? 'La nouvelle judéophobie', neo-crypto-Judaism and the future of French Jews in Éliette Abécassis's *Alyah*," *French Cultural Studies*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2018, pp. 228-243.

Bharat, Adi Saleem "*Shalom alikoum!* Challenging the conflictual model of Jewish-Muslim relations in France through stand-up comedy," in *Jewish-Muslim Interactions: Performing Cultures in North Africa and France*, edited by Samuel Sami Everett and Rebekah Vince. Francophone Postcolonial Studies Series, Liverpool University Press, 2020.

Bokobza, Serge. “Expressions of Jewish Identity in French Cinema: The 'Total Jew',” *The French Review*, vol. 85, no. 5, 2012, pp. 888-903.

Bond, Lucy and Jessica Rapson. “Introduction,” *Transcultural Turn: Interrogating Memory Between and Beyond Borders*, edited by Lucy Bond, Jessica Rapson, and Astrid Erll. De Gruyter, 2014, pp. 1-26.

Boniface, Pascal. *Est-il permis de critiquer Israël?* Laffont, 2003.

Bonnafous, Simone, Bernard Herszberg, and Jean-Jacques Israel (Eds.). Sans distinction de ... race [special issue]. *Mots/Langage du politique*, vol. 33, 1992, pp. 5-399.

Boum, Aomar. *Memories of Absence: How Muslims Remember Jews in Morocco*. Stanford University Press, 2013.

Bourget, Carine. *The Star, the Cross, and the Crescent: Religions and Conflicts in Francophone Literature from the Arab World*. Lexington Books, 2010.

Bowen, John. *Can Islam Be French? Pluralism and Pragmatism in a Secularist State.* Princeton University Press, 2010.

Brenner, Emmanuel [Georges Bensoussan]. *Les Territoires perdus de la République : antisémitisme, racisme et sexisme en milieu scolaire*. Mille et une nuits, 2002.

Brenner, Emmanuel [Georges Bensoussan]. *France, prends garde de perdre ton âme : fracture sociale et antisémitisme dans la République*. Mille et une nuits, 2004.

Brett, Michael. “Legislating for Inequality in Algeria: The Sénatus-Consulte of 14th July 1865,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 51 (3), 1988: pp. 451-465.

Broussard, Philippe. “Le malaise persistant des juifs de France.” *Le Monde*, Sept. 20, 2003, p. 12.

Brown, Laura. “Not Outside the Range: One Feminist Perspective on Psychic Trauma,” *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, edited by Cathy Caruth. John Hopkins University Press, 1995, pp. 100-112.

Brown, Malcolm D. “Comparative Analysis of Mainstream Discourses, Media Narratives and Representations of Islam in Britain and France Prior to 9/11,” *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2006, pp. 297-312.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Harvard University Press, 2004.

Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. T. & T. Clark, 1937.

Cairns, Lucille. *Post-War Jewish Women’s Writing in French*. Legenda, 2011.

Cairns, Lucille. *Francophone Jewish Writers: Imagining Israel*. Liverpool University Press, 2015.

Camus, Jean-Yves and René Monzat. *Les Droites nationales et radicales en France: Répertoire critique*. Presses universitaires de Lyon, 1992.

Carroll, James. *Constantine's Sword: The Church and the Jews.* Mariner Books, 2001.

Carter, Robert T. "Racism and Psychological and Emotional Injury: Recognizing and Assessing Race-Based Traumatic Stress," *The Counseling Psychologist*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2007: 13-105.

Cesari, Jocelyne. *Être musulman en France: Associations, militants et mosquées*, Karthala-Iremam, 1994.

Cesari, Joceylne. "Securitization of Islam in Europe," *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 52, no. 1, 2012, pp. 430-449.

Chabal, Emile. *A Divided Republic: Nation, State and Citizenship in Contemporary France*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Chambers, Simone and Jeffrey Kopstein. "Civil Society and the State," in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*, edited by John S. Dryzek, Bonnie Honig, and Anne Phillips. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Chambon, Frédéric. "A Garges-lès-Gonesse, le fragile équilibre entre juifs et musulmans." *Le Monde*, Oct. 14, 2000, p. 14.

Chambon, Frédéric. "Comment des jeunes de banlieue sont gagné par la judéophobie." *Le Monde*, Apr. 12, 2002, p. 11.

Chambraud, Cécile. "Entretien. Joël Mergui: 'C'est à chaque citoyen de protéger la démocratie." *Le Monde*, Jan. 17, 2015, p. 8

Cheyette, Bryan. *Diasporas of the Mind: Jewish and Postcolonial Writing and the Nightmare of History.* Yale University Press, 2013.

Chouraqui, Jean-Marc. "La tradition juive confrontée à la modernité politique: l'exemple des rabbins français aux XIXe siècle," *Romantisme* 125 (3), 2004: 9-25.

Cohen, Cathy J. "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?" *GLQ*, vol. 3, no. 4, 1997, pp. 437-465.

Cohen, Cathy. "The Radical Potential Of Queer?: Twenty Years Later," *GLQ*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2019, pp. 140-144.

Cohen, Mark R. *Under Crescent and Cross: The Jews in the Middle Ages*. Princeton University Press, 1995.

Cohen, Martine. "Juifs et Musulmans en France: le modèle républicain d'intégration en question," *Sociétés contemporaines* 37 (1), 2000: 89-120.

Cohen, Thierry. *Avant la haine*. Flammarion, 2015.

Cole, Joshua. "Massacres and their historians: Recent Histories of State Violence in France and Algeria in the Twentieth Century," *French Politics, Culture & Society*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2010, pp. 106-126.

Cole, Joshua H. *Lethal Provocation: The Constantine Murders and the Politics of French Algeria*. Cornell University Press, 2019.

d'Ormesson, Jean. "Un journal d'écrivains," *Le Figaro*, May 5, 2011. http://www.lefigaro.fr/livres/2011/05/05/03005-20110505ARTFIG00520-un-journal-d-ecrivains.php Last accessed August 10, 2018.

David et Jonathan. *Les homosexuels ont-ils une âme ? Hommes et femmes de David & Jonathan*. L'Harmattan, 2008.

David et Jonathan, HM2F, and Beit Haverim. *Rencontres et dialogues en Israël et Palestine*. Documentary, 2011.

Davidson, Naomi. *Only Muslim: Embodying Islam in Twentieth-Century France*, Cornell University Press, 2012.

Debrauwere-Miller, Nathalie (ed.). *Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in the Francophone World*, Routledge, 2010.

De Gaulle, Charles. "Appel du 18 juin 1940," *Les Appels du Général de Gaulle*. Ordre de la libération, 1940. https://www.ordredelaliberation.fr/fr/les-appels-du-general-de-gaulle Last Accessed June 12, 2020.

Deltombe, Thomas. *L'islam imaginaire: La construction médiatique de l'islamophobie en France, 1975-2005*. La Découverte, 2005.

DeSaix, Deborah Durland and Karen Gray Ruelle. *The Grand Mosque of Paris: A Story of How Muslims Rescued Jews During the Holocaust*. Holiday House, 2009.

Devecchio, Alexandre. "Georges Bensoussan : «Nous assistons à l'émergence de deux peuples»," *FigaroVox*, August 14, 2015. https://www.lefigaro.fr/vox/societe/2015/08/14/31003-20150814ARTFIG00248-georges-bensoussan-nous-assistons-a-l-emergence-de-deux-peuples.php Last accessed June 9, 2020.

Dhume-Sonzogni, Fabrice. *Communautarisme: Enquête sur une chimère du nationalisme français*. Demopolis, 2016.

Dodds, Jerrilynn D., María Rosa Menocal, and Abigail Krasner Balbale. *The Arts of Intimacy: Christians, Jews, and Muslims in the Making of Castilian Culture*. Yale University Press, 2009.

Downing, Joseph. "Influences on State-Society Relations in France: Analysing Voluntary Associations and Multicultural Dynamism, Co-Option and

Retrenchment in Paris, Lyon and Marseille." *Ethnicities*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2016, pp. 452-469.

Downing, Joseph. *French Muslims in Perspective: Nationalism, Post-Colonialism and Marginalisation under the Republic*. Palgrave, 2019.

Draï, Raphaël. *Sous le signe de Sion : l'antisémitisme nouveau est arrivé*. Michalon, 2002.

Dreyfus, Jean-Marc and Jonathan Laurence. "Anti-Semitism in France," *Brookings*, May 14, 2002. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/anti-semitism-in-france/ Last accessed June 9, 2020.

Dunning, Ted. "Accurate methods for the statistics of surprise and coincidence," *Computational Linguistics*, vol. 19, no. 1, 1993, pp. 61-74.

Duportail, Judith, Jean-Marc Leclerc, and Service Infographie. "À Paris, manifestation propalestinienne sous haute surveillance," *Le Figaro*, July 23, 2014.

Dussert- Galinat, Delphine. *Le dialogue interreligieux. Entre discours officiels et initiatives locales*. Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2013.

Eckart, Thomas and Quasthoff Uwe. "Statistical Corpus and Language Comparison on Comparable Corpora," *Building and Using Comparable Corpora*, edited by Pierre Zweigenbaum, Reinhard Rapp, Serge Sharoff, and Pascale Fung. Springer, 2013.

Egorova, Yulia. *Jews and Muslims in South Asia: Reflections on Difference, Religion, and Race*. Oxford University Press, 2018.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and John Ehrenreich. "The Professional-Managerial Class," *Radical America*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1977, pp. 7-31.

Encel, Frédéric. *De quelques idées reçues sur le monde contemporain: Précis de géopolitique à l'usage de tous*. Champs actuel, Flammarion, 2014.

Erll, Astrid. "Transcultural memory," *Témoigner: Entre histoire et mémoire*, vol. 119, 2014, p. 178.

Eveno, Patrick. *Le Monde: Histoire d'une entreprise de presse*. Editions Le Monde, 1996.

Everett, Samuel Sami. "Interfaith Dialogue and Faith-Based Social Activism in a State of Emergency: *laïcité* and the Crisis of Religion in France," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, vol. 31, no. 4, 2018, pp. 437-454.

Fairclough, Norman. "Critical Discourse Analysis as a Method in Social Scientific Research," *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer. Sage, 2001.

Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. Routledge, 1989.

Fanon, Frantz. *Peau noire, masques blancs*. Éditions du Seuil, 1952.

Farris, Sara. "From the Jewish Question to the Muslim Question. Republican Rigorism, Culturalist Differentialism and Antinomies of Enforced Emancipation," *Constellations*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2014, pp. 296-307.

Ferguson, Roderick A. *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique*. University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Fernando, Mayanthi L. *The Republic Unsettled: Muslim French and the Contradictions of Secularism*. Duke University Press, 2014.

Ferroukhi, Ismaël. *Les hommes libres*, 2011. Film.

Finkielkraut, Alain. *Au Nom de l'autre : réflexions sur l'antisémitisme qui vient.* Gallimard, 2003.

Finkielkraut, Alain. *L'identité malheureuse*, Stock, 2013.

Ford, Joseph. *Writing the Black Decade: Conflict and Criticism in Francophone Algerian Literature*. Lexington Books, forthcoming 2021.

Fottorino, Eric. "Le Monde: Portrait d'un quotidien," *Le Monde*, 2009. http://medias.lemonde.fr/medias/pdf_obj/200912.pdf Last accessed June 15, 2018.

Fouletier-Smith, Nicole M. "Les Nord-Africains en France : réalités et représentations littéraires," *The French Review*, vol. 51, no. 5, 1978, pp. 683-691.

FRA (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights). *Experiences and perceptions of antisemitism: Second survey on discrimination and hate crime against Jews in the EU*. Publications Office of the European Union, 2018.

Frèche, Emilie. *Le sourire de l'ange*. Points, 2015.

Fredette, Jennifer. "Social movements and the state's construction of identity: The case of Muslims in France," *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society*, vol. 54, 2011, pp. 45-75.

Fredette, Jennifer. *Constructing Muslims in France: Discourse, Public Identity, and the Politics of Citizenship*. Temple University Press, 2014.

Friedman, Elizabeth. *Colonialism and After: An Algerian Jewish Community*. Bergin and Garvey, 1988.

Fysh, Peter and Jim Wolfreys. *The Politics of Racism in France*. Palgrave, 2003.

Gabizon, Cécilia. "L'imam de Drancy prône l'ouverture." *Le Monde*, Mar. 27, 2009, p. 16

Galonnier, Juliette. "The racialization of Muslims in France and the United States: Some insights from white converts to Islam," *Social Compass*, 62 (4), 2015: 570-583.

Gauchet, Marcel. *Le Désenchantement du monde*. Gallimard, 1985.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Basic Books, 1973.

Genette, Gérard. *Seuils*. Seuil, 1987.

Giffney, Noreen. "Denormatizing Queer Theory: More Than (Simply) Lesbian and Gay Studies," *Feminist Theory*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2004, pp. 73-78.

Gildea, Robert. *France since 1945*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

Gilroy, Paul. *After Empire: Melancholia or Communal Culture?* Routledge, 2004.

Giniewski, Paul. *Antisionisme : le nouvel antisémitisme.* Cheminements, 2005.

Giordan, Henri. *Démocratie culturelle et droit à la différence: Rapport présenté à Jack Lang, ministre de la Culture*. La Documentation française, 1982.

Gleize, Yves, Fanny Mendisco, Marie-Hélène Pemonge, Christophe Hubert, Alexis Groppi, Bertrand Houix, Marie-France Deguilloux, Jean-Yves Breuil. "Early Medieval Muslim Graves in France: First Archaeological, Anthropological and Palaeogenomic Evidence," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2016.

Goldmann, Annie. *Les filles de Mardochée: Histoire familiale d'une emancipation*. Denoël/Gonthier, 1979.

Goodman, Leo A. "Snowball Sampling," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 32, no. 1, 1961, pp. 148-170.

Gottreich, Emily. *The Mellah of Marrakesh*, Indiana University Press, 2006.

Graebner, Seth. "The Louvre Abu Dhabi: French Universalism, Exported," *L'Esprit Créateur*, vol. 54, no. 2, 2014: pp. 186-199.

Hajjat, Abdellali and Marwan Mohammed. *Islamophobie: Comment les élites françaises fabriquent le « problème musulman »*. La Découverte, 2013.

Hall, Stuart. "Encoding/Decoding," in *Culture, Media, Language*, ed. Stuart Hall et al., Routledge, 1980 [1973].

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies," in *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler. Routledge, 1992, pp. 277-294.

Halliday, David. Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. Edward Arnold, 1978.

Hanley, Will. "Grieving Cosmopolitanism in Middle East Studies," *History Compass*, 6, 2008, pp. 1346-1367.

Hargreaves, Alec. *Multi-Ethnic France: Immigration, Politics, Culture and Society*, 2nd edition. Routledge, 2005.

Hathroubi-Safsaf, Nadia. *Ce sont nos frères et leurs enfants sont nos enfants*. Zellige, 2016.

Hertzberg, Arthur. *The French Enlightenment and the Jews: The Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism*. Columbia University Press, 1968.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan: Or The Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiasticall and Civil*, edited by Ian Shapiro. Yale University Press, 2010 [1651].

Hodes, Joseph. *From India to Israel: Identity, Immigration, and the Struggle for Religious Equality*. McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014.

Houellebecq, Michel. *Soumission*. Flammarion, 2015.

Hughes, Aaron W. *Abrahamic Religions: On the Uses and Abuses of History*. Oxford University Press, 2012.

Hyman, Paula. *From Dreyfus to Vichy: The Remaking of French Jewry, 1906-1939*. Columbia University Press, 1979.

Ifop. *Analyse du vote au premier tour des élections municipales en fonction des habitudes médias*. March 23, 2014. https://www.ifop.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/2588-1-study_file.pdf Last accessed August 10, 2018.

Ipsos. France 2013 : les nouvelles fractures. January 25, 2013. https://www.ipsos.com/fr-fr/france-2013-les-nouvelles-fractures Last accessed August 10, 2018.

Jackson, John L. *Thin Description: Ethnography and the African Hebrew Israelites of Jerusalem*. Harvard University Press, 2013.

Jackson, Pamela Irving. "Race, Crime and Criminal Justice in France," *Race, Crime and Criminal Justice: International Perspectives*, edited by Anita Kalunta-Crumpton. Palgrave, 2010, pp. 51-71.

Jennings, Jeremy. *Revolution and the Republic: A History of Political Thought in France since the Eighteenth Century*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Joseph-Gabriel, Annette K. *Reimagining Liberation: How Black Women Transformed Citizenship in the French Empire*. University of Illinois Press, 2019.

Juhem, Philippe. "La participation des journalistes à l'émergence des mouvements sociaux: Le cas de SOS-Racisme," *Réseaux*, vol. 98, 1999, pp. 119-152.

Kandiyoti, Dalia. "Imagining Cosmopolitanism, Conviviality, and Coexistence in World Literature: Jews, Muslims, Language, and Enchantment in Joann Sfar's *The Rabbi's Cat*." *Prooftexts*, vol. 36, no. 1-2, 2017: 53-82.

Kang, Jing, Austin Scholp, Jack J. Jiang. "A Review of the Physiological Effects and Mechanisms of Singing," *Journal of Voice*, vol. 32, no. 4, 2018, pp. 390-395.

Kaplan, Steven. "The Beta Israel and the Rabbinate: law, ritual and politics," *Social Science Information*, vol. 27, no. 3, 1988, pp. 357-370.

Katz, Ethan. "Did the Paris Mosque Save Jews? A Mystery and Its Memory," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. 102, no. 2, 2012, pp. 256-87.

Katz, Ethan. "Jews and Muslims in the Shadow of the Republic: A Century of Coexistence and Conflict." in *A History of Jewish-Muslim Relations: From the Origins to the Present Day*, edited by Benjamin Stora and Abdelwahab Meddeb. Princeton University Press, 2013.

Katz, Ethan. *The Burdens of Brotherhood: Jews and Muslims from North Africa to France*. Harvard University Press, 2015.

Katz, Ethan B. "Where Do the Hijab and the Kippah Belong? On Being Publicly Jewish or Muslim in Post-*Hebdo* France," *Jewish History*, vol. 32, 2018, pp. 99–114.

Kepel, Gilles. *La Revanche de Dieu: Chrétiens, juifs et musulmans à la reconquête du monde*. Seuil, 1991.

Kenbib, Mohammed. *Juifs et musulmans au Maroc : des origines à nos jours*. Tallandier, 2016.

Kritzman, Lawrence. "Identity Crises: France, Culture and the Idea of the Nation," *Substance* 24 (1/2), 1995: pp. 62-72.

Kuhn, Raymond. *The Media in Contemporary France*. Open University Press, 2011.

Lamine, Anne-Sophie. *La cohabitation des Dieux. Pluralité religieuse et laïcité. Presses universitaires de France*, 2004.

Laurence, Jonathan and Justin Vaïsse. *Integrating Islam: Political and Religious Challenges in Contemporary France*. Brookings Institution Press, 2006.

Lanzmann, Claude. "J'accuse Raymond Barre d'être un antisémite," *Libération*, March 6, 2007. https://www.liberation.fr/france/2007/03/06/j-accuse-raymond-barre-d-etre-un-antisemite_86667 Last accessed May 30, 2020.

Le Nouvel Antisémitisme en France. Albin Michel, 2018.

Le Sueur, James. *Uncivil War: Intellectuals and Identity Politics during the Decolonization of Algeria*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Lean, Nathan. *The Islamophobia Industry: How the Right Manufactures Hatred of Muslims*. Pluto Press, 2012.

Le Cain, Blandine. "Début de polémique sur le port de la kippa à Marseille," *Le Figaro*, January 13, 2016. https://www.lefigaro.fr/actualite-france/2016/01/12/01016-20160112ARTFIG00322-debut-de-polemique-sur-le-port-de-la-kippa-a-marseille.php Last accessed June 9, 2020.

Lefebvre, Edwige. "Republicanism and Universalism: Factors of Inclusion or Exclusion in the French Concept of Citizenship," *Citizenship Studies*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2003, pp. 15-36.

Lendvai, Paul. *Anti-Semitism without Jews: Communist Eastern Europe*. Doubleday, 1971.

Levi, Primo. *Se questo è un uomo*. De Silva, 1947.

Levi, Primo. *If This Is a Man*. The Orion Press, 1959.

Lévy, Elisabeth and Robert Ménard. *Les Français sont-ils antisémites ?* Editions Mordicus, 2009.

Liogier, Raphaël. *Le mythe de l'islamisation: Essai sur une obsession collective*, Seuil, 2012.

Loersch, Chris and Arbuckle, Nathan L. "Unravelling the mystery of music: Music as an evolved group process," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 105, no. 5, 2013, pp. 777-798.

MacMaster, Neil. *Colonial Migrants and Racism: Algerians in France, 1900-62*. MacMillan Press, 1997.

MacMaster, Neil. "Islamophobia in France and the 'Algerian Problem'," in *The New Crusades. Constructing the Muslim Enemy.*, edited by Emran Qureshi and Michael A. Sells, Columbia University Press, 2003.

Magid, Shaul. "Why Peter Schäfer's Resignation as Director of the Jewish Museum in Berlin Matters," *Tikkun*, June 18, 2019. https://www.tikkun.org/why-peter-schafers-resignation-as-director-of-the-jewish-museum-in-berlin-matters Last accessed March 24, 2020.

Maikey, Haneen. "Interfaith Dialogue: Faith in the a-political at the expense of social justice," *alQaws.org*, November 7, 2011. http://www.alqaws.org/articles/-Interfaith-Dialogue-Faith-in-the-a-political-at-the-expense-of-social-justice?category_id=15 Last accessed March 7, 2020.

Maltz, Judy. "Palestinians and Settlers Tried to Make Peace on Their Own, and Then This Happened," *Haaretz*, May 13, 2017.

Mandel, Maud. *Muslims and Jews in France: History of a Conflict*, Princeton University Press, 2014.

Martel, Frédéric. *J'aime pas le sarkozysme culturel*. Flammarion, 2012.

Massad, Joseph A. *Islam in Liberalism*. University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Maxwell, Rahsaan and Erik Bleich. "What Makes Muslims Feel French?" *Social Forces*, vol. 93, no. 1, 2014, pp. 155-179.

McAdams, Dan P. and Kate C. McLean. "Narrative Identity." *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2013, pp. 233–238.

McGann, Jerome J. *Don Juan in Context*. University of Chicago Press, 1976.

McGonagle, Joseph. *Representing ethnicity in contemporary French visual culture*. Manchester University Press, 2017.

Meer, Nasar. "Racialization and religion: race, culture and difference in the study of antisemitism and Islamophobia," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2013, pp. 385-398.

Menocal, María Rosa. *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain*. Back Bay Books, 2002.

Mehta, Uday Singh. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. John W. Parker and Son, West Strand, 1859

Mills, Charles W. *The Racial Contract*. Cornell University Press, 1997.

Ministère de l'action et des comptes publics. *Effort financier de l'état en faveur des associations*, tome 1, 2017.

Ministère de l'action et des comptes publics. *Effort financier de l'état en faveur des associations*, tome 1, 2014.

Moirand, Sophie. "Le choc des discours dans la presse française: de la crise des banlieues à celle des universités (novembre 2005, mars 2006)," in *Explorations and Encounters in French*, edited by Jean Fornasiero and Colette Mrowa-Hopkins. University of Adelaide Press, 2010, pp. 35-75.

Mondon, Aurelien. "The French secular hypocrisy: the extreme right, the Republic and the battle for hegemony," *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 49, no. 4, 2015, pp. 392-413.

Moosavi, Leon. "The Racialization of Muslim Converts in Britain and Their Experiences of Islamophobia," *Critical Sociology* 41 (1), 2014: 41-56.

Morel, Pierrick de. "Le Figaro : un quotidien 'de conviction', pas un journal militant," *France Culture*, January 1, 2014. https://www.franceculture.fr/medias/le-figaro-un-quotidien-de-conviction-pas-un-journal-militant Last accessed May 30, 2020.

Muñoz, José Esteban. *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics. University of Minnesota Press*, 1999.

Nirenberg, David. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton University Press, 1996.

Noiriel, Gérard. *Immigration, antisémitisme et racisme en France (XIX^e et XX^e siècle) : discours publics, humiliations privées*. Fayard, 2007.

Noiriel, Gérard. *Une histoire populaire de la France* : de la guerre de Cent Ans à nos jours. Agone, 2018.

Noiriel, Gérard. *Le venin dans la plume. Édouard Drumont, Eric Zemmour et la part sombre de la République*. La Découverte, 2019.

Noiriel, Gérard. "Les propos d'Eric Zemmour sont une incitation à demi-mot à la guerre civile," *Libération.fr*, October 1, 2019b. https://www.liberation.fr/debats/2019/10/01/gerard-noiriel-les-propos-d-eric-zemmour-sont-une-incitation-a-demi-mot-a-la-guerre-civile_1754672 Last accessed March 7, 2020.

Ogan, Christine, Lars Willnat, Rosemary Pennington, and Manaf Bashir. "The rise of anti-Muslim prejudice: Media and Islamophobia in Europe and the United States," *The International Communication Gazette*, vol. 76, no. 1, 2014, pp. 27-46.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States*. Routledge, 1986.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States*, 3rd edition. Routledge, 2015.

Panikkar, Raimon. *The Intra-religious Dialogue*. Paulist Press, 1978.

Paoli, Paul-François. "Contes, légendes, clichés et réalité d'une civilisation," *Le Figaro*, October 26, 2017, p. 6.

Parvez, Z. Fareen. *Politicizing Islam: The Islamic Revival in France and India.* Oxford University Press, 2017.

Pettigrew, Thomas and Linda Tropp. "A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 90, 2006: 751-783.

Peyrefitte, Alain. *C'était De Gaulle.* Gallimard, 2002.

Planche, Jean-Louis. *Sétif 1945: Histoire d'un massacre annoncé*. Perrin, 2006.

Poole, Elizabeth. *Reporting Islam: Media Representations of British Muslims*. Bloomsbury, 2002.

Polloni, Camille. "«Il n'y a pas de race dans la police»: le message de Didier Lallement à ses troupes," *Mediapart*, June 2, 2020. https://www.mediapart.fr/journal/france/020620/il-n-y-pas-de-race-dans-la-police-le-message-de-didier-lallement-ses-troupes Last accessed June 5, 2020.

Powell, Kimberly A. "Framing Islam: An Analysis of U.S. Media Coverage of Terrorism Since 9/11," *Communication Studies*, vol. 62, no. 1, 2011, pp. 90-112.

Prouteau, Lionel. *Le bénévolat en France en 2017 : état des lieux et tendances*. Centre de Recherches sur les Associations and Consumer Science & Analytics, October 2018.

Puar, Jasbir. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Duke University Press, 2007.

Racimor, Madeleine and Alain Beit. *Judaïsme et homosexualité: 40 ans d'histoire avec le Beit Haverim : son histoire, son combat pour les droits des LGBT, sa lutte contre l'homophobie et l'antisémitisme, ses activités...* Beit Haverim, 2017.

Ramadan, Marwa. "Friendship without Boundaries: Spirituality and Sufi Wisdom in Schmitt's 'Monsieur Ibrahim and the Flowers of the Qur'an' / صداقة تتخطى الحواجز: الروحانية والحكمة الصوفية في مسيو إبراهيم وزهور القرآن لشميت," *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, no. 36, 2016, pp. 158-176.

Raymond, Gino and Tariq Modood. *The Construction of Minority Identities in France and Britain*. Palgrave McMillan, 2007.

Rebhun, Uzi and Chaim I. Waxman (eds.). *Jews in Israel: Contemporary Social and Cultural Patterns*. University Press of New England, 2004.

Renton, James and Ben Gidley. *Antisemitism and Islamophobia in Europe: A Shared Story?* Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Diallo, Rokhaya. "France's dangerous move to remove 'race' from its constitution," *Washington Post*, July 13, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/global-opinions/wp/2018/07/13/frances-dangerous-move-to-remove-race-from-its-constitution/ Last accessed June 5, 2020.

Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford University Press, 2009.

Rothberg, Michael. "From Gaza to Warsaw: Mapping Multidirectional Memory," *Criticism*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2011, pp. 523–548.

Roy, Olivier. *La laïcité face à l'islam*. Stock, 2005.

Rushdie, Salman. "Imaginary Homelands," *London Review of Books*, vol. 7, no. 18, 1982, pp. 18-19.

Said, Edward W. "Arabs and Jews," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1974: pp. 3-14.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books, 1978.

Said, Edward. *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. Vintage Books, 1997[1981].

Said, Edward W. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Harvard University Press, 2000.

Samuels, Maurice. *The Right to Difference: French Universalism and the Jews*. University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Sauvaget, Bernadette. "Un ticket pour la paix entre juifs et musulmans," *Libération*, December 28, 2012, pp. 12-13.

Schain, Martin. "Minorities and Immigrant Incorporation in France: The State and the Dynamics of Multiculturalism," in *Multicultural Questions*, edited by Christian Joppke and Steven Lukes, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Schechter, Ronald. *Obstinate Hebrews: Representations of Jews in France, 1715-1815.* University of California Press, 2003.

Schor, Naomi. "The Crisis of French Universalism." *Yale French Studies*, vol. 100, 2001, pp. 43- 64.

Scott, Joan. *Parité! Sexual Equality and the Crisis of French Universalism*. University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Sedar, Alice. "À Créteil, les actes de violence n'ont pas été oubliés." *Le Figaro*, Sep. 14, 2002, p. 8.

Segré, Ivan. *La Réaction philosémite: La trahison des clercs*. Editions Lignes, 2009.

Segu, Frédéric. *Le premier Figaro, 1826-1833*. Les Belles Lettres, 1932.

Selby, Jennifer A. *Questioning French Secularism: Gender Politics and Islam in a Parisian Suburb*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Sen, Amartya. *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. W.W. Norton & Co., 2006.

Seres, Aude. "Week-end d'amitiés judéo-musulmanes." *Le Figaro*, Nov. 6, 2010, p. 11

Shepard, Todd. *The Invention of Decolonization: The Algerian War and the Remaking of France*, Cornell University Press, 2006.

Shils, Edward. "The Virtue of Civil Society." *Government and Opposition*, vol. 26, no. 1, 1991, pp. 3-20.

Shohat, Ella. "The Invention of the Mizrahim," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 21 (1), 1999: pp. 5-20.

Silverman, Max. "Rights and difference: questions of citizenship in France," in *Racism, Ethnicity and Politics in Contemporary Europe*, edited by Alec G. Hargreaves and Jeremy Leaman. Edward Elgar, 1995, pp. 253-263.

Silverman, Max. "The French Republic unveiled," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 30, no. 4, 2007, pp. 628-642.

Silverman, Maxim. *Deconstructing the Nation: Immigration, Racism and Citizenship in Modern France*. Routledge, 1992.

Silverstein, Paul. "The Fantasy and Violence of Religious Imagination: Islamophobia and Anti-Semitism in France and North Africa," *Islamophobia/Islamophilia: Beyond the Politics of Enemy and Friend*, edited by Andrew Shyrock. Indiana University Press, 2010, 141-172.

Snir, Reuven. *Who Needs Arab-Jewish Identity?: Interpellation, Exclusion, and Inessential Solidarities*. Brill, 2015.

Snow, David and Robert Benford. "Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization," *International Social Movement Research*, 1 (1), 1988: 197-217.

Stein, Rebecca. *Itineraries in Conflict: Israelis, Palestinians, and the Political Lives of Tourism*. Duke University Press, 2008.

Stein, Sarah Abrevaya. *Saharan Jews and the Fate of French Algeria*, The University of Chicago Press, 2014.

Stillman, Dinah Assouline. "Muslim-Jewish Relations in France through the Lens of Recent Cinema," *Jewish-Muslim Relations in Past and Present: A Kaleidoscopic View*, edited by Josef Meri. Brill, 2017.

Stockemer, Daniel and Abdelkarim Amengay. "The voters of the FN under Jean-Marie Le Pen and Marine Le Pen: Continuity or change?" *French Politics*, vol. 13, 20015, pp. 370-390.

Stora, Benjamin. *Le transfert d'une mémoire: De l'Algérie française au racisme anti-Arabe*. La découverte, 1999.

Stovall, Tyler. *Transnational France: The Modern History of a Universal Nation.* Westview Press 2015.

Stubbs, Michael. *Words and phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Blackwell, 2001.

Sussman, Sarah Beth. *Changing lands, changing identities: the migration of Algerian Jewry to France, 1954-1967*. PhD Thesis. Stanford University, 2002.

Taguieff, Pierre-André. *La Force du préjugé : essai sur le racisme et ses doubles*. La découverte, 1987.

Taguieff, Pierre-André. *La Nouvelle Judéophobie*. Mille et une nuits, 2002.

Ternisien, Xavier. "On a crié 'Mort aux juifs' à Strasbourg." *Le Monde*, Nov. 7, 2000, p. 17.

Taguieff, Pierre-André. "Nouvelle judéophobie en France: l'année terrible (janvier 2014-janvier 2015) en perspective," *Cités*, no. 62, 2015, pp. 129–141.

Ternisien, Xavier. "La communauté juive s'inquiète d'une recrudescence des agressions antisémites." *Le Monde*, Dec. 3, 2001, p. 11.

Thomas, Elaine. *Immigration, Islam, and the Politics of Belonging in France: A Comparative Framework*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Trigano, Shmuel. *La Démission de la République: juifs et musulmans en France*. Presses universitaires de France, 2003.

Van Dijk, Teun A. *News as discourse*. L. Erlbaum Associates, 1988.

Van Dijk, Teun A. "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis," *Discourse & Society*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1993, pp. 249-283.

Van Dijk, Teun A. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage, 1998.

Van Leeuwen, Theo. "Legitimation in discourse and communication," *Discourse & Communication*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2007, pp. 91-112.

Vichniac, Judith E. "French Socialists and *Droit à la Différence*: A Changing Dynamic," *French Politics and Society*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1991, pp. 40-56.

Ville de Ris-Orangis. *Compte rendu succinct du conseil municipal*. March 30, 2017.

Villiers, Philippe de. *Les mosquées de Roissy*. Albin Michel, 2006.

Villiers, Philippe de. *Les cloches sonneront-elles encore demain* ? Albin Michel, 2016.

Vince, Rebekah. *Negotiating Unsettling Memories: Contemporary Franco-Maghrebi Literature on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. PhD Thesis. University of Warwick, 2018.

Vulser, Nicole. "Dassault rachète trois périodiques à France-Antilles," *Le Monde*, July 4, 2001: 19.

Xu, Wenying. *Eating Identities: Reading Food in Asian American Literature*. University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

Warner, Michael. "Introduction: Fear of a Queer Planet." *Social Text*, no. 29, 1991, pp. 3-17.

Warner, Michael. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. The Free Press, 1999.

Waskul, Dennis, Phillip Vannini, and Janelle Wilson. "The Aroma of Recollection: Olfaction, Nostalgia, and the Shaping of the Sensuous Self," *The Senses and Society*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2009, pp. 5-22.

Weill-Raynal, Guillaume. *Une haine imaginaire: contre-enquête sur le nouvel antisémitisme*. Armand Collin, 2005.

Weinstein, Daniel, Jacques Launay, Eiluned Pearce, Robin I.M. Dunbar, Lauren Stewart. "Singing and social bonding: changes in connectivity and pain threshold as a function of group size," *Evolution and Human Behavior*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2016, pp. 152-158.

Weiss, Susan M. and Netty C. Gross-Horowitz. *Marriage and Divorce in the Jewish State: Israel's Civil War*. Brandeis University Press, 2012.

Wiesel, Elie. *La nuit*. Editions de Minuit, 2007[1958].

Wieviorka, Michel (ed.). *Une société fragmentée ? Le multiculturalisme en débat*. La découverte, 1997.

Wieviorka, Michel. "Racism and Diasporas," *Thesis Eleven*, vol. 52, no. 1, 1998, pp. 69-81.

Wieviorka, Michel. *La tentation antisémite : haine des juifs dans la France d'aujourd'hui*. R. Laffont, 2005.

Wieviorka, Michel. "La mutación del racismo," *Migraciones*, vol. 19, 2006, pp. 151-163.

Wieviorka, Michel. *The Lure of Anti-Semitism: Hatred of Jews in Present-Day France*. Brill, 2007.

Wenden, Catherine Wihtol de and Rémy Leveau. *La Beurgeoisie: les trois âges de la vie associative issue de l'immigration*. CNRS Éditions, 2001.

Wenden, Catherine Wihtol de. "Multiculturalism in France," in *The Governance of Multiculturalism*, edited by John Rex and Guharpal Singh, Palgrave, 2004.

Wiesel, Elie. *La nuit*. Les Éditions de Minuit, 1958.

Winock, Michel. *La France et les Juifs: de 1789 à nos jours*. Seuil, 2004.

Wolfreys, Jim. *Republic of Islamophobia: The Rise of Respectable Racism in France*. Hurst, 2018.

Zahed, Ludovic-Mohamed. *Le Coran et la chair*. Max Milo, 2012.

Zahed, Ludovic-Mohamed. *LGBT Musulman-es: du placard aux lumières !* Des ailes sur un tracteur, 2016.

Zahed, Ludovic-Mohamed. *Homosexuality, Transidentity, and Islam: A Study of Scripture Confronting the Politics of Gender and Sexuality*, translated by Adi S. Bharat. Amsterdam University Press, 2019.

Zemmour, Eric. *Le Suicide français*. Albin Michel, 2014.

Appendix

Table 1. Chronology of Key Events (1970-2018)

Date	Event
Mar.-May 1971	Anti-Arab attacks kill nine
Jan.-Feb. 1972	Marcellin-Fontanet circulars
Jul. 1972	Parliament passes law prohibiting racial discrimination and incitement to racial violence
Sep. 1973	Algerian government halts emigration following further racist killings in France
Jul. 1974	Suspension of labour migration by non-EC nationals
Oct. 1980	Terrorist attack at the rue Copernic Synagogue in Paris
Mar. 1981	Mitterrand declares: "Nous proclamons le droit à la difference"
May 1981	François Mitterrand is elected president
Aug. 1982	Terrorist attack at the Goldenberg restaurant in the Marais in Paris
Jul. 1983	Beginning of a wave of anti-Arab killings
Sep. 1983	First FN electoral breakthrough: Jean-Pierre Stirbois obtains 16.7% of the votes in Dreux the first round of the municipal elections
Oct.-Dec. 1983	Beginning of the Marche pour l'égalité et contre le racisme (Marche des beurs)
Nov. 1983	25-year-old Habib Grimzi is thrown out of train window and killed by three men in a racially-motivated attack
Jun. 1984	The FN wins 10 seats (11% of the national vote) in the European Parliament
July 1984	SOS Racisme founded
Mar. 1985	18 wounded after a bomb goes off during a Jewish film festival in Paris
Jun. 1985	SOS Racisme holds its first rock concert in Paris, attracting a crowd of 300,000
Dec. 1985	Beginning of ten-months of terror attacks in Paris by terrorists linked to the Middle East
Sep. 1986	Pasqua Law passed, making it more difficult for foreigners to enter and reside in France
Aug. 1989	Joxe Law passed, eases some restrictions in the Pasqua Law
Oct. 1989	Headscarf affair begins
Dec. 1989	FN candidate wins Dreux by-election.
May 1990	Desecration of Jewish graves by neo-Nazis at the Carpentras cemetery
Jul. 1990	Gayssot law against Holocaust denial passed

Oct. 1990	Riots in Vaulx-en-Velin after youth passenger on a motorbike is killed in a crash with a police car, which was said to have cut off the motorbike. The riots are emblematic of long-standing tensions between banlieue youths and the police.
Mar.-Jun. 1991	Outbreak of riots in numerous banlieues
Jun. 1992	The line "la langue de la République est le français" is added to the French Constitution
Jul.-Aug. 1993	Pasqua laws passed
Sep. 1994	Bayrou circular on the "port de signes ostentatoires dans les établissements scolaires" provokes renewed debates over the headscarf
Apr. 1995	19-year-old Imad Bouhoud is killed by neo-Nazis in Le Havre
Jul.-Oct. 1995	Series of terrorist attacks in Paris
Dec. 1996	Terrorist attack at the Port-Royal RER station
Feb. 1997	FN mayor elected in Vitrolles
Mar. 1997	Debré reform of Pasqua laws passed by parliament
Jul. 1998	An ethnically diverse, "black, blanc, beur" French football team wins the World Cup
Dec. 1998	Ten-day riots in Mirail after a youth is killed by police
Apr. 2002	After the first round of the presidential election, Le Pen emerges second
May 2002	More than a million people take to the streets in protest of Le Pen
May 2002	Jacques Chirac is re-elected with 82% of the votes over Le Pen's 18%.
Dec. 2002	The Mémorial national de la guerre d'Algérie et des combats du Maroc et de la Tunisie is inaugurated in Paris.
Mar. 2004	Chirac signs law against "conspicuous" religious symbols in schools.
Feb. 2005	New law requires the teaching in high schools of the 'positive' role of colonization
Jun. 2005	Sidi Ahmed is killed in La Courneuve. Nicolas Sarkozy, then the minister of the interior, declares his intention to "nettoyer le quartier au Kärcher"
Oct.-Nov. 2005	Two youths die electrocuted in an electric transformer after being pursued by the police, sparking riots in numerous banlieues across the country. The government declares a state of emergency in the affected communes. 10,000 police officers are sent into the affected banlieues.
Jan. 2006	Chirac puts an end to the requirement to teach the 'positive' role of colonization.
Feb. 2006	Ilan Halimi is tortured to death in an antisemitic attack by a gang of youths.
Sep. 2010	Law passed banning face coverings in public space.

Mar. 2012	Mohammed Merah kills children at a Jewish school and soldiers.
Apr. 2012	Marine Le Pen obtains a historic score (17.9%) for the FN in the first round of the presidential elections.
Jun. 2014	Mehdi Nemmouche, who carried out the 2013 Jewish museum attack in Brussels, is arrested in Marseilles.
Jan. 2015	Terrorist attacks against Charlie Hebdo and a Jewish supermarket.
Feb. 2015	Jewish cemetery desecrated in Sarre-Union.
Nov. 2015	A series of terrorist attacks leave 130 dead and more than 350 injured. A state of emergency is declared.
Jul. 2016	Truck attack in Nice leaves 86 dead and 434 injured.
Aug. 2016	Burkini affair
Feb. 2017	Police brutality during an arrest in Aulnay-sous-Bois sparks riots
Apr. 2017	Champs-Élysées attack leaves one dead and three injured.
Apr. 2017	After the first round of the presidential elections, Emmanuel Macron and Marine Le Pen come out on top
Apr. 2017	Sarah Halimi is murdered in an antisemitic attack
May 2017	Emmanuel Macron is elected president
Mar. 2018	Terrorist attacks in Carcassonne and Trèbes leave four dead and 15 injured.
Mar. 2018	Mireille Knoll, a survivor of the Shoah, is killed in an antisemitic attack
Apr. 2018	300 public figures sign a manifesto, published in *Le Parisien*, against the 'new antisemitism.'
May 2018	Macron gives a speech on the banlieues
Jul. 2018	Twenty years later, another ethnically diverse French football team wins the World Cup, sparking fresh debates on multiculturalism and universalism both in France and abroad.

Table 2.1. Frames in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	%	Frame
152	50.8	Muslim (new) antisemitism
137	45.8	Israel-Palestine
112	40.8	Youth
92	30.7	Communautarisme
78	26.1	Similarity
67	22.4	Religious (-)

46	15.4	Religious (+)
39	13.0	School
35	11.7	Religious (neutral)
27	9.0	Memory (+)
13	4.3	Memory (-)
10	3.3	Jewish 'Islamophobia'

Table 2.2. Frames in *Le Monde*

Freq.	%	Frame
82	46.3	Muslim (new) antisemitism
81	45.8	Israel-Palestine
57	32.2	Communautarisme
54	30.5	Similarity
54	30.5	Youth
29	16.4	Religious (-)
24	13.6	School
24	13.6	Religious (+)
21	11.9	Religious (neutral)
18	10.2	Memory (+)
8	4.5	Jewish Islamophobia
5	2.8	Memory (-)

Table 2.3. Frames in *Le Figaro*

Freq.	%	Frame
71	58.2	Muslim (new) antisemitism
59	48.3	Youth
57	46.7	Israel-Palestine
39	32.0	Religious (-)
36	29.5	Communautarisme
24	19.7	Similarity

22	18.0	Religious (+)
15	12.3	School
14	11.5	Religious (neutral)
9	7.4	Memory (+)
8	6.5	Memory (-)
2	1.6	Jewish 'Islamophobia'

Table 3.1. Keyword list for *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	Keyness	Keyword
1112	7616.723	juifs
901	5299.691	musulmans
434	3278.219	antisémitisme
508	2613.698	islam
332	2154.750	juive
1249	1982.608	france
289	1700.129	juif
263	1515.447	musulmane
182	1390.367	antisémites
251	1349.550	racisme
408	1273.788	israël
159	1245.819	crif
229	1140.460	musulman
373	1109.333	communauté
162	1055.155	juives
203	1001.323	mosquée
254	983.360	actes
131	896.669	antisémite
213	887.784	religieux
119	813.399	synagogue
165	787.219	culte
198	781.547	religion

Table 3.2. Keyword list for *Le Monde*

Freq.	Keyness	Keyword
707	5168.029	juifs
525	3183.133	musulmans
313	2591.137	antisémitisme
232	1627.809	juive
205	1304.531	juif
740	1156.513	france
222	1055.350	islam
170	1035.183	musulmane
121	1005.947	antisémites
174	1005.354	racisme
280	947.926	israël
263	862.493	communauté
185	789.777	actes
91	768.733	crif
104	720.603	juives
94	700.439	antisémite
131	658.963	musulman
113	557.329	mosquée
128	543.334	religieux
73	529.106	synagogue
100	497.560	haine
110	425.928	arabes

Table 3.3. Keyword list for *Le Figaro*

Freq.	Keyness	Keyword
408	3029.019	juifs
378	2414.370	musulmans
286	1724.172	islam
239	1550.975	figaro
121	984.440	antisémitisme
512	857.569	france
103	687.264	juive
68	616.533	crif

93	553.822	musulmane
62	528.250	antisémites
98	526.256	musulman
84	484.602	juif
90	470.581	mosquée
68	450.587	imam
82	442.673	culte
77	403.761	racisme
58	401.950	juives
89	384.429	religion
61	379.503	religions
85	369.295	religieux
129	362.993	israël
46	344.074	synagogue

Table 4.1. Lexical collocates of juif(s) and juive(s) in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
255	15.64345	france
214	14.37265	musulmans
160	12.52579	communauté
78	8.78807	institutions
74	8.35251	français
65	7.47306	on
57	7.47235	conseil
53	7.24364	représentatif
56	7.08083	ils
51	7.07869	chrétiens
51	7.04906	crif
53	6.52845	leur
41	6.30075	arabes
42	6.23812	jeunes
38	6.07087	communautés
31	5.37180	musulmane
28	5.16135	responsables

28	5.13862	enfants
32	5.09141	nous

Table 4.2. Lexical collocates of juif(s) and juive(s) in *Le Monde*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
168	12.56074	france
136	11.34066	musulmans
113	10.48340	communauté
54	7.29596	institutions
42	6.14914	français
36	5.90251	conseil
36	5.89006	crif
43	5.83303	on
37	5.80381	israël
34	5.78542	représentatif
32	5.37890	jeunes
30	5.35755	arabes
32	5.12441	ils
36	5.06480	leur
25	4.91039	chrétiens
24	4.78127	communautés
24	4.52721	deux
28	4.41731	juifs

Table 4.3. Lexical collocates of juif(s) and juive(s) in *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
87	8.77051	france
78	8.40758	musulmans
47	6.62812	communauté
32	5.27696	français
26	5.01115	chrétiens
24	4.82022	institutions
21	4.45493	conseil

19	4.29799	représentatif
15	3.70266	crif
22	3.67766	on
14	3.58754	communautés
15	3.43487	israël
11	3.26909	étudiants
11	3.21530	union
15	3.14993	leur
11	3.11899	arabes
11	3.07270	enfants
11	2.98764	musulmane

Table 5.1. Lexical collocates of musulman(s) and musulmane(s) in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
211	14.26793	juifs
170	12.71577	france
119	10.74917	français
78	8.68872	communauté
75	8.59624	culte
68	8.09179	jeunes
60	7.68481	conseil
49	6.62993	nous
45	6.58098	certains
43	6.53079	arabo
38	6.07394	responsables
38	6.10555	chrétiens
35	5.53273	leur
34	5.57799	monde
34	5.41262	ils

Table 5.2. Lexical collocates of musulman(s) and musulmane(s) in *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
77	8.34804	juifs
57	7.31931	français
55	6.84898	france
36	5.90760	culte
35	5.70084	jeunes
32	5.57311	conseil
20	4.43307	arabo
20	4.42405	frères
20	4.28131	certains
20	4.18965	communauté
16	3.96556	judéo
20	3.89289	nous
14	3.65096	association
14	3.64468	chrétiens
15	3.49214	monde

Table 5.3. Lexical collocates of musulman(s) and musulmane(s) in *Le Monde*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
134	11.25221	juifs
115	10.33154	france
62	7.65297	français
58	7.44989	communauté
39	6.15623	culte
33	5.52289	jeunes
28	5.20197	conseil
28	5.19245	origine
28	5.18610	responsables
29	4.90413	nous
25	4.82932	certains
24	4.82491	chrétiens
23	4.75940	arabo

20	4.22045	juive
22	4.17036	ils
21	4.08767	leur
19	4.02051	monde

Table 6. Various Descriptors for French Muslims and French Jews

French Muslims	French Jews
Musulmans français	Juifs français
Français musulmans	Français juif
Musulmans en France	Juifs en France
Français de culture musulmane	Français de culture juive
Communauté musulmane de France	Français de confession juive
Français d'origine musulmane	Juifs de France
Français issus de l'immigration	Communauté française juive
Jeunesse française d'origine immigrée et musulmane	Communauté juive de France
Population française musulmane	
Français arabes ou musulmans	
Musulmans de France	
Français et musulmans	

Table 7. Lexical collocates of jeune(s) in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
63	7.77682	Musulmans
32	5.37890	Juifs
30	5.34386	Français
21	4.19730	France
17	4.06975	Origine
15	3.85696	Issus
15	3.78050	Certains
13	3.57896	maghrébine
12	3.34645	juif
11	3.29707	banlieue

10	3.10118	immigration
10	2.96874	antisémitisme
9	2.87637	musulmane
7	2.63722	beurs
7	2.63509	voilées
7	2.46720	juive
6	2.44488	désoeuvrés
6	2.42531	agression
6	2.40055	quartier

Table 8. Various Descriptors for Young Muslims and Young Jews

Young Muslims	Young Jews
Jeunes fidèles à l'islam	Jeunes juifs
Jeunes de banlieue	Jeune Français juif
Jeunes musulmans français	Jeunes de confession juive
Jeunes	Jeune juif français
Jeunes d'origine maghrébine ou de confession musulmane	
Jeunes d'origine immigrée qui se considèrent musulmans	
Jeunes musulmans	
Jeunesse française d'origine immigrée et musulmane	
Jeunes Français musulmans	
Jeunes musulmans de seconde génération	
Jeunes d'origine musulmane	
Jeunes des banlieues françaises	
Jeunes issus de l'immigration arabo-musulmane	
Jeunesse de culture arabo-musulmane	
Jeunes gens d'origine arabo-musulmane	
Jeunes Français	
Jeunes hommes des cités	
Jeunes hommes musulmans	
Jeunes musulmans de France	
Jeunesse musulmane	
Jeunes issus de l'immigration maghrébine	

Table 9.1. Lexical collocates of islam in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
67	7.89624	france
26	5.08048	radical
20	4.43536	judaïsme
18	3.84034	musulmans
15	3.77635	religion
15	3.72462	politique
16	3.63567	nous
14	3.48503	islam
10	3.09772	laïcité
11	3.02141	français
9	2.98929	modéré
9	2.95023	terrorisme
8	2.79635	amalgame
8	2.78967	islamisme
8	2.69143	république

Table 9.2. Lexical collocates of islam in *Le Monde*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
35	5.51607	france
15	3.84858	radical
8	2.75625	laïcité
7	2.58360	judaïsme
6	2.43637	modéré
9	2.43106	musulmans
6	2.15703	jeunes
5	2.06870	religion

Table 9.3. Lexical collocates of islam in *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
32	5.23851	france
13	3.55994	judaïsme
11	3.28813	radical
12	3.18691	islam
11	3.14337	politique
10	3.04393	religion
12	3.04341	nous
7	2.46429	certains
9	2.43106	musulmans
6	2.40705	critique
6	2.40473	islamisme
6	2.38853	terrorisme
6	2.29130	république
7	2.27568	français
5	2.19549	amalgame
5	2.19296	pratique
5	2.10674	paix

Table 10.1. Lexical collocates of antisémite(s) and antisémitisme in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
79	8.87421	actes
58	7.53564	france
36	5.97961	racisme
25	4.99064	agressions
22	4.68314	montée
21	4.57896	nouvel
21	4.46398	juifs
16	3.99050	acte
13	3.59284	racistes
13	3.59460	violences

13	3.48348	jeunes
13	3.55432	musulmans
12	3.45721	antisionisme
12	3.36912	raciste
12	3.45904	leur
11	3.28459	graffitis
11	3.31324	agression
11	3.29443	anti
11	3.26548	face
11	3.30237	pays
11	3.31045	très
10	3.15519	depuis
10	3.15072	caractère
10	3.09924	préjugés
10	3.15704	lutte

Table 10.2. Lexical collocates of antisémite(s) and antisémitisme in *Le Monde*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
49	6.94117	actes
46	6.48424	france
27	5.11815	racisme
20	4.43747	agressions
15	3.85881	nouvel
15	3.84380	montée
15	3.40809	juifs
11	3.29277	raciste
11	3.27865	acte
11	3.21048	pays
10	3.12091	racistes
9	2.98762	graffitis

9	2.98062	antisionisme
9	2.95963	lutte
10	2.95342	israël
9	2.94940	violences
9	2.94779	anti
11	2.87696	musulmans
8	2.80902	caractère
8	2.80445	agression
9	2.79599	jeunes
8	2.77933	manifestation
8	2.58064	antisémitisme
7	2.55603	haine
7	2.55359	face

Table 10.3. Lexical collocates of antisémite(s) and antisémitisme in *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
30	5.45453	actes
12	3.28794	france
9	2.95922	racisme
7	2.63286	montée
6	2.44272	nouvel
6	2.22762	juifs
5	2.21907	acte
5	2.21514	agressions
5	2.21296	propos
5	2.20882	extrême
5	2.19378	droite

Table 11. Lexical collocates of islamophobe and islamophobie in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
9	2.97634	racisme
9	2.88199	france
7	2.64446	ccif
7	2.59936	antisémitisme
6	2.44406	collectif
6	2.44083	lutte

Table 12. Lexical collocates of racisme in *Le Monde* and *Le Figaro*

Freq.	t-score	Collocate
38	6.15654	sos
36	5.93245	antisémitisme
27	5.17872	anti
15	3.85490	lutte
14	3.42916	france
9	2.97634	islamophobie
8	2.82017	licra
9	2.75998	nous
8	2.63493	même
7	2.62669	forme
7	2.60410	arabe
7	2.59845	victimes
7	2.55186	président
7	2.52891	mots
6	2.44301	ordinaire
6	2.43996	blancs
6	2.43462	amitié
6	2.41975	mouvement
7	2.40748	leur

6	2.35379	racisme
6	2.34883	société
7	2.32700	musulmans
7	2.24158	on
5	2.23356	antimusulman

Table 13. Affective Terminology

Term	Freq.	Term	Freq.
malaise, mal-être, sentiment d'insécurité, angoisse, mal, inquiétude, inquiet, s'inquiéter, inquiétant, anxiété, appréhension	16	tension.s, tendu.es, crispation	9
peur, crainte, craindre, redouter, redouté.es	13	passion, passionné.es, attiser les passions, excités, échauffement des esprits	5
choqué, choc, abasourdie	4	indignation, indigné.es	4
écœurant, mal au ventre	3	sentiment	3
étonner, surpris	2	ressentir	2
émotion	2	désarroi	2
rancœur, ressentiment	2	honte	1
frustrations	2	satanisation	1
traumatisme, traumatisé	2	fantasmer	1
ébranlement	1	blessure	1
fissure	1	tiraillé	1
amour	1	révoltés	1
se sentir abandonnée	1	tristesse	1
irrationnel.le	1		

Table 14: Interviewees

Name	Ethnic Background	Role	Association	Location & Date
Amina, early 20s, Egyptian Muslim	Egyptian	Member	Coexister	Paris, 14/09/2019
Yasmina, early 40s, French Muslim	Moroccan	President/ Founder	Convivencia	Aix-en-Provence, 20/09/2019
David, Mid-20s, French Jew	Algerian and Moroccan	Employee	SOS Racisme	Paris, 24/09/2019
Rachida, late 20s, French Muslim	Tunisian	President	Coexister	Paris, 25/09/2019
Edouard, mid-50s, French-Israeli Jew	Algerian; German	Independent interreligious dialogue facilitator	N/A	Paris, 27/09/2019
Ismael, Late 20s, French, No religious affiliation, from a Muslim background	Algerian	President/ Founder	Shams-France	Paris, 16/10/2019, 30/10/2019
Thierry Cohen (real name), Late 50s, French Jew	Algerian	Novelist, Association Founder	Noël Ensemble	Lyon, 17/10/2019

Farhad, Early 50s, French Bahá'í	Iranian	Member	Convivencia	Marseille, 19/10/2019
Miriam, Mid-40s, French Jew	Moroccan	Member	Convivencia	Marseille, 21/10/2019
Ludovic-Mohamed Zahed (real name), Early 40s, French Muslim	Algerian	Founder	CALEM/HM2F	Marseille, 21/10/2019
Emilie, Early 40s, French No religious affiliation	White European	Employee	IMA	Paris, 23/10/1990
Valérie (early 50s) and Nathanaël (early 30s) No religious affiliation	White European	Vice- president and president, respectivel y	Parler en Paix	Paris, 25/10/2019
Christophe, Early 50s, French Christian	White European	Former President	David et Jonathan	Paris, 27/10/2019
Michel, Early 40s, French Jew	Ashkenazi	Former employee	Formerly mahJ	Paris, 28/10/2019
Ahmed, Late 20s, French Muslim	Moroccan	Member	Coexister	Paris, 29/10/2019

Nadia Hathroubi-Safsaf (real name), Early 40s, French Muslim	Tunisian	Novelist, Editor in Chief, Elected Official, PhD student in sociology	Courrier de l'Atlas	Paris, 29/10/2019
Sara, Mid 60s, French-Israeli Jew	Algerian; Tunisian	Employee	mahJ	Paris, 29/10/2019
Noam, Late 30s, French Jew	Moroccan	Board member/ Co-founder	Centre Dalâla	Paris, 31/10/2019

Table 15: Events Attended

Event	Association	Location & Date
Salam, Shalom, Salut Launch Event	SOS Racisme	La Bellevilloise, Paris, 30/10/2019
Guided tour: Juifs et musulmans, une histoire partagée	IMA and mahJ	IMA, Paris, 02/10/2019
Chorale de Convivencia	Convivencia	Marseille, 19/10/2019
Friday Prayers & Apéro	CALEM	Marseille, 20/09/2019, 18/10/2019
Board Meeting	Centre Dalâla	Paris, 08/10/2019

Talk on “orthodoxies et homosexualités”	Beit Haverim	Paris, 03/10/2019

Document 1: Initial contact email

Bonjour,

Je m’appelle Adi Bharat et je mène un projet de recherche dans le cadre de mon doctorat à l’Université de Manchester. Je vous écris pour vous inviter à participer à mon projet intitulé : Jewish-Muslim Intergroup/Interfaith Activism in Paris.

Le but de cette étude de comprendre comment des activistes intergroupes/interreligieux construisent et maintiennent des liens de solidarité entre musulmans et juifs. Les résultats de cette recherche pourront aider à comprendre le rôle de l’interreligieux dans les relations entre juifs et musulmans dans la France contemporaine.

Vous êtes un.e candidat.e éligible à cette étude si vous : (1) avez 18 ans ou plus ; (2) parlez français ; (3) avez été ou êtes toujours impliqué.e dans l’interreligieux.

Si vous désirez participer, vous n’avez qu’à lire les document ci-joints (feuille de renseignements et formulaire de consentement) et à m’envoyer un mail. Je vous contacterai ensuite dans les plus brefs délais pour fixer un rendez-vous.

Bien à vous,
Adi

Document 2: Information Sheet

Interfaith Solidarity Movements in Paris
Feuille de renseignements

Vous êtes invités à participer à une étude dans le cadre de ma recherche de doctorat sur les relations judéomusulmanes dans la France contemporaine. Avant de décider de participer, il est important que vous compreniez les raisons pour cette étude et de quoi elle consistera. Veuillez prendre le temps de lire attentivement les informations suivantes et d’en discuter avec d'autres personnes si vous le souhaitez avant de décider de participer. N'hésitez pas à me poser des questions s'il y a quelque chose qui n'est pas clair ou si vous souhaitez plus d'informations.

A propos de cette étude

- **Qui va mener l'étude?**

Adi S. Bharat, French Studies, University of Manchester

- **Quel est le but de l'étude ?**

Cette étude cherche à comprendre comment les activistes intergroupes / interconfessionnels construisent et maintiennent des liens de solidarité entre musulmans et juifs. Les participants seront choisis sur la base de leur statut de militants intergroupes / interconfessionnels.

Les résultats de la recherche seront-ils publiés?

Les résultats de cette étude seront inclus dans ma thèse de doctorat. Les participants seront informés des résultats et s'ils seront publiés sous quelque forme que ce soit à l'avenir.

Qui a examiné le projet de recherche?

- Ce projet a été examiné par le comité d'éthique de la recherche proportionnelle de l'université de Manchester.

Qui finance le projet ?

Ce projet est financé par la School of Arts, Languages and Cultures de l'Université de Manchester.

Ma participation

Que devrais-je faire si je participais?

- Si vous êtes d'accord, vous serez interviewé entre 45 minutes et une heure et demie. L'entretien se déroulera pendant la journée dans un lieu public (restaurants, cafés, parcs) ou dans un cadre professionnel (bureaux, salles de réunion). Vous ne serez interviewé qu'une seule fois, mais vous aurez l'occasion de relire la transcription de l'interview une fois prête.

Vais-je être rémunéré pour ma participation?

- Vous ne serez pas rémunéré pour votre participation.

Que se passe-t-il si je ne veux pas participer ou si je change d'avis?

C'est à vous de décider de participer ou non. Si vous décidez de participer, il vous sera demandé de conserver cette fiche d'information et de signer un formulaire de consentement. Si vous décidez de participer, vous êtes toujours libre de vous retirer à tout moment sans donner de raison et sans vous porter préjudice. Cependant, il ne sera pas possible de supprimer vos données du projet une fois qu'elles auront été pseudonymisées, car nous ne serons pas en mesure d'identifier vos données spécifiques. Cela n'affecte pas vos droits de protection des données. Si vous décidez de ne pas participer, vous n'avez rien à faire de plus.

Un enregistrement audio de l'entrevue est essentiel à la création d'une transcription exacte. Par conséquent, votre participation dépend de votre acceptation de l'enregistrement. Cependant, vous êtes libre d'arrêter l'enregistrement à tout moment.

Protection des données et confidentialité

Quelles informations allez-vous collecter sur moi ?

Afin de participer à ce projet de recherche, nous devrons collecter des informations permettant de vous identifier, appelées « informations personnelles identifiables ». Plus précisément, nous devrons collecter:

- Votre description de vos identités individuelles et collectives
- Vos points de vue sur les expériences juives et musulmanes et sur les relations entre juifs et musulmans en France
- Des détails sur votre implication dans l'interreligieux
- Votre consentement écrit

Les enregistrements audio ne captureront que votre voix et celle du chercheur.

Sur quelle base légale collectez-vous ces informations?

Nous recueillons et stockons ces informations personnelles identifiables conformément à la loi sur la protection des données, qui protège vos droits. Celles-ci indiquent que nous devons disposer d'une base légale (raison spécifique) pour collecter vos données. Pour cette étude, la raison spécifique est qu'il s'agit « d'une tâche d'intérêt public » et « d'un processus nécessaire à des fins de recherche ».

Quels sont mes droits par rapport aux informations que vous allez collecter sur moi ?

La loi sur la protection des données vous confère un certain nombre de droits concernant vos informations personnelles. Par exemple, vous pouvez demander une copie des informations que nous détenons sur vous, y compris les enregistrements audio. Si vous souhaitez en savoir plus sur vos différents droits ou sur la manière dont nous utilisons vos informations personnelles pour vous assurer que nous respectons la loi, veuillez consulter notre Privacy Notice for Research:
http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=37095

Ma participation à l'étude sera-t-elle confidentielle et mes informations personnelles identifiables seront-elles protégées?

Conformément à la loi sur la protection des données, l'Université de Manchester est le Data Controller de ce projet. Cela signifie que nous sommes responsables de la sécurité, de la confidentialité et de l'utilisation de vos informations personnelles uniquement dans la manière qui vous a été précisée. Tous les chercheurs sont formés dans cet esprit et vos données seront traitées de la manière suivante:

- Pour assurer la confidentialité, les participants se verront attribuer un numéro d'identification uniquement connu par le chercheur.
- Les données seront donc pseudonymisées dans les meilleurs délais.
- Les enregistrements seront enregistrés numériquement et transcrits par moi-même.
- Les enregistrements seront créés conformément à la procédure standard de l'Université pour la création d'enregistrements audio de participants à la recherche.
- Un appareil crypté fourni par l'université sera utilisé pour l'enregistrement. Les enregistrements seront stockés dans un endroit sûr (système de stockage des données de recherche de l'université).
- Une fois les enregistrements sauvegardés dans un emplacement sécurisé, ils seront supprimés de l'appareil d'enregistrement.
- • Les transcriptions seront créés rapidement et stockés sur des serveurs universitaires conformément à la procédure standard pour le traitement des enregistrements audio des participants à la recherche scientifique.
- • Les transcriptions ne seront stockées qu'en des emplacements chiffrés approuvés par l'université. Les transcriptions seront produites dans un environnement où seul le transcripteur pourra entendre l'entretien, à l'aide d'écouteurs.
- À aucun moment, les enregistrements ou les transcriptions ne seront partagés avec qui que ce soit.
- • Seul le chercheur aura accès à vos informations personnelles, mais il les anonymisera dès que possible. Votre nom et toute autre information qui pourrait vous identifier seront supprimés et remplacés par un numéro d'identification aléatoire. Seule le chercheur aura accès à la clé qui relie ce numéro d'identification à vos informations personnelles. Votre formulaire de consentement et vos coordonnées seront conservés pendant 5 ans dans le système de stockage des données de recherche de l'université.

Veuillez également noter que l'Université de Manchester ou des autorités de régulation peuvent avoir besoin d'examiner les données recueillies pour cette étude afin de s'assurer que le projet est mené à bien comme prévu. Cela peut impliquer de regarder des données identifiables. Toutes les personnes impliquées dans l'audit et le suivi de l'étude auront un devoir de confidentialité strict envers vous en tant que participant à la recherche.

Et si j'ai une plainte?

Toute plainte peut être adressée aux directeurs de recherche du chercheur à l'Université de Manchester. Si vous souhaitez adresser votre plainte à une personne indépendante du projet de recherche, vous devez vous adresser au Research Governance and Integrity Officer dont les coordonnées sont ci-dessous:

Coordonnées

Si vous avez une plainte à adresser aux membres de l'équipe de recherche, veuillez contacter [contact details of supervisors].

Si vous souhaitez déposer une plainte formelle à une personne indépendante de l'équipe de recherche ou si vous n'êtes pas satisfait de la réponse que vous avez reçue du chercheur en première instance, veuillez contacter [The Research Governance and Integrity Officer's contact information]

Informations de contact

Si vous avez des questions sur l'étude ou si vous souhaitez y participer, veuillez contacter le chercheur : [Adi Bharat's contact details]

Document 3: Consent Form

Interfaith Solidarity Movements in Paris
Formulaire de consentement

Si vous souhaitez participer, veuillez remplir et signer le formulaire de consentement.

	Activities	Initials
1	Je reconnais avoir pris connaissance de la feuille de renseignements ci jointe (Version 1, 16/04/2019) pour l'étude précitée. Je confirme que j'ai eu la possibilité d'examiner les renseignements contenus dans le document et de poser des questions qui ont été repondues de façon satisfactoire.	
2	Je comprends que ma participation à cette étude est entièrement volontaire et que je peux décider de me retirer en tout temps, sans aucune pénalité. Je comprends que ce ne sera pas possible de supprimer mes données du projet une fois qu'il a été anonymisées et fait partie de l'ensemble de données.	
3	J'accepte d'être enregistré sur bande audio.	
4	Je donne mon accord pour que les données collectées puissent être publiées sous forme anonyme dans des livres universitaires, des rapports ou des revues scientifiques.	

5	Je comprends que les données recueillies au cours de l'étude peuvent être examinées par des personnes de l'Université de Manchester ou des autorités de réglementation, dans la mesure où elles sont pertinentes pour ma participation à cette recherche. J'autorise ces personnes à accéder à mes données.	
6	J'accepte de plein gré de participer à la présente étude.	

Protection des données

Les informations personnelles que nous collectons et utilisons pour mener cette recherche seront traitées conformément à la loi sur la protection des données, comme indiqué dans la feuille de renseignements et dans la Privacy Notice for Research Participants:

http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=37095

_____ _____ _____

Nom du participant Signature Date

_____ _____ _____

Nom du chercheur Signature Date

Une copie de ce formulaire sera fournie au participant, tandis que le chercheur conservera l'original.

Document 4: Interview Questions

Où et quand êtes-vous nés?
Où as-tu grandi?
Parlez-moi un peu de votre famille.
Parlez-moi un peu de votre expérience scolaire.
Parlez-moi de votre parcours professionnel. Quel genre de carrière avez-vous eu jusqu'à présent?

Quels mots utilisez-vous pour vous décrire?
Pourriez-vous me parler un peu de votre choix de mots pour vous décrire?
Pensez-vous que ce sont les mêmes mots que d'autres personnes utilisent pour vous décrire?
Comment pensez-vous que vos identités sont perçues par les autres?
Pourriez-vous me parler de votre relation à la religion?
Qu'en est-il de vos amis et de votre famille?
Quel est l'état actuel des relations entre juifs et musulmans en France?
Comment les relations judéomusulmanes sont-elles représentées dans le discours politique et dans les médias français contemporains?
Quel en est le lien avec les interactions sur le terrain entre juifs et musulmans en France?
Pourriez-vous m'aider à comprendre l'islamophobie dans la France contemporaine?
Qu'en est-il de l'antisémitisme contemporain?
L'islamophobie et l'antisémitisme sont-ils liés?
Que pensez-vous de l'idée d'un nouvel antisémitisme ou d'une nouvelle judéophobie?
Comment êtes-vous devenu membre de cette association?
Quels sont les principaux objectifs et ambitions de cette association?
Pensez-vous que l'association est près d'atteindre ces objectifs?
Quels sont les défis auxquels l'association est confrontée ou a été confrontée dans le passé ?
Pourriez-vous me parler un peu des succès qu'a eu l'association?
De quoi êtes-vous le plus fier à propos de cette association?
En quoi cette association est-elle bien équipée pour atteindre ses objectifs principaux?
Pourriez-vous me parler de la structure organisationnelle de l'association?
Qui en sont les membres ?
Est-elle active ? La plupart des membres participent-ils activement au sein de l'association?