

From Jerusalem to Paris : the Institutionalization of the Category of the "Righteous of France"

Sarah Gensburger

▶ **To cite this version:**

Sarah Gensburger. From Jerusalem to Paris : the Institutionalization of the Category of the "Righteous of France". French Culture Politics and Society, 2012, 30 (2), pp.150-171. halshs-00911399

HAL Id: halshs-00911399
https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00911399

Submitted on 29 Nov 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

« From Jerusalem to Paris: the Institutionalization of the Category of the 'Righteous of France'", French Culture Politics and Society (Berghahn Books), special issue on « Rescue in France », Summer 2012, vol 30, n°2, p. 150-171.

From Jerusalem to Paris: the Institutionalization of the Category of 'Righteous of France'[i]

Sarah Gensburger, sgensburger@yahoo.fr
National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS/ISP)

Although the title of "Righteous among the Nations" has been awarded in Israel since 1963, foreign governments did not show any interest in this commemoration before the end of the 1990s.[ii] Since then however, a growing number of European governments have been adopting the term to celebrate their citizens who helped Jews during the Second World War. The commemoration of the "Righteous" has even spread beyond the borders of the old continent and is no longer only applied to the extermination of the Jews.[iii] In this process, the French appropriation of the Israeli terminology may have gone the furthest. The French governments have, indeed, been forging a new national commemorative expression : les "Justes de France." On January 18, 2007, President Jacques Chirac finally honored these "Righteous of France" in an official ceremony at the Pantheon, Paris' most prestigious resting place.[iv] This fixing of a permanent honorific inscription turned these French people who rescued Jews during the German Occupation into "great men."[v]

Today, when the French government commemorates the "Righteous of France," it is an act of domestic policy whose hoped-for purpose is to foster tolerance and the peaceful coexistence among Jews and non-Jews within a single nation-state. When the commemoration of the "Rigtheous among the Nations" was implemented in Israel in the 1960s, it was seen as a diplomatic tool. It grew out of a foreign policy perspective as well as an early Israeli belief that it was impossible for Jews and non-Jews to live together in the same state. In order to understand this radical shift in meaning given to this commemoration, this article explores the ways the French lexical appropriation has been taking place and pays attention to the role played by former Jewish rescuers in this process. In doing so, it seeks to introduce a new perspective into the current debate on the transnationalization of memory that goes beyond the empirical case studies of the "memory of rescue"[vi]. Between cosmopolitanization and diversification, to what extent do the different States interested in the commemoration of the "Righteous", in this case mainly Israel and France, speak the same language and whose language is it ?

Israel, 1963. Diplomacy, Righteous Among the Nations and commemoration

In his study of *The Holocaust in American Life*, Peter Novick considers that, "the intention of most commemoration of the 'righteous minority' has been to damn the vast 'unrighteous majority'. The institutional use of commemoration of Righteous Gentiles as 'the exceptions that prove the rule' has usually been in the service of shoring up that mentality – promoting a wary suspicion of gentiles"[vii]. While Novick's assumption relies exclusively on a handful of public declarations made by Yad Vashem officials in the 1990s, the commemoration of the "Righteous" by Israel is considered here as a way to establish the impossibility of a conciliation between Jews and Gentiles. The gap between Novick's interpretation and the contemporary use of the term by the French government, as way to reconcile Jews and non-Jews in a Republican perspective, demands an in-depth study of the initial creation of the title of "Righteous among the Nations."

The expression "Righteous among the Nations" comes from the Hebrew "Hasidei Ummot Ha-Olam". In the talmudic tradition, this phrase stands for the Gentiles who abide by the divine commandments[viii]. With time, considering the hostility of non-Jews as an established fact, the expression has stood for those Gentiles who are friendly with Jews. The first project for the public recognition of the non-Jews who helped Jews during the Holocaust adhered to this etymological meaning. The wish to honor the "Righteous among the Nations" appeared first and as early as 1942 in the Yishuv in Mordecai Shenhavi's project for a Memorial Institution for the Destruction which participated in the affirmation of the end of the Diaspora.[ix] This memorial Institution expressed what Dalia Ofer calls a "strong Zionist bias"[x]. However, within this overall project, the hoped-for commemoration of the "Righteous" was given a diplomatic function. For example, in 1947, after the death of the King of Denmark, Shenhavi suggested to Golda Meir to what extent the recognition of the Danish monarch as a "Righteous among the Nations" would benefit the foreign relations of the future state of Israel[xi]. The initial intention behind commemorating the Righteous thus participated in the "statist ideology" shared by the elites of the Yishuv[xii]. It aimed at establishing a relationship of parity between Israel and the other countries of the world[xiii].

It was not until 1953, however, with the adoption of the Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance

Law, that the "Righteous among the Nations" were legally defined by the Knesset as "high-minded gentiles who risked their lives to save Jews"[xiv]. Reacting to the establishment of a Memorial in Paris, Israel established Yad Vashem, the national commemorative institute earlier envisaged by Shenhavi. Still, once legally defined and counted among the missions of Yad Vashem, the commemorative title of "Righteous among the Nations" remained without any institutional and effective use for nearly ten years[xv]. Here, the question of a linear and clear "intention" addressed by Novick seems anachronistic.

The situation changed with the Eichmann trial in 1961. On April 13, on *Har Hazikaron* (Mount of Remembrance) in Jerusalem, the ceremony for *Yom Hashoah* brought together the President of the State of Israel, members of the government, diplomats, ghetto fighters and, for the first time, some people officially introduced as "Righteous among the Nations." The Eichmann Trial, which had begun a few days before, was interrupted for the occasion. This allusion to the Righteous among the Nations during the trial resulted first from the wish, of David Ben Gurion and Gideon Hausner, the Prosecutor of the State, to avoid some of the negative consequences of the trial in terms of foreign policy. The treatment of the Federal Republic of Germany was the most significant. Ben Gurion was willing to treat his new German ally tactfully. Heinrich Grüber, a German Minister who had helped Jews and was subsequently sent to Dachau, would appear before the Court to speak on behalf of his country and symbolize the "Other Germany"[xvi]. Hausner introduced him at the ceremony as a "Righteous among the Nations"[xvii].

More broadly, during the trial, the evocation of the "Righteous" stood for a means of stressing the positive aspects of the history of European countries during the Holocaust. In this way, the Israeli government hoped to strengthen Israeli diplomacy. It is striking to see the extent to which the Prosecutor for the state in the Eichman trial paid attention to even the slightest help extended toward Jews in Europe. Here these new heroes, were not referred to by their individual names but through their collective national identities. In his closing argument, Hausner expressed his gratitude to : from "the Norwegian resistance" to the "Italian administration", the "clergy and the modest people from Italy," including, among others, "the French resistance," the "Polish people who helped Jews" and the "Polish resistance"[xviii]. At the end of his speech, Hausner insisted on completing what he called "his first chapter on the Righteous among the Nations." He apologized for having forgotten "other countries" such as

the people from Yugoslavia or Greece and he concluded : "I have been reminded that Bulgaria counts among the satellite states which have refused to turn over their Jews, even if at the beginning they had agreed to." The evocation of the "Righteous among the Nations" during the trial was thus a diplomatic tool. It assisted in the development of Israel's foreign relations with the rest of the world in the early 1960s[xix].

In contrast to Hausner's assertions in his memoirs[xx], however, the government and Yad Vashem had not yet planned the creation of a permanent means of commemoration of the Righteous among the Nations by the time the trial began. On this matter, the establishment of an actual and formal procedure of granting award was more an unforeseen and indirect effect of the trial than a result of a political and institutional agenda. The trial stimulated an abundance of individual and institutional initiatives. Numerous Jews, both Israeli citizens and representatives of the Diaspora, wrote to the Israeli prime minister demanding that Israel honor those who had helped Jews. These queries were aimed at improving the image of the state of Israel abroad, primarily in the United States and Western Europe. Some institutions such as the Claims Conference, the American Joint Distribution Committee and Rabbi Harold M. Schulweis's Institute for the Righteous Acts[xxi] were considering, at the time, the creation of their own commemorative means. The World Jewish Congress expressed its wish to implement a "World Council for 'Hassidei Haumoth'" in order to deal with the new diplomatic situation[xxii]. Finally Yad Vashem responded to these competing projects. Claiming its original commemorative mission, it established a "Righteous among the Nations Department" in February 1962[xxiii]. In March, the idea of planting trees was decided. The planting procedure served as a "national icon"[xxiv] and helped foster in the diplomatic interpretation at the core of the creation of the title of Righteous. At first, the Righteous were chosen by the administration of Yad Vashem and the Israel Ministry for Foreign Affairs. At the beginning of 1963, Aryeh Kubovy, Head of Yad Vashem, declared "this recognition gives Israel a chance to cherish those people. It has crucial political consequences. We cherish the Righteous, we become their friend and then a friend of their friends and of their State"[xxv]. The first trees were planted on May 1 1962[xxvi]. Twelve plantings were initially scheduled. But only eleven Righteous were actually honoured by Golda Meir, Minister of Foreign Affairs, during the official ceremony. The case of the twelfth one, Oskar Schindler, had indeed been harshly discussed during the weeks before. Some of the former European Jews who lived in Germany during the war were accusing Schindler to have acted out of financial interest and not of altruism.[xxvii] Given the polemics, the establishment of a quasi-judicial commission,

expected to be seen as unbiased, was decided. This commission was composed of lawyers and judges, on the one hand, resistance fighters and Holocaust victims, on the other. It was led by Moshe Landau, former president of the tribunal during the Eichmann trial[xxviii].

The 1963 formal creation of the title of Righteous among the Nations cannot therefore be attributed solely to the intention of commemoration. Rather, the creation of this title took place over a period of time of more than twenty years and depended on the actions of a large number of protagonists. Between 1942 and 1963, the title of "Righteous among the Nations" took shape in both the Yishuv and Israel, as an institutional category gradually and sporadically. The title of "Righteous among the Nations" was meant to honor a minority of individuals who had helped Jews and also to serve as a diplomatic means of improving relations between Israel and foreign countries. The gap between this rationale and the contemporary use of the term is striking. Today, when the French governments commemorate the "Righteous of France" as a collectivity, it signifies an act of domestic policy which results from the desire to foster tolerance and the peaceful coexistence of Jews and non-Jews, and more broadly ethnic and religious tolerance within a state. This commemoration nevertheless takes as its reference an institutionalized reminder of the past that fits in with a foreign policy perspective and which grew out of the belief that it was impossible for the Jews and Gentiles to live together. The contemporary use of the term by many political and institutional actors thus constitutes a radical shift in meaning form the original intent.

From Jerusalem to Paris (and back) in the mid-1980s. Jewish Rescuers and the commemoration of the French Righteous among the Nations.

In order to understand this shift, it is necessary to, first, retrace the process through which the expression "Righteous among the Nations" was translated into French, both literally and metaphorically. Who, in France, first spoke of these new heroes ? What words did they use and why did they begin to speak out ?

During its first meeting in February 1963, and arising out of its criminal court inspiration, the Commission for the Distinction of the Righteous Among the Nations enacted the rule that the title would be awarded only at the request of at least two Jews considering they were "rescued" and on the basis of their testimonials. In other words, in order to become effective,

the Israeli institutional framework for the commemoration of the "Righteous among the Nations" has to be based on the memories of individuals. Until the late 1980s, this framework had been barely filled as far as the French Righteous were concerned. The disparity with both the Polish and the Dutch cases was striking as the table below illustrates.

Table 1. Number of Righteous recognized by Yad Vashem per year and per country of origin of the righteous person. 1963 - 1990[xxix]

Year	France	Poland	Netherlands	Total
1963	0	11	4	15
1964	2	34	29	65
1965	4	60	26	90
1966	2	56	26	84
1967	9	48	39	96
1968	5	33	36	74
1969	19	24	33	76
1970	9	10	37	56
1971	24	12	48	84
1972	2	10	92	104
1973	22	13	97	132
1974	10	29	142	181
1975	13	48	82	143
1976	18	42	82	142
1977	19	43	118	180
1978	21	100	218	339
1979	39	144	225	408
1980	24	78	229	331
1981	25	150	225	400
1982	41	160	231	432
1983	21	249	377	647
1984	39	225	227	491
1985	35	221	177	433

1986	27	241	140	408
1987	33	251	106	390
1988	76	271	82	429
1989	153	359	113	625
1990	109	280	109	498
Total	**801**	**3202**	**3350**	**7353**

By 1985, 1,579 Polish and 2,623 Dutch people had been awarded the title of "Righteous among the Nations," but only 368 French people had received this distinction. More than twenty years after its creation, the institutional framework made available by Yad Vashem was not yet become meaningful for the majority of Jews who survived the war in France. Moreover, the few Jewish witnesses who, in this early period, asked for recognition of French citizens were either Israeli citizens, or if they were still in France, they held positions of responsibility in French organizations sympathetic to Zionism and Israel. Simultaneously, the portraits drawn up by the witnesses overwhelmingly described the French "Righteous among the Nations" as "friends of Israel" and as diplomatic allies, at least potentially. Meanwhile, aside from some rare local Synagogues ceremonies, no public events, in France, were dedicated to the commemoration of the Righteous. The Israeli term "Righteous among the Nations" was never referred to in the French press or the national political sphere. The medals and diplomas to which new Righteous were entitled were given almost exclusively to those who visited Israel and Yad Vashem. In other words, even as late as 1985, the commemoration of the French "Righteous among the Nations" was both weak and limited to an Israeli space. It had not yet been conveyed to France.

This situation changed in the 1980s. In this decade, several former leaders of the Jewish rescue networks published their autobiographies[xxx] and the association of the "*Anciens de la Résistance Juive en France*" (ARJF, Association of Veterans of the Jewish resistance in France) was officially created[xxxi]. At Yad Vashem, an auditorium dedicated to these veterans opened in 1982, and a formal "Memorial de la Résistance Juive en France" would, from now on, collect files under the names of each of the veterans[xxxii]. While reuniting (uniting would one say[xxxiii]) with one another, the former Jewish rescuers began asking for official recognition of their heroism from both the Israeli and French governments. In this process, some of them realized they had not paid tribute to the non-Jews who had assisted them in their rescue mission. In 1982, Jacques Pulver – a former member of the "*Eclaireurs Israélites de*

France" network (EIF, Jewish Scouts of France) and spokesman for the ARJF in Israel – decided to request that the Righteous award to be given to the woman who had helped his family cross the Swiss border[xxxiv]. Three years later, Denise Sikierski – a former comrade in the EIF – did the same for two women she had worked with in rescue[xxxv]. In doing so, the two friends, so to speak Pulver and Sikierski, noticed the weakness of the commemoration of the French Righteous and the "casual way" – as they called it - Yad Vashem had been dealing with it[xxxvi]. With some of their former comrades in resistance, they decided to mobilize and called themselves the "*Volontaires francophones pour le Département des Justes de Yad Vashem*"[xxxvii]. First, they wanted more files to opened under French names. To achieve that, they publicized the Yad Vashem procedure among French Jews. They called for witnesses in synagogues and formalized, for the first time in French language, some testimony guidelines. Secondly, they made sure each French Righteous received his or her medal and diploma. For that, they arranged public ceremonies in Israel when ever the Righteous was willing to come, but also, and increasingly, they organized ceremonies in France where they asked mayors and other republican officials to hold the event and made every effort to get as much media coverage as possible[xxxviii]. So in the mid 1980s, some former Jewish rescuers committed themselves to the establishment, both quantitative and qualitative, of the commemoration of French citizens as "Righteous among the Nations." The emergence of a group of people thinking of themselves as "Jewish Resistants" played an important role in this evolution. The ARJF did not, however, host the "*Volontaires francophones*." Jacques Pulver and his comrades shared additional characteristics : they lived partly in France and partly in Israel. This peculiar position – both geographic and symbolic – explains not only why they played the role of conveyor, but it also explain the shift in meaning given to the commemoration implied by these go-betweens. If the *Volontaires francophones* still pursued some diplomatic goals, they were interested only in bilateral foreign relations. Through the commemoration of the French Righteous, they hoped to improve not only the image of Israel in France but also the image of France in Israel.

Despite the early shift in emphasis, the meaning then attributed to the commemoration of the French "Righteous among the Nations" was far from the one given today to the celebration of the "Righteous of France" by the French government. Nevertheless, the action of the *Volontaires francophones* had some unexpected outcomes. As expected, their mobilization led first to an important and lasting increase in the number of French who were officially

recognized as "Righteous among the Nations." Since 1989 and the peak of 153 new awards, the annual number has never been below 90 and stayed most often above 110.

During the first years of the *Volontaires*' mobilization, the "new" witnesses they were working with, were mostly linked, in one way or another, to former Jewish rescue networks. By 1990 however, most of the files introduced to Yad Vashem under French names emanated from people who did not personally know one of the *Volontaires*. In other words, the Israeli title began to be meaningful for a growing number of French Jews, and the commemoration of the Righteous was becoming institutionalized in France. Moreover, the mostly informal initiative finally received official recognition from Yad Vashem. In the 1988, an official representation of Yad Vashem in France (The *Comité français pour Yad Vashem*) had been created under the 1901 association status. It was originally intended to raise money for Yad Vashem projects and was not intended to deal with issues related to the "Righteous among the Nations". By 1990 however, with the fund raising mission failing, the adoption of the *Volontaires'* initiative became a way to revitalize the *Comité français* whose everyday activity would, from now on, be dedicated primarily to the commemoration of the "Righteous among the Nations." In 1995, the *Volontaires francophones* no longer existes as a specific group, and the *Comité français* (The Yad Vashem Committee in France) modified its statutes and name[xxxix] to give room to its new mission, which even today constitutes the core of its activities.

This formal institutionalization of the *Volontaires*' impulse was above all made possible by the parallel and progressive acknowledgment of the importance of commemorating the French Righteous by some representatives of the French republic. Through the work done to publicize the award ceremonies and the efforts made to hold them in public places such as city halls, the *Volontaires*' initiative began to bear fruit. First, Israel's commemoration of the French "Righteous among the Nations" began to receive mention both in the regional and national press. Second, in small villages as well as in Paris, local civil servants or representatives began to participate in these ceremonies. Between 1985 and 1995 a process of synthesis and hybridization began to take place. If the title was originally linked exclusively to the state of Israel, it now began to assume some symbols and attributes of the French state, allowing the commemoration to acquire both new audiences and new meanings.
Most notably, in 1989 the *Volontaires* solicited support from the mayor of Paris, who then

happened to be Jacques Chirac, and they asked him to host a huge award ceremony. At this occasion, Chirac and his entourage encountered directly the Israeli concept of "Righteous among the Nations," and they began to understand the symbolic potentialities of this concept for the French context. Then in 1994 and 1995, two important Yad Vashem award ceremonies took place successively in the National Assembly and the Senate, the two French parliamentary chambers. In other words, by 1995 the actions of those who called themselves *Volontaires francophones* to win support for the Israeli commemorative title began to be endorsed by French political elites. Already on July 16, 1986, during the commemoration of the anniversary of the most massive roundup of Jews during the Second World War, Chirac had insisted on the role played by the French civil population in helping Jews. In doing so, he was already seeking to balance the Vichy regime's participation in the roundups and deportations with a more positive assessment of the sympathetic attitude of the population as a whole[xl]. But at no point during this ceremony had he referred to those who had helped rescue Jews as the "Righteous among the Nations". As an unexpected outcome of the *Volontaires*' mobilization which started precisely in 1986, the situation ten years later had changed when the same man became president of the Republic.

Paris 2007. Domestic Affaires, Righteous of France and commemoration

On July 16, 1995, in a historic discourse, Jacques Chirac acknowledged the French government's role in the mass deportation of Jews during the Holocaust. Going back to the Klaus Barbie trial of 1987, many factors explain this presidential address, which has been largely commented since 1995.[xli] None of these commentaries, however, pointed at the fact that the expression "Righteous among the Nations" appeared there for the first time in a speech emanating from the head of state. This use of the term of "Righteous among the Nations" in the 1995 presidential speech was an unexpected outcome of the *Volontaires*' mobilization and of the socialization of the French political actors to the Israeli award it enabled. In Chirac's rhetoric, the evocation of the "Righteous among the Nations" enabled to substitute a new dichotomy between the Vichy Government and the Righteous, who were meant to embody "true" France, for the previous Gaullist one between the defeated French state and the armed Resistance fighters. Simultaneously, in a sentence that he would systematically repeat afterwards, Chirac placed himself under Serge Klarsfeld's symbolic authority by attributing the survival of the tree quarters of the Jews in France to the role of the

Righteous *("ces "Justes parmi les Nations" qui, comme l'a dit Serge Klarsfeld, ont sauvé les trois-quarts des Juifs de France"*).

This first presidential evocation of the "Righteous among the Nations" opened a new era in which the commemoration of these new national heroes would increasingly be seen as legitimate and resourceful. This trend proved instrumental, for instance, in the 1995 *Comité Français of Yad Vashem*'s decision to officially modify its mission and to explicitly include in its name its role in the commemoration of the French "Righteous among the Nations." From now on a growing number of social actors would publicly refer to the expression, "the Righteous among the Nations".

Each time this happened, this social actors' appropriation of this term would strengthen and legitimize the French state's investment in the commemoration of the French Righteous. From the 1995 speech to the 2007 Pantheon ceremony in "*Hommage de la Nation aux Justes de France"* (National Tribute to the Righteous of France), this reciprocal legitimization between the French state and some diverse social actors, including the *Consistoire central de France*, the *Fondation pour la Mémoire de la Shoah*, the *Comité français pour Yad Vashem* – progressively led to the definitive appropriation of the Israeli title of "Righteous among the Nations", and eventually to its translation as the "Righteous of France." Between 1995 and 2000, Chirac had several occasions to speak publicly about the Second World War. Each time, he suggested the same dichotomy between the "darkness" and the "light," - the collaboration of the French State in the deportations, on the one hand, and the solidarity of the French "Righteous among the nations" with the Jewish population, on the other. From one speech to the next[xlii], he dropped any mention of Serge Klarsfeld and substituted the expression of "Righteous of France" from the "Righteous among the Nations." This lexical evolution accompanied the progressive identification of the individual Righteous with the collectivity to which they belonged : the French people. The "Righteous of France" were said to be found in any geographical part, social group, religious confession or political side of the French society. The "Righteous of France" came to embody the French national pride.

Finally, in July 2000, the French Parliament passed a law establishing the concept of "Righteous of France." July 16 – day of year 1942 of the most massive round-up of Jews in France - became a national day of commemoration, "in honor of the victims of the racist and anti-Semitic crimes of the French state and in honor of the 'Righteous' of France."[xliii] In

sponsoring a memorial day for tens of thousands of Jews who had been victims of the Vichy government which had collaborated with the Nazis during the Second World War, the parliament intended to praise as well the brave actions of the French Righteous who were responsible for saving the lives of many Jews. Even the binary name of this commemorative day served as a sort of rhetoric of exoneration. It opposed the "bad" and the "good," the "darkness" and the "light." In a way, this law served as the culmination of a process that had been going on since 1995.

This commemoration, however, resulted as much from the success of the French appropriation process of the Israeli expression as from its limits, if not failure. Indeed the bill was promoted by two socialist members of parliament who initially wanted to create a formal title of "Righteous of France" with its own commission, criteria and symbols. This complete nationalization of the "Righteous" award faced opposition from some Jewish associations, including the *Comité français pour Yad Vashem*[xliv], which had however helped to legitimate the previous steps of the French appropriation of the Israeli expression. The legislative project of a French award appeared to break with the previous hybridization of both Israel and French symbols, which happened to be in harmony with the hybrid and complex belonging of the members of the association. Thus, in 2000, and despite the fact that the term of "Righteous of France" had entered French law, the word "Righteous" still bore a "foreign origin", as the legal department of the *Assemblée Nationale* had significantly pointed at.

From this perspective, the ceremony held in the Pantheon in January 2007 overcame this problem. It advanced one step further the national, legal and lexical appropriation of the expression of "Righteous" and the reinterpretation of this term as describing a collectivity as opposed to individuals. For the first time in history, the Pantheon did not host a physical person or a collectivity whose individual members were evoked by name. The introduction of the "Righteous of France" among the "great men" was materially mediated by the fixing of a commemorative plaque on the wall. In the text written on this plaque, none of the "Righteous of France" was designated by name. Instead, the "Righteous of France" were described as "anonymous" heroes. They could be anyone, thus they embraced the majority of the France population. In his speech, Chirac praised the "Righteous." It was due to them, he declared, that "we can look our history in the face, sometimes seeing profoundly dark moments but also the best and most glorious moments. Thanks to them we can be proud to be French." The French appropriation of the term "Righteous among the Nations" was made complete by the

French government's decision not to invite the Israeli Ambassador to attend the ceremony. While the two speeches given for this occasion – by Jacques Chirac and Simone Veil - referred jointly to the expression of "Righteous of France" and to the title of "Righteous among the Nations", neither of them ever pronounced the name of Israel.

Syncretism, multiple meanings and commemoration

A live television broadcast covered this national event and more than 42 000 people visited the Pantheon the following week. The ceremony was extensively commented on and acclaimed in the media, by journalists, witnesses and historians. During the year before however, the public debate had regularly denounced the diverse "uses" of the past by government, starting with the question of the government's effort to introduce references to the "positive role of colonialism" into the school curriculum. In the case of the government's use of the term "Righteous", the evocation of the "positive role" of France, embodied in the allegedly numerous and mostly anonymous Righteous, was neither criticized nor even put into perspective. It seemed to rest on a consensus. Everything looked as if the category of "Righteous of France" and the meaning attributed to it seemed both natural and spontaneous. This consensus tells us a great deal about the very social mechanism that made possible this shift in the meaning accorded to the commemoration of the French Righteous. As mentioned above, beginning at the end of the 1980s and accelerating especially since 1995, a process of symbolic syncretism has taken place. The interviews, the archives or the participant observation fieldwork reveal that this syncretism has been profoundly meaningful for most of the potential witnesses as well as the Righteous themselves.

First, the French government's commitment to commemorate the Righteous among the Nations was immediately followed by a new and enduring increase in the number of requests addressed to Yad Vashem under French names. The year 1996 marked the climax of the nomination of French Righteous with 196 new awards. Since the 2007 Pantheon ceremony, the French Righteous recognition has been once more revitalized. In 2010, 157 Righteous titles were granted to French citizens, elevating France to the first rank among all European countries that year. This mechanism appears also on a qualitative level. Since 1995, in several of the Yad Vashem files, the witnesses referred explicitly to the role played by the different steps of the French State commemoration of the national Righteous as instrumental in their

decision to request that their rescuer be acknowledged by Israel.

Actually, the involvement of the French government in a commemoration originally recognized only by Israel has, largely, complemented the complex and increasingly hybrid identity of most of the French Jews, with the intersection of the French, the Israeli and the Jewish cores of identification. Indeed, from the 1990s on, the vast majority of the witnesses have been French Jewish citizens who have lived in France since the end of World Word Two.

Table 2: Distribution of witnesses by country of permanent residence, 1963-1999[xlv]

Witnesses' present country of residence	**Percentages between 1963 and 1990**	**Percentages between 1991 and 2000**
Israel	40 %	14 %
France	55 %	80 %
Miscellaneous other	5 %	6 %

Here again, this quantitative observation is backed by considerable qualitative data. For example, this evolution is sometimes apparent in one and the same case file. In 1978, Yvonne Deltour was awarded the title of Righteous among the Nations. The nomination was based on testimony given by a French citizen who was an activist in the Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO). In her narrative, Deltour was mainly described as a very good "friend of Israel" and the "Jewish people". However, in 1994, a witness living in France who believed he owed his life to Yvonne Deltour, addressed Yad Vashem in these terms : "I would be grateful if you would inform me on what initiative and with what proof M^{me} Deltour Yvonne, who hid me during the years 1942-1944, was decorated with the order of the Righteous." This time there was no mention made of any tie with the Jewish state or any particular mobilization in its favor. The word Israel appeared neither in the letter making contact nor in the testimony itself. On the other hand, the expression "decorated with the order of the Righteous" apparently translated the mental framework of the witness, evoking French Republican references such as the National Order of Merit, the Order of the Legion of Honor or again the Order of Liberation.

In other words, the 2007 Pantheon ceremony ultimately finished to open up the spectrum of interpretations of the commemoration of the Righteous in the French case. The appearing consensus was therefore mainly an illusion and rested precisely on the very polysemy of both the term and the meaning of the event. Meaningfully, this final French appropriation of the "Righteous" and the fact that no references to Israel were made during the ceremony alienated some of the people who had, so far, been recognizing themselves in the commemoration of the Righteous in France. Two Israeli women – one of whom had addressed Yad Vashem for the recognition of her "Righteous" in 1997, participating in an important ceremony at the Conseil Economique et Social - publicly expressed their discomfort in some French-speaking

Israeli web newspapers[xlvi].

Despite this limit, and considering the fact that, by far, most of the potential witnesses were French citizens, it appears that from 1963 to 2007, from Jerusalem to Paris, the institutionalization of the term of "Righteous of France" can be explained by the very polysemy that the increasing intersection of French, Jewish and Israeli symbols made possible. In a way, the "success" of the Yad Vashem title since 1995 comes from the fact that the potential witnesses could give various symbolic attributes to the term "Righteous". This choice would depend on his or her own social position and identity at the intersection of the French, the Israeli and the Jewish collective spaces. Two examples will be, briefly, taken here.

At one pole of the spectrum, a very pious Jewish woman, who lived in the eastern part of Jerusalem, asked Yad Vashem to acknowledge her French rescuer considering him as a non-Jew who was a very rare exception to the generally hostile behaviour of the non-Jewish population. In our discussion which took place in French, she then told me that the only possible explanation for the behaviour of her rescuers was that he must had Jewish roots without being aware of it. The Spanish origin of her rescuer's name was said to be a sign that he was a descendant of the marranos and as such a Jew. At the other pole, a non-religious Jewish man, who had long been a communist, who still lived in France began the interview by addressing his political concerns. He wanted to clarify that his rescuers did not help him because he was a Jew but because he was a human being. Indeed, he decided to ask for the recognition of his rescuers as Righteous as a way to further Human Rights, and he regretted the fact that the French Republic had not created a national medal to honour French citizens who had helped Jews during the war. Thus we can see that the symbolic combination implied by the institutionalization of the category of "Righteous of France" enabled individuals to identify themselves with any of the three entities - Israel, Judaism or France, or most often a combination of the three. In 1963, when the Israeli government first established the title of Righteous, it saw itself speaking on behalf of the "Jewish people" as a whole. At the 2007 Pantheon ceremony, Simone Veil, head of the Foundation of the Memory of the Shoah in France, which had promoted the event, delivered a speech in addition to Chirac's. In her discourse, she alternatively gave two meaning to the pronoun "we." That is French Jews, on the one hand, and the French people and the Republic, on the other. The increasing French state's involvement in this commemoration was central in this evolution.

At this point, and to come back to the comparative perspective initiated with the table 1, it is possible to address the question of the specificity of the French institutionalization of the commemoration of the "Righteous among the Nations". In the 1990s and in a context where the issue of the European countries' responsibilities in the Holocaust kept arising, the French State was not the only one to create a national commemoration of the "Righteous". During the same period of time, most of the European governments implemented permanent means to celebrate these new national heroes[xlvii]. However the French case is the only one where this national appropriation of the commemoration of the "Righteous" went with an important change in the trend - in this case an increase - of the number, and nature, of testimonies sent to Yad Vashem in favour of new nominations. In the French case, the public expression of ethnic or religious belongings, and more broadly of any particular belongings, can only take place through a complex articulation with the French State and its symbols.

The reasons for the differences between the French, the Polish and the Dutch data can therefore be addressed. The small number of requests for recognition coming from France in the years following the creation of the title and up until the mid-1970s would seem to be primarily the result of the relatively low rate of immigration of French Jews to Israel in the early years of the Hebrew state's existence.[xlviii] Symmetrically, the fact that during the number of Polish rescuers was comparatively high must be placed in perspective with immediate postwar immigration figures. Between 1948 and 1951, 106,400 Polish Jews settled in the Hebrew state.[xlix] This mass arrival, later reinforced by the waves of 1958 and 1968, explains why in its first years of existence, petitions were regularly made to Yad Vashem's Righteous among the Nations Department concerning the Polish. In 1968, the immigration following the Six-Day War considerably increased the number of Israelis from France. The average age of the new arrivals was about 25: they were not all potential witnesses, far from it.[1]

Nevertheless, between 1968 and 1972, the influx of 18,000 French Jews more than doubled the little French community in Israel. This evolution may explain why nomination requests for Righteous who had been active in France gradually increased in the 1970s. Although this evolution is not linear, it began precisely in 1969, the year that the number of French "Righteous" attained a two-digit figure for the first time. Changes in migration from France to Israel explain the expression of memories as they were manifested by applying for the title of Righteous. In this first period, a person who decides to testify about his "rescue" thereby asserts a form of tie with the Hebrew state and stress the role of the men and women he considers as having given their implicit support for the existence of his new nation.

This explanation is however partial. Indeed, for the Dutch case, the number of nominations was relatively high from the start and during the 1970s, the annual nomination figures rose constantly. For the year 1974 alone, 142 earned the title, compared to only 10 French. Yet even if Dutch immigration to Israel in the immediate postwar period was proportionally higher than the French, it remained limited in absolute numbers. In 1948 and 1953, only 1,500 Dutch Jews made their *aliyah*. Even after the Six-Day War, emigration to the Hebrew state did not exceed 300 departures per year.[li] But the Dutch situation differs from the French case on two main points. First of all, adherence to Zionism appears historically broader and deeper among Dutch Jews than among those in France.[lii] Furthermore, and above all, the Dutch political system and citizenship regime was fundamentally, and from the very beginning, in tune with the underlying idea of recourse to the title of Righteous among the Nations of minimal support for a "natural" distinction between Jews and non-Jews. As it was constructed since the 19th century, "the Dutch model remained very different from the new French republican culture."[liii] It in particular rests on society's strong polarization around the Catholic and Calvinist pillars. Since it is common to define oneself publicly by one's religious belonging, it seems legitimate to base one's memory on a title that supposes a central and established distinction between Jews and non-Jews.

By comparison, the social system induced by the "French model" based on universalism and the refusal of particularistic, especially religious, qualifications and the more recent development of support for Zionism among the French Jews can be assumed to constitute a second factor liable to explain the belated rise and long limited number of French nominations. This interpretation allows us symmetrically to understand the rise in the number of requests for recognition in the French case at the end of the 1980s and especially during the 1990s. This evolution can first be related to a form of naturalization of the relationship to Israel for French Jews who since that time have formed the majority of "witnesses" who appeal to the Yad Vashem Righteous among the Nations Department. Research by Doris Bensimon conducted in the mid-1980s shows that even if the Hebrew state gradually constituted a pole of identification for French Jews, this relation was not shared by all at the time.[liv] Since, this division has evolved and finally disappeared. Precisely since the early 1990s, "even if the existence of Israel remains an absolute imperative of the modern Jewish consciousness, the forms of expressions of solidarity with the state are less visible and less political today than they were in the 1970s […]. The relationship to Israel has become more ordinary and lost some of its ideological content."[lv] Furthermore, and at the other spectrum of

the symbolic hybridization at the core of the institutionalization of the commemoration of the "Righteous" in France, the evolution in the relations French Jews have with their country on one hand, and with Judaism, on the other, should also be placed in perspective. As Pierre Birnbaum explains, "The gradual rise in cultural pluralism considerably changes the place of Jews in French society."[lvi] It however takes place through a complex relationship with the State. Indeed, and as Pierre Birnbaum pointed out, statization is, historically, the main mechanism of the expression of any distinctive identiy in France[lvii]. It is through their relationship to the State that more and more potential witnesses can express their private memories, at least partly labelled as Jewish and/or Israeli. So the commitment of some French representatives of the Republic into the initially Israeli only commemoration opened a path for the public expression of at least partly ethnic and religious memories through a from now on hybrid category of "Righteous".

So, beyond constituting an exploration into the "memory of rescue," our conclusion invites to put into perspective both the literature on "commemorations" and the one on "universalization of memory". First, it appears that commemorations do not have linear effects, but follow a circular mechanism, being subject to complex social appropriations of which they are themselves the product. It is only when individuals become able to recognize themselves, at least partly, in the reference point offered by these commemorations that the proposed narrative of the past can "take hold" of their memory, always in a polysemous manner. Secondly, while several scholars interpret the current globalization of memory as an indication of the actual of common vision of the past, the fact that the diffusion of the Israeli commemorative category of "Righteous among the Nations" was built on a radical shift in meaning given to this very commemoration calls for a critical perspective.

---

[i] The author would like to thank Harriet Jackson, Robert O. Paxton and Shanny Peer for their invitation at the 2011 conference on rescue at the Maison Française (Columbia University) for which a first version of this text was written and Vicki Caron for her advice. This text owes her a lot.

[ii] On the French, Israeli and Polish cases in this first period, see Sarah Gensburger, "Les figures du Juste et du Résistant et l'évolution de la mémoire historique française de l'Occupation," *Revue Française de Science Politique*, 52, 2 (September 2002), 291-322 ; "La création du titre de Juste parmi les Nations 1953-1963," *Bulletin du Centre de Recherche Français de Jérusalem*, 15 (Fall 2004), 15-35, and Gensburger and Agnieszka Niewiedzial, "Figure du Juste et politique publique de la mémoire en Pologne : entre relations diplomatiques et structures sociales," *Critique Internationale*, 1, 34 (January-March 2007), 127-148.

[iii] Sarah Gensburger, "L'émergence de la catégorie de Juste parmi les Nations comme paradigme mémoriel. Réflexions contemporaines sur le rôle socialement dévolu à la mémoire," in *Culture et mémoire*, ed. Carola Hähnel-Mesnard *et al*. (Paris : Editions de l'Ecole Polytechnique, 2008), 25-32.

[iv] On the concept of "great men," Mona Ozouf, "The Panthéon : the Ecole Normal of the Dead," in

Realms of Memory. Rethinking the French Past, ed. Pierre Nora (New York : Columbia University Press, 1996 [1992]), 3, 324-346.

[v] On the ceremonies at the Pantheon, see Avner Ben-Amos, "The Other World of Memory : State Funerals of the French Third Republic as Rites of Commemoration," *History and Memory*, 1,1 (Spring-Summer 1989), 85-108, and Ben-Amos, "The Sacred Center of Power : Paris and Republican State Funerals," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 22, 1 (Summer 1991), 27-48.

[vi] Ulrich Bech, Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider, "Cosmopolitanization of Memory : The Politics of Forgiveness and Restitution," in *Cosmopolitanism in Practice*, ed. Magdalena Nowicka and Maria Rovisco (Aldershot : Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 111-128; Levy and Sznaider, "The Cosmopolitanization of Holocaust Memory : From Jewish to Human Experience," in *Sociology Confronts the Holocaust*, ed. Judith M. Gerson and Daniel L. Wolf (Durham : Duke University Press, 2007) 313-330 and Levy and Sznaider, *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age* (Philadelphia ,Temple University Press, 2005).

[vii] Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Boston-New York : Houghton Mifflin Company,1999), 180.

[viii] Eugen Korn, "Gentiles, the World to Come and Judaism : The Odyssey of a Rabbinic Text," *Modern Judaism*, 14, 3 (1994), 265-287.

[ix] From Mordecai Shenhavi to the direction of the Jewish National Fund, 10 September 1942, Yad Vashem Archives (YV), AM 1/288. See also Central Zionist Archives (CZA) S26/1326. If the Shenhavi's project has already been studied as a whole, the part dealing with the commemoration of the Righteous has never been alluded to. For example, even Tom Segev's extensive work does not mention it, *The Seventh Million. The Israelis and the Holocaust* (New York, Owl Book, 2000). For an overall analysis of the project as whole, see Mooli Brog, "In Blessed Memory of a Dream : Mordechai Shenhavi and Initial Holocaust Commemoration Ideas in Palestine, 1942-1945," *Yad Vashem Studies*, XXX (2002), 227-336.

[x] Dalia Ofer, "The Strength of Remembrance : Commemorating the Holocaust During the First Decade of Israel," *Jewish Social Studies*, 6, 2 (Winter 2000), 40.

[xi] Letter from Mordecai Shenhavi to Golda Meir, 23 April 1947, YV, AM 1/293.

[xii] Nir Kedar, "Ben-Gurion's *Mamlakhtiyut* : Etymological and Theoretical Roots," *Israel Studies*, 7, 3 (Fall 2002), 117-133.

[xiii] Eliezer Don-Yehiya, "Memory and Political Culture : Israeli Society and the Holocaust," *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, IX (1993), 146.

[xiv] Official translation of the August 19, 1953 law. See CZA, Z6-2030 and *Divrei Ha-Knesset*, May 12, 18 and August 19, 1953.

[xv] For example, it does not appear at all among the points stressed by the President of Yad Vashem in 1957, see Ben Zion Dinur, "Problems confronting Yad Vashem in its Work of Research," *Yad Vashem Studies*, 1 (1957), 7-30 and see the reports of activities of Yad Vashem and its correspondence with its partners, CZA, Z6/1829, Z6/1827, C6/420, C2/11355Z6/1956 and Archives of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (AJDC), "55/67 Israel Organizations", 1955-1967.

[xvi] Roni Stauber, "Realpolitik and the Burden of the Past : Israeli Diplomacy and the "Other Germany"" *Israel Studies*, 8, 3 (Fall 2003), 115.

[xvii] Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine (CDJC), DCCLV-41, acts of the Eichmann trial.

[xviii] CDJC, DCCLV-113, acts of the Eichmann trial.

[xix] Hanna Yablonka, *The State of Israel vs. Adolf Eichmann* (New York : Schocken Books, 2004), 244.

[xx] Gideon Hausner, *Justice à Jérusalem. Eichmann devant ses juges* (Paris : Flammarion, 1976).

[xxi] Ronald Zweig, *German reparations and the Jewish World : A History of the Claims Conference* (London : Frank Cass, 2001) and AJDC, "Christians who helped Jews (Hassidei Haumot)," n°4159, 1961-1967. The Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany was founded in 1951 to secure measures of justice for Jewish victims of Nazi persecutions. The Institute for the Righteous Acts was created in the United States of America at the beginning of the 1960s to study and celebrate the acts of rescue. In 1986, it gave birth to the Jewish Foundation for the Righteous, which still exists.

[xxii] CZA, C6/27, C6/85 and YV, 116 946.

[xxiii] CZA, C6/423, Propositions by Aryeh Kubovy, February 25, 1962.

[xxiv] Yael Zerubavel, "The Forest as a National Icon : Literature, Politics and the Archeology of Memory," *Israel Studies*, 1, 1 (Spring 1996), 61-99.

[xxv] Proceedings of the first reunion of the Commission for the Designation of the Righteous, February 1, 1963, YV.

[xxvi] For a description of the ceremony in more details see Sarah Gensburger, "From the memory of rescue to the institutionalization of the title of Righteous among the Nations," in *Resisting Genocide. Multiple forms of*

rescue, ed. Claire Andrieu, Sarah Gensburger and Jacques Semelin (New York : Columbia University Press, 2011), 19-32.

[xxvii] Gabriele Nissim, *Il Tribunale del Bene* (Milan : Mondadori, 2003), 102-120.

[xxviii] For a presentation of the decisions of the commission see Hemda Gur-Arie's work, for example her paper "The Righteous Gentiles Committee, Jewish Identity and the Memory of the Holocaust", 13th European Forum for Young Legal Historians, *"Crossing Legal Cultures"*, Seville, September 5-8, 2007.

[xxix] For some details on the sources of this table and on some of the archives used bel142ow, see Sarah Gensburger, *Les Justes de France. Politiques publiques de la mémoire* (Paris : Presses de Science180s Po, 2010).339

[xxx] Léon Poliakov, *L'Auberge des Musiciens. Mémoires* (Paris : L'Harmattan, 1981) ; Robert Gamzon, *Les eaux claires. Journal 1940-1944* (Paris : Editions des EIF, 1981) ; Frédéric Hammel, *"Souviens toi d'Amalek" : témoignage sur la lutte des Juifs en France 1938-1944* (Paris : CLKH, 1982) and René Kapel, *Un rabbin dans la tourmente*(Paris : Editions du CDJC, 1986).

[xxxi] Archives of the "Préfecture de Police de Paris, Bureau des Associations", Status n°7436 8P, October 31, 1985.

[xxxii] Today, a "Memorial Ceremony for the Association of Veterans of the Jewish Resistance in France" still takes place in the auditorium of Yad Vashem on every Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day.

[xxxiii] The question to know whether all the Jews who resisted constituted a "Jewish resistance" movement is still being debated, see the prefaces of Gérard Loinger, *Les Résistance Juives pendant l'occupation* (Paris : Albin Michel, 2010).

[xxxiv] Department of the Righteous among the Nations, Yad Vashem (DRYV), file n°2613, Rolande Birgy.

[xxxv] Files nos 3210 and 3211, Emilie Guth and Hermine Orsi, DRYV.

[xxxvi] Private papers, Fanny Wertheimer, mainly "Remise de médailles et diplômes d'honneur aux "Justes parmi les Nations" et plantation d'arbres à Yad Vashem." This document, written by Jacques Pulver, February 19, 1990, was meant to describe the action of the "Volontaires francophones" to Mr. and Mrs. Wertheimer who then decided to become involved.

[xxxvii] Two other former EIF have joined them to form the core of a group which relies on all of the resistance networks to be efficient : Lucien Lazare, who is the French speaking member of the Yad Vashem commission for the designation of the Righteous among the Nations, and Edouard Simon.

[xxxviii] For more details on this commitment, Sarah Gensburger, "The Righteous Among the Nations as Facts of Collective Memory," *International Social Science Journal*, 203-204 (September 2011-March 2012), forthcoming.

[xxxix] The full name is now "*Comité Français pour Yad Vashem. Association pour la mémoire et l'enseignement de la Shoah et pour la nomination des Justes parmi les Nations*" (Association for the remembrance and the transmission of the Holocaust and the recognition of the Righteous among the Nations).

[xl] We are not addressing here the question to know whether the attitude of the French population was or was not instrumental in the understanding of the survival rate of the Jews of France during the war. For a synthesis of these historiographical stakes, see : Robert Paxton, "La spécificité de la persecution des Juifs en France," *Annales* 48, 3 (May-June 1993) : 605-619.

[xli] See, for example, Henry Rousso, "Sortir du dilemme : Pétain, est-ce la France ?" et "Le débat continue…," *Le débat* 2, 89 (Spring 1996), 198-204 and 206-207.

[xlii] For example, see : Speech for the inauguration of the "Clairière des Justes" (Forest of the Righteous) in Thonon-les-Bains, November 2, 1997 and Speech at the Shoah Memorial, Paris, December 5, 1997.

[xliii] Law of July 10, 2000, *Journée nationale à la mémoire des victimes des crimes racistes et antisémites de l'Etat français et d'hommage aux "Justes" de France.*

[xliv] The reasons for this opposition are not as obvious as one would think but these cannot be adressed here, see Sarah Gensburger, *Les Justes de France. Politiques publiques de la mémoire*.

[xlv] These data were calculated on the basis of a sample of 645 files, chosen on the basis on every two since 1963.

[xlvi] Jacqueline Schochat-Rebibo, "Etrange Malaise," *Site Primo*, Jerusalem, January 29, 2007 and Tsilla Herscho, "Questions sur le prochain hommage aux Justes au Panthéon," *Guysen Israël News*, January 15, 2007.

[xlvii] For an in-depth study of the Polish case, see : Gensburger and Niewiedzial, "Figure du Juste et politique publique de la mémoire en Pologne". And for an overall presentation of this evolution, with the evocation of the 1999 Belgian creation of a "diplôme d'honneur de Juste," see : Gensburger, "L'émergence de la catégorie de Juste parmi les Nations comme paradigme mémoriel."

[xlviii] Franck Leibovici, "Esquisse d'une histoire des Français d'Israël," *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'Histoire*, 78 (April-June 2003), 4.

[xlix] · Official Jewish Agency for Israel data (www.jafi.org/); Amir Ben-Porat, "Proletarian Immigrants in Israel, 1948-1961," *Social Inquiry* 60, 4 (November1990) : 395-404.

[l] · The witnesses are supposed to have directly experienced the facts they relate.

[li] · Chaya Brasz, "Expectations and Realities of Dutch Immigration to Palestine/Israel After the Shoah," *Jewish History* 1-2 (1994) : 323-338.

[lii] · Catherine Nicault, *La France et le sionisme, 1897-1948. Une rencontre manquée?* (Paris : Calmann-Lévy, 1992) and Doris Bensimon, "L'immigration juive en France," *Yod* 6 (1999) : 53-66. Chaya Brasz, "Dutch Jews as Zionists and Israeli Citizens," in *Dutch Jews as Perceived by Themselves and By Others. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on the History of the Jews in the Netherlands*, ed. Chaya Brasz and Yosef Kaplan (Leiden : Brill, 2001), 215-234, and Brasz, "After the Shoah: Continuity and Change in the Postwar Jewish Community of the Netherlands," *Jewish History* 15 (2001), 149-168.

[liii] · Pierre Birnbaum, *Sur la corde raide. Parcours juifs entre exil et citoyenneté* (Paris : Flammarion, 2002), 66. See also : Ido De Haan, "The Postwar Jewish Community and the Memory of the Persecution in the Netherlands," in *Dutch Jews as Perceived by Themselves and By Others,* 405-436.

[liv] · Doris Bensimon, *Les Juifs de France et leurs relations avec Israël, 1945-1988* (Paris : l'Harmattan, 1989).

[lv] · Martine Cohen, "Les juifs de France. Modernité et identité," *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'Histoire* 66 (April-June 2000), 105.

[lvi] · Pierre Birnbaum, *La France imaginée: déclin des rêves unitaires?* (Paris: Gallimard, 2003 [1st ed., Paris, Fayard, 1998]), 32.

[lvii] Pierre Birnbaum, "Les Juifs entre l'appartenance identitaire et l'entrée dans l'espace public : la Révolution française et le choix des acteurs," *Revue française de sociologie*, 30, 3-4 (1989), 497-510.