האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

Working Paper 103/2011

The Burden and Joy of Commemoration

The Commemoration of Jews and Judaism in the Public Space in Vienna and Prague

Yemima Ayala Cohen

המרכז ללימודי אוסטריה
CENTER FOR AUSTRIAN STUDIES
EUROPEAN FORUM AT THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY

ARON MENCZER FUND

European Forum at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91905, Israel | http://www.ef.huji.ac.il
Tel: (972 2)588-3286 | Fax: (972 2)588-1535 | ef@savion.huji.ac.il

I would like to thank the Aron Nenczer Fund and the European Forum at the Hebrew University for their generous support for this research. The research would not have materialized without their assistance. In addition, I would like to thank Prof. Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi for her help and guidance. Prof. Vinitzky-Seroussi‘s studies in the area of collective memory were a fundamental inspiration for this research.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In the Jewish Museum in Vienna the Jewish tradition is described using the past tense only, for example: "the Shabbat was celebrated on the seventh day." In the Jewish Museum in Prague (JMP) the Jewish tradition is described as part of the present, for example: "for Jews, Shabbat is the day of rest." This is one example of the differences between the character and message of the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in the cities of Vienna and Prague.

This article deals with the present-day commemoration of Jews and Judaism in the public space of these two cities. Commemoration of Jews is a focus on the individuals who saw themselves or were seen by others as Jews. Commemoration of Judaism is a focus on the group's characteristics such as religion, language and culture. I would like to show that there is a difference between the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Prague and in Vienna, respectively.

In Prague the commemoration revolves around individuals, the Jews, and they are represented as both an ancient and a living part of the modern city. In Vienna most of the commemoration focuses on Judaism, which is represented as a dead and remote tradition that is absent from the city. Even in the few cases where the focus is on the individuals – the Jews, they are represented as dead and irrelevant.

The disparity stems from the differences between the history of the Jews in the two cities during the Second World War. In Vienna the Jews' wartime experience was difficult, involving moral trauma and threatening the fundamental myth of Austrian society. In Prague, however, the Second World War is understood as a sad occasion, but not one that points a finger of blame at the Czech population or involves moral trauma. The nature of the history in each of these cities fundamentally influences the character and message of the commemoration in them.

These pasts are embodied in a form and commemoration through the work and influence of the relevant memory agents. A significant distinction is between commemoration done by an affiliated memory agent, who considers herself part of the commemorated group, and a nonaffiliated memory agent, who is not part of the commemorated group.

I will maintain that when commemorating a difficult past, such as in Vienna, the nonaffiliated memory agent will create a commemoration focusing on the group, which is Judaism, and not the group members, or the Jews. In addition, the group will

be represented as dead and absent from the city. In contrast, when commemorating a difficult past the memory agent who is part of the commemorated group will focus on the individuals and emphasize their lives.

In cases of commemoration of a sad past that is not a difficult past and does not threaten the main social myths, as in Prague, there will be no apparent strong difference between commemoration that is shaped by affiliated or nonaffiliated memory agents. Group members and non-group members will commemorate Jews as part of the city and Judaism as a live tradition.

As we shall see, the commemoration in Vienna is done mainly by memory agents who are not part of the commemorated group. This commemoration, mainly driven by international political needs, reflects the conflict between the Austrian narrative of being victims of the war and the Jewish narrative of suffering at the hands of the local population during the Holocaust. The Austrian self-understanding of themselves as victims serves as camouflage for the fact that they were not victims but victimizers. This narrative is the main foundational myth of Austrian society. By presenting themselves as victims the Austrians managed to elude the accusations about their cooperation with Germany. Therefore, the history of the Jews in Vienna is a good example of a difficult past, a past that threatens the fundamental national myth (Wagner-Pacifici and Schwartz, 1991). The nature of that past affects the character of the commemoration and as a result, Jews are depicted by nonaffiliated memory agents as dead and Judaism as an ancient, absent tradition.

In Prague most of the commemoration is done by memory agents who are part of the Jewish community. For this reason, the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Prague is a celebration of the antiquity and continuity of the Jews in the city. This celebration is shared by Jews and non-Jews alike because the local Jewish narrative and a general Czech narrative do not contradict each other. In the Czech narrative, the Czechs were conquered by Germany against their will and they resisted the Nazi conquest. The Jewish narrative of the Jews as victims of Hitler does not contradict the local narrative; the Jews are understood to be the most unfortunate social group that was persecuted the most within the Czech society. Hence the commemoration of Jews and Judaism is a commemoration of a sad past, not of a difficult one, and Jews are commemorated as an integral part of the city and Judaism as a living tradition.

In addition, this article demonstrates that the choice of the location has an important influence over the character of the commemoration. In particular, the

"power of the place," the usage of the exact location where the event occurred, significantly affects the character and context of the commemoration that occurs in it (Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2008). In Vienna and Prague, two kinds of such locations are used as spaces of commemoration. The first kind is a "place of death," a location which was the scene of difficult, violent events, the majority of which include death. The second kind is a "place of life," which refers to locations in which normal, routine aspects of life transpired.

The choice of the place does not only refer to choosing exactly where to commemorate but also to determining and constructing the chosen place at either a place of death or a place of life. As we shall see, several places that are used to commemorate Jews and Judaism in Prague and Vienna today could be described as both places of death and places of life. They were the scenes of routine life and also of violent persecutions. The memory agent here chooses what to make of these places. We shall see that in cases of commemorating a difficult past the nonaffiliated memory agent will emphasize and represent the chosen place as a place of death. The affiliated memory agent, and in cases of commemorating a sad but nondifficult past also the nonaffiliated memory agent, will choose to make this controversial place a place of life by emphasizing the routine daily life that occurred there.

Finally, the element of time that has passed since the moment when the event itself happened, along with the period in which the event was commemorated, have strongly influenced the message of the commemorations in Vienna and Prague. It was political and historical circumstances that fostered the need and the possibility for those commemorations and eventually affected their respective messages. I will argue that the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna is strongly connected to Austria's entrance into the European Union and, therefore, reflects an attempt to satisfy the EU's standards regarding the memory of the Second World War. In Prague the commemoration of Jews and Judaism was constructed only after the fall of the communist regime, and hence the commemoration is also a celebration of the newly gained freedom to remember.

The analysis offered in this article suggests that the strongest element affecting the character of the commemoration is the nature of the past, namely, whether it is a difficult or a sad past. This important distinction is embodied in different forms through the memory agents, who play a central role in determining the nature and message of the commemoration. In cases of a difficult past, the nonaffiliated memory

agent will commemorate Judaism as a dead and Jews as absent, while focusing on the group and using the place to construct the message. In cases of a sad past, affiliated and nonaffiliated memory agents alike will use the place in order to commemorate Jews as playing a relevant part in the life of the city. The article, thus, explains the connection between the character of the commemorated past, the character of the memory agent and the nature of the place of commemoration.

The first chapter presents the theoretical background, revealing how this research connects to the existing literature in the field of collective memory. The second chapter discusses the methods employed to collect and analyze the information. The third chapter surveys the history of Prague and Vienna in relation to the history of the Jews in these cities. The commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna is analyzed in the fourth chapter; the fifth chapter analyzes the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Prague. The final chapter presents the conclusions of this research.

Theoretical Review

This research deals with the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in the public space of the cities of Prague and Vienna today. The beliefs, understandings and interpretations of the past by a social group are commonly known as collective memory. The embodiment of collective memory in a physical or social form is commemoration. This article deals with the commemoration of events that can be described as a difficult or a sad past.

It is hard to present a single definition of collective memory; several scholars have defined the concept differently. The widest definition of collective memory can be found in the introduction to the book *Cultural Memory Studies*, in which Munning (2008) defines collective memory as "the interplay of past and present in the social-cultural context." This definition allows a wide space for interpretation and usage.

The origins of the study of collective memory can be found in the writings of Émile Durkheim. He used the phrase "collective representation," by which he meant a set of ideas that are more than a collection of the individual's ideas. These ideas are owned by the society and exist within its frame. Durkheim claims that the society has the tools to preserve and express these collective ideas in a way that will promote and contribute to the society's consolidation (Coser, 1992). For Durkheim, collective representation is a tool through which a society can be understood, and not an analysis unit in its own right.

The first scholar to make collective memory the center of a study-and-analysis unit was Durkheim's great student Maurice Halbwachs.[1] Halbwachs maintained that the collective memory is a creation that was constructed by the group members, always in connection to the problems, needs and changes of the society in the present. According to him the active past stays alive through the designation of time or place for it by the group's members. As long as there is some kind of engagement with the past, it remains relevant and becomes the collective memory. Halbwachs suggested that, as opposed to "history" which is a dead past, collective memory is an active past that influences the identity of the group members in the present (Olick and Robbins, 1998).

[1] Although Halbwachs is remembered as the founding father of collective memory, his ideas were not a new invention but rather a development of an already existing theoretical approach to the subject. Halbwachs contributed to the foundation and establishment of collective memory through the use of already-existing theories (Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi and Levy, 2011).

Halbwachs's position emphasizes the ever-changing, dynamic character of collective memory. Several other scholars have agreed with him, and they define collective memory as an outcome of an ever-changing process which is connected to process in society. Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983) understand collective memory as a manipulation performed in the present, using the past to meet the current needs of the society. Mead (1932) and Lowenthal (1985) agree that there are always changes in the collective memory, but maintain that these result from different understandings of the past; the past is always being understood in new frames and ways on the basis of experiences in the present.

Durkheim and (1965) Shils (1981) offer a different approach, emphasizing the static, fixed character of collective memory. They argue that collective memory always has an aspect of continuity and that the changes in collective memory are not fundamental. These changes are new manifestations of the traditional messages and content of the collective memory. Assmann (1992) agrees with them and contends that social habit is responsible for the static character of collective memory.

Schwartz (1997) presents a different definition, maintaining that collective memory is a product of social construction which is always a combination of change and continuity. Schwartz agrees with several of the definitions offered by Halbwachs and claims that there is indeed a central aspect of change in the social construction of collective memory regarding the needs, ideals and wishes of the group members in the present. He emphasizes the ongoing and yet fixed aspect of collective memory, which can be found in symbols and meanings that are transmitted through generations. Coser (1992) agrees with Schwartz and suggests that collective memory is a renewed creation that is never written on: "an empty page".

The understanding of collective memory as containing both change and continuity leads Schwartz to argue that collective memory can serve as a tool that reflects society or as a tool that reflects its aspiration and goals. Borrowing phrases from Geertz Schwartz (1996) suggests that collective memory can be a "model of society," reflecting its current needs, and can be used as a tool to understand and explore the society. Collective memory can also, however, be a "model for society," by which the society transmits traditional meanings.

One of the ways in which collective memory takes shape in society is through commemoration. Vinitzky-Seroussi (2008) describes commemoration as "tangible public presentation and articulation of collective memory." Schwartz (2001) defines

commemoration as a social action based on the perception that historical meaning can be represented and transformed by objects, traditions or rituals. Griswold (1987) suggests that commemoration is "a common meaning which is embodied in a form." Elsewhere Schwartz (1982) adds to his earlier definition by asserting that commemoration is a part of history that is made into a sacred meaning, in a way that is always connected to the values of the commemorating group.

Commemoration, then, is a social product and the process that deals with the principles, values and main meanings of the members of the group or parts of the social group. Hence it appears that the task of commemoration is to bring together, present and preserve these values and ideas. This position was earlier taken by Durkheim (1965), who claimed that the role of commemoration is to preserve and enhance the central values of the group and that commemoration is essential to the group's consolidation. This concept of commemoration as the focus of harmonious social consolidation can be found in the research of several other scholars (Warner, 1959; Barber, 1972; Shils, 1981).

In her book Vinitzky-Seroussi (2008) posits four "pillars of commemoration," which are the place, the narrative, the time and the memory agent. She maintains that commemoration is always constructed of these four elements.

Vinitzky-Seroussi categorizes the space into two characteristics. The first concerns the location: a central place in the city or, conversely, one remote from the center, or a relatively small place in the city be it a square or a street. The second characteristic concerns whether the subject is commemorated in a single location or in numerous ones. In addition, Vinitzky-Seroussi emphasizes what she calls "the power of the place." She thereby refers to places where the commemorated event actually occurred, "where it really happened." She demonstrates the influence of the power of the place on the commemoration that occurs in it (Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2008).

Narrative is another important pillar of commemoration. Narrative is a collection of dates and facts that provides meaning, worldview and perception of the current situation and of the past (Zerubavel, 1933; Papadakis, 1994; Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2008). In other words, narrative is the story which is embodied in the commemoration. When the visitor looks at a monument or exhibit, she is exposed not only to the details and feelings but also to point of view and interpretation.

Vinitzky-Seroussi defines time as consisting of two dimensions. The first is the time which is used to commemorate the subject, for example, memorial days. The

second is the time that has passed since the events and their commemoration (Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2008). This article will not analyze the first dimension; the focus of this research is commemoration that occurs in a public space, as opposed to memorial days and social events. The second dimension posited by Vinitzky-Seroussi is, however, very relevant to this research. The time that passes between the event itself and its commemoration strongly influences the message and the content of commemoration. When the commemoration is done several generations after the event itself, the commemoration is no longer mediated by personal experiences and hence is more historical than autobiographical (Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2008).

In the case studies of Vienna and Prague, most of the commemoration that occurs today was created relatively late. The event itself, the Holocaust, was not personally experienced by the majority of the memory agents and the visitors. However, the fact that considerable time has passed does not make the commemoration process easier or the subject operation less problematic. When commemorating a difficult past, the fundamental moral trauma that is embodied in the commemorated past can threaten the society's consensus even decades later. As long as the fundamental issues that are at the center of the difficult past are not confronted, any commemoration of them will remain problematic. In this article I will show that the time that has passed since the event and the commemoration of the event significantly affects the message of the commemoration.

I would suggest that the third pillar, time, should be understood not just as the time that has elapsed since the event and its commemoration, but also as the historical and political events that took place during that period. Wagner-Pacifici and Schwartz (1991) show how the historical beginnings of commemorations can indicate a good deal about the message and meaning of this process. They maintain that analyzing why the commemoration began when it did can reveal the context of the commemoration. In line with that concept, I suggest that the commemoration in Vienna began when commemorations of this kind had become politically and socially beneficial; while in Prague the commemoration began when it was allowed by the government and by political circumstances.

These elements of time, place and narrative can be found in any kind of commemoration. Some of the commemorated events do not enjoy a consensus. These events are described as "an inherent moral trauma: they not only result in loss or failure but also evoke disagreement and inspire censure." Such events are defined as a

"difficult past" (Wagner-Pacifici and Schwartz, 1991). Although a difficult past could also be a sad one, not every sad historical event also constitutes a moral trauma and a threat to the consensus.

Scholars have defined two main models of commemoration in cases of a difficult past. The first model is a multivocal commemoration. In this kind of commemoration the members of the group share a certain element: place, text, time or an object, while they do not share a narrative and have different interpretations of these elements. This kind of commemoration is typified by controversy, as in the case of the Washington Monument commemorating the fallen soldiers of the Vietnam War (Wagner-Pacifici and Schwartz, 1991).

The second form is fragmented commemoration. Commemoration within this module involves the usage of multi-commemorations while employing many different places, times, objects and meanings to commemorate different narratives specific to different parts of the group (Vinitzky-Seroussi, 2002).

When commemorating difficult pasts in a public space, whether in a fragmented or multivocal model, there are relatively limited forms in which the commemoration can take place. Common forms of commemoration that can be found in public space are monuments and museums. Young (1993) claims that monuments should be understood in two contexts. The first is the social context in which they were created and in which they are used; the second is the artistic context that is connected to the artwork. Schwarz and Wagner-Pacifici (1991) maintain that a monument should be read according to its "operational meaning"; the way the onlooker uses and understands the monument reveals its message.

As for Vinitzky-Seroussi's (2008) fourth pillar, the people who are responsible for the creation and construction of these monuments and museums are called memory agents, or those individuals who create, initiate and make commemoration possible and ongoing. Fine (2001) shows how memory agents, whom he calls reputational entrepreneurs, strongly influence the commemoration process and the memory that is created. He emphasizes the fact that these agents always reflect several interests, and that they should be understood according to those interests. Lang and Lang (1990) demonstrate that the reputation and the memory of artists depend strongly on the role of the agents, whom they call "creators." Lang and Lang posit two different categories of agents. The first comprises the close, "significant others," who have an emotional interest in creating the memory. The second comprises institutions or persons who

hope to gain by creating and keeping the memory alive, and who thus have material interests.

In the commemoration process of Jews and Judaism in Vienna and Prague, the memory agents play a central role. I will argue that two kinds of memory agents may be characterized. The first is an "affiliated memory agent." This memory agent is connected and in many cases is also part of the commemorated group, in this case the Jewish community. The second is a "nonaffiliated memory agent." This is a memory agent who would be considered an outsider and not connected to the commemorated group. This categorization is related to that of Lang and Lang (1990). The affiliated memory agents are similar to the significant others, who have emotional interests and are connected to the subject of commemoration. The nonaffiliated memory agents are similar to the institutions posited by Lang and Lang; these memory agents have material interests, which affect the commemoration they create.

I will maintain that the memory agent affects two important aspects of the commemoration, namely, its message and its subject.

Regarding the message, using the case studies of the cities of Vienna and Prague, I will show how in cases of commemorating a difficult past, a nonaffiliated memory agent will usually tend to promote a commemoration that focuses on the aspects of death and the tragic, difficult experiences of Jewish history; as a result, the message of the commemoration will present Jews as absent and dead and Judaism as a remote tradition. The affiliated memory agent is not influenced by the issue of commemorating a difficult past or a sad past, and in both cases will more likely focus on messages of life and continuation and will generally commemorate Jews and Judaism as an ongoing, relevant subject.

Regarding the subject of the commemoration, it is the memory agent who chooses whether the commemoration will focus on Jews as individuals or on Judaism, that is, their group and its characteristics. Needless to say, there is a strong connection between the memory agent and the choice of the subject of the commemoration. An affiliated memory agent will most probably create a commemoration for Jews as individuals. Correspondingly, in cases of commemorating a difficult past, a nonaffiliated memory agent, who is not part of the commemorated group, will more likely choose a commemoration for Judaism, as a group.

Thus, as I will show, in cases of commemorating a difficult past, when the memory agent understands herself as not being part of the subject of commemoration,

it is very probable that the commemoration will revolve around the religious, social, ethnic and historical characteristic of that social group. When the memory agent feels herself to be familiar with the subject of commemoration, then the individuals will be central to the message of the commemoration.

	Affiliated memory agent	**Nonaffiliated memory agent**
Difficult past	Main focus on the individuals; Jews are commemorated as a relevant part of the city.	Main focus on the group, Judaism, which is commemorated as a dead and absent tradition.
Sad past	Main focus on the individuals; Jews are commemorated as a relevant part of the city.	Main focus on the individuals; Jews are commemorated as a relevant part of the city.

On Methods

This research focuses on how memory takes place in the public space. In order to analyze that, I mapped the entire existing commemoration projects, in Vienna and Prague, and analyzed them one by one in order to determine their messages. Eventually, putting all the messages and aspects of commemoration together clarified the general message of commemoration in each city.

The sites of commemoration that can be found in Vienna are: the Jewish Museum (which is divided into two houses, one in the Judenplatz and the other in Dorotheergasse); the Monument against War and Fascism, a complex of commemoration in the Judenplatz Square; a commemoration within the central synagogue; the Sigmund Freud museum; the staircase named after Dr. Theodor Herzl; and the Path of Memory Project. The commemorations for Jews and Judaism in Prague today are first and foremost the JMP; a commemoration project for the murdered Jews, The Stolpersteine in Prague; and the Franz Kafka Museum.

The monuments and museums discussed in this research are a sample of the entirety of commemoration that can be found in these cities. In Vienna I will analyze: (1) the complex of commemoration in the Judenplatz Square, and (2) the Path of Memory Project. In Prague the examples are: (1) two parts of the JMP, namely, the Pinkas Synagogue and the Old Jewish Cemetery, and (2) the Franz Kafka Museum. In each city I have chosen two examples, one of commemoration by an affiliated memory agent and one of commemoration by a nonaffiliated memory agent. These examples were chosen because they reflect the pattern of commemoration that can be found in each of these cities.

Information gathering was conducted by several methods. First, in-depth interviews were used. I interviewed the people who make the memory – for example, several memory agents including the directors of the Jewish museums in both cities, employees of the museums, local tour guides and the Chief Rabbis of these communities. In addition, I interviewed several visitors to the museums and tourists beside the monuments in order to understand how they interpret the messages of commemoration.

Second, the analyses of the museums were carried out via participant observation: I joined several guided tours in the museums so as to understand how these museums display themselves to the visitors.

Third, I analyzed the artifacts that are distributed by the establishments, such as the Jewish museums or city councils. The artifacts carry the unspoken message and meaning of the commemoration, and by analyzing them the character of the establishment or the message constructed by the memory agent can be unveiled.

This aspect influenced the research. The analyses of the local Austrian and Czech cultures in this research are made from an outsider's perspective. As an outsider to these cultures I had the opportunity to examine them in a detached, much more global and distinct fashion that may have helped shape more general understandings about them. On the other hand, linguistic or cultural translation is always dependent on the translation that is given and so it is always facilitated.

Historical Background

Understanding the pattern of commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Prague and Vienna requires understanding the basic history of these cities and their Jewish population. Here I will offer a short introduction to these histories, including the place of the relevant facts in the national myths of Austria and Czech Republic.

The Czech Republic is the modern name of the country that was established about two decades ago. Over the centuries this region was known by several different names reflecting the changes it underwent. Throughout the Middle Ages the Czech lands were part of the Holy Roman Empire. The Middle Ages is the time of the first records of permanent Jewish settlements in the Czech lands. The fifteenth century was an era of social unrest and a religious struggle led by Jan Hus. This religious struggle led to the weakening of the imperial power, and the Jews were no longer protected and were banished from several cities. Over the next two centuries, a large percentage of the population of Bohemia was converted to the Hussite Protestant movement (Paces, 2009).

This religious choice was not shared by the new rulers, the Catholic House of Habsburg that took power in the Czech lands in 1526. The Jews flourished under the new regime, enjoying renewed privileges, and their population in Prague doubled (Berger, 1990). At the start of the seventeenth century, local revolts against this royal house broke out in Prague. The local Bohemian forces were defeated by the Habsburg forces in the Battle of the White Mountain (1620), and the region officially became part of the Austrian kingdom (Hochman, 1998). In this struggle the Jews supported the Catholic emperor, and he in turn protected them and renewed their privileges (Berger, 1900).

The Habsburg period brought with it several important developments. The Jews received tolerance and privileges from the rulers when they were needed, and suffered persecutions when they were regarded as a burden. In this period the Jewish population of Prague became organized and official. Towards the end of the nineteenth century the Jews in the Czech lands enjoyed full emancipation and took part in the social economy and, in particular, the intellectual life of the Czech region. The Czech lands remained under Austrian control until the end of the First World War (1918) and the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

After the empire was dissolved in 1918, the Czech lands became an independent country and the First Republic was founded. The name chosen for the new nation was Czechoslovakia. The first president of the First Republic was Thomas Masaryk (Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk), a Czech politician-philosopher and a member of the Jewish community (Hochman, 1998). Masaryk was considered the founding father of the new nation and is still remembered as such today (Berger, 1900).

The new nation led by Masaryk faced serious social challenges; Slovaks, Czechs, Germans and Jews lived there together. The newly established Czechoslovakia was the only European country that recognized Jews as a minority and gave them minority rights, including the right to be represented in the parliament as a political party. The period of the First Republic was a time of great opportunities for Jews in which they became an integral part of the society and contributed in various ways to the country's development (Berger, 1900). Today the First Republic is remembered proudly in the Czech Republic as the foundation of the latter and as a beacon of democracy in the twentieth century (Kubis, 2005).

The difficult social situation in the early Czech Republic, the tension between the different minorities, ethnic groups and social groups, eventually erupted somewhat before the Second World War. In September 1938, the leaders of the major European powers signed the Munich Agreement, which stipulated that the Sudetenland, would become part of Germany. The Sudetenland was a region in which the majority of the population was of German ethnicity, and a region that was highly developed industrially. At that time another attempt to strengthen the nation was made by several politicians who reestablished Czechoslovakia, so that the period is known as the Second Republic. However, the Second Republic died young: in the spring of 1939 the leader of the Slovak minority met with Hitler and, with his help, established independent Slovakia. Concurrently, German forces invaded Czechoslovakia and conquered it in a few days. Shortly thereafter, Hitler came to Prague to inaugurate the German Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, and independent Czechoslovakia ceased to exist.

The Jewish minority in conquered Czechoslovakia suffered extremely from the German conquest. From 1941 to 1945 the majority of the Jews were sent to the Theresienstadt ghetto and from there to the extermination camps in the east. Of the community of almost 395,000 Jews who lived in Czechoslovakia, 250,000 were murdered by the Nazis. It is estimated that the majority of the Jewish community of

Prague, approximately 50,000 people, were murdered by the Nazis. The majority of the survivors emigrated, mainly to the United States and Israel (Berger, 1900).

The Jews were not the only ones to suffer from the Nazi conquest; the local population regarded the Germans as invaders and enemies. Under Nazi occupation the independent government of Czechoslovakia continued to lead the Czech people from its exile in London, coordinating a network of resistance organizations (Rothkirchen, 1979). The most successful and well-known act of resistance was the assassination of the second-in-command of the protectorate, Reinhard Heydrich. The German reaction to the assassination was severe; approximately 1,300 random citizens were arrested and executed. In addition, two villages that the Germans considered accomplices to the assassination, Lidice and Ležáky, were destroyed; the men were executed and the women and children sent to concentration camps (Hochman, 1998). This German brutality, and especially the fate of Lidice, became a symbol of Czech resistance to the Nazi occupation and remains so, strongly, today (Kubis, 2005).

On 5 May 1945, towards the end of the Second World War, thousands of the inhabitants of Prague attacked German soldiers in their city in what is known as the Prague Uprising. They were joined by the Soviet Army, which conquered the region (Hochman, 1998).

When the war ended the Third Republic was declared, again under the name Czechoslovakia. The exiled leadership returned from London, and one of its first decisions was to order the expulsion of almost three million Germans living in the Sudetenland. In 1948 the Soviet regime took over the government, forcing the Third Republic to become part of the communist bloc (Hochman, 1998). In 1968 a brief attempt to revive liberalism, commonly known as the Prague Spring, was crushed by a Soviet military invasion of Czechoslovakia (Hochman, 1998).

The suppression of the Prague Spring brought with it a governmental persecution of Jews. This included anti-Israeli and anti-Jewish propaganda along with strict restrictions on Jews. Several members of the Jewish community were put without basis on trial for treason and executed (Berger, 1900).

With the decline of Soviet control, Czechoslovakia regained its independence via a nonviolent struggle known as the Velvet Revolution. Soviet rule was abolished and open elections were held (Hochman, 1998). In 1993 the country was peacefully divided into the Czech Republic and Slovakia. In 2004 the Czech Republic became a member state of the European Union.

Today approximately 7,000 Jews live in the Czech Republic, most of them in Prague. In a city of more than 1,200,000 inhabitants, only 1,600 citizens are registered as members of the Jewish community; it is estimated that about 5,000 Jews live in Prague altogether.

The history of Austria and the Jews of Vienna is similar in some respects and quite different in others. Similarly to the Czech lands, throughout the Middle Ages Austria was a region ruled by royal houses that were part of the Holy Roman Empire. In the thirteenth century the House of Habsburg took power in Austria, and this dynasty ruled the region for 640 years (Stadler, 1971). During that long period, Jews lived in Austria and especially in Vienna and enjoyed privileges and the protection of the monarchs. But these were revoked whenever it was convenient to the ruler, and then the Jews were persecuted or banished from the cities (Borkenau, 1938).

In the eighteenth century Austria was ruled by several monarchs who shaped the country's character and strongly influenced its relationship to the Jewish community. The empress Maria Therese took measures to integrate the Jews into the local society. Her son Joseph the Second continued her attempts and gave Jews permission to work along with freedom of belief, urging them to use German as a first language and to take part in the local culture (Borkenau, 1938).

The Napoleonic Wars found Austria in a difficult position. Eventually the Austrians fought against Napoleon, who was defeated by a European coalition. But the wars had a powerful influence, evoking local aspirations for self-definition and national identity. As a result a local revolution took place in Austria, calling to establish a national local government in several regions. Known as the 1848 Revolution, this attempt eventually failed and the Austrian monarchy remained in place until the end of the First World War (Stadler, 1971).

One of the results of the 1848 Revolution was the replacement of the old emperor with his nephew, Franz Joseph. The new emperor chose to meet the national challenges through an alliance with the nobles of Hungary. He changed the name of his monarchy, from then on called the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Stadler, 1971).

Franz Joseph was extremely popular among the Jews; he gave them full civil rights and allowed them to live freely in Vienna. As a result the Jewish community in the capital group and the Jews became a central, active part of Austria's culture and scientific development The highly integrated Jews became part of Austrian society and several of them were elected to parliament.

The Austro-Hungarian Empire fought alongside the Central Powers in the First World War. Following the defeat of this alliance, the empire was dissolved into several national states. It was at this point that the Austrian First Republic, like the Czech First Republic, was established; its official name was German Austria. The victorious countries in the war decided, however, that Austria should be independent of Germany and forced the new country to change its name to the Republic of Austria (Stadler, 1971).

The annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany, commonly known as the Anschluss, occurred in March 1938 when German troops entered Austria unchallenged and took control of the country. Historians maintain that the Germans were much welcomed by the Austrian population. As a result of the Anschluss, Austria ceased to be an independent country and became an official, integral part of Nazi Germany, called Ostmark (Pick, 2000).

At the time of the Nazi conquest approximately 200,000 Jews were living in Austria, about 167,000 of them Vienna. Two-thirds of the Austrian Jews emigrated immediately after the Anschluss. In 1939 the Nazis began to banish the local Jews from Vienna and Austria to concentration camps and from there to death camps. It is estimated that some 70,000 of the local Jews were murdered by the Nazis (Pick, 2000).

With the end of the war, Austria ceased to be part of Germany. On 28 March 1945, American troops set foot on Austrian soil, and two days later the Red Army of the Soviet Union crossed the eastern border, taking Vienna on 13 April. In several villages the local Austrians fought against the invaders; for example, near the city of Graz, Austrians killed American paratroopers.

Even though Austria was occupied by foreign troops, the invaders authorized the establishment of the Second Republic – the independent state of Austria which exists until today. A year before the forces left, Austria became a neutral country in the global Cold War conflict. As part of the effort to maintain Austria's neutrality, the victorious countries characterized it as "the first victim of Hitler." The construction of that historical self-understanding helped the Austrians cope with their recent past and explains why the Americans did not impose a de-Nazification process on the Austrian society as they did in occupied Germany. As a result, Austrian society embraced its foundational myth as the first victim of Hitler (Judt, 2005).

Austria has managed to remain a democratic republic, separate from Germany, from the end of the war until the present. In 1970 a Jewish politician, Bruno Kreisky, was elected for the first time as chancellor of Austria, and he remained in office until 1983 after winning three consecutive elections (Pick, 2000). In 1995 Austria became a member state of the European Union, and in 1999 Austria issued the new European coin, the Euro, as an official currency.

Today approximately 13,000 Jews live in Austria. It is hard to estimate the total because it is not obligatory to be registered as part of the Jewish community. Among the nearly 1,700,000 people living in Vienna today, about 6500 are Jews. The majority of the Jews living in Austria today immigrated into the country after the war, and only a small minority of them are Holocaust survivors and their descendants. In July 1991 the Austrian government recognized for the first time its responsibility for the Nazi crimes.

There are, then, several similarities between Prague and Vienna. Both were both capital cities of relatively new nation- states which today are member states of the European Union. For centuries both cities were part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and were ruled by the same monarchs. The Jewish communities in these two cities underwent similar experiences. Throughout the Middle Ages, Jews were protected when needed and persecuted when this served the needs of the local population and the rulers. In the eighteenth century both communities began to undergo emancipation and gradually became part of the local population. In the course of the Second World War, the Jewish communities of both Vienna and Prague were subject to violent persecution with the majority of members being murdered.

Despite these striking similarities, one principal difference emerges. Throughout the Second World War, the local population in Austria took active part in persecuting the Jewish community. For example, some historians estimate that approximately half the guards in the concentration camps In general were Austrian (Judt, 2005). For this reason, the history of the Jews in Austria and Vienna in the twentieth century can be considered a case of a difficult past. Since the Austrians took part in the persecution of the Jews, for Austrian society the memory of that history is an example of a "moral trauma," not just a sad event but a history that threatens the consensus and the social myths.

On the other hand, the history of the Jews in the Czech Republic and Prague cannot be understood as a difficult past. The local population resisted the Nazi

occupation, and this resistance has been a strong component of the Czech Republic's national identity until the present. In the national myth of the Czech Republic, a myth that was reinforced in the period of the communist regime, the Czechs were not passive victims but an active, resisting population (Kubis, 2005). The local population does not feel shame or hidden culpability for the history of the Jews in Prague during the Second World War; instead they understand themselves as a population that opposed and tried to prevent the persecution.

The narrative of Jewish suffering in the Holocaust in Prague, then, cannot be considered a difficult past because it does not threaten the main myths and identity of the local population. That is not to say there are no difficult pasts in the history of the Czech Republic. The Czechs feel culpable for the sufferings of the Roma minority during World War II (Crowe, 2002). Thus, an important distinction is that the Jewish narrative of suffering does not threaten the Czech identity and national myths whereas the Roma narrative does.

Even though the histories of the Jews in Vienna and in Prague during the Holocaust culminated in similar tragic outcomes, these histories involve two different kinds of memory. For the Austrians, the history of the Holocaust in their country is the history of a difficult past that reminds them of their role in this tragedy, a role that was not fully recognized for decades. For the Czechs, the history of the Holocaust in their country is a sad story that does not threaten but completely corresponds to their national myths.

The Commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna

The commemoration of Jews and Judaism in the city of Vienna can be characterized as relatively new. The strongest and almost sole active memory agent is the City Council. I will analyze two examples of commemoration in Vienna, one done by the city and the other initiated by a member of the Jewish community. These constitute but a sample and not a representative one. While, as noted, most of the commemoration is done by the City Council, I have chosen to present an example of commemoration by another memory agent in order to define the difference between the commemoration by the city and by other agents.

The Commemoration of Jews and Judaism in the Judenplatz: *"There are no Jews in the Jewish Square."*

In the Judenplatz there are three monuments, not completely separate from each other, that commemorate Jews and Judaism. These are: a monument named "the Nameless Library" in memory of the Jews murdered in the Holocaust, a statue of the author Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, and one of the buildings of the Jewish Museum, which is named Museum Judenplatz Wien (JW Museum).

The Judenplatz, a square, is located in close proximity to the main tourist attractions in Vienna. However, this square is relatively concealed. It is quite hard to find, and no signs direct the visitor towards it or the museum in it. The square is not marked on most of the tourist maps that are distributed in Vienna. Hence, despite the central location, the commemoration offered in the Judenplatz is very hard to reach.

The Judenplatz Square: the "Nameless Library" monument and the statue of the author Ephraim Lessing. The gate at the distance is the entrance to the JW Museum.

The first monument to be erected in the square was the statue of Lessing (1729-1781), a German Christian author who wrote in favor of full emancipation for Austrian Jewry. In 1935 this statue was first unveiled in the square. It was meant to symbolize the integration process of the Jews in Vienna in an attempt to make them part of the city and the country. This statue, a symbol of tolerance, was removed and melted down by the Nazis in 1939. In 1986 the statue was rebuilt by the original artist, and it stands today in the square.

This statute does not commemorate the Jews but, rather, tolerance towards them, through the image of a local author who expressed ideals of tolerance. The statue relates to the Jews incidentally; the story that it tells uses them to emphasize tolerance in Vienna. The Jews as a subject are not represented by the statue; that is, they are absent from the commemoration of the tolerance towards them.

The two remaining monuments in the square are the most important; and the JW Museum and the library monument are closely connected to each other. In 1994 there was a city initiative to build a monument in this square in memory of the Jews who were murdered in the Holocaust. During the building of the library monument several remains of an ancient synagogue of Vienna were found. The discovery prompted a wide public debate, and the question arose: what should be done with the unearthed remains and how would their discovery affect the already planned monument? Eventually the City Council decided that the monument would be built as planned while parallel to it, underneath it, a historical museum the JW Museum would be built which would preserve the remains of the ancient synagogue (Gillman, 2004).

The JW and the library monument above it are connected and complementary to each other. Nevertheless, I wish to analyze them separately. The JW Museum deals with the history of the Jews in the Middle Ages. Its main purpose is to preserve and display the center of Jewish life in Vienna at the time of the Middle Ages, which is the ancient synagogue. The JW Museum's brochure says that here the visitor can "feel the life in the Jewish Quarter in the Middle Ages." Despite that declared purpose, the JW Museum creates an atmosphere of death and mourning. In addition, it commemorates Judaism as a religion and a group, and not Jews as persons and individuals. The JW Museum also depicts Judaism as belonging to the past. It conveys this message through its design and also in the content of the commemoration, which is presented in the form of a movie and text.

The design of the JW Museum conveys a stronger message. Giebelhausen (2005) asserts that this museum's architecture and design are the main tool by which its message is transmitted to the visitor. The design is modernistic and minimalist, and does not correspond with the period with which the JW Museum concerns itself. In the space of the JW Museum, four main colors cam be seen: metallic silver, white, black and concrete gray. The main visible materials are concrete and metal. These materials were not used at the time of the Middle Ages, and they distance the visitor from the medieval experience. The entrance to the museum is surrounded by concrete, creating the feeling of a basement.

As noted, the main exhibit in the JW Museum is the ancient synagogue, whose remains are displayed in the central room. The walls of this room are black, and lighting room is scarce and focused. This design creates the feeling of a tomb. The design of the central room expresses the rejection of attempting to reconstruct the past and make it a living place again, and transmits to the visitor that the past, and with it the ancient synagogue, is dead in an ultimate way.

The remains of the ancient synagogue as they are displayed in the JM Museum

The JW Museum gives the same messages through other means as well, such as the movie and the explanations given beside the exhibits. The movie depicts life in the Jewish Quarter in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It does not, however, recreate that life; in all its ten minutes it does not present a single character. The Jewish

Quarter is portrayed as being completely empty. The emphasis is archeological, and the focus is on objects and buildings – by nature, the things that are left behind after the person has gone forever. The main feeling is that the Jews of the fourteenth and fifteen centuries are absent.

It can be said, then, that the JW Museum is a museum for the history of Judaism and not of the Jews. The museum signifies the Judaism that existed in Vienna during the Middle Ages without connection or continuation to the present time. At the center of the commemoration stands the West European Orthodox Judaism that existed in Vienna in the Middle Ages, represented as an ethnic group. The focus on the ethnic group as opposed to the individuals in that group is evident in the JW Museum's emphasis on objects. The objects and buildings attract most of the attention, and through them the knowledge is conveyed to the visitor. As for people and images, the museum adduces them only via the objects; the objects stand at the center and their owners are a footnote.

Since the object and its remains seem to be the focus of this museum, much can learned from the way they are presented. The material culture of the Viennese Jews in the Middle Ages is displayed in a way that makes these objects appear like dead remains and the remains of the dead. The objects are displayed in metal and glass shelves with dim light directed on them and minimalistic explanations next to each of them. These explanations do not elaborate on where the object was used and what it was used for in life. Hence these objects appear remote and dead, and their original owners appear the same.

Most of the knowledge that is transmitted is connected to the Jewish religion, including festivals, traditions and commandments. The Jewish tradition is displayed here as a museum exhibit in its own right. Such a focus on the Jewish tradition, as opposed to the Jewish people, emphasizes the absence of the Jews from the commemoration.

In addition, nowhere in the JW Museum did I find a reference to these traditions as ongoing and still existing. The explanations about the various traditions are given in past tense only. For example, in the movie the visitor hears a voiceover explaining: "Women *were* not obligated to come to the synagogue…." "At the age of thirteen children *celebrated* their bar mitzvah" (emphasis added). The commemorated Judaism is presented as a museum exhibit and, thus, as belonging to the past.

Despite being located in a central square, the Judenplatz, the JW Museum does not appear to be very central. Its entrance is quite hard to find, and no signs direct the visitor towards the museum. In addition, the JW Museum is visited by few tourists – only 15,503 people came to it last year. In comparison, 65,000 people visit the Freud Museum in Vienna each year. Moreover, those 15,503 visitors in the JW Museum are a very small percentage of the over five million tourists who visit Vienna annually.

The second main monument in the square is the library monument or the Nameless Library. This monument was created by the non-Jewish artist Rachel Whitread. It was initiated in 2000 (Keil, 2009). The monument is built in the shape of symmetrical bookshelves, with the books positioned backwards, their covers towards the inside. The visitor cannot open the books or see their names or contents. Hence the form is that of a large concrete square resting on a lower concrete square. On the lower part of the monument, six names of death camps are engraved. On one of the sides a Star of David is engraved, and underneath it there is an additional inscription in Hebrew, English and German: "In commemoration of more than 65,000 Austrian Jews who were killed by the Nazis between 1938 and 1945."

Because of its size and material, the library monument dominates the square; it projects a message of emptiness and death. The library that is presented is a metaphor for the Jewish people, the "People of the Book." But it is a dead library, one that does not exist and in which it is impossible to read. The books that cannot be opened form a structure that cannot be entered. This monument can be understood as the death mask of a library; it is a space which does not live. Therefore, the commemoration that is designed here for Jews is actually a commemoration of Jews as dead and nonexistent, like a library in which nothing can be read.

This message is also reinforced by the location and the shape of the monument. It is located right above the remains of the ancient synagogue that is preserved in the JW Museum. It is shaped like a symmetrical square, and looks from a distance like a smooth stone. These two elements give the library monument the appearance of a tombstone. The monument buries the ancient synagogue and thereby completes its removal into the past and into the earth.

The unique choice of shape for this monument has an additional connotation. While it is true that the artist's intention was to create a representation of a library, as reflected by the choice of the monument's name, it is not certain that her intention was achieved. Examining this monument closely reveals that it does not resemble a

normal library at all. The shelves are completely symmetrical, and the books in these shelves are completely identical – in size, shape, width and color. A normal library usually contains a variety of books, but in this monument the same book repeats itself.

Several scholars have interpreted this memorial as a metaphor for the Jewish people. The metaphor is quite clear: the books symbolize the people, and each book is like a person. Just as the books cannot be opened or read, the murdered people will never again be alive (Gillman, 2004). Thus the Nameless Library monument understands and represents the Jewish people as one large block of unrecognizable individuals. If the books symbolize the people, then the fact that they are completely, unrealistically identical to each other teaches much about the way Jews are understood in this commemoration. The library monument commemorates the Jews as an unrecognizable mass of individuals, without personality and uniqueness.

This conclusion corresponds with my earlier remark about differences between commemoration of the Jews and of Judaism. As noted, the distance between the subject of the commemoration and the memory agent is reflected in the choice to commemorate the social group rather than the individuals. In the present interesting example, even when the nonaffiliated memory agent, the City Council, attempted to create a commemoration for Jews, the latter were not perceived as individuals but rather as one large group containing similar individuals. This indicates the difficulty for the nonaffiliated memory agent of perceiving and representing the others as something other than a group.

How should one view this location? Is this square a place of death or a place of life? Originally it had the potential to be both; this location was a center of Jewish life in the Middle Ages, and it was also the place where this community was murdered and its buildings destroyed. In light of the content and the connotations of the commemoration analyzed above, this square should be viewed as an example of a place of death. As mentioned, in this square there is an attempt to depict Jewish life, but the result is a commemoration of Jews as dead and Judaism as absent. This message reflects the fact that the nonaffiliated memory agents feels more comfortable with locations of commemoration which can be described as places of death. In this square, even though the historical details offered an alternative, the choice was made to use the space in a way that would emphasize the difficult, tragic events that "really happened" there.

In summation, this square is the focus of a multilevel process of the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna. This process led to a situation in which this square, which is named after the Jews, now includes several monuments and elements of commemoration. The visitor to the square is exposed to parallel messages. These monuments have one common denominator: they all create a commemoration of the Jews as absent and of Judaism as a dead world, which is separate and distant. Thus the Jews are absent from the commemoration in the square that carries their name.

The Path of Remembrance and the Stones of Remembrance: "*They were alive for sixty years, they are not just dead*."

In Vienna, the only commemoration projects for Jews which were not connected to the city are "The Stones of Remembrance" and "The Path of Remembrance." Both were initiated by a member of the Jewish community, Dr. Elisabeth Ben-David Hindler, and they are not completely separate from each other. The first project, "The Stones of Remembrance," was initiated in July 1996. It commemorates Austrian Jews by writing their names on small metal plaques that are affixed to the street in front of their original lodgings.

A very similar project was launched in Germany, and was functional a few years before this project in Vienna. Dr. Ben-David Hindler recognizes that a project of this kind is not her own invention; she stated: "Yes, this was a good idea in Germany, but I feel that it is important that the people of our city also have such a project, so that it can come from the people. And so we did it ourselves" (interview, 22 July 2010).

The second project, "The Path of Remembrance," began in 2005 and is a continuation and enlargement of "The Stones of Remembrance." "The Path of Remembrance" consists of similar "stones," small metal plaques, which are placed in front of the houses, buildings and institutions that were part of Jewish life in the Second District of the city. Whereas the first project only commemorates people, "The Path of Remembrance" commemorates Jewish shops, a Jewish boys' school, a Jewish theater and a Jewish market.

These two projects commemorate Jews in a way that brings them back into the streets of Vienna and attempts to make them visible in this part of the city. The focus

is on commemorating Jewish life in Vienna, and the Jews as a living part of the city. The founder of these projects emphasizes this strongly:

> All of my grandparents had died in the war, the Holocaust. I always thought of them as dead. It was only later on that I understood that even though they died when they were sixty, they still had sixty years. They were alive for sixty years, they are not just dead. So it is these sixty years that I would like to bring back to the streets of Vienna. (interview, 22 July 2010)

A similar viewpoint was expressed by the head of the Austrian Jewish community, Rabbi Paul Haim Isenberg:[2] "Yes, we must remember that there is a memorial day for the Holocaust, but this is not every day: not every day is the Holocaust Day" (interview, 24 August 2010). In other words, the message of life and continuity is more important than emphasizing the death and the tragedy of the local community.

The focus on Jewish life is evident from the places where the stones are displayed and their context. The stones are positioned next to establishments connected to everyday life, such as shops and schools. By commemorating these mundane locations, the focus of the commemoration is on life itself with all its aspects.

As mentioned before, a large part of the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna tends to portray Jews as absent and Judaism as remote. But the commemoration in these two projects is very different. The message of this commemoration is strongly connected to the personal connection between the founder of these projects, Dr. Ben-David Hindler, and the Jewish tradition and community. Dr. Ben-David Hindler is a member of the Jewish community and considers this the reason why she created this commemoration and its message:

> This project is Jewish, for me it is Jewish and it is very important to me that I am Jewish because I have the connection with the people in the project and I can empathize with them because I am Jewish. I feel this project inside my heart and I think it is very important that I am Jewish. There was another group that tried to do something similar but they didn't do it with their heart, they were not Jewish and you could see that they were not suitable. You need to want this goal. You

[2] Rabbi Eisenberg has served as a rabbi since 1986.

need to want to see that piece of you, of these lifes, on the street. (interview, 22 July 2010)

What fostered this difference is that here, the memory agent felt unable to respond to the already existing commemoration. Because of her connection to the subject of commemoration, Dr. Ben-David Hindler could not accept the commemoration of Jews in Vienna as dead and absent from the city. As she said: "I don't like that commemoration, there has to be more, they were not just washing the streets and dead books"[3] (interview, 22 July 2010).

Conclusions

In this chapter we have seen how the City Council as a nonaffiliated memory agent created a certain pattern of commemoration for the Jews and Judaism in Vienna. This pattern involves a strong preference for commemorating Judaism rather than Jews. Judaism in Vienna is commemorated as a separate, distant tradition which is not relevant to the present. Jews are in most cases commemorated as dead and absent from the city.

When the commemoration is done by the City Council, it occurs in places of death. This commemoration of Judaism and Jews does not reject the Jewish narrative of the Jews as victims of the Nazi regime. However, that narrative is presented as secondary to its rival, which is the general Austrian victimhood narrative. The affiliated memory agents attempt to create a different memory for Jews and Judaism, but their attempts are secondary to the commemoration that is done by the City Council, not as central and well known.

How should this pattern of commemoration be understood? How can there be commemoration that, for the most part, presents Jews as minor and Judaism as a separate and dead tradition? The answer can be found in the historical and sociological context within which this commemoration was created.

As noted earlier, since the end of the Second World War the main obstacle to Austrian society creating any sort of commemoration for the Jewish suffering under the Nazi regime was Austria's self-understanding as the first victim of the Nazis. This attitude was pronounced until the mid-1980s (Pelinka, 1997). Bunzl (2003) argues

[3] She refers here to the "Monument against War and Fascism" and the "Nameless Library" monument.

that there were two main reasons for the change in this foundation myth. The first was concern about Austria's image; the Waldheim Affair had brought to the surface several difficult aspects of the country's history. As a result, Austria had ceased to be viewed only as a country of cream and music; instead it was seen as having a difficult past (Uhl, 2006). Hence, Austrian politicians sought to improve Austria's image in the world. This was achieved by promoting the memory of the Austrian Jewish community; the history of the Jews in Vienna in particular became an asset to be proud of, and was made into a social value (Bunzl, 2003).

The second reason Bunzl (2003) gives is a geopolitical one. The foundation myth of Austrian society was relevant and important at the time of the Cold War. This myth helped shape Austria and keep it neutral; towards the end of the 1980s, however, neutral Austria was no longer relevant because the Soviet Union had collapsed and Austria was making its way into the European Union.

Several scholars have argued that it was Austria's entrance into the European Union that had the greatest influence on the creation of commemorations for Jews and Judaism from the mid-1980s to the present (Bunzl, 2003; Judt, 2005; Uhl, 2008). Levy and Sznaider (2002) maintain that since the 1980s there has been a commemoration boom in Europe for the Holocaust, a process in which the memory of the Holocaust has become a moral criterion. The memory of the Holocaust serves as the common ground of a new community, namely, the EU, and has thereby become a bounding definition of right and wrong, of good and evil. This definition today forms an extraterritorial "cosmopolitan memory" that is the new foundation moments of European civilization.

The process that Levy and Sznaider characterize as a creation of "cosmopolitan memory" made Austrian leaders want to work with and reflect the "European values" such as pluralism and tolerance. Since these values entailed denouncing the Nazi regime as the ultimate negative past, Austrian society, by commemorating the Jews and Judaism, fit better into its newly adopted political structure (Bunzl, 2003; Judt, 2005; Uhl, 2006, 2008).

These scholars maintain that the entrance into the European Union impelled a real change in Austrian society (Bunzl, 2003; Judt, 2005; Uhl, 2006, 2008). In their view, then, the current commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna can be described as a "model of society." A commemoration of this kind reflects the values, perception and needs of the commemorating group or society (Schwartz, 1996).

While it is indeed true that a change that occurred in the mid-1980s led to commemoration project for Jews and Judaism in Vienna, this should not be seen as a "model for society." A model for society is a commemoration that attempts to define a society's goals and values, thereby offering a cognitive structure for realizing them (Schwartz, 1996). However, Austrian society did not undergo a change that resulted in these commemoration projects. Instead, these projects reflect a desire to create a change, and to appear as if the new "European values" were absorbed. Thus, the commemoration does not reflect the society; it is an attempt to make it look as if it does.

Because the current commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna is an attempt to meet the standards of the current "European values" and in accordance with the new "cosmopolitan memory," the commemoration is done in a way that represents Judaism as a separate tradition and Jews as absent from the city and dead. In other words, the commemoration, created by the prominent City Council as a nonaffiliated memory agent, reflects an attempt to satisfy a global standard. This is what fostered the message and tone of the commemoration.

The Commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Prague

The vast majority of the commemoration to be found in the public space in Prague today is done and managed by affiliated memory agents, namely, the Jewish Museum in Prague (JMP). This chapter will present two examples concerning the JMP. In order to compare this commemoration with projects by a nonaffiliated memory agent, I will analyze the commemoration in the Franz Kafka Museum.

The Jewish Museum in Prague

The JMP was founded in 1906 as a museum for Jewish culture. It was built in order to preserve the Jewish objects from the synagogues in Prague that were destroyed in the "urban renewal" process at the beginning of the twentieth century. This process was an attempt to renovate and modernize the Jewish ghetto, and it included the destruction of several synagogues and historical Jewish buildings (Parik, 2009).

With the Nazi occupation of the region, the museum's activities were no longer possible. The Museum Association was dissolved and its collection became the property of the Jewish community of Prague. In the autumn of 1941, Dr. Karel Stein started negotiating with the Nazis in order to salvage as many Jewish objects as possible. Although eventually the Nazis approved the project, they had a different intention; they aimed to include the collection of Jewish objects from Bohemia and Moravia in a "museum of the extinct race" (Parik, 2009). Hence the Nazis allowed several members of the JMP to collect Jewish objects from former Jewish communities and store them in the museum. The staff was then ordered to set up exhibits in the vacant synagogues. Towards the end of 1945, most of the staff of the JMP was deported to concentration camps (Berger, 1900).

Immediately after the war the JMP renewed its activities under the administration of the Council of Jewish Communities in Czechoslovakia. In 1950 the communist regime took control of the museum and its property. During this period the commemoration of Jews and Judaism was restricted. Eventually almost all the permanent exhibits were closed down for alleged technical reasons (Parik, 2009).

In 1994 the museum and the historical buildings were returned to the Federation of Jewish Communities in the Czech Republic. Today the JMP rents the ancient synagogues and the Old Jewish Cemetery from the Prague Jewish community, which uses the rent proceeds to finance its social activities. In 1995 the Czech government

declared the Old Jewish Cemetery in Prague to be a "National Cultural Treasure" (Parik, 2009).

Ever since its foundation the JMP has been in a struggle to preserve memory, with the ancient Jewish objects and buildings serving as a mnemonic talisman. The mnemonic objects and buildings are now proudly utilized to show that the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Prague is not only possible but stronger than ever.

For this reason the JMP is very central and visible; the entrances are large and inviting, and above them the flags and symbols of the JMP can be seen. The streets are full of signs directing visitors to the different synagogues and buildings. The JMP's management has installed an additional set of these signs, bearing the JMP logo on the top. Because of the difficult history in which Jewish commemoration was not possible, today the JMP cannot be missed in the public sphere of the city.

The JMP has a strong influence over tourism in Prague; it is one of the main tourist attractions in the city. The museum is located in the ancient Jewish Quarter, which is a five-minute walk from the city's other main tourist attractions such as the Charles Bridge (Karlův most) and the Old City Square with its famous Astronomical Clock. Each year approximately four and a half million tourists visit Prague, and 600,000 of them visit the JMP. That number is especially impressive in light of the relatively high price of an entry ticket[4] at €18.[5] For example, entrance to both houses of the Jewish Museum in Vienna costs only €6.50. It is estimated that an even larger number of tourists visit the Jewish Quarter each year, without paying the JMP's entrance fee. These visitors stroll among the different synagogues and enjoy them from the outside.

The JMP is especially attractive because the museum is located within the historical site itself. As the museum's director describes it:

> We are happy enough having several historic synagogues here in Prague which are very rare from an architectural point of view.... This is very special and it makes Prague an attraction. For example, the Jewish Museum in Amsterdam is one of many museums in a town, but in Prague people come to see the "Jewish Town," which is all of these synagogues. Prague's "Jewish Town" refers to the Jewish

[4] Including admission to the old-new synagogue.
[5] 450 Kč.

Museum, our permanent exhibits are displayed in these synagogues (interview, 12 November 2010)

That the Jewish Quarter or "Jewish Town" is one of Prague's main attractions is not just the director's opinion. Every map that is distributed to tourists in the city shows the Jewish Quarter and highlights the different synagogues in it.[6] In addition, a worldwide tourist company that offers basic walking tours in a large number of world capitals includes the Jewish Quarter in its basic walking tour of Prague. Gift shops all over the city sell postcards and pictures of buildings in the quarter.

Because the JMP is such a central attraction for tourists, a private company has paid its management for the rights to rent audio guides to the visitors. Next it to two tickets offices of the JMP, visitors can rent audio guides in seven different languages. This research will analyze the audio guide as part of the commemoration in the JMP. This can be done since, according to the JMP's director, the content of the audio guide was created through consultation with the JMP and approved by it.

Today the JMP is the strongest, most influential memory agent in the field of commemoration of Jews and Judaism in the city. This major memory agent should be understood as an affiliated one. The JMP is an independent institution managed by a board of directors, most of whom are members of the community. In an interview, the director of the JMP, Mr. Leo Pavlát, described his organization as follows: "I would say this is a Jewish institution. At the same time our ties with the government are very good. But we have to be self-sufficient as we are not connected to the state budget and we are independent" (interview, 12, November 2010).

The JMP offers exhibits in seven of its buildings and historical sites. In this article I will discuss two of them, the Pinkas Synagogue and the Old Jewish Cemetery. These two parts of the JMP reflect the main message of the commemoration and serve as an example for the entire museum.

1. The Pinkas Synagogue: "*Is there a pain like my pain*."

The Pinkas Synagogue was originally built in the sixteenth century. Today it is no longer active as a synagogue. Its first floor is a memorial for all the Jews of Bohemia

[6] I have checked more than ten different maps that are distributed for free in restaurants and tourist information points. All of these indicate the Jewish Quarter using the Star of David. Some maps also show enlarged images of the synagogues.

and Moravia who were murdered in the Holocaust. The second floor is a display room with an exhibit of children's drawings from the Theresienstadt (Terezín) concentration camp. This Synagogue commemorates the Jews, not Judaism. That is, it commemorates the murder of local Jews by presenting them as individuals, not as a group.

Immediately after the Second World War, the survivors began to commemorate their relatives and friends by writing their names on the walls of this synagogue. In 1968 the communist regime found an excuse to close the synagogue, and several of the names that were written on the walls were gradually removed. Only after the fall of that regime, when the synagogue again became a property of the Jewish community, were the names restored to the walls and the commemoration renewed. Because of this complicated history of commemoration, the synagogue not only commemorates that the majority of the community members were murdered but also that their commemoration was forbidden by the communist regime.

Because the Pinkas Synagogue commemorates the murdered Jews, its atmosphere is very serious and respectful. In the courtyard in front of the synagogue are signs asking the visitor to respect the holy place. The first room of the first floor of the synagogue serves as a second introduction to the memorial. On the walls of this room are two texts. The first is another explanation, describing exactly what kind of memorial the visitor is about to experience. The text runs:

> The Pinkas Synagogue was built in the 30s of the 16th century by Aharon Horoviz. On its walls the names of the Jews of Czechoslovakia and Moravia, the victims of the Holocaust are commemorated. The Synagogue, in which the prayers of the Jews in Prague were heard for centuries, became a commemoration site for more than 800,000 blameless men, children and women. (from the Pinkas Synagogue)

The second text in this room is a quote from the Book of Lamentations: "Is there a pain like my pain"[7] (Book of Lamentations, 1:15). This quote emphasizes the message and the atmosphere of the Pinkas Synagogue and helps to prepare the visitor for the next room, which is the memorial. Both texts that are displayed in the first room use

[7] "היש מכאוב ככאבי" (איכה, א, 15).

an ancient Jewish method to commemorate sorrow and destruction. During the centuries it was customary to keep one part of the wall in a Jewish household unplastered and unpainted. This raw piece of wall served to symbolize the destruction of the Second Temple and of Jerusalem. The two texts that are displayed in the entrance room of the Pinkas Synagogue are written within a very similar unplastered square and look exactly like the traditional unpainted parts of a house. Thus, the Pinkas Synagogue constructs the atmosphere of the memorial by using a traditional mourning element.

The visitor enters the empty main hall of the first floor, which is the memorial. The only thing to be seen there are the names of the murdered Jews written on the walls. The names seem to be endless and uncountable. The message is the magnitude of the sorrow, death and destruction. The sorrow and the void cannot be perceived, just as the number of the names cannot be perceived. The names appear to be infinite, and thus the loss appears infinite as well.

The atmosphere with its message of death and sorrow is enhanced by sound effects as well. When looking at the names on the wall, visitors hear the voice of a cantor singing the traditional mourning scroll, the Book of Lamentations. This voiceover is extremely sad and at some points sounds like actual wailing.

In addition, the message of death and sorrow is enhanced by the use of the structure itself, the synagogue, which emphasizes the void and the tragedy. Although the bimah (elevated platform for reading aloud from the Torah) and the Torah ark can still be seen in the Pinkas Synagogue, it is obvious that they are unused. The bimah is surrounded by a closed fence, the Torah ark by the names of concentration camps. The synagogue is used to show the visitor that this former house of prayer is dead like the murdered individuals who are commemorated in it.

Visitors walk through the main hall in complete silence, despite the fact that there is no sign asking them to do so. The visitors walk through the monument not because they are looking for a name, or because there is special information on the walls, but to assimilate the message and observe the atmosphere. It is the experience, not historical knowledge, that is central to this commemoration.

The second floor of the Pinkas Synagogue is not part of the monument but is closely connected to it. This floor is a display room for drawings by children in the Theresienstadt concentration camp, most of whom did not survive the war. This floor also has one board with explanations of what happened to these children and the

circumstances in which the drawings were made. Next to most of the drawings is a picture of the small artist with the name, date of birth and date of death. The pictures and the dates emphasize the horror of these children's murder.

The exhibit of the children's drawings from Theresienstadt concentration camp is especially shocking and effective. The contrast between the naiveté and vulnerability of the victims, which is emphasized by the drawings, and the cruelty and inhuman character of their murderers, is the main message of this exhibit. The children's drawings symbolize all the Jewish victims of the Nazis. This message can be found in the final sentence of the explanations that accompany this exhibit: "These drawings are a memory not only for the children who were murdered but also for all the other victims of the Nazis in this community including those whose names and the place of burial were forgotten" (quote from the exhibit). The audio guide defines this exhibit as "A testimony to Jewish suffering" (quote from the audio guide). It is evident that for the memory agent this horrifying exhibit is a symbol of the entire Holocaust experience and memory of the community.

The commemoration that is constructed in the Pinkas Synagogue is a commemoration of Jews. Its main message is the tragedy of the murder of the Jews by Nazis in the Second World War. The children's drawings on the upper floor display the life of these children only in order to emphasize their murder. It is not the community or the collective that is displayed; instead it is the individual who is remembered using the most individual thing, the person's name.

What is remarkable here is the use of the place. The Pinkas Synagogue is most certainly a place of life, yet the commemoration found in it carries the message of death. The memory agent, the JMP, has managed to make the place of life into a place of death. This initiative innovation is spelled out at the entrance to the synagogue, in the explanations of the first room: "...The synagogue, in which the prayers of the Jews in Prague were heard for centuries, became a commemoration site for more than 800,000 [the number of Jews from Bohemia and Moravia who were murdered] blameless men, children and women" (quote from the Pinkas Synagogue). It says here that the place of life, where one used to pray, *became*, was made into, a commemoration site for the dead. The next station in the self-guided tour will show that the memory agent has succeeded to make a place of death into a place that commemorates Jewish life.

2. The Old Jewish Cemetery: "Beit hahaim, *a house of life*."

The Old Jewish Cemetery is one of the best-preserved historical attractions in the Jewish Quarter of Prague. In an interview, the director of the JMP named the cemetery as one of the three most popular parts of his museum (interview, 12, November 2010). Indeed, the window of the ticket office next to the old Jewish synagogue carries a sign saying: "We haven't got tickets just for the cemetery." Clearly, large numbers of tourists wish to visit the cemetery and it is one of the greatest attractions of the Jewish Quarter. The management of the JMP certainly views the cemetery as important; the only picture to be found on the front of the museum's brochure, and on the ticket, is a picture of the Old Jewish Cemetery.

This great attraction cannot be understood outside its context. The Old Jewish Cemetery is located adjacent to the Pinkas Synagogue, and this alone considerably affects the cemetery. The cemetery and the synagogue share the same entrance, and visitors are directed to enter the former and then to visit the latter. As mentioned earlier, the atmosphere that the visitor absorbs in the Pinkas Synagogue is sad and serious. But the feeling and the message in the Old Jewish Cemetery are quite the opposite.

The message of the cemetery is the antiquity, continuity and abundance of Jewish life in Prague. As the JMP director said: *"*people are buried there but this is the place of real life" (interview, 12, November 2010). This message is constructed in the Old Jewish Cemetery by several means: first, introducing several well-known individual Jews who are buried there; second, introducing details about the life of Jews in Prague; and third, using the walk in the cemetery to construct an atmosphere that supports the message of life and balances the experience of visiting the Pinkas Synagogue.

First, iconic individual Jews who used to be part of the Jewish community and today are buried in the cemetery are presented mainly via the brochure and the audio guide. The visitors have to follow the path which was paved by the JMP's management. This path is rather long and winds around the cemetery in circles. The purpose of this extended path is to introduce the visitor to several headstones, and thereby to the individuals who are buried beneath them. As the JMP director put it:

> This is not an exhibit. When the visitors go there I cannot push them. One cannot push people to feel something, but the visitor can imagine and understand the life of the Jews. The visitor can be impressed with the rabbis who used to live here and the symbols of the families. If you read Hebrew you can read about the life of the people. You could say it is an archive in stone. (Interview, 12, November 2010)

On the museum's brochure the visitor can see a map of the cemetery. Marked on the map are fourteen headstones of individuals who lived and died in Prague. The visitor can connect the name in the brochure with a headstone in front of him. The visit to the cemetery becomes a visit to the old Jewish community of Prague. The visitor gets to know specific individuals and can listen to their life story in the audio guide.

The list of the buried individuals who are highlighted and made into local icons by the memory agent is highly indicative. The individuals chosen are notable for their achievements in life. For example, Mordechai Maizel[8] was the mayor of the Jewish ghetto; David Gantz[9] was a mathematician and historian; and the most famous may be the Maharal, Rabbi Judah Loew ben Bezalel**,** perhaps the greatest Jewish leader of Prague. The individuals chosen help emphasize the fact that Jews lived in this city for centuries and their lives were abundant in culture, science and education. The memory agent did not choose to focus on individuals who are buried in the cemetery and are notable for difficult reasons, such as having been persecuted or murdered. The audio guide expresses this message perfectly: "Walking by the headstones of the Old Jewish Cemetery really means to walk through the life of the Jews in Prague" (quote from the audio guide).

Second, the message of life which is constructed in the visit to the Old Jewish Cemetery is also achieved by using the headstones to narrate certain details of the life of Jews in Prague. The audio guide draws the visitor's attention to certain symbols on the headstones that are used to explain aspects of the everyday life of Jews. For example, the audio guide gives several explanations for family names, legends about a beautiful young girl and even a love story with a perfect ending. Clearly, the

[8] מורדכי מייזל (1609).
[9] דוד גאנץ (1613).

headstones are not the subject but an object in the cemetery; they are used to tell the story of the life of Jews in Prague.

Third, the fact that the visitor has to go through the cemetery in circles makes the visit feel like a stroll. The cemetery looks like a garden. It is completely surrounded by a wall, remote from the street and very quiet, with old trees and with grass and flowers growing between the headstones. The cemetery almost resembles a peaceful, beautiful park. The JMP director is certainly not unaware of this aspect: "We have to understand that the cemetery changes all the time, and there are people I know who come to it every time they are in Prague because, with the seasons, sometimes it is beautiful white ground and sometimes you can see the autumn leaves on the ground" (interview, 12, November 2010).

Visitors in the Old Jewish Cemetery

The fact that the cemetery is so peaceful, and that the visitor has to pass through it in circles, makes the visit a relaxing experience after the sad, heavy experience of

visiting the Pinkas Synagogue. This relaxation is a process. In the first steps of the stroll through the cemetery, visitors look serious and puzzled; but subsequently they usually relax, start to laugh and eventually take pictures of each other. The act of taking pictures has a specific meaning, as both in the synagogue and the cemetery there are signs forbidding tourists to do so. This request is honored by the visitors only in the synagogue, because of the serious, heavy message it carries. The visitors cease to honor this request when they go out and stroll in the cemetery, whose message and atmosphere allow them to ignore the signs. The fact that visitors find it appropriate to be photographed next to headstones shows to what extent the relaxation process in the cemetery succeeds. This calming experience contributes to the constructed message of the Old Jewish Cemetery, which emphasizes the everyday life of Jews in the city.

In summation, the memory agent uses the headstones and information on the individuals buried in the cemetery in a selective way that emphasizes the antiquity of Jewish life in Prague, life that was full of culture and happiness. The cemetery thereby embodies the traditional Jewish term for a cemetery: "a house of life." The Old Jewish Cemetery in Prague has indeed been made into a house of life.

As noted, there is a strong affinity between the Pinkas Synagogue and the Old Jewish Cemetery. For one thing, both sites use multiple methods to create their message. The synagogue uses a multiplicity of names to emphasize the extent and depth of mourning; the cemetery uses the multiplicity of headstones to emphasize the abundance of life. Both sides seek to show the visitor that there is more and more, an endless number of something; their methods are similar, their messages contradictory.

In addition, both the Pinkas Synagogue and the Old Jewish Cemetery transmit their message through the experience. The JMP director described this by saying: "Really what is special is that this is not an exhibit, it is actually an impression." The visitor is not supposed to absorb new knowledge; he is supposed to undergo an experience. By passing through the countless names of the dead or the beautiful house of life, the visitor assimilates the message.

By creating these two sites of memory, the memory agent has achieved something remarkable. Very strong messages of life and death dwell right next to each other without overshadowing each other. The Pinkas Synagogue is where the Holocaust and sorrow dwell, while the Old Jewish Cemetery is the house of the living; these two inverse messages do not contradict or stand in the way of each other. Rather, the close

proximity of these two messages reflects the memory agent's understanding that death and sorrow are neither remote nor more important or larger than life. For the memory agent, the Pinkas Synagogue does not control or tower above the Old Jewish Cemetery; the Holocaust does not prevail over life. This is why these two neighbors, the synagogue and the cemetery, live so peacefully next to one another.

In summation, the Jewish Museum in Prague conveys several messages. Most of the JMP focuses on Jews, that is, on individuals and their lives. In addition, most of its parts commemorate Jews as a living, relevant part of the city. Their contribution to their city is strongly emphasized, and they are presented as having been part of it since ancient times. When the Jewish tradition is the focus of the commemoration, the tradition is presented as a relevant, ongoing religion which is part of the present and of the city.

But the JMP does not focus solely on life; it also commemorates the Holocaust and the murdered members of the community. The commemoration of the Holocaust is done by representing the murdered Jews as individuals and not as a group. In addition, the message of the tragedy and death of the local Jews does not dominate the entire JMP. The Holocaust is only one part of the museum, and it is denoted only at the Pinkas Synagogue and as part of the historical exhibit in the Spanish Synagogue. The Holocaust is presented as part of history but not as the end of history.

This point can be explained by the fact that the JMP is managed by a Jewish organization, and hence the memory agent is an affiliated one. An affiliated memory agent tends to focus on messages of life, and that is why the Holocaust is not the main message of the elements of the JMP. The JMP seems to follow the reasoning of yet another affiliated memory agent, Rabbi Isenberg of Vienna: "Not every day is Holocaust Day."

Lustig (2009) calls such usage of old Jewish ghettos a form of "Jewish Disneyland." She refers to the creation of a "theme park of Judaism" which uses the ancient buildings and history of the ghettos to sell them to the public as an attraction along with additional Jewish merchandise. The JMP, however, is not a theme park for Judaism but a theme park for Jews and their lives in Prague. The museum's focus is on the individuals and not the group.

Whether a Jewish ghetto is made into a "Disneyland" reflects the character of the commemoration. In the Prague commemoration, Jewish lives in the old Jewish ghetto are celebrated. Lustig (2009) criticizes the selling of accessories and souvenirs related

to Jewish history in the old Jewish ghettos as an attempt to brand the citiy in question and make commercial use of memory. This process can be seen in the old Jewish ghetto of Prague. Jewish life in Prague is perceived as a positive symbol of the city and therefore is worthy of "becoming merchandise." Jews and non-Jews alike sell souvenirs of Jewish life in Prague because the commemoration of it is constructed as something worthy of celebration and not just lamentation,

The celebration of Jewish history in Prague reflects the fact that this history is presented as an overall positive past, albeit with difficult aspects. Not only the affiliated memory agent but also the general population of the city takes part in celebrating Jewish antiquity and continuity in Prague. That cooperation in making the Jewish past in Prague into a celebrated local symbol reflects the fact that the history of Jews in Prague is perceived to be part of the general local history.

The Franz Kafka Museum

The Franz Kafka Museum (FKM) was opened to the public in the summer of 2005. The FKM is a private institution managed by a private society called COPA. The permanent exhibit in the FKM is called "The City of K.: Franz Kafka and Prague." The FKM has two focal points – Franz Kafka himself, and Prague. Each of these is used to highlight and explain the other. The FKM's main message is the commemoration of Kafka as a renowned local genius.

The FKM focuses on how special and unique the writer and his city are. This is achieved by creating a very special visiting experience. The museum is designed to reflect the atmosphere and feeling conveyed in Kafka's writing. All the walls are black; the space is divided in a way that produces shapes of confusing angles. Sound effects of birdcalls and cranking machines are added to foster an ominous atmosphere. The city is displayed as a mysterious place that influenced Kafka's famous works. This connection between him and Prague is summarized beautifully on the final wall of the exhibit: "The myth of Prague and Kafka's aura feed each other" (quote from the exhibit).

Location is a very important element in this commemoration. The FKM is located on the riverbank right next to the Charles Bridge, which is a prominent tourist attraction in its own right. When standing on this bridge, one cannot miss the sign indicating the entrance to the museum. The museum is not located in or near a place

where Kafka lived or died. It is, however, located next to the largest tourist attractions, which are considered by the tourist to be the "real Prague." Therefore, for tourists, the FKM is part of Prague. The fact that the FKM stands at the center of the city, in the midst of its symbols, further enhances the message. The location is not used to emphasize Kafka's life (as would be done by using a place where he lived or died), but to connect him to the city by situating him at the center of Prague's modern-day icons.

Kafka is one of the most famous and influential writers of the twentieth century, and his writing is certainly very special and very connected to Prague. Kafka was also Jewish, and that fact shaped his identity and work. The FKM does not ignore this; his Jewish identity is mentioned throughout the exhibit as part of the attempt to explain the special characteristics of this local writer. For example, the first part of the exhibit offers pictures and explanations of the Jewish ghetto in Prague. The ghetto is included in the display so as to showcase its effect on the writer. One of the explanations next to the pictures states: "The ghetto was influential in the nostalgic perception of Kafka and in his writings" (quote from the exhibit). The FKM's directors described the museum's attitude towards Kafka's Jewishness in a fairly general way: "Normally, we don't ignore it, we present it as a normal fact, without any special interpretation" (interview, 13, November 2010).

Thus, Kafka's Jewish identity is noted, but it is not the center or the purpose of this exhibit. No explanations are offered of Judaism or the history of the Jews in Prague during Kafka's lifetime. It is only Judaism's influence on the writer himself that is mentioned. For example, one part of the exhibit deals with Kafka's peculiar approach to his own body. An explanation next to his picture states: "As a member of the Jewish bourgeoisie of Prague he was exposed to their contradiction of urban modernity. The conflict began with a visit of a customer to his father's shop…" (quote from the exhibit). Another place in the exhibit notes his childhood experiences: "When his family moved to live outside of the ghetto, children mocked him for being short and thin, sharp-nosed and hollow-cheeked" (quote from the exhibit). The focus here is on his Jewish identity's impact on him as a person and as the writer he was to become.

This commemoration reveals that there is no programmatic or difficult history that needs to be dealt with by this nonaffiliated memory agent. The fact that Kafka was Jewish does not stand in the way, nor is it made the main point of the museum's

message. As mentioned earlier, the foundation myths of Czech society contain the Jewish history and narrative and do not reject it. One of the main components of current Czech identity is understanding themselves as going back to the democratic period of the First Republic; the democracy which was led by Thomas Masaryk has been made into a symbol of that period. Kafka, just like Masaryk, is a Jewish individual who symbolizes that glorious time. He is remembered as a relevant, "living" part of the city because his memory is consistent with the current, constructed national identity. Therefore, Kafka and his Jewish identity are celebrated as local symbols of Prague.

Conclusions

The commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Prague is a good example of a commemoration where there is no difficult past. The commemoration is mostly done by an affiliated memory agent which constructs Jews as part of the city and Judaism as a living, ongoing part of the present. As noted, this memory agent presents the Holocaust as a sad, traumatic event that does not overshadow the entire local Jewish history.

This kind of commemoration should not come as a surprise when it is done by an affiliated memory agent. We have seen that affiliated memory agents usually tend to focus on positive messages. What is interesting is that the nonaffiliated memory agents in Prague, and indeed the entire city, seem to embrace the same kind of commemoration.

The history of the Jews in the Czech lands and, in particular, at the time of the Second World War cannot be described as a difficult past. The Jews do not blame the non-Jewish inhabitants of Prague for participating in the Nazi crimes, and the Czechs do not see themselves as responsible for them. For the non-Jewish population in Prague, the history of the Jews in their city does not threaten them with blame or shame.

This fact is even more striking when comparing the Czech attitude towards the commemoration of Jews and the Czech attitude towards the commemoration of the Roma minority. The history of the Roma minority and their suffering in the Holocaust is a difficult past for the Czech population because of their part in it. As a result, today there is no recognition or commemoration for the Roma minority in the Czech

Republic and all of the attempts to create such memorials are met with bureaucratic difficulty and noncooperation by government officials (Crowe, 2002). The attitude towards Jewish history and narrative is a striking opposite because it is not perceived to be pointing a finger or containing a moral trauma.

For this reason Jews and Judaism are commemorated in Prague as a living part of the city, as individuals and not as a group. Jews are commemorated as permanent, living, important local individuals, as in the case of Franz Kafka. For this nonaffiliated memory agent, Kafka, like other important Jewish individuals, can be understood as an integral part of Prague and thus represented as such.

The memory and commemoration of Jews and Judaism as a living part of Prague can be seen in the symbols and icons the city presents to the visitor. The renowned Rabbi Judah Loew ben Bezalel (the Maharal) and the Golem, the servant he created from scratch according to legend, are widespread local icons. The Maharal is commemorated in a statue in the City Hall building. This statue presents him as an important local persona, and his name is inscribed in Hebrew underneath. The statue was built at the beginning of the twentieth century, removed by the Nazis in the 1940s, and restored to its original position after the war (Rothkirchen, 1979).

The rabbi and the Golem are found on souvenirs, postcards, restaurants and coffee shops. The fact that these icons, which are no doubt very Jewish, have become general icons of the city reflects the city's attitudes and approach to Jews and Judaism. Prague celebrates its local Jews as part of the local culture. For example, in the relatively new tourist attraction known as the Ghost Museum of Prague, the Golem is presented as a local ghost that was created in Prague's Jewish ghetto and may still be seen occasionally at night in the streets of the city.

Schwartz and Wagner-Pacifici (1991) assert that "The most successful cultural objects reproduce themselves." That is, the icons and images that appear again and again in different ways throughout a commemoration are probably the most successful and most suitable to the message. The Golem and the Maharal are very common cultural images that are used repeatedly by Jews and non-Jews alike. In line with Schwarz and Wagner-Pacifici's point, the Golem and the Maharal are as widespread as they are because they are successful cultural objects. It is only because the Golem and the Maharal are understood as part of the story of the city, just as the Jews are, that they are considered suitable and successful cultural objects.

A local Souvenir shop in town offers Jewish objects and symbols next to Christian icons.

Final Remarks

There is a difference between the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna and in Prague. In Vienna, the history of the Second World War is understood as a difficult past that threatens the national self-understanding and identity. Because most of the commemoration in Vienna is done by nonaffiliated memory agents, this commemoration represents Jews as dead and Judaism as an ancient and absent part of the city. Although several affiliated memory agents in Vienna attempt to offer a different commemoration that emphasizes life and continuity, their efforts are limited and serve to reflect the hegemony of the nonaffiliated memory agents and their message.

In Prague, Jews are commemorated as individuals and as an ancient yet living, relevant part of their city. Because the history of the Second World War is not understood in Prague as a difficult past but rather as a sad event worthy of being remembered, there is no apparent difference between a commemoration done by affiliated or nonaffiliated memory agents. The ancient yet ongoing existence of Jews as part of Prague seems to be commemorated both by members and nonmembers of the Jewish community.

Schwartz and Wagner-Pacifici (1991) define two different ways to understand and represent the past. The first is done in order to "come to terms with the past"; the second is a commemoration that "celebrates the past." In line with this definition, I suggest that the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna is an attempt to come to terms with the past. This commemoration revolves around an unresolved, difficult past in the history of the Austrian society. Hence the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna, which is done by nonaffiliated memory agents, always reflects the difficult rivalry between the Austrian and the Jewish narratives. This commemoration attempts to find a solution to that rivalry. But it is not resolved, and the attempt to come to terms with the past does not succeed. As a result, the struggle to come to terms with the past becomes a reflection of the past. The fact that Jews were murdered in Vienna becomes the prominent image and memory of the Jews in this city.

In Prague there is no such rivalry between the narratives, and the history of Jews and Judaism is remembered positively. This commemoration is a double celebration: Jews and non-Jews alike celebrate the ancient, special history of Jews in Prague as well as the newly gained opportunity to remember it. Within the celebration of this

proud past, the memory of the Holocaust and Jewish suffering in Prague is not forgotten, but it is not made into the center of the message. The Holocaust is remembered as part of an ancient, ongoing history and hence is presented as part of a larger, happier story.

The character and the message that are projected by the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Vienna suggest that this commemoration in Vienna constitutes a burden for the nonaffiliated memory agents. Since the memory of the Jews and the narrative of their suffering during the Second World War pose a threat to the general Austrian identity, commemorating the Jews and their religion is done reluctantly. The attempts to come to terms with the past through commemoration reflect the burdensome nature of this task. The burden of commemoration is reflected in its message.

In Prague, conversely, the history of the Jews is celebrated and therefore the commemoration is done joyfully. When the past is not shameful or controversial, commemorating it, even when it contains several sad episodes, is a positive experience. The joy of commemorating the Jews and Judaism in Prague is shared by group members and non-group members and is reflected in the message of this commemoration.

The theoretical position advanced in this article could be evaluated by further research, which would include analyzing the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Bratislava, the capital of Slovakia. Since Slovakia in the past was part of Czechoslovakia, it is strongly connected to the history and culture of the Czech Republic. During the Second World War, however, Slovakia was an independent country which was closely connected to Nazi Germany and took an active part in the crimes of the Third Reich. Therefore, the history of the Second World War in Slovakia is no doubt another example of a difficult past in a newly established nation-state within the European Union.

Analyzing the commemoration of Jews and Judaism in Bratislava could reveal whether my theoretical analysis is correct. According to my suggestion, in Bratislava we can expect to fined commemoration done by nonaffiliated memory agents commemorating the Jews as a group and as an absent part of the city. However, only a future research could determine if this is so.

Bibliography

Books:

Berger, Natalya. *A Meeting of Cultures: The Story of the Jews of Czechoslovakia*. Tel Aviv, 1990. (in Hebrew)

Borkenau, Franz. *Austria and After*. London, 1938.

Edy, Jill A. *Troubled Pasts: News and the Collective Memory of Social Unrest*. Philadelphia, 2006.

Erll, Astrid, Ansgar, Nünning. *Cultural memory studies: an international and interdisciplinary handbook*. Berlin, 2008.

Hochman, Jiri. *Historical Dictionary of the Czech State*. London, 1998.

Holy, Ladislav. *The Little Czech and the Great Czech Nation*. Cambridge, 1996.

Judt, Tony. *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945*. New York: Penguin, 2005.

Pace, Cynthia. *Prague Panoramas: National Memory and Sacred Space in the Twentieth Century*. Pittsburgh, 2009.

Pick, Hella. *Guilty Victims: Austria from the Holocaust to Haider*. London, 2000.

Stadler, Karl. *Austria*. New York, 1971.

Vinitzky-Seroussi, Vered. *Forget-Me-Not: Yitzhak Rabin's Assassination and the Dilemmas of Commemoration*. Albany, 2008.

Young, E. James. *Of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. London, New Haven, 1993.

Articles and chapters from books:

Crowe, David. "The Roma and the Burden of Memory." In *Zerstörer des Schweigens: Formen künstlerischer Erinnerung an die nationalsozialistische Rassen- und*

Vernichtungspolitik in Osteuropa, ed. Frank Grüner, Urs Heftrich and Heinz-Dietrich Löwe, 3-16. Göttingen, 2002.

Keil, Martha. "A Clash of Times: Jewish Sites in Vienna (Judenplatz, Seitenstettengasse, Tempelgasse)." In *Reclaiming Memory: Urban Regeneration in the Historic Jewish Quarters of Central European cities*, ed. Monika Murzyn-Kupisz and Jacek Purchla, 139-161. International Cultural Centre, 2009.

Kubis, Karl. "Troublesome Anniversary: The Rise of the Czechoslovak Republic and Its European Fellows in Czech Collective Memory." In *Collective Memory and European identity*, ed. Klaus Eder and Willfried Spohn, 151-170. Ashgate, 2005.

Lustig, Sandra. "Alternatives to "Jewish Disneyland" Same Approaches to Jewish History in European Cities and Towns" in *Reclaiming Memory: Urban Regeneration in the Historic Jewish Quarters of Central European Cities*, ed. Monika Murzyn-Kupisz and Jacek Purchla, 81-98. International Cultural Centre, 2009.

Parik, Arno. "The Struggle to Protect the Monuments of Prague's Jewish Town." In *Reclaiming Memory: Urban Regeneration in the Historic Jewish Quarters of Central European Cities*, ed. Monika Murzyn-Kupisz and Jacek Purchla, 181-215. International Cultural Centre, 2009.

Pelinka, Anton. "Taboos and Self-Deception: The Second Republic's Reconstruction of History." In *Austrian Historical Memory and National Identity*, ed. Guenter Bischof and Anton Pelinka, 143-160. Transaction Publishers, 1997.

Simpson, Moria. "Revealing and Concealing Museums, Objects and the Transmission of Knowledge in Aboriginal Australia." In *New Museum Theory and Practice*, ed. Janet Marstine, 153-174. Blackwell, 2006.

Uhl, Heidemarie. "The Politics of Memory: Austria's Perception of the Second World War and the National Socialist Period." In *Austrian Historical Memory and National Identity*, ed. Guenter Bischof and Anton Pelinka, 120-142. Transaction Publishers, 1997.

Uhl, Heidemarie. "From Victim Myth to Co-Responsibility Thesis." In *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe,* ed. Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, 40-66. Duke University Press, 2006.

Uhl, Heidemarie. “From Discourse to Representation: Austrian Memory in Public Space.” In *Narrating the Nation: Representation in History, Media and the Arts*, ed. Stefan Berger, Linas Eriksonas, and Andrew Mycock, 123-140. Berghahn Books, 2008.

Articles:

Ben-Ze’ev, Efrat and Eyal Ben-Ari. “Imposing Politics: Failed Attempts at Creating a Museum of ‘Co-Existence’ in Jerusalem.” *Anthropology Today* 12 (1996): 7-13.

Bunzl, Matti. “On the Politics and Semantics of Austrian Memory: Vienna’s Monument against War and Fascism.” *History and Memory* 7 (1996): 132-150.

Bunzl, Matti. “Of Holograms and Storage Areas: Modernity and Postmodernity at Vienna’s Jewish Museum.” *Cultural Anthropology* 14 (2003): 435-468.

Gillman, Abigail. “Cultural Awakening and Historical Forgetting: The Architecture of Memory in the Jewish Museum of Vienna and in Rachel Whiteread’s ‘Nameless Library.’” *New German Critique* 93 (2004): 145-173.

Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznaider. “Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory.” *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (2002): 87-106.

Olick, Jeffrey K. “Genre Memories and Memory Genres: A Dialogical Analysis of May 8, 1945 Commemorations in the Federal Republic of Germany.” *American Sociological Review* 64 (1999): 340-381.

Papadakis, Yiannis. “The National Struggle Museums of a Divided City.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 17 (1994): 400-419.

Rothkirchen, Livia, “Czech Attitudes towards the Jews during the Nazi Regime.” *Yad Vashem Studies* 13 (1979): 287-320.

Schwartz, Barry. “The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory.” *Social Forces* 61 (1982): 374-402.

Schwartz, Barry. “Memory as a Cultural System: Abraham Lincoln in World War I.” *American Sociological Review* 61 (1996): 908-927.

Schwartz, Barry. “Collective Memory and History.” *Sociological Quarterly* 38 (1997): 469-496.

Schwartz, Barry. “Commemorative Objects.” In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, ed. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. Vol. 4, 2267-2272. Macmillan Co, 2001.

Teeger, Chana and Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi. “Controlling for Consensus: Commemorating Apartheid in South Africa.” *Symbolic Interaction* 30 (2007): 57-78.

Teeger, Chana and Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi. “Unpacking the Unspoken: Silence in Collective Memory and Forgetting.” *Social Forces* 88 (2010): 1103-1122.

Wagner-Pacifici, Robin and Barry Schwartz. “The Vietnam Veterans Memorial: Commemorating a Difficult Past.” *American Journal of Sociology* 97 (1991): 376-420.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. “In the Beginning: Notes on the Social Construction of Historical Discontinuity.” *Sociological Inquiry* 63 (1993): 457-459.