

Simon Perego

# **“The Communist Schism in Jewish Life”: Transnational Politics and Holocaust Commemorations among Parisian Jews during the Cold War**

## **Introduction**

In the aftermath of the liberation of Paris (August 19–25, 1944), many Jewish organizations based in the French capital sought to publicly preserve the memory of the tragic experience suffered by Jews in France and other European countries during the Second World War.<sup>1</sup> With this in mind, they planned frequent commemorations, a term with multiple meanings that here refers to public gatherings aimed at recalling an event or a figure from the past and that “tend to bring together a community on the anniversary of this event or figure.”<sup>2</sup> Some of these ceremonies commemorated the participation of Jews in key moments of the armed struggle against Nazi Germany: the military combat of 1940, the resistance under the occupation, the liberation of the French capital city, and the final victory over the Wehrmacht. Others addressed antisemitic persecution and extermination. Large annual gatherings were devoted to the memory of all the Jewish victims or commemorated specific events such as the imprisonment of foreign Jews in internment camps after their arrest in Paris on May 14, 1941; the Vel’ d’Hiv’ roundup perpetrated in the same city and its suburbs on July 16–17, 1942; the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising in April–May 1943; or the liberation of the Nazi concentration camps two years later. These ceremonies left a deep mark on the Jewish year during the two decades following the Second World War. In doing so, they placed the memory of the Holocaust at the center of Jewish life long before

---

1 This chapter is based on: Simon Perego, “Conflictualité politique, identités partisanses et commémorations de la Shoah dans le monde juif parisien, 1944–1967,” in *Résurgences conflictuelles: Le travail de la mémoire entre arts et histoire*, ed. Renaud Bouchet et al. (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2021), 195–209. I would like to thank Rennes University Press (PUR) for allowing me to use a translation of the previously published chapter as a point of departure for this chapter, as well as Arby Gharibian, who translated the French article into English, and the research group LabEx EHNE (“Écrire une histoire nouvelle de l’Europe”) for its financial support.

2 Robert Frank, “La mémoire empoisonnée,” in *La France des années noires, tome 2: De l’Occupation à la Libération*, ed. Jean-Pierre Azéma and François Bédarida (Paris: Seuil, 2000 [1st ed. 1993]), vol. 2, 560.

the Six-Day War (June 5–10, 1967), which has often – and too hastily – been seen as prompting in France the sudden emergence of a “Jewish memory” of the Holocaust in reaction to the existential risks facing the Israeli population in the event of its army’s defeat.<sup>3</sup>

By seeing commemorations as “immediately recognizable carriers of memory [. . .] that by definition express explicit and voluntarist representations of the past,”<sup>4</sup> the historians who have taken an interest in Jewish commemorative ceremonies in postwar France have primarily sought to analyze the discourses that these gatherings conveyed regarding the Holocaust. For Annette Wieviorka, for instance, the distinctive feature of the fate suffered by the Jews was not fully perceived by the Jewish organizations, whose commemorations in the immediate postwar period were not really able to grasp the radical novelty of the violence inflicted by the Nazis on the Jews of Europe.<sup>5</sup> This interpretation has subsequently been debated, notably by François Azouvi, who has endeavored to deconstruct what he calls the “myth of the great silence” regarding the Holocaust in postwar France.<sup>6</sup> While his work firstly focuses on the cultural and intellectual production devoted to the genocide and its reception on the French national scale, he has also taken an interest in certain Jewish commemorations and showed that these rituals did not help to silence what distinguished the Holocaust from other Nazi crimes.<sup>7</sup>

The exploration of commemorative practices, grasped in their full social thickness, nevertheless calls for moving beyond – though without losing sight of – the exclusive study of representations of the past. It is therefore important to point out, as Paul Connerton has done, that commemorations are part of a

---

3 On the Six-Day War as a turning point in the emergence of Holocaust memory among French Jews, see for example: Henry Rousso, *Le syndrome de Vichy de 1944 à nos jours* (Paris: Seuil, 1990 [1st ed. 1987]), 155. For a reappraisal of this idea, see: Simon Perego, ed., *Archives juives: Revue d'histoire des Juifs de France* 51, no. 2 (2018), special issue, “Première(s) mémoire(s): Les Juifs de France et la Shoah, de la Libération à la guerre des Six Jours.”

4 Henry Rousso, “La mémoire n’est plus ce qu’elle était,” in *Écrire l’histoire du temps présent: En hommage à François Bédarida*, ed. Institut d’histoire du temps présent (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1993), 108.

5 Annette Wieviorka, *Déportation et génocide: Entre la mémoire et l’oubli* (Paris: Hachette, 2003 [1st ed. 1992]), 391–411. See also: Rebecca Clifford, *Commemorating the Holocaust: The Dilemmas of Remembrance in France and Italy* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 25–70.

6 François Azouvi, *Le mythe du grand silence: Auschwitz, les Français, la mémoire* (Paris: Fayard, 2012). See also: Renée Poznanski, *Propagandes et persécution: La Résistance et le “problème juif”, 1940–1944* (Paris: Fayard, 2008), 551–592; Samuel Moyn, *A Holocaust Controversy: The Treblinka Affair in Postwar France* (Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2005); Philip G. Nord, *After the Deportation: Memory Battles in Postwar France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

7 Azouvi, *Le mythe du grand silence*, 65–75. See also: Simon Perego, *Pleurons-les: Les Juifs de Paris et la commémoration de la Shoah, 1944–1967* (Ceyzérieu: Champ Vallon, 2020), 169–203.

"broader phenomenon, that of ritual action."<sup>8</sup> The gatherings studied in this article are indeed similar to sociopolitical rituals in their own right, with ritual at a minimum being defined by Emmanuel Fureix as "an ordered sequence of symbolic, codified, and repetitive words and gestures organizing the relations between individuals and groups."<sup>9</sup> And in a Parisian Jewish community sharply divided in terms of ideology, against the backdrop of the Cold War to boot, the relations "organized" by ceremonies were of an eminently political and agonistic nature. By analyzing the ways in which politics intruded during ceremonies – in the rituals observed, actors mobilized, and discourse pronounced – as well as during the moments preceding and succeeding the gatherings, the focus here will therefore be on studying the political conflict at work within commemorative activity in the context of the bipolar confrontation and its implications on "the Jewish street" from the end of World War Two until the end of the 1960s. Apart from their historiographical consistency in terms of the recent reevaluation of Holocaust memory's chronology,<sup>10</sup> it is during these two and half decades that the political confrontation was the most intense among Jewish organizations in France. In this respect, the Six-Day War of 1967 constitutes an important turning point,<sup>11</sup> which simultaneously boosted Zionist commitment, caused a drastic drop in Communist influence exacerbated by the "anti-Zionist" campaign in Poland in 1968, and weakened the Bundist agenda.

To explore this period and address the political functions of Jewish commemorative rituals in postwar France, this article begins with a discussion of the politicization of the Jewish community of Paris in the aftermath of the Second World War. This will help to identify the ways in which commemorations were a favored medium for political conflict, enabling the commemorating groups to strengthen their own partisan identities. Consequently, the approach to rituals as practices that produce solidarity within a community will here be linked with a

---

8 Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012 [1st ed. 1989]), 42.

9 Emmanuel Fureix, *La France des larmes: Deuils politiques à l'âge romantique, 1814–1840* (Seysel: Champ Vallon, 2009), 18.

10 Hasia R. Diner, *We Remember with Reverence and Love: American Jews and the Myth of Silence after the Holocaust, 1945–1962* (New York: NYU Press, 2009); *After the Holocaust: Challenging the Myth of Silence*, ed. David Cesarani and Eric J. Sundquist (London: Routledge, 2012); *Before the Holocaust Had Its Name: Early Confrontations with the Nazi Mass Murder of the Jews*, ed. Regina Fritz, Éva Kovács, and Béla Rásky (Vienna: New Academic Press, 2016).

11 Samuel Ghiles-Meilhac, "Les Juifs de France et la guerre des Six Jours: Solidarité avec Israël et affirmation d'une identité politique collective," *Matériaux pour l'histoire de notre temps*, no. 96 (2009), 12–15.

consideration of the conflicts that ritual action can – over time and in connected fashion – exacerbate among different groups.

## The Politicization of Parisian Jewry

Jewish institutions faced a number of challenges at the time of France's liberation.<sup>12</sup> They had to obtain compensation for the damages suffered, assist those in need – beginning with the rare deportees who returned from the camps – locate the children hidden by non-Jewish organizations and individuals, and, more broadly, proceed with the reorganization of Jewish life in their country.<sup>13</sup> Between 90,000 and 100,000 French Jews died during the war, a great many in deportations, representing approximately a third of the Jewish population from 1939.<sup>14</sup> As terrible as these numbers are, the toll was comparatively “lighter” than in other European countries. The Jews who survived thus served as the foundation on which the Jewish population of France rebuilt itself, with its numbers growing from 170,000 in 1945 to 450,000 in 1966,<sup>15</sup> an increase due largely to the arrival of Jews from the Maghreb

---

12 On the postwar situation of French Jewry, see: David H. Weinberg, “The Reconstruction of the French Jewish Community after World War II,” in *She'erit Hapletah, 1944–1948: Rehabilitation and Political Struggle. Proceedings of the Sixth Yad Vashem International Historical Conference, Jerusalem 1985*, ed. Yisrael Gutman and Avital Saf (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1990), 168–186; Annette Wieviorka, “Les Juifs en France au lendemain de la guerre: État des lieux,” *Archives juives: Revue d'histoire des Juifs de France* 28, no. 1 (1995), 4–22; Anne Grynberg, “Après la tourmente,” in *Les Juifs de France: De la Révolution française à nos jours*, ed. Jean-Jacques Becker and Annette Wieviorka (Paris: Liana Levi, 1998), 249–286; Maud S. Mandel, *In the Aftermath of Genocide: Armenians and Jews in Twentieth-Century France* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003).

13 Katy Hazan, *Les orphelins de la Shoah: Les maisons de l'espoir, 1944–1960* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2000); Daniella Doron, *Jewish Youth and Identity in Postwar France: Rebuilding Family and Nation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015); Shannon Fogg, *Stealing Home: Looting, Restitution, and Reconstructing Jewish Lives in France, 1942–1947* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).

14 Serge Klarsfeld, *Vichy-Auschwitz: Le rôle de Vichy dans la solution finale de la question juive* (Paris: Fayard, 1985), vol. 2, 180; Doris Bensimon and Sergio Della Pergola, *La population juive de France: Socio-démographie et identité* (Paris: CNRS and Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1986 [1st. ed 1984]), 35. According to the most recent calculations, only 3,943 of the 74,000 Jews deported from France between 1942 and 1944 survived the “Final Solution of the Jewish Question.” Alexandre Doulut, Sandrine Labeau, and Serge Klarsfeld, *1945: Mémorial des 3 943 rescapés juifs de France* (Paris: The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, FFDJF, and Après l'Oubli, 2018), 15.

15 *American Jewish Year Book – 1945–1946* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1945), 635; *American Jewish Year Book – 1967* (New York: The American Jewish Committee and The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1967), 462.

in Metropolitan France. From a material point of view, the early postwar years were marked by major difficulties, with many Jewish families having to count on the assistance of Jewish welfare organizations. Jewish organizations themselves benefited largely from Jewish assistance from America, as well as from German "reparations" from the 1950s onward.<sup>16</sup> These difficulties were nevertheless temporary and the general situation improved in the favorable climate of the *Trente Glorieuses* ("the Glorious Thirty," i.e., the three decades of postwar reconstruction and economic growth between 1945 and 1975). Finally, the return of Republican rule of law and the relatively low level of antisemitism – or at least of its public expression – in postwar French society<sup>17</sup> kept the vast majority of French Jews from immigrating to Israel or other countries. In this context, a particularly rich Jewish life was able to develop in Paris. The capital and its suburbs accounted for a considerable portion of demographic growth: 125,000 Jews lived in Paris in the early 1950s and 300,000 in the late 1960s.<sup>18</sup> International and foreign Jewish organizations, both American and Israeli, had their European and North African offices there, as did the major national Jewish institutions and the Jewish press published in the country. However, Paris was also home to many organizations whose activity took place on a local scale, which had different ways of expressing Jewish identity and were active in various domains (culture, education, religion, political life, social action, etc.).

While the years between 1944 and 1967 saw the confluence of factors favorable to the reconstitution and development of a dynamic Jewish life in Paris, the Jews of the capital did not travel hand in hand down the path of reconstruction. On the contrary, they divided into more or less hermetic microcosms, which stood out from one another through their different geographic origins, each with a history and a specific series of religious, cultural, political, and socioeconomic

---

16 Ronald W. Zweig, *German Reparations and the Jewish World: A History of the Claims Conference* (London: Frank Cass, 2014 [1st ed. 1987]); Constance Pâris de Bollardi re, "La p rennit  de notre peuple." Une aide socialiste juive am ricaine dans la diaspora yiddish: le Jewish Labor Committee en France (1944–1948)" (PhD diss., School for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences [EHESS], 2017); Laura Hobson Faure, A "Jewish Marshall Plan": *The American Jewish Presence in Post-Holocaust France* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2022 [1st ed. 2013]).

17 Anne Grynberg, "Des signes de r surgence de l'antis mitisme dans la France de l'apr s-guerre (1945–1953)?", *Les Cahiers de la Shoah* 1, no. 5 (2001), 171–223; Emmanuel Debono, ed., *Archives juives: Revue d'histoire des Juifs de France* 49, no. 2 (2016), special issue, "L'antis mitisme en France au lendemain de la Seconde Guerre mondiale."

18 Roger Berg, "O  va le juda isme fran ais ?", *Journal de la Communaut *, no. 51, April 11, 1952, 1; *American Jewish Year Book – 1967*, 466.

characteristics.<sup>19</sup> In the capital, those who are today referred to as Ashkenazim and Sephardim lived alongside one another, but without forming two homogeneous communities. The first group included both Jews, who had been French for generations (from Alsace or Lorraine) – those who were referred to as “*israélites*”<sup>20</sup> – and Jews of foreign background, who had come from Eastern Europe and often spoke Yiddish. The Sephardim included other Jews, who had settled in France for generations and were initially located in the Southwest, in addition to Jews from the former Ottoman Empire (Greece, Turkey, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, etc.), Egypt, and the Maghreb (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia). Given this diversity, did the Jews of the capital form, in the words of Nancy Green, “a Parisian Jewish melting pot?”<sup>21</sup> With regard to postwar Paris, it is perhaps more appropriate to speak of a Parisian Jewish “archipelago,” as this notion, taken from geography, emphasizes the importance of the links between what were at first glance isolated elements as well as the autonomy they continued to enjoy from one another.

This division in terms of origins was accompanied by a fracture of an ideological nature, under the effect of what the writer Arnold Mandel has called the “Communist schism in Jewish life.”<sup>22</sup> Since the arrival of the first Eastern European Jewish migrants in the late nineteenth century, the political tensions imported from their countries of origin were part of the daily fate of immigrant Jewish circles in Paris, which were notably divided between Bundists, Communists, and Zionists.<sup>23</sup> The imperative of fighting the Germans and the Vichy regime won out for a time over these ideological oppositions and led to the creation of a unified organization of resistance, the General Jewish Defense Committee (*le Comité général de défense des Juifs*, CGD)<sup>24</sup> and later the Representative Council of the Jews of France (Conseil représentatif des Juifs de France, CRIF), which connected immigrant Jews with the Israelite Central Consistory of France (Consistoire cen-

19 Michel Roblin, *Les juifs de Paris: Démographie. Économie. Culture* (Paris: A. et J. Picard et Cie, 1952); Perego, *Pleurons-les*, 31–59.

20 Muriel Pichon, *Les Français juifs, 1914–1950: Récit d'un désenchantement* (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 2009).

21 Nancy L. Green, “Jewish Migrations to France in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: Community or Communities?”, *Studia Rosenthaliana* 23 (supplement), no. 2 (1989), 135.

22 Arnold Mandel, “France,” in *European Jewry Ten Years after the War: An Account of the Development and Present Status of the Decimated Jewish Communities of Europe*, ed. Nehemiah Robinson (New York: Institute of Jewish Affairs, 1956), 208.

23 Nancy L. Green, *The Pletzl of Paris: Jewish Immigrant Workers in the Belle Epoch* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1986); David H. Weinberg, *A Community on Trial: The Jews of Paris in the 1930s* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977 [1st ed. 1974]).

24 Adam Rayski, “Le Comité juif de défense, son rôle dans la résistance juive en France,” *Le Monde juif*, no. 51 (1968), 32–37.

tral des israélites de France), the institution that represented the French-born Jews since the Napoleonic era.<sup>25</sup> The specific context of the war's aftermath was also favorable to the unification of forces – or at least to the muting of ideological disputes – for during the first months and years following liberation, Jewish organizations had to attend to the highly urgent tasks mentioned earlier.

This unified environment did not survive the incredibly tense political and geopolitical context of the early Cold War. The confrontation between the Eastern and the Western blocs involved questions to which Jews were particularly sensitive, beginning with the future of the Jews in Eastern Europe and Palestine (and in Israel from 1948 onward) – questions that caused polemics within the Jewish community of Paris. This was especially true for its Eastern European fringe, which saw confrontation among the Communist Jewish Union for Resistance and Mutual Aid (*Union des Juifs pour la Résistance et l'entraide*, UJRE), the Bund – which alongside the Workmen's Circle (*Arbeter Ring*) defended a Jewish socialism linked to Yiddish culture and language – and the Zionist-leaning Federation of Jewish Societies of France (*Fédération des sociétés juives de France*, FSJF). The upheaval triggered by the Slánský trial in Czechoslovakia in late 1952 and the supposed "Doctors' Plot" in the USSR in early 1953 – two affairs that revealed the scope of Stalinist antisemitism – spasmodically heightened this tendency toward division already begun in the late 1940s. The shockwave profoundly disrupted Jewish life, leading to divisions and the constitution of two blocs within the community: one Communist and highly homogeneous, recruiting among Jewish immigrants of Yiddish language and culture, the other marked by a certain internal diversity in terms of both origins (immigrants and "natives," Sephardim and Ashkenazim) and political or religious orientation, but united in their visceral opposition to the Communists.

## The Constitution of Rival Commemorative Blocs

As Yael Zerubavel has argued, "the commemoration of historical events is not only a powerful means of reinforcing social solidarity but also an arena of struggle over power and control."<sup>26</sup> That is why political conflict – which reflected a struggle for influence among the components of the Jewish archipelago of Paris – expressed itself on the commemorative stage in particular. In this respect, the first years fol-

---

<sup>25</sup> Samuel Ghiles-Meilhac, *Le CRIF: De la Résistance juive à la tentation du lobby* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 2011), 18–39.

<sup>26</sup> Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), xix.



lowing liberation until the late 1940s unfolded beneath a contrasting light. This brief moment of unanimity, which was rooted in the experience of persecution and the management of its consequences, saw several joint commemorative ceremonies organized – under the auspices of the CGD and the CRIF – by Jewish groups opposed on the political level. However, this half-decade was not spared the tensions that would deeply fracture the Parisian Jewish community during the 1950s. Conscious of the fragility of the union forged during these initial gatherings, the organizers sought to propose a ritual that was as consensual as possible by equitably distributing speaking time among the representatives of the participating organizations, which included artists or artistic groups inspired by different political sensibilities, as was the case of the commemorations of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising organized by the CGD on April 19, 1945, and April 20, 1946.<sup>27</sup>

This irenicism did not last long. The outbreak of the Cold War soon had an effect on Jewish commemorative activity, whose fragmentation from 1948 onward led to the formation of rival commemorative blocs. That year, the growing condemnation of Soviet policy in Eastern Europe by the Bundists translated into their withdrawal from the joint commemoration of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising and the organization of their own ceremony on April 16, 1948.<sup>28</sup> The following year, worsening relations between the USSR and Israel, together with the adoption of a pro-Arab policy by the Soviets, led to a deterioration in relations between Parisian Zionists and Communists and the end of their commemorative collaboration, with the UJRE commemorating the uprising alone on April 17, 1949.<sup>29</sup> The following year, Communists, Zionists, and Bundists organized for the first time three distinct commemorations of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.<sup>30</sup> The polemics sparked by the Slánský trial and the “Doctors’ Plot” heightened the opposition in the commemorative domain between “progressives” – as Jewish Communists referred to themselves at the time – and their detractors, leading to an almost systematic doubling of all major

---

27 “Di troyer-akademye tsum 2tn yortog fun geto-oyfshtand,” *Undzer Shtime*, April 28, 1945, 6; “Di haskore-fayerung funem kamf in varshever geto,” *Undzer Vort*, April 27, 1945, 1; “Di fayerlekhe ondenk-akademye in Pleyel tsum 3tn yortog fun varshever geto-oyfshtand,” *Naye Prese*, April 23, 1946, 1; “Impozante fayerung tsum 3tn yortog fun varshever geto-oyfshtand,” *Undzer Shtime*, April 27, 1946, 1; “Groyse fayerung tsum 3tn yortog fun varshever geto-oyfshtand,” *Undzer Vort*, April 26, 1946, 3.

28 “Grandyeze yisker-fayerung,” *Undzer Shtime*, April 18–19, 1948, 1.

29 “Dos yidishe Pariz hot virdik baert di heldn fun varshever geto,” *Naye Prese*, April 19, 1949, 1–3.

30 “Di impozante akademye tsum ondenk fun oyshtand in varshever geto,” *Naye Prese*, April 20, 1950, 3; “Impozanter ondenk-ovnt lekoved dem 7tn yortog fun heldishn geto-oyfshtand in Varshe,” *Undzer Shtime*, April 21, 1950, 3–4; “Nouvelles de France,” *Journal de la Communauté*, no. 4, April 28, 1950, 5.



Parisian ceremonies. While the holding of multiple commemorations of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, sometimes simultaneously, represented the most striking feature of this fragmentation, the commemoration of other events – such as the Vel' d'Hiv' roundup or the execution of approximately fifty Jewish hostages at Mont-Valérien on December 15, 1941 – also gave rise to concurrent ceremonies, driven especially by the anti-Communist Jewish deportee and veterans' groups created in 1952 and 1953, in the wake of polemics on antisemitism in the USSR and popular democracies.

An important part of the opposition between the commemorative blocs played out in the numerous efforts their leaders made to attract the largest number of people to their gatherings, or at least more than their opponents. In a competitive commemorative environment, audience size demonstrated the success of the commemoration and thereby, it was believed, the degree of conviction behind the political positions defended by its organizers. In advance of ceremonies, competing organizers used different strategies to ensure the presence of a large audience. Since the promotion of a commemorative gathering required spreading word among the target audience, organizers placed more and more announcements in the Jewish press, notably in Yiddish-language dailies, in both the front and middle pages. These announcements sought not only to inform the target audience about the date, time, location, and purpose of the ceremony, but to also encourage them to attend by presenting participation at the gathering as a moral obligation.<sup>31</sup> This was also done by emphasizing its capacity to unite and the support garnered by its organizers,<sup>32</sup> as well as by developing programs with attractive content. The campaign involved the presence of renowned public figures, the participation of distinguished artists, and even the projection of films.<sup>33</sup> Yet the promotion of the commemorations was not limited to the period before the event, as it was also important to its organizers that it be the subject of laudatory articles afterwards. Once finished, commemorative gatherings began a "second

---

31 For instance: "Zuntik veln ale yidn fun Pariz opgebn koved di 48 deroshosene orevnikes oyf Mon Valeryen," *Undzer Vort*, December 18, 1954, 1; "Morgn ale tsum Vel d'Hiv," *Undzer Vort*, July 15, 1958, 3.

32 For example: "Liste fun sosyetes, velkhe hobn gegeben zeyer onshlus in der morgndiker geto-akademye un rufn zeyere mitglieder in ir onteyltsunemen," *Naye Prese*, April 18–19, 1964, 1; "Yidishe folks-organizatsyes rufn parizer yidn zikh tsu bateyliken in der geto-fayerung montik ovnt in groysn zal fun 'Mityalite'," *Undzer Vort*, April 18, 1964, 7.

33 Among many examples, see: untitled announcement, *Undzer Shtime*, April 14, 1948, 1 (Yehudit Moretzka presented as a "well-known singer"); untitled announcement, *Naye Prese*, April 18, 1952, 1 (the movie *Undzere Kinder* shown "for the first time in Paris"); untitled announcement, *Undzer Vort*, April 19, 1966, 3 (Gideon Hausner introduced as the "attorney general for the Eichmann trial").

life” in the top stories of the Jewish press, with the media representing a parallel scene to commemorative activity<sup>34</sup> – to the point where the commemoration of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising in 1965 included “a special desk [. . .] for the members of the press”<sup>35</sup> installed on the main stage of the ceremony.

Finally, in this competitive context, actors were not simply content with presenting their gatherings in the best light possible, but also directly attacked their opponents. Non-Communist Jewish organizations constantly accused “progressive” organizations of using their commemoratives gatherings for purely political purposes. The annual commemoration of all victims of the Holocaust, organized at Bagneux cemetery by the Union of Jewish Societies of France (*Union des sociétés juives de France*, USJF) – a Communist-leaning organization bringing together mutual aid societies for Jewish immigrants – was, for instance, the target of frequent denunciations of this type. In September 1953, the Yiddish daily of Zionist persuasion *Undzer Vort* (Our Word) – the sworn enemy of its Communist counterpart *Naye Prese* (New Press) – saluted the refusal of multiple Jewish groups to “participate in the Communist plot, that horrible blasphemy of Communists for whom even a cemetery is a favorable place for garnering political and demagogical capital.”<sup>36</sup> Communist Jewish organizations often reproached their opponents for working against the unity appropriate to paying tribute to the dead, a unity that they also claimed to desire. “Are the ashes of a burned Communist of a different color than those of a Zionist?” asked a speaker on September 17, 1961, during a USJF ceremony in Bagneux.<sup>37</sup> Anti-Communist organizations endeavored to return this accusation of division, denouncing their opponents as promoters of a fictitious unity, and presenting themselves as the true protectors of Jewish cohesion with respect to both memory and the shared challenges of the present and future. In July 1952, while explaining in the press why the Independent Association of Former Jewish Deportees and Inmates (*Association indépendante des anciens déportés et internés juifs*, AIADIJ) – an anti-Communist group created in February 1952<sup>38</sup> – did not want to commemorate the Vel’ d’Hiv’ roundup together with the Association of Former Jewish Deportees (*Amicale des anciens déportés juifs*, AADJF), which was close to the UJRE, one of its

---

34 François Lustman, *Entre Shoah, communisme et sionisme: Les Juifs yiddish de Paris et leur presse au lendemain de la Seconde Guerre mondiale* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2012).

35 “Iber 3 000 parizer yidn hobn virdik baert di heldn fun varshever geto-oyshtand,” *Undzer Vort*, April 28, 1965, 1.

36 “Toyznter yidn oyfn beys-oylem Banye,” *Undzer Vort*, September 14, 1953, 3.

37 “Toyznter yidn fun farshidene shatirungen hobn baert virdik di umgekumene,” *Naye Prese*, September 21, 1961, 4.

38 “Gegrindet a nayem fareyn fun gev. deportirte un internirte,” *Undzer Vort*, January 14, 1952, 3.

leaders indicated his group’s refusal to “suffer blackmail under the pretext of the word unity.”<sup>39</sup>

Numerous observers of Jewish commemorative activity strongly criticized this state of almost permanent conflict, believing that the commemoration of the Holocaust and the Second World War should suspend rather than exacerbate conflict: “Jews, good Jews, wonder why we cannot organize a joint commemoration in Paris for our martyrs. The Nazis did not ask what party one belonged to or what ideology one supported when they dragged the victims from their beds,”<sup>40</sup> wrote the journalist Nathan Silberberg in July 1961 on the occasion of the commemoration of the Vel’ d’Hiv’ roundup, which had split once again into two concurrent ceremonies. Attempts in Paris to forge the unity of Jewish groups, at least for the duration of a commemoration, nevertheless yielded limited results, with the exception of occasional joint events such as the commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising on April 21, 1963.<sup>41</sup> This was all the more true as the actors seeking to lead these initiatives actually leaned in favor of the anti-Communist camp,<sup>42</sup> whether it was the Consistoire, which claimed the neutrality conferred by its religious mission, the CRIF, which emphasized its function as an apolitical umbrella organization representative on the national scale, or the Memorial of the Unknown Jewish Martyr (*Mémorial du martyr juif inconnu*, MMJI), a monument inaugurated on October 30, 1956, which sought the following year, and not without difficulty, to assert itself as the central space within the commemorative Jewish landscape in the French capital.<sup>43</sup>

## The Affirmation of Partisan Identities

Thus, while some communal activists believed that paying tribute to the dead should avoid partisan disputes, others considered the commemoration of the Holocaust as such a crucial and sacred mission that it was impossible to make com-

39 “Eynhey, yo! Ober mit vemen?,” *Undzer Vort*, July 3, 1952, 3.

40 “Tseremonye lekoved di yidishe martirer fun 16tn yuli 1942,” *Undzer Vort*, July 17, 1961, 3.

41 “Cérémonie grandiose à la mémoire du 20e anniversaire de la révolte du ghetto de Varsovie,” *Le Monde juif*, no. 32–33, January–June 1963, 105–112.

42 Perego, *Pleurons-les*, 96–134.

43 On the MMJI, see: Annette Wiewiorka, “Un lieu de mémoire et d’histoire: Le mémorial du martyr juif inconnu,” *Revue de l’Université de Bruxelles*, no.1–2 (1987), 107–132; Simon Perego, “Les commémorations de la destruction des Juifs d’Europe au Mémorial du martyr juif inconnu du milieu des années 1950 à la fin des années 1960,” *Revue d’histoire de la Shoah* 2, no. 193 (2010), 471–507.

promise on its behalf. Therefore, commemorative ceremonies became one of the most propitious places for the expression and exacerbation of political conflicts. Yet in doing so, the commemorations organized by Jewish groups on the basis of partisan belonging also helped to reinforce them and to thereby harden the opposition to their opponents. As the Bundist, Communist, and Zionist organizers of ceremonies were openly engaged politically, their ceremonies also proved to be highly politicized, with various markers bringing them closer to the register of the political meeting. First, the identity of speakers contributed to the politicization of commemorations, as it was always Bundist, Communist, and Zionist leaders who spoke, along with public figures supporting their cause from near or far.<sup>44</sup> For example, the commemorations of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising organized by the UJRE movement saw intellectuals close to the French Communist Party (*Parti communiste français*, PCF) express themselves, such as the poet Paul Éluard.<sup>45</sup> This was also true of politicians who were party members, like Maurice Kriegel-Valrimont,<sup>46</sup> as well as official or non-official representatives from Communist countries, such as the ambassador of Poland on many occasions<sup>47</sup> or the former resistance fighter and deportee, now an East German citizen, Willy Heun, in 1956.<sup>48</sup>

The artistic program that ended some commemorations did not escape this politicization process either. For example, support for Zionism was evoked during the artistic section of FSJF commemorations through the use of texts composed in Hebrew, such as the Israeli hymn *Hatikva* (The Hope), the poems of Hannah Szenes who was the heroine of the Yishuv (the Jewish community of Palestine before the creation of Israel), and the songs of the Palmach, one of the Jewish paramilitary forces in Mandatory Palestine.<sup>49</sup> Finally, even the location and decorum of ceremonies were marked by the political identity of their organizers, with many Communist gatherings organized in the Père Lachaise cemetery – an im-

---

44 Simon Perego, "Commemorating the Holocaust during the First Postwar Decade: Jewish Initiatives and non-Jewish Actors in France," in *Before the Holocaust Had Its Name*, ed. Fritz, Kovács, and Rásky, 223–239.

45 "3 000 yidn oyf der akademye tsum ondenk fun di oyfshtand fun varshever geto," *Naye Prese*, April 22, 1952, 3.

46 "Dos yidishe Pariz hot virdik baert di umshterblekhe heldishe kemfers," *Naye Prese*, April 22, 1960, 1.

47 For instance: "Grandyeze geto-akademye in Alhambra bay onveznheyt fun iber dray toyznt yidn," *Naye Prese*, April 22, 1958, 1.

48 "Paris commémore l'insurrection du ghetto de Varsovie," *Naye Prese*, April 28–29, 1956, 8.

49 For example: "Impozante troyer-akademye tsum 12tn yortog fun varshever geto-oyfshtand," *Undzer Vort*, April 21, 1955, 3.

portant *lieu de mémoire* of the French Left<sup>50</sup> – and with Bundist commemorations of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising never taking place without the presence of the red flags of the Bund and the *Arbeter Ring*, as well as portraits of their most famous activists who perished during the uprising, as pointed out by the summaries published in the Yiddish-language Bundist daily *Undzer Shtime* (Our Voice).<sup>51</sup>

For the Bundists, the Communists, and the Zionists, ceremonies in memory of the Jews that took part in the resistance in Warsaw were an occasion to celebrate the most important feat of arms of the Jewish resistance against Nazism, but also an important part of their own history, with the three political movements being represented among the ghetto's insurgents. This commemoration thus provided speakers with an opportunity to point out the exploits of their own side, which was a source of political legitimacy during the postwar period, all while reaffirming the partisan belonging and memory that they laid claim to. Bundist speakers welcomed the Bund's active role in the preparation and unfolding of the revolt, as well as the activities of this party in Eastern Europe even before the Second World War among the Jewish population, preparing it for the revolt by shaping it politically. On April 19, 1962, the anniversary of the uprising, the New York Bundist Alexander Erlich, who had been invited by his Parisian colleagues, declared: "April 19 [the first day of the revolt] was in large measure the result of the decades of education and transformation of Jewish life by the Bund, which had influenced other movements by setting a new tone, a tone of fighting."<sup>52</sup> For the Zionists, the ghetto uprising represented the beginnings of the national struggle of Jews for the independence of their state. For example, on April 15, 1950, FSJF Vice President Reuven Grinberg "emphasized how much this glorious page in Jewish history was connected to the one written by the combatants of Israel," and the rabbi representing the French section of the World Jewish Congress (WJC), René Kapel, followed suit by presenting the uprising as "one of the sacrifices that

---

50 Madeleine Rébérioux, "Le Mur des Fédérés. Rouge, 'sang craché,'" in *Les lieux de mémoire*, ed. Pierre Nora (Paris: Gallimard, 2003 [1st ed. 1984–1992]), vol. 2, 535–558; Danielle Tartakowsky, *Nous irons chanter sur vos tombes: Le Père-Lachaise, XIXe–XXe siècles* (Paris: Aubier, 1999). A famous battle took place in May 1871 during the Commune's repression – known as the "semaine sanglante" ("Bloody Week") – in this cemetery, with many "Communards" shot in front of a wall that was later named the "Mur des Fédérés" (Communards' Wall) and became a rallying point for Leftist groups.

51 For instance: "Dos parizer yidntum fayert oyf a virdikn oyfn dem 11tn yortsayt fun oysfhtand in varshever geto," *Undzer Shtime*, April 20, 1954, 1.

52 "Di ondenk-manifestatsye tsum 19tn yortog fun oysfhtand in varshever geto," *Undzer Shtime*, April 24, 1962, 4.

enabled the Jewish people to revive a Jewish homeland.”<sup>53</sup> For the Communists, mentioning the revolt allowed them to emphasize the USSR and the Red Army, by establishing a connection between the outbreak of the uprising and the victory of the Soviets at Stalingrad a few months earlier. On April 19, 1951, UJRE representative Albert Youdine asserted with regard to the insurgents that “their fate was connected to that of all freedom fighters throughout the world, chief among them the Soviet army, whose victories prompted the Jews of the ghetto to take up arms.”<sup>54</sup>

The ceremonies’ organizers were aware of one another’s narratives, with the various accounts of this revolt serving as the source of intense polemics. The Zionists and Bundists especially reproached the Communists for remaining silent about the participation of non-Communist Jewish resistance members in the uprising and for overemphasizing the assistance provided to the insurgents by the Polish Communist resistance. “Today’s falsifiers of history ‘know’ with certainty that there were no Zionists among the combatants of the ghetto, only Communists, and that the Polish and the Russian army greatly helped the rebels of the ghetto,” wrote an *Undzer Vort* journalist with irony in his summary of the FSJF commemoration of April 16, 1953.<sup>55</sup> Yet opposition to Communist accounts did not only involve factual elements. The debate was also about the interpretation of the uprising and the meaning ascribed to the heroism and sacrifice of the rebels. During this same commemoration, the Zionist leader Marc Jarblum denounced “the terrible profanation of God’s name that the falsifiers of history – the Communists – have committed with regard to the sacred memory of these heroes, many of whom died with *Shema Israel* on their lips, and their thoughts directed toward our country Israel.”<sup>56</sup> He also reproached the “progressives” for understanding the revolt solely in light of their anti-fascist and pro-Soviet frame of reference, denying the religious and Zionist aspirations of Jewish resistance members.

Speakers affirmed their support for a political cause on the commemorative stage directly as well, not just through evocations of the past. The figures who spoke at Communist gatherings were always sure to mention the major structural topics of the PCF’s political discourse. For instance, on July 15, 1951, Marcel Paul, the president of the National Federation of Resistant and Patriotic Deportees and Internees (Fédération nationale des déportés et internés résistants patriotes,

53 “Les Juifs de Paris commémorent le 7e anniversaire du soulèvement du ghetto de Varsovie,” *La Terre retrouvée*, no. 14 (274), April 15, 1950, 11.

54 “Di mentshhneyt vet zign! Rede fun A. Yudin,” *Naye Prese*, April 21–22, 1951, 2.

55 “Der yisker ovnt in ‘Mutualite’,” *Undzer Vort*, April 20, 1953, 3.

56 “Der yisker ovnt in ‘Mutualite’,” *Undzer Vort*, April 20, 1953, 3. *Shema Israel* (“Hear, O Israel” in Hebrew) is the Jewish believer’s profession of individual faith.

FNDIRP) close to the Communist party, mentioned before the Vélodrome d'Hiver "the atrocities in Korea committed against women and children, which are a repetition of Nazi atrocities, and should be strongly condemned by all honorable men regardless of their opinion regarding the causes of the Korean conflict," before proceeding with a broader denunciation of American foreign policy in Southeast Asia.<sup>57</sup> Parisian Bundists offered speech-length praise to the Social Democrat and anti-Communist left, as well as criticism of the Soviet bloc. On April 18, 1953, the New Yorker Borekh Shefner, who had been invited by Parisian Bundists to their commemoration of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, asked his audience to lead "the struggle against dictatorship in all its forms, the struggle against slavery, the hatred of peoples and the jingoism that is the cause of wars," and celebrated "the love of justice and equity, of a free and socially honest world."<sup>58</sup> Unsurprisingly, the Zionists concentrated on the systematic defense of the state of Israel and the accusation of its enemies and detractors. On April 17, 1951, during the FSJF's commemoration of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, its president Israel Jefroykin solemnly declared: "After honoring the sacred memory of our martyrs, let us raise our heads to the East, toward Israel, the glory of the Jewish people."<sup>59</sup>

In the context of the Cold War, antisemitism was also a divisive matter of concern frequently addressed by speakers during commemorations.<sup>60</sup> While Jewish Communists and their guests praised all the Communist countries in Central and Eastern Europe, their opponents repeatedly criticized the Jews' fate in the Soviet bloc, arguing that honoring the memory of the Holocaust should lead to fighting the perpetuation of antisemitism wherever it existed. In their ceremonies, Parisian Bundist militants frequently paid homage to their comrades Henryk Ehrlich and Wiktor Alter, who had died at the hands of the NKVD during World War Two.<sup>61</sup> In the meantime, Zionists focused their criticisms on the current situation of Jews in the Soviet bloc. In 1962, for instance, during a Warsaw Ghetto Uprising commemoration, the writer Mendel Mann declared that their complete isolation

---

57 "Dos yidishe Pariz hot oyf a geeyniktn un virdikn oyfn baert baym Velodrom d'Hiver zayne 30 toyznt martirer," *Naye Prese*, July 16, 1951, 4.

58 "Virdiker farloyf fun der groyser troyer-akademye fun Bund un Arbeter-ring tsum 10tn yortog fun varshever geto-oyfshtand," *Undzer Shtime*, April 20, 1953, 3.

59 "Ayndruksfule troyer-akademye tsum 8tn yortog fun geto-oyfshtand in Varshe," *Undzer Vort*, April 19, 1951, 3.

60 Johannes Heuman, "'Comme les Juifs sous l'Occupation': La mémoire de la Shoah dans la lutte antiraciste en France, 1944–1967," *Archives juives: Revue d'histoire des Juifs de France* 51, no. 2 (2018), 39–58.

61 For instance: "Impozante fayerung lekoved dem 12tn yortsayt fun oyfshtand fun varshever geto," *Undzer Shtime*, April 21, 1955, 2. Ehrlich committed suicide in his jail cell in 1942 and Alter was executed by firing squad in 1943.



had a goal: “the liquidation of Jews as a people, their spiritual destruction.”<sup>62</sup> Moreover, in the Zionist leaders’ minds, such manifestations of antisemitism continued through the Soviet policy in the Near East and its support to Arab countries whose leaders – beginning with Nasser – were often described as Hitler’s followers. The denunciation of antisemitism behind the Iron Curtain was constant but reached several peaks in intensity in relation to events such as the Prague Trial in 1952; the “Doctors’ Plot” in 1953; the revelation of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee’s liquidation in 1956; the publication in 1964 of an antisemitic brochure in Kiev under the auspices of the Ukrainian Science Academy; and the Six-Day War in 1967. In 1956, for example, Perets Guterman, a local Bundist leader, evoked “the Stalinist murderer of Jewish writers and of Jewish Culture” during a ceremony in memory of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.<sup>63</sup> But in the year in question, exceptionally in the context of de-Stalinization, the Communist commemoration dedicated to the same event yielded the floor to a Leftist Zionist speaker who said: “The recent news of Jewish writers’ liquidation in the Soviet Union has left us in a state of astonishment and mourning. We would like to be reassured regarding the possibility for Jewish culture in the future to freely develop and flourish in the USSR.”<sup>64</sup>

In response to the recurrent criticisms of the Soviet Union, Communist Jews used to explicitly defend the USSR by underlining what this country had done for the Jews, and they did so constantly from the second half of the 1940s until the end of the 1960s. For instance, during the first Communist commemoration dedicated to the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising in 1949, Albert Youdine affirmed: “the Jewish people knows and nobody could make us forget [. . .] that without Stalingrad we would not have been here today, that without Stalingrad we would not have had the State of Israel.”<sup>65</sup> Another strategy consisted of pointing out manifestations of antisemitism in the Western bloc, especially in the United States. In 1948, while giving a speech at a commemoration dedicated to the first shooting of Jewish hostages by the Germans in Paris in 1941, Yidl Korman, a speaker representing the first organization of former Jewish camp survivors under Communist leadership created after the war (soon to become the AADJF), declared: “Anti-Communism, anti-Sovietism

---

<sup>62</sup> CDJC, Claude Kelman’s files, MDIII-82, Mendel Mann, *La révolte héroïque du ghetto de Varsovie* (Paris: FSJF, 1962), unpaginated.

<sup>63</sup> “Der troyer un dermonung-ovnt tsum 13tn yortsayt fun varshever geto-oyfshtand,” *Undzer Shtime*, April 21, 1956, 2.

<sup>64</sup> “Après la ‘déstalinisation’, les milieux juifs d’extrême-gauche à Paris ‘bougent’ eux aussi,” *Journal des Communautés*, no. 149, May 11, 1956, 9.

<sup>65</sup> “Dos yidishe Pariz hot virdik baert di heldn fun varshever geto,” *Naye Prese*, April 19, 1949, 3.

always pair with Anti-Semitism, racism and bloody extermination of the Jews."<sup>66</sup> At the beginning of the 1950s, the case of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg was addressed by representatives of Jewish Communist organizations with the same argument. In September 1953, a few months after the Rosenbergs' execution, the president of the USJF declared during the commemorative ceremony in memory of all the victims of the Holocaust in the Bagneux cemetery: "How could we, us common people and leaders of mutual-aid societies [. . .] who do not forget the terrible years of Hitlerism, not recall the memory of the two new victims of modern Anti-Semitism, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, the proud democrats and peace fighters?"<sup>67</sup>

Jewish Communists sometimes also denounced other forms of racism, mostly when their protest allowed them to criticize the United States and its allies. In 1951, for example, a Jewish Communist activist and former prisoner of Auschwitz, Nahum Fansten, took part in a commemoration of the first massive arrest of Parisian foreign Jews and of their transfer to French internment camps. During his speech, he denounced "the racial condemnation of the negro Willie Mac Gee in the State of Mississippi," referring to the thirty-six-year-old black truck driver, who was arrested in 1945, accused of raping a white woman, condemned by an all-white jury in less than a day, and executed in 1951 following two additional trials.<sup>68</sup> The same year, in another commemoration, Alfred Grant, yet another Jewish Communist militant, targeted the United States by affirming that "those who armed the Nazi bandits tolerate anti-Semitism at home and yearn for racial discrimination."<sup>69</sup> For their part, while denouncing racism in general, Zionists and Bundists mostly focused, as previously said, on antisemitism, especially its manifestations beyond the Iron Curtain. Even the denunciation of acts of racial hatred or discourse was influenced on both sides by the Cold War.

---

66 "Ayndruksfule troyer-akademye tsum 7tn yortog fun di 48 dershosene orevnikes oyf Mon-Valeryen," *Naye Prese*, December 17, 1948, 2.

67 "Iber 15 000 parizer yidn baern dem ondenk fun di martirer un heldn," *Naye Prese*, September 14, 1953, 1.

68 "Le pèlerinage des Israélites à leur ancien camp d'internement de Pithiviers," *La République du Centre*, May 15, 1951, 3.

69 "15 toyznt yidn baern dem ondenk fun zeyere noente un fun ale kdyoyshim," *Naye Prese*, October 8, 1951, 3.

## Conclusion

From 1944 to the late 1960s, commemorations of the Holocaust were a ritual deeply rooted in a divided and politicized Parisian Jewish community in the context of the Cold War, especially among immigrants from Eastern Europe. While often sharing the same way of conducting and ritualizing ceremonies, a number of their groups turned the commemorative stage into a political resource – a space for consolidating partisan identities and for expressing ideological conflicts – thereby contributing to the politicization of memory in relation to polemical topics such as Soviet foreign policy in the Middle East and Israel, the conditions for Jewish life in the USSR and in its allied countries, the rearmament of West Germany, or more broadly the opposition between the Eastern and the Western blocs. A moment of mourning and remembrance, the commemoration could also serve as a platform for actors who made no distinction between their Jewish identity, ideological convictions, and their involvement in the bipolar confrontation. Therefore, in the years following liberation and at least until the end of the 1960s, commemorations were not only a means for the reconstruction of Jewish life, but also a space for expressing political belonging within a fragmented community.

In the following decades, the commemoration of the Holocaust remained a polemical matter in France. However, the subject of controversy and the actors involved gradually changed. While polemics of the early postwar period only concerned the Jews (with few exceptions) – their commitment or opposition to Communism and their involvement in transnational politics regarding the Cold War – the 1970s and 1980s saw a nationalization of the debate, with increasing denunciations of the attacks perpetrated by the Vichy regime against the Jews between 1940 and 1944.<sup>70</sup> A new generation of Jewish activists, represented by the outstanding figure of Serge Klarsfeld, began to claim public recognition of the Vichy crimes against the Jewish population in France. Commemoration became a useful tool for such multi-faceted public campaigns, which contributed to making the Holocaust more visible within the French public sphere. The climax was reached in Paris in July 1992, when part of the audience booed the French president François Mitterrand during the commemoration of the Vel' d'Hiv' roundup, demanding an official gesture of acknowledgment of France's responsibility in the Holocaust.<sup>71</sup>

At this point, the Soviet Union had ceased to exist only a few months earlier, marking the formal end of the Cold War. These two parallel events, even though

---

<sup>70</sup> Rouso, *Le syndrome de Vichy*, 155–194.

<sup>71</sup> Clifford, *Commemorating the Holocaust*, 108–140.

not comparable in scope, reveal the transformation of the political and memorial configuration in France regarding the commemoration of the Holocaust by the early 1990s. Having already lost its relevance for several years, the Cold War framework for Holocaust memory had now "officially" disappeared among Parisian Jews. For most of them, postwar quarrels between Zionists, Communists, and Bundists, and their impact on the memorialization of Jewish wartime experiences, had fallen into oblivion.

