

Chapter Title: (Trans)National Spaces: Jewish Sites in Contemporary Germany

Chapter Author(s): MICHAEL MENG

Book Title: Three-Way Street

Book Subtitle: Jews, Germans, and the Transnational

Book Editor(s): JAY HOWARD GELLER, LESLIE MORRIS

Published by: University of Michigan Press. (2016)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3998/mpub.9221214.18>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. Funding is provided by Knowledge Unlatched Select 2020: HSS Backlist.



University of Michigan Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Three-Way Street*

CHAPTER 14

(Trans)National Spaces: Jewish Sites in Contemporary Germany

MICHAEL MENG

In 1945, the physical markers of Jewishness in Germany were ruins—defiled synagogues, destroyed Jewish cemeteries, silent Jewish neighborhoods. Although a significant number of Jews rebuilt their lives in occupied and divided Germany, ruined spaces of prewar Jewish life were all that was left in most villages, towns, and cities. Jewish ruins have elicited a wide range of responses from Germans since 1945. Jewish sites have been protected, preserved, altered, restored, destroyed, or simply left alone; they have provoked anxiety, melancholia, nostalgia, and fascination. How Germans have dealt with Jewish sites has depended on how they have valued these embodiments of the past at specific moments in time and space. In the 1950s and 1960s, Germans on both sides of the Iron Curtain generally swept away many Jewish sites as worthless rubble. Yet, beginning in the late 1970s, some Germans began to see Jewish spaces as valuable relics of the past that should be protected. This interest in Jewish sites has continued over the past three decades and has become ever more transnational as people from various parts of the world—although mostly from the United States and Israel—have become similarly attracted to Germany's built Jewish heritage.¹

In this chapter, I would like to explore the local, national, and transnational meanings that this rediscovery of the Jewish past in the built environment involves.² I am interested in considering at one and the same time the national and transnational contexts of Germany's recovery of Jewish sites. In some cities, especially post-1989 Berlin, Germany's ethnically diversifying society and enlarged Jewish population has led to novel conjurings of Jewishness amid the proliferation of new Jewish spaces and transnational engagements with the Jewish past. As people with different backgrounds, interests, and his-

tories encounter Jewish spaces and reflect upon the Holocaust, Germany's long-standing national framing of memory as a hermetic ethno-cultural German practice appears to be loosening, suggesting, more broadly, the emergence of cosmopolitan memories among some segments of society in Berlin.³ And yet such transnationalization of memory is rare: many Jewish spaces in Germany remain deeply entangled in the identifications, meanings, and discourses of the nation-state. As the example of Essen shows perhaps most vividly, Jewish spaces still largely function as sites to manage Germany's violent history for the production of post-Nazi national identifications in the present. Valued and framed as symbolic markers of national recovery, highly public and institutionalized Jewish spaces underpin Germany's postwar redemptive understanding of itself as a nation-state that has successfully developed into a tolerant, cosmopolitan polity.⁴

By looking at the two cities of Berlin and Essen, this chapter thus examines the interplay of transnational and national memories in the local built environment. The case of Essen unearths how memory and space remain anchored in local and national framings of the past, while some of Berlin's newer and less institutional Jewish spaces point to the emergence of transnational memories. The chapter concludes by arguing that transnational memories emerge most visibly on the local level within efforts to transcend the hermetic identifications, meanings, and boundaries that Holocaust memory in Germany has now often come to reinforce. Put simply, this chapter attempts to capture the complexity of the contemporary moment defined by, on the one hand, the persistence of national framings of the past in Germany, and by, on the other hand, the diversification of the country's memory landscape as different segments of society seek to invest the past with new meanings.

Essen's synagogue has had an unusual career over the past one hundred years. In 1913, the synagogue's construction reflected the exuberance of Imperial Germany on the eve of the Great War: its majestic dome and monumental stone masonry captured Essen's arrival as an industrial linchpin of Germany's burgeoning global economy. "I am convinced," exclaimed one local in the *Essener Volkszeitung*, "that the entirety of Essen is proud of this noble building, just as Essen's citizenry is with the same right proud of the unprecedented development of our hometown, which now has experienced through this wonderful building such a splendid enhancement that so magnificently fits into the image of our city."⁵ The synagogue was viewed as an integral part of Essen's physical landscape and urban identity. Twenty-five years later, as Esseners stared at the burning building on November 9, 1938, the synagogue was seen as the very

opposite. It was now a defiled structure that had to be expelled from the urban landscape. In 1941, urban planner Sturm Kegel, who later influenced the rebuilding of postwar Essen, envisioned demolishing the synagogue in general plans for the city's reconstruction.⁶ In the end, that never happened. The massive stone building survived the Nazi period and the extensive bombing of Essen during the war. In 1945, the synagogue's interior was charred, but it remained intact. The synagogue stood in fact as one of the few buildings in an otherwise ruined city that Esseners could recognize.

After the war, Esseners struggled to figure out what to do with this once celebrated, yet now scarred and violated space. The town's official Jewish community of 145 members no longer wanted to use the building. The synagogue had become a "defiled house of worship" and was, practically speaking, too large for their needs.⁷ The Jewish Trust Corporation owned the property but sold it to the city of Essen in 1960, when city officials finally reached a decision about the synagogue's future after neglecting it for nearly fifteen years. City officials decided to turn it into an exhibition on the wonders of the German economic miracle, tying the synagogue into Essen's new postwar identity as the "Shopping City" of the Federal Republic. On November 24, 1961, the exhibition opened its doors in a newly renovated synagogue, which cost the city two million marks to carry out. The interior had been altered completely, and the grand opening capped the building's transformation with an odd negotiation between past and present. In a speech at the unveiling, the state cultural minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, Werner Schütz, noted that "perhaps it would have been a good solution" to turn the synagogue into a powerful monument "of the terrible things in the past," but then suggested that the current exhibition might foster such remembrance.⁸ Schütz left unexplained how an exhibition of dishwashers, stoves, and irons was to represent the Holocaust, yet few in Essen seemed to question his logic, at least in public. "The synagogue has been used very well," one visitor remarked. "The city of Essen could not have done any better."⁹ The synagogue, now called the House of Industrial Design, was integrated into Essen's postwar transformation as a thriving industrial and consumerist hub of the West German economic miracle. It showcased one of West Germany's key post-Nazi identities as a nation-state defined by economic prosperity and ingenuity.

The peculiarity of this appropriation of Essen's synagogue was eloquently captured by Amos Elon, who travelled to postwar Germany in the mid-1960s and wrote about his impressions of its "reconstruction" in *Journey Through a Haunted Land: The New Germany*. Germany's newness, prosperity, monotony, and tranquility struck Elon as particularly uncanny. In the country's bland neon

lights and twisting Mercedes stars, he saw a ubiquitous urge to start entirely anew, an ebullience to turn the year 1945 into a radically new temporal moment that would break through the continuity of the past: "Before one knows if Germany has changed, one sees it is new. In 1945 Germany was a pile of rubble; twenty years later—a 'little America.' The resurrected cities—brand new, clean, sober, infinitely monotonous—stand on the former ruins."¹⁰ Even so, the past could not be erased; the dialectic of postwar reconstruction—the building of the new from the ruins of the past—failed to efface all physical markers of the past. Passing through Essen, Elon stumbled upon its synagogue:

In the center of Essen, new skyscrapers have gone up next to Krupp's old red brick enormities. Essen is the old armory of the Reich. Its fate is intricately enmeshed with the industrial revolution and the debacles of the German nation.

In 1945 the center of town lay for the most part in ruins; today it is completely rebuilt. Fourteen large department stores and many smaller shops make Essen the shopping center of the entire Ruhr region. The larger Jewish synagogue has been transformed into an industrial exhibition; it had become too large for the few Jews still living here.¹¹

By the mid-1960s, a handful of Esseners began to voice unease with the synagogue's modernist transformation. Local historian Ernst Schmidt, a member of the Association of the Victims of the Nazi Regime (VVN) and of the German Communist Party (DKP), became the most vocal opponent. In 1967, he prepared a proposal for the VVN's annual meeting that called for the construction of a museum to be located in the synagogue. The museum would be on contemporary history and focus on ten themes, including the Nazi seizure of power, the persecution of the Jews, resistance, occupied Europe, Stalingrad, and postwar peace.¹² Detlev Peukert, who rapidly became one of West Germany's most imaginative historians before his sudden death in 1990, joined forces with Schmidt a decade later. The two forged an intergenerational alliance to advance knowledge about Nazi Germany and develop a permanent exhibition in the synagogue. After years of cajoling, they were able to convince city officials to support their plans.

On November 9, 1980, their exhibition, "Resistance and Persecution in Essen, 1933–1945," was unveiled in the redesigned synagogue. Mirroring Peukert's scholarly interests in resistance and the broad sociocultural conditions that made Nazism possible, the exhibit discussed the rise of Nazism and local opposition to it.¹³ At the exhibition's unveiling, Essen's mayor, Horst Katzor of

the Social Democrats, touched on the “terrible times,” “guilt,” “murder,” and “undesirable crimes” that the building symbolized before adding: “But this building in the middle of the city is also a symbol of courage, bravery, inner greatness, human dignity, steadfastness, sturdy belief, unique sacrifice—examples for us and future generations.”¹⁴ On the anniversary of the synagogue’s violent destruction during Kristallnacht, the mayor crafted a narrative of recovery and hope about a victimized German population that had made it through tough times, tragedy, and barbarism to build the peaceful, democratic society of today. If throughout the 1960s the synagogue displayed German industrial ingenuity, now it symbolized German suffering and resistance. As the local newspaper put it, the “synagogue is a memorial for all victims of violence.”¹⁵ This formulation oddly placed German Jews on the same level as non-Jewish Germans who were supposedly resisting rather than perpetrating Nazi crimes. Indeed, the pamphlet for the new exhibition began by describing a photo of the synagogue. It was not the one snapped in 1938, showing a crowd of Esseners gawking at the burning building, but one taken just after the war that showed the synagogue in the middle of the city full of rubble and ash. The pamphlet suggested that this picture symbolized “destruction in a material, moral, and physical sense” and the plight of the “few who were prepared to offer resistance.”¹⁶ This photo, placed in the synagogue, invoked the iconic image of the bombed-out German city to offer a spatial, visual, and mnemonic interpretation of German suffering and resistance.¹⁷

This exhibition, though, did not last long. As the Holocaust became the subject of greater public discussion throughout the Federal Republic in the 1980s and gradually became an important aspect of German national identity during the bitter memory feuds of that decade, a handful of local church leaders, residents, and Jewish community members expressed interest in changing the building’s function to reflect more clearly its complicated, traumatic history.¹⁸ In the early 1980s, a local committee on the synagogue was formed to discuss proposals to develop a new exhibition on Jewish history and to restore the synagogue’s interior to its original prewar design, which had been heavily damaged during Kristallnacht and altered in 1960. Local protestant church leaders were especially pushing for the building’s restoration.¹⁹ They were joined by former Jewish residents of Essen who returned to the city in the early 1980s only to find that the synagogue’s interior had been transformed into a functional exhibition space. As criticism of the exhibition mounted, Essen’s mayor announced in 1986 that the city would restore the building’s interior to its original form and revise the current exhibition to emphasize the Nazi persecution of the Jews. On November 5, 1988, the synagogue reopened its doors to a restored interior and

new exhibition on Jewish life. It marked the building's third post-1945 transformation. Just as in 1961 and 1981, so too now a large crowd gathered to hear speeches about the synagogue's importance. Mayor Peter Reuschenbach said that the building counteracted "any attempts to smooth over our history," while Johannes Rau, the minister-president of North Rhine-Westphalia and future German president, urged Esseners to act "against forgetting and silence."²⁰ The synagogue, long incorporated into Essen's identity of postwar consumption and briefly turned into a symbol of German victimization, now appeared as a site of Jewish suffering that must not be forgotten.

Today, the synagogue continues to serve this mnemonic function, but it has recently undergone yet another change—its fourth—that has broadened its purpose. In February 2008, Essen's city council approved a 7.4 million euro plan to transform the building into a "House of Jewish Culture."²¹ A building whose "Jewish character for too long was 'deformed, concealed, or ignored'" is now no longer a memorial that "reduces Jews only to the role of the victim." The synagogue seeks to be an "open house, a meeting point for lively exchange."²² The newly designed space was unveiled in July 2010 in time for Essen's debut as the regional hub of the 2010 "European Capital of Culture." As in 1961, 1981, and 1988, Essen's mayor spoke of the synagogue's importance in front of a large crowd gathered in the building. He connected the restored synagogue to its original unveiling in 1913, saying that "today is once again a good day for this building and for our city."²³ Noting that "dealing with Jewish culture" has long been a "measure" of German "openness, humanity, and tolerance," the mayor framed the House of Jewish Culture as evidence of Germany's transformation into a tolerant, democratic polity. As Essen now positions itself as a "European" city, the recovery of its Jewish past provides a public symbol of cosmopolitanism. Passing over the building's complicated history in two sentences and underplaying the complex realities of ensuring tolerance today in Germany's diversifying society (24 percent of Essen's population has a "migration background"), the mayor seemed to imply that Essen had now arrived at an appropriate use of the building.²⁴

In Berlin, the rediscovery of Jewish spaces is both quite similar and different from that of Essen. In the 1950s and 1960s, most of what remained of Berlin's Jewish sites, especially the ruins of its synagogues, was cleared during urban reconstruction. Beginning in the late 1970s, Berliners on both sides of the Wall either began to discover the few sites that had escaped the wrecking ball or to commemorate the spaces of those now gone. In West Berlin, this interest in the city's Jewish past largely involved demarcating what was no longer present,

working through the absence of Jewish sites by publishing local histories, sponsoring museum exhibitions, writing guidebooks, and erecting monuments about them.²⁵ These efforts emerged on the district level (*Bezirk*) with the rise of local and everyday history. In the 1980s, West Berlin became home to a number of local history workshops, which sought out historical narratives different from the generally political and social-scientific accounts produced by professional historians. These organizations embraced “everyday history” with its emphasis on experience as opposed to the grand, structural narratives of social history dominant at the time. Using less traditional types of historical sources such as oral history, they focused on understanding one’s local world, or as the saying went, to “excavate where you stand” (*Grabe wo du stehst*).

In East Berlin, the rediscovery of Jewish traces in the built environment involved similar local efforts but was more centrally managed by the state in response to growing international concerns about the regime’s policies toward Jews. By the late 1970s, East Berlin’s Jewish community had dwindled to a few hundred members and its Jewish sites were crumbling away. Hundreds of tombstones had fallen over at the Jewish cemetery on Schönhauser Avenue in the district of Prenzlauer Berg, and the city’s most visible site, the New Synagogue on Oranienburger Street, remained in bombed-out form as it had since the end of the war. In the mid-1970s, state officials became increasingly concerned about these sites, urging that something be done with them, given the increasing number of “international Jewish tourists” coming to East Berlin.²⁶ By the early 1980s, East Germany’s top leadership, including Erich Honecker, decided to restore some Jewish sites to mollify growing international protests and improve the regime’s image abroad in a shifting Cold War world. In 1988, Honecker announced that the New Synagogue would be restored to serve as a Jewish museum and monument to the past.

The fall of the Berlin Wall soon intervened in Honecker’s plans, but the collapse of Communism only further stimulated interest in documenting, marking, and memorializing Berlin’s Jewish past. What began as small, localized, and selective efforts in the 1980s grew tremendously over the 1990s and 2000s and today continues to expand at an almost frenetic rate. Contemporary Berlin is perhaps ideal for such a vibrant rediscovery of Germany’s Jewish past. Edgy, young, energetic, and the current European darling of papers like the *New York Times*, Berlin has exploded onto the post-1989 imagination as a hip, cool, tolerant, free-flowing, almost-everything-goes kind of city.²⁷ “Our image here is completely decoupled from that of the rest of Germany,” a tourist office spokesperson explained to *Time Magazine* for its article “Hip Berlin: Europe’s Capital of Cool.”²⁸ Over seventeen million tourists visited Berlin in

2007, and many of them seem to absorb the image of the new Berlin. The majority of the 2,164 tourists interviewed by the city's marketing firm described Berlin with such adjectives as "multicultural," "creative," "alternative," "young," "innovative," "vibrant," "historically interesting," and "dynamic."²⁹

This image elides the postwar and contemporary reality of Berlin's streets. Berlin has problems with right-wing extremism, and its sizeable Turkish population remains, in the minds of some Berliners and others in Germany, segregated in districts such as Kreuzberg and Neukölln.³⁰ These mythic Turkish districts—sometimes described as ghettos—have provoked exaggerated fears about the growth of "parallel societies" in Germany, self-segregated neighborhoods whose supposed existence hinder immigrants from accepting Germany's language, customs, dress, and democratic beliefs.³¹ From 1975 to 1990, West Berlin attempted to discourage additional migrants from moving into certain districts through a combination of urban renewal projects, rent increases, and regulatory measures such as stamps in passports (the so-called *Zuzugssperre*). Most tourists rarely visit these parts of Berlin where its socioeconomic divisions are more apparent.³²

The image of cosmopolitan Berlin hinges, partly and somewhat selectively, on the city's public embrace of its Jewish past, which, as in Essen, has become a marker of Berlin's transformation into a cosmopolitan metropolis after the collapse of Nazism and Communism. The explosion of the Jewish past into Berlin's present is visible in a variety of media—print, film, music, and even food—but it has been expressed perhaps most of all in the city's built environment and particularly in one area of town—the so-called Barn Quarter, more commonly known by its German name of the Scheunenviertel.³³ Located in the middle of the city and once part of East Berlin, the Scheunenviertel and its surrounding environs have come to be seen as the closest area Berlin has to a Jewish district, a cultural construct that only partially reflects the area's history. Since the 1700s, Jews had lived in this area, and many Jewish religious sites, bakeries, butchers, schools, and bookstores were built there. Moreover, East European Jews settled in the Scheunenviertel, especially in the 1920s, making it seem perhaps distinctly "Jewish" because East European Jews tended to stand out from their acculturated, middle-class German Jewish brethren.³⁴ The district's main street of East European Jewish life, Grenadierstrasse (today Almstadtstrasse), had around twenty prayer houses and many kosher stores on it.³⁵ Thus, even if the Scheunenviertel was not quite a compact Jewish district, it has often been imagined as one, including to this day, thanks in part to tourism. In one week alone, at least ten city tours of "Jewish Berlin" can be found walking the streets of the city, moving often through the Scheunenviertel.³⁶

The Scheunenviertel is, though, hardly the only area in contemporary Berlin where Jewishness is practiced, performed, and imagined. Unlike Essen, where the House of Jewish Culture dominates, Berlin has a plethora of other Jewish spaces, which have proliferated over the past twenty years, with Berlin's growing Jewish population.³⁷ Some of these spaces, to borrow from Diana Pinto, are "Jewish-Jewish spaces" that are open to religiously defined Jews, such as synagogue services (these kind of spaces have of course existed since 1945 in both West and East Berlin, but they have expanded greatly since 1989).³⁸ Other spaces, run by the Jewish community or a Jewish organization, are open to Jews and non-Jews (examples include, among others, the Jewish Cultural Days, the Jewish Evening School, the Heinz-Galinski School, the Jewish High School, the German-Israeli Society, and the American Jewish Committee). Still other Jewish spaces, which are operated neither by the Jewish Community nor a Jewish organization, are Berlin's most open, public, and prominent Jewish sites (the Jewish Museum and the Holocaust Memorial). All of these Jewish spaces are managed by local, national, or international organizations, which are either religious or secular, private or state operated (or a mix of these in some cases).

Finally, a number of other, less institutional Jewish spaces—actual physical sites but also conceived here more broadly as events, venues, websites, and places where Jewishness is performed, discussed, and interrogated—have also emerged in Berlin since 1989.³⁹ In these new Jewish spaces, different, less institutionalized voices surface, including ones that engage with the memories and identities that some of the city's most prominent Jewish sites reinforce. In 2009, for example, Maya Escobar, an American Jewish performing artist, organized an exhibition called *Berlin's Eruv*. Berlin does not currently have an *eruv*, a space marked in public that allows observant Jews to carry items such as keys on the Sabbath, which Jewish religious law otherwise prohibits. Yet Escobar created a "metaphorical eruv" through interviews with Jews about the spaces they inhabit in Berlin, documenting a Jewish community "frequently overshadowed by the city's prominent monuments and memorials commemorating Jewish life (death)." As she explains, "*Berlin's Eruv* is a conceptual project that addresses the assumed non-presence of Jews in Germany. . . . *Berlin's Eruv* weaves together voices from Berlin's Jewish community in an attempt to construct a metaphorical *eruv* representative of a living Jewish Community. Just as the *eruv* exists in the minds of the people who abide by it, *Berlin's Eruv* manifests itself through the conversations surrounding the idea of the piece."⁴⁰

In a similar yet perhaps more provocative register, Daniel Kahn, a young Jewish Klezmer musician from Detroit, has been creating since 2005 alternative

Jewish spaces in Berlin with his band Painted Bird, named after Jerzy Kosiński's novel about wartime Poland.⁴¹ Kahn's music, what he calls "alienating Klezmer," deals with a range of economic and cultural themes but often references the Nazi past in some way.⁴² Kahn is not interested, though, in writing songs to reinforce lachrymose narratives of Jewish history. Rather, he seeks to unsettle that conventional identity by drawing attention to new forms of prejudice against other marginalized groups. "There is this idea of the abstract 'Jew' as the 'Other,'" he told the *Frankfurter Rundschau*. "But in this world there are always more groups who become strangers, guest workers, exiles, or foreigners. And these groups are never really accepted into the majority society."⁴³

Jewish suffering is Khan's starting point for reflecting on exclusion and persecution in the contemporary world. In 2010, for example, he performed the lead role in a play, *Warten auf Adam Spielman*, about a multiethnic group of people who are looking for Adam Spielman from Detroit to save them from violence, persecution, and confusion. Written by Hakan Savaş Mican from Berlin and directed by Michael Ronen from Jerusalem, the play questions cultural, ethnic, and religious identifications. The themes of displacement, exile, wandering, and cosmopolitanism nourish in the play salvific hopes. Performed at Ballhaus Naunynstrasse, a house devoted to artists and visitors with "migrant and postmigrant identifications," Kahn wrote and performed the play's four-part "testament." The last installment—"absolution"—speaks of bringing out the "Jewishness" in everyone:

So when they ask you for your papers and you don't know what to do
 Remember in this moment what you're carrying with you
 Because the day will come when all your papers are refused
 And then you'll find yourself in exile, too
 So learn to take the rootless cosmopolitan world view,
 Blood and land are things with which it doesn't have to do.
 Religion is a matter most irrelevant here, too:
 I talk about the inner Other hiding inside you.
 I mean it as a question, not an answer to your blues
 The question is the answer and the question, it is you
 And the name I give this question is a Jew
 But a Jew can be an Arab or a German or a Druze.
 So if you have a better name that you would like to use
 I'd love to read the testament of you
 The imaginary messianic diasporic you
 The *post-migrantisch kreuzberg wohnen naunynstrasse* du . . .⁴⁴

These two brief examples of Khan and Escobar may capture briefly several broader cultural and intellectual shifts that are coming together in some of Berlin's newest Jewish spaces amid the city's emergence as a significant destination for Jewish travelers and artists. Long viewed as a space of death, attitudes toward Germany, and Europe more broadly, among some Jews in North America and Israel appear to be becoming more complex.⁴⁵ As Zionism has lost its appeal among some Jews in the United States and Israel, some have turned to Europe and Germany to explore new questions about what it means to be Jewish and what it means to live in a world defined by different ethnic, religious, and cultural identifications.⁴⁶

In short, some Jewish spaces can be characterized as transnational in contemporary Berlin, and by this I mean not just through diverse encounters by people from different parts of the world, but more deeply through, as Kahn's collaborative work in *Warten auf Adam Spielman* suggests, efforts to explore the multidirectional, cosmopolitan possibilities of memory and "Jewishness" in Germany's diversifying society.⁴⁷ Almost a fifth of Germany's population is made up of immigrants or descendants of immigrants. How do they fit into Germany's memory culture of the Holocaust? Do migrants have an obligation to remember the Nazi past? For years, Germany's leading proponents of remembering the Holocaust, such as Jürgen Habermas, tended to exclude migrants from Germany's memory culture.⁴⁸ In recent years, this hermetic conceptualization of German memory has loosened somewhat but with seemingly ambiguous effects. The dissemination of Holocaust memory has increasingly become an important element of "integration." In 2010, the CDU minister responsible for integration in North Rhine-Westphalia remarked that the Holocaust is "an important part of our national identity" and "a part of our shared guiding culture (*Leitkultur*)." "Especially when society changes," he noted, "it is important to always embrace anew the legacy of our history and pass it on."⁴⁹ Such calls for memory integration may be genuinely inviting; but they may also reprise essentializing assumptions about Germans and immigrants: Germans, who have long been versed in the history of the Holocaust, may emerge as enlightened teachers imparting knowledge about the Nazi past to backward pupils whose "migration background" is declared as the reason for their lack of understanding about the Holocaust. Along with recent assertions that Germany's "Judeo-Christian heritage" needs to be protected from the alleged Islamification of Germany and Europe, demands for Holocaust education can reinforce exclusive understandings of national belonging and membership.⁵⁰

These demands also unwittingly overlook the complexity of what is happening in places such as Berlin. To be sure, one can find ignorance about the

Holocaust among migrants in Germany—although such lack of knowledge cannot be explained by essentialist arguments about ethnicity, culture, and religion (and indeed is by no means limited to migrants alone). But one can also find examples of people with various backgrounds reflecting on Germany's past.⁵¹ *Warten auf Adam Spielman* is one such example, and many others exist in film, literature, music, and politics.⁵² These multidimensional efforts do not invoke the Holocaust as a component of “*Leitkultur*” but instead explicitly challenge such ethnonational framings of Germany's past and present. As German society diversifies and Jewish subjectivities shift in a migratory world, pluralist initiatives in Jewish spaces are unfolding that consider the multiple meanings of the Holocaust and Jewishness.

Nevertheless, Jewish spaces still reflect the complex temporal layers of Germany's twentieth century, reflecting histories of integration, violence, expulsion, reconstruction, democracy, and remembrance. These layers of time have long been and still are today deeply embedded in the national context of German history. Reflections on the past have of course long been central to constructing and sustaining group identifications,⁵³ but recently a number of scholars have argued that the entanglement of memory with one particular group—the national community—seems to be breaking down amid the processes of European unification and globalization. As people, goods, and ideas traverse national borders (both physically with migration and virtually with the Internet), so too are collective memories supposedly crossing boundaries as never before. In this view, the Holocaust often appears as paradigmatic of memory's transnational mobility. In *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider argue that the Holocaust has become a universal memory.⁵⁴ In *Memory in a Global Age*, Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad intimate that the era of national collective memories appears to be ebbing. “Today, memory and the global have to be studied together,” they write, “as it has become impossible to understand the trajectories of memory outside a global frame of reference.”⁵⁵

Such arguments about the rise of transnational and global memories appear to rest on several key assumptions about memory, the nation-state, the contemporary period, and the Holocaust: first, memory tends to be viewed as a commodity that moves across, below, and beyond nation-states; second, the transnationalization of memory is assumed to define the post-1989 period when memory is viewed as moving across national borders like never before with the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe, the expansion of the European Union, and the increased role of global actors and institutions with the

expansion of trade and the Internet; third, the nation-state in general is believed to be diminishing in cultural force, especially in Western Europe; and fourth, arguments about the transnationalization of Holocaust memory in particular presume that the Holocaust marks the defining event of twentieth-century European history, if not global history.

To conclude this chapter I would like to unsettle some of these assumptions. Memory is less a thing, something that is present or absent, recalled or repressed, nationally contained or transnationally diffuse, than it is an encounter with the past, an encounter that is nested in broader cultural meanings, identities, and narratives that change over time and space.⁵⁶ These meanings, identities, and narratives have long been situated in and framed by various local, national, and transnational contexts.⁵⁷ Much depends on the site and the broader urban landscape in which a particular site resides. Unlike Berlin, Essen is not a major international metropolis. The postwar history of Essen's synagogue has been determined almost exclusively by locals (as is the case for the vast majority of cities, towns, and villages across Germany and Europe). The building's shifting postwar history has mirrored the city's changing political identifications over the past sixty years.

Berlin, then, would seem like Essen's foil: international actors have shaped encounters with its Jewish sites over the past sixty years, and Berlin is home to many different kinds of Jewish spaces, around which transnational memories are being expressed. Yet in Berlin, too, national narratives strongly structure interpretations of the past. Berlin's two most prominent Jewish sites—the Jewish Museum and the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe—are deeply framed by a redemptive narrative of national recovery. Both projects represent the outcome of a political consensus that emerged by the early 1990s about the role of the Holocaust in German public life.⁵⁸ After a series of bitter memory feuds over the 1980s, a growing number of West German intellectuals, writers, academics, politicians, and journalists—first from the left but gradually from across the political spectrum—began to embrace a self-critical memory of their country's past. This embrace has become a central theme in Germany's postwar narrative of political redemption—that is, in its celebrated story of transformation into an introspective democratic society.⁵⁹ Thus, arguments about the emergence of European and global memories of the Holocaust underplay how strongly national politics still shape interpretations of the past, even in palimpsestic and global cities such as Berlin.

But it is precisely the enduring importance of the nation-state to which transnational memories of the Holocaust appear to be reacting. Cosmopolitanism exists in relationship to nationalism.⁶⁰ This relationship often takes on the

form of critique: cosmopolitan memories intend to controvert conventional national narratives and identities. This self-critical kind of memory-work often can be found on the grassroots level.⁶¹ In the 1970s and 1980s, some West and East Germans encountered the physical remnants of Jewish life in their towns and cities partly to critique dominant national narratives of German victimization. Although these self-critical efforts have continued in reunited Germany over the past twenty years, the cosmopolitan stakes of them have shifted from, first, securing a central place for the memory of the Holocaust in German public life to, second, now considering the pluralist meanings of memory when the country has diversified and Holocaust memory has become a core element of German national identity. The critical task of memory has shifted with changes in Germany's political and social landscapes. Indeed, in some of Berlin's less institutionalized Jewish spaces, efforts are now emerging to challenge rigid identifications and narratives that Holocaust memory has over time come to reinforce.⁶² These localized, more pluralist efforts do not imply that the Holocaust is a global icon above the many other cataclysms of the twentieth century, nor do they seek to overcome national narratives altogether. Rather, they consider the Holocaust's intersections with other histories of violence and reflect on its potential meanings for Germany's changing society and collective sense of self.

NOTES

1. In what follows, I use the word transnational in one of two ways: first, to denote the emergence of multiple, diversifying encounters with Jewish spaces that traverse the nation-state; or second, to describe a memory that critiques conventional national histories in support of transnational, cosmopolitan attachments.

2. This chapter pushes in new directions themes and material presented in Michael Meng, *Shattered Spaces: Encountering Jewish Ruins in Postwar Germany and Poland* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011). On moving beyond essentializing notions of Jewishness and Jewish space, see Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett and Jonathan Karp, eds., *The Art of Being Jewish in Modern Times* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Barbara E. Mann, *Space and Place in Jewish Studies* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012).

3. On the framing of memory as an ethno-cultural German responsibility, see Rita Chin et al., *After the Nazi Racial State: Difference and Democracy in Germany and Europe* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009), 22; Andreas Huyssen, "Diaspora and Nation: Migration into Other Pasts," *New German Critique* 88 (winter 2003): 147–64; Michael Meng, "Silences about Sarrazin's Racism in Contemporary Germany," *The Journal of Modern History* 87, no. 1 (March 2015): 102–35; A. Dirk Moses, *German Intellectuals and the Nazi Past* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge Univer-

sity Press, 2007), 235–39; Damani J. Partridge, “Holocaust *Mahnmal* (Memorial): Monumental Memory amidst Contemporary Race,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52, no. 4 (2010): 820–50. For somewhat similar observations for Italy and Europe more broadly, see Jeffrey D. Feldman, “Ghetto Association: Jewish Heritage, Heroin, and Racism in Bologna,” *Identities* 8, no. 2 (2001): 247–82; David Theo Goldberg, *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2009), 151–98.

4. For readings of German memory as redemptive, see Meng, *Shattered Spaces*; Moses, *German Intellectuals*; Michael Geyer, “The Politics of Memory in Contemporary Germany,” in *Radical Evil*, ed. Joan Copjec (New York: Verso, 1996), 194–95.

5. “Die Einweihung der neuen Synagoge zu Essen,” *Essener Volkszeitung*, September 27, 1913.

6. Essen Stadtarchiv (ESA), Sturm Kegel, “Das Zukunftsbild des Stadtkernes Essen. Erläuterungen zum Entwurfsplan vom 1. Februar 1941.”

7. “Was wird aus der Synagoge?,” *Rheinische Post*, May 19, 1948, in ESA, B4 (Zeitungsausschnitte).

8. ESA, 143, nr. 10798, speech by Schütz, November 24, 1961.

9. “Bessere Lösung gab es nicht. Fast alle Besucherstimmen loben das neue Haus Industrieform,” *Neue Ruhr Zeitung*, August 21, 1963.

10. Amos Elon, *Journey through a Haunted Land: The New Germany*, trans. Michael Roloff (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967), 13.

11. Elon, *Journey*, 49–50.

12. Ruhrlandmuseum, Archiv Ernst Schmidt (RAES), VVN proposal, April 15–16, 1967, quoted in Ernst Schmidt, “Alte Synagoge Essen. Der lange Weg zur Mahn- und Gedenkstätte,” 17–18.

13. *Widerstand und Verfolgung in Essen, 1933–1945* (Essen: Alte Synagoge, 1980).

14. RAES, 19–606, box 1, Speech by Horst Katzor, November 9, 1980.

15. “Synagoge Gedenkstätte für alle Gewaltopfer,” *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, January 9, 1980.

16. “Widerstand und Verfolgung in Essen, 1933–1945.” exhibition pamphlet.

17. On the symbolic importance of bombed, ruined cities in postwar Germany, see Neil Gregor, *Haunted City: Nuremberg and the Nazi Past* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008); Gilad Margalit, *Guilt, Suffering, and Memory: Germany Remembers Its Dead of World War II*, trans. Haim Watzman (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010), 147–85.

18. Saul Friedländer, *Memory, History, and the Extermination of the Jews of Europe* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993); Geoffrey H. Hartman, ed., *Bitburg in Moral and Political Perspective* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); Ilya Levkov, ed., *Bitburg and Beyond: Encounters in American, German, and Jewish History* (New York: Shapolsky Publishers, 1987); Richard J. Evans, *In Hitler’s Shadow: West German Historians and the Attempt to Escape from the Past* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989); Wulf Kansteiner, *In Pursuit of German Memory: History, Television, and Politics after Auschwitz* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006); Charles S. Maier, *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); Harold Marcuse, *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses*

and *Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 1933–2001* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); H. Glenn Penny, “The Museum für Deutsche Geschichte and German National Identity,” *Central European History* 28, no. 3 (1995): 343–72.

19. RAES, 19–606, box 1, meeting protocols for March 18, 1980, November 26, 1981, and March 16, 1982; Wilhelm Godde, “Warnehmung eines Monuments im Herzen der Stadt,” in *Ein Haus, das bleibt. Aus Anlass 20 Jahre Alte Synagoge Essen* (Essen: Klartext, 2000), 52.

20. “Alte Synagoge in Essen wurde wiedereröffnet,” *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 7, 1988; “Weiter wirken als Stein des Anstoßes,” *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 7, 1988.

21. “Neukonzeption Alte Synagoge Essen,” *Niederschrift über die Sitzung des Rates der Stadt*, February 27, 2008.

22. All quotes from Marcus Schymiczek, “Ein Haus des Austauschs,” *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 5, 2008.

23. Reinhard Paß, “Neueröffnung der alten Synagoge zum Haus jüdischer Kultur,” July 13, 2010, from www.essen.de (accessed July 21, 2010).

24. *Bevölkerung nach Migrationsstatus regional* (Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt, 2013), 36.

25. *Synagogen in Berlin. Zur Geschichte einer zerstörten Architektur* (Berlin: Berlin Museum, 1983); *Wegweiser durch das jüdische Berlin* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1987); *Juden in Spandau. Vom Mittelalter bis 1945* (Berlin: Edition Heinrich, 1988); *Juden in Kreuzberg. Fundstücke, Fragmente, Erinnerungen* (Berlin: Edition Heinrich, 1991); *Berlin-Wilmersdorf—die Juden, Leben und Leiden* (Berlin: Berlin-Wilmersdorf Kunstamt, 1987).

26. Bundesarchiv (SAPMO), DY 30 IV/B2 14/174, “Zu einigen Fragen der Situation, Struktur, usw. in den Jüdischen Gemeinden in der DDR,” August 19, 1975. See also Landesarchiv Berlin (LAB), C Rep. 104, Nr. 382, Report by Director of VP-Inspection, Prenzlauer Berg, February 19, 1975; LAB, C Rep. 104, Nr. 382, notes on Jewish cemetery, March 11, 1975; LAB, C Rep. 104, Nr. 601, “Information zu einigen Problemen der Jüdischen Gemeinde von Groß-Berlin,” April 2, 1976.

27. “Berlin: On This Stage, Every Dancer Is a Player,” *New York Times*, April 20, 2008; “One Wall Down, Thousands to Paint,” *New York Times*, March 2, 2008; “Street Food with Ambition in Berlin,” *New York Times*, November 12, 2006; “36 Hours: Berlin,” *New York Times*, December 10, 2006.

28. Peter Gumbel, “Hip Berlin: Europe’s Capital of Cool,” *Time Magazine*, November 16, 2009.

29. *Imagebefragung: Tourismusstandort Berlin in seiner bezirklichen Vielfalt* (Berlin: KOMBI Consult GmbH, 2006), 77–78.

30. Hans H. Nibbrig, “Zahl rechtsradikaler Straftaten steigt,” *Berliner Morgenpost*, February 8, 2008.

31. On perceptions and contestations of the ghetto myth, see Ayse S. Çağlar, “Constraining Metaphors and the Transnationalisation of Spaces in Berlin,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27, no. 4 (2001): 601–13.

32. Many tourists appear to stay in the districts of Mitte and Charlottenburg-Wilmersdorf. *Imagebefragung: Tourismusstandort Berlin in seiner bezirklichen Vielfalt* (Berlin: KOMBI Consult GmbH, 2006), 82.

33. Alexander Jungmann, *Jüdisches Leben in Berlin. Der aktuelle Wandel in einer metropolitanen Diasporagemeinschaft* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2007).

34. Joachim Schlör, *Das Ich der Stadt. Debatten über Judentum und Urbanität, 1822–1938* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 111–13.

35. Anne-Christian Saß, “Das Scheunenviertel. Zur Urbanität eines Stadtquartiers, in *Berlin Transit: Jüdische Migranten aus Osteuropa in den 1920er Jahren* (Berlin: Stiftung Jüdisches Museum Berlin, 2012), 63.

36. Kirsten Küppers, “Marketing mit Davidstern,” *Der Tagesspiegel*, November 20, 2000. Andrew Roth and Michael Frajman, *The Goldapple Guide to Jewish Berlin* (Berlin: Goldapple, 1998); Bill Rebigier, *Jewish Berlin: Culture, Religion, and Daily Life Yesterday and Today* (Berlin: Jaron, 2005). See also Joachim Schlör, “From Remnants to Realities: Is There Something Beyond a ‘Jewish Disneyland’ in Eastern Europe,” *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* 2, no. 2 (2003): 150–51; Joachim Schlör, “Auf der Suche nach dem Ort des Judentums,” *Kritische Berichte. Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften* 24, no. 3 (1996): 6–12.

37. Jungmann, *Jüdisches Leben in Berlin*, 427–542; Jeffrey M. Peck, *Being Jewish in the New Germany* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2006).

38. Diana Pinto, “Jewish Spaces and Their Future,” in Erica Lehrer and Michael Meng, eds., *Jewish Space in Contemporary Poland* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014).

39. Cyberspace is particularly key in the pluralization of Jewish spaces. See Peck, *Jewish*, 165–68; Jungmann, *Jüdisches Leben*, 530–41.

40. www.berlineruv.com (accessed August 15, 2011).

41. On Kahn, see Magdalena Waligórska, “The Magical versus the Political Jew: Representations of Jews on the Polish and German Kletzmer Scene,” in Magdalena Waligórska and Sophie Wagenhofer, *Cultural Representations of Jewishness at the Turn of the 21st Century* (Florence: European University Institute, 2010), 117–34. On Kletzmer in contemporary Germany (and Poland), see Magdalena Waligórska, *Kletzmer’s Afterlife: An Ethnography of the Jewish Music Revival in Poland and Germany* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

42. For example, his reworking of the traditional Yiddish song Borsht explains in its credits the use of English because the song was “written in Radziłów, Poland in order to avoid singing Yiddish on Lent & having to discuss the infamous barn burning of ’41 with the locals.” Quote from Daniel Kahn’s official website, www.paintedbird.net (accessed September 6, 2011).

43. Charlotte Misselwitz, “Sechs Millionen Deutsche,” *Frankfurter Rundschau*, January 11, 2011.

44. “Warten auf Adam Spielman,” Program, Ballhaus Naunynstrasse.

45. This changing cultural and intellectual moment has been captured most thoroughly for Poland. See Erica Lehrer, *Jewish Poland Revisited: Heritage Tourism in Unquiet Places* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).

46. On post-Zionism, positive evaluations of diaspora, and new Jewish identities, see Caryn S. Aviv and David Shneer, *New Jews: The End of the Jewish Diaspora* (New York: New York University Press, 2005); Daniel Boyarin and Jonathan Boyarin, “Diaspora: Generation and the Ground of Jewish Identity,” *Critical Inquiry* 19, no. 4 (1993): 693–725; Laurence Silberstein, *The Postzionism Debates: Knowledge and Power in Israeli Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1999).

47. Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009).

48. On Habermas's understanding of memory as central to his postnational national identity of Germanness, see Moses, *German Intellectuals*, chapters five and ten. On the tensions in Habermas's memory politics, see Meng, "Silences about Sarrazin's Racism"; Michael Meng, "Why Do We Remember? On the Ambiguities of Cosmopolitan Memory in Contemporary Central Europe," The Laura Shannon Prize Acceptance Lecture, The University of Notre Dame, October 2013.

49. "Minister Armin Laschet: 'Gedenken an Holocaust Teil unserer gemeinsamen Leitkultur,'" January 27, 2010 (accessed August 17, 2011, <http://www.nrw.de/presse/minister-laschet-gedenken-an-holocaust-teil-unserer-gemeinsamen-leitkultur-8549>).

50. In the wake of President Christian Wulff's claim that "Islam also belongs to Germany" as well as the nearly year-long discussion about Thilo Sarrazin, Germany's "Judeo-Christian heritage" has become increasingly asserted. In November 2010, the Christian Democrats passed a party decision declaring that "our cultural values, shaped by the heritage of the Ancient world, the Christian-Jewish tradition, the Enlightenment, and historical experiences, are the basis for societal cohesion and form the guiding culture in Germany." "Verantwortung Zukunft," Beschluss des 23. Parteitages der CDU Deutschlands, November 16, 2010 (downloaded January 18, 2011, www.cdu.de); "Vielfalt schätzen—Zusammenhalt fördern," Rede von Bundespräsident Christian Wulff zum 20. Jahrestag der Deutschen Einheit am 3. Oktober 2010 in Bremen (downloaded January 20, 2011, www.bundespraesident.de); Thilo Sarrazin, *Deutschland schafft sich ab: Wie wir unser Land aufs Spiel setzen* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2010). On the Sarrazin debate and the rise of anti-Islamic and anti-immigrant politics more generally, see Sarrazin—*Eine Deutsche Debatte* (Munich: Pieper, 2010); *Die Sarrazin Debatte* (Hamburg: Die Zeit, 2010); Meng, "Silences about Sarrazin's Racism"; Geoff Eley, "The Trouble with 'Race': Migrancy, Cultural Difference, and the Remaking of Europe," in Chin et al., *After the Nazi Racial State*, 137–81; Allan Pred, *Even in Sweden: Racisms, Racialized Spaces, and the Popular Geographic Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Verena Stolcke, "Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rhetorics of Exclusion in Europe," *Current Anthropology* 36, no. 1 (1995): 1–24; Peter Morey and Amina Yaqin, *Framing Muslims: Stereotyping and Representations after 9/11* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011); David Art, *Inside the Radical Right: The Development of Anti-Immigrant Parties in Western Europe* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

51. Zafer Şenocak, *Gefährliche Verwandtschaft* (Munich: Babel, 1998); *Das Märchen vom Letzten Gedanken* (Ballhaus Naunynstrasse, October 8, 2009); Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste, *Neuköllner Stadtteilmütter und ihre Auseinandersetzung mit der Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin: Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste, 2010).

52. Michael Rothberg and Yasemin Yildiz, "Memory Citizenship: Migrant Archives of Holocaust Remembrance in Contemporary Germany," *Parallax* 17, no. 4 (2011): 32–48.

53. Classic statements of this argument include Jan Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge and

New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, trans. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982).

54. Daniel Levy and Natan Sznajder, *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, trans. Assenka Oksiloff (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006).

55. Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, eds., *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

56. Alon Confino, "Telling about Germany: Narratives of Memory and Culture," *Journal of Modern History* 76, no. 2 (2004): 389–416; Alon Confino, "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," *American Historical Review* 102, no. 5 (1997): 1386–1403; Alon Confino and Peter Fritzsche, eds., *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 2002), 1–21.

57. See, for example, Nils Roemer, *German City, Jewish Memory: The Story of Worms* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2010).

58. I wish to stress here *public, official* memory, which conflicts with the endurance of narratives of victimization in family memories. See Harald Welzer, Sabine Moller, and Karoline Tschuggnall, *Opa war kein Nazi. Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust im Familiengedächtnis* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2002).

59. The importance of the Holocaust to Jewish American and Jewish Israeli identities are two other examples of the centrality of Holocaust memory to group identity formation (and, as in the German case, some Jewish Americans and Jewish Israelis are now contesting this Holocaust-centric understanding of Jewishness). See Jack Kugelmass, "The Rites of the Tribe: The Meaning of Poland for American Jewish Tourists," *YIVO Annual* 21 (1993): 395–453; Jackie Feldman, *Above the Death Pits, Beneath the Flag: Youth Voyages to Poland and the Performance of Israeli National Identity* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008); Rona Sheramy, "From Auschwitz to Jerusalem: Re-enacting Jewish History on the March of the Living," *POLIN: Studies in Polish Jewry* 19 (2007): 307–26. In different registers, critical accounts of Holocaust memory in American and Israeli life include: Avraham Burg, *The Holocaust Is Over: We Must Rise from Its Ashes* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008); Ronit Lentin, *Israel and the Daughters of the Shoah: Reoccupying the Territories of Silence* (New York: Berghahn, 2000); Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1999); Idith Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*, trans. Chaya Galai (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

60. See, for example, Malachi Haim Hacohen, "Dilemmas of Cosmopolitanism: Karl Popper, Jewish Identity, and 'Central European Culture,'" *The Journal of Modern History* 71, no. 1 (1999): 105–49.

61. My suggestion here about localized, self-critical forms of cosmopolitanism draws on the work of Kwame Anthony Appiah and B. Venkant Mani. Appiah's cosmopolitanism recognizes the "idea that we have obligations to others, obligations that stretch beyond those to whom we are related by the ties of kith and kind," but does not expect or desire "that every person or every society should converge on a single mode of life." This cosmopolitanism differs from the caricature of the rootless world citizen.

In Appiah's view, cosmopolitans can remain rooted in their national, religious, ethnic, and cultural contexts if they so choose. While I appreciate Appiah's insight that cosmopolitanism can be grounded in national and local contexts, I disagree with his seamless joining of cosmopolitanism with these contexts. Cosmopolitanism demands critique of the local and the national if it is to be more than a phrase. Indeed, Mani locates cosmopolitanism in the novels of Turkish-German writers who interrogate their local, national, ethnic, and cultural affiliations. His cosmopolitanism emerges in the crossing, displacing, and unsettling of identities, in critiques of rigid conceptions of nation, community, and ethnicity. Pulling together Appiah's insight about the local inflections of cosmopolitanism with Mani's urge for critical self-reflection and interrogation, I am conceptualizing cosmopolitanism as localized and self-reflective. Although not emphasized by either Appiah or Mani, memory is crucial to my understanding of cosmopolitanism. It is key to provoking introspective, critical awareness about one's own past, present, and future. Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006), xv; Appiah, *The Ethics of Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), chapter 6; B. Venkat Mani, *Cosmopolitical Claims: Turkish-German Literatures from Nadohny to Pamuk* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2007).

62. Along with Berlin, Kraków is one of the most fascinating and richly researched spaces where this on-going process of reconfiguring rigid group identifications and national narratives is unfolding. See Lehrer, *Jewish Poland Revisted*.