YEHUDA C. GOODMAN
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
NISSIM MIZRACHI
Tel Aviv University

"The Holocaust does not belong to European Jews alone":

The differential use of memory techniques in Israeli high schools

A B S T R A C T

On the basis of participant-observations of classroom discussions in Jewish Israeli high schools during two memorial days, we examine how different ethnoclass groups within a presumably consensual national collectivity remember the nation. We found that teachers use different memory techniques with different groups of students and in relation to different historical memories, and we suggest that doing so variously repositions subgroups toward the public sphere. We argue that, to understand ethnoclass memory work and its differential appropriation and refraction along ethnoclass divides, scholars need to go beyond the contents of historical narratives and collective ceremonies to inquire into the plethora of memory techniques social actors use. [*ethnoclass, national memory, memory techniques, citizenship participation, hegemony, Israel, high school*]

A teacher delivers a lesson to a low-academic-track class in a Jewish Israeli high school during the morning of Holocaust Day, right before the school's public commemorative ceremony. The class, seated in the traditional frontal arrangement, is composed mainly of Mizrahim (from families whose countries of origin are in Arab lands) and lower-class students. Following Ministry of Education regulations, the teacher tries to focus his students on memories of the Holocaust: "As I was born in 1962," he says, "and grew up between the Six Day War [1967], the Yom Kippur War [1973], and Sheleg [shorthand for 'Peace for the Galilee,' the official Israeli name for the 1982 war in Lebanon], the Holocaust captured my imagination. The past experience of the Holocaust is related to our experience today, to our need to fight, because others want to destroy us. [. . .] I don't come from the same Diaspora as these people who went through the Holocaust, but I feel I'm very much connected to it" (Tekhnologit-track class, School A, April 29, 2003).[1]

In a nearby classroom filled with students enrolled in a high-status academic track—mainly Ashkenazim (whose families are of European origin) and middle- to upper-class students—the discussion takes place in a different format. Tables and chairs are arranged so that students sit facing each other rather than the teacher. The chalkboard is covered with newspaper clippings about the Holocaust collected by the students and their teacher. The lesson is conducted mainly by the students, and their discussion begins with a debate on the uniqueness of the day and whether Holocaust Day should be observed in combination with Remembrance Day, which is dedicated to commemorating Israel's military dead. Students tell personal stories about their recent visits to the death camps in Poland and repeat stories they have heard at home. One student tells her classmates about her grandfather, who ate paper to avoid starving while imprisoned in the camps. Another student talks about his grandfather, a painter who managed to survive by drawing maps for the Nazis.

The other students find the stories moving, and some cry (Ben-Tehumit-track class, School A, April 29, 2003).

State-sponsored collective memory work during Israeli memorial days, including the work done in high school settings, is aimed at incorporating citizens into the collective national narrative (Handelman and Katz 1998). Still, because the Jewish Israeli academic tracking system reproduces ethnic divisions between Mizrahim and Ashkenazim that are highly correlated with socioeconomic status (Ayalon and Shavit 2004; Swirski 1990),[2] we ask how Jewish ethnoclass subgroups in the Israeli nation-state remember, when they all presumably share a hegemonic national ethos. The issue of memory work is especially intriguing in the Jewish Israeli context because, in contrast to other countries (e.g., the United States; see O'Connor 1999), in Israel race and ethnic (and, to some extent, class) differences are obscured, downplayed, or even squelched in schools (and in society at large). For example, students who are marginalized along ethnic, race, or social-class lines do not fully acknowledge their disadvantaged position in the structure of opportunities described by sociologists.[3] Furthermore, although collective memory in Israeli schools is refracted along the divide between Jews (Ben-Amos and Bet-El 1999) and Arabs (Al-Haj 1995), and although Israeli–Palestinian national memory has been deeply debated among sociologists and historians in recent years (Ram 2003), Jewish students and teachers do not experience collective memory as a contested terrain of alternative narratives and typically assume that there are no differences among themselves.[4] This widespread assumption creates a public secret around ethnoclass memory work, the existence of which forms the social conundrum we examine in this article.

Ethnoclass complexities and memory techniques

National memory and ethnoclass

National memories are contradictory and contested perspectives on the past (Wertsch 2002:24). Social groups do more than "organize" national memories to fit their present concerns (Halbwachs 1980); they shape them in light of political struggles (Gillis 1994), ideological and moral debates (Irwin-Zarecka 1994), and power relations (Schudson 1995). Social, racial, ethnic, and political disagreement (Devine-Wright 2003:14–17) over collective memory may be overt, with each social group openly debating national memory (e.g., Barton and McCully 2003) or with one group attempting to undermine that memory (e.g., Ahonen 1992; Wanner 1998:94–108, 141–169). But conflict over collective memory may well be more covert and devious. On the basis of insights into postcolonial societies (e.g., Bhabha 1994, 1998), anthropologists appropriated Antonio Gramsci's notion of "hegemony" to examine the complexities of a presumable

memory consensus and showed how subaltern accounts, in the face of a dominant version, are expressed through dual meanings, circuitous routes, hidden tracks, and memory traces (Cole 2001; Smith 2004; Swedenburg 2003).

Continuing this line of inquiry, we ask the pragmatic question of how disparate ethnoclass groups come to remember the nation differently in instances of covert social conflicts. How are social divisions explicated through memory work when their overt expression is limited or obscured, that is, when relations between groups are not openly conflictual but, rather, take the form of social centrality versus peripherality? What happens when diverse groups do not necessarily adhere to different national narratives (Wertsch and O'Connor 1994) but actually share a dominant narrative? In such cases, common notions of a pluralistic public space—such as "contestation" and "agency"—which are used to account for clear-cut struggles over national memory, appear unfit to capture the intricacies of memory work, especially given socially blurred, downplayed, and even suppressed and denied group differences. In the midst of what seems to be national solidarity and agreement, differences are worked out in much more subtle ways, in particular, through the differential use of "innocent" memory practices.

The pragmatics of collective memory: Memory techniques

Further insights into how different ethnoclass groups remember may be achieved, we argue, by adopting a specifically social-practice perspective. We join recent anthropological approaches that have challenged monolithic and deterministic understandings of national memory by offering a "bottom-up" direction of inquiry.[5] Consistent with the growing interest in practice theory in anthropology (Holland et al. 1998:19–46), psychological anthropology (Desjarlais and O'Nell 2000), and sociology (Schatzki et al. 2001; particularly in repertoire theory—see, e.g., Mizrachi et al. 2007; Swilder 2003), these approaches emphasize personal experience of collective memory and aim at analyzing the mediating space between shared histories and subjectivities (White 2001). Continuing anthropological research into nondiscursive and nonideational mediations of memory (e.g., Basso 1996; Battaglia 1992; Bloch 1998; Connerton 1989; Stoller 1995), we try to further develop the concept of "memory techniques." We attempt to broaden and deepen the study of the differential ways in which ethnoclass subgroups remember the nation by examining the social situations in which memories are articulated, by exploring the diverse practices through which collective memory is worked out, and by inquiring into how the same group remembers selected national memories differently. By *techniques,* we mean sets of practices through which individuals and groups are conceived, shaped, acted on, and allowed to act. The notion of "techniques" or "technologies" in relation to human capacities, experiences, and

subjectivities is derived from Michel Foucault's (1994) understanding of modern power as a form of practical reason, conceptualized as "governmentality."[6] Following Rose (1996:33), we aim to "map the topography" of memory techniques by going beyond historical narrative to uncover other technical forms.[7] We suggest incorporating within the concept "memory work" nondiscursive actions, embodied memories (emotional gestures, spatial and temporal organization of participants, and forms of engagement and disengagement by individuals), group interactions (forms of conversation, types of group discussions, and physical configuration of relations between participants), and enactments (e.g., dramatic simulations of past events).

Contrary to Rose's (1996, 1999) emphasis on the government of individuals and populations, however, we attend to the ways that the use of memory techniques plays a role in regulating relations between groups within a local social field,[8] re-creating and rearticulating specific social differences. We are interested, then, not in examining how memory practices govern individuals or populations in the abstract but in how group differences are inscribed and worked out in a specific field through the differential use of such practices. Thus, we examine how the differentiated usage of memory techniques is tied to Jewish Israeli national cultural politics, to the nation's unique ethnoclass patterns and to its socially obscured or downplayed conflicts, and to the diversity of national memories discussed. Furthermore, in line with our pragmatic emphasis, we analyze memory work of actors and, so, follow teachers and students not as passive carriers and mediators of the state (and Ministry of Education regulations)—or of "resistance"—but, rather, as active negotiators of collective memory. We do not assume, then, that all subjects within this social field are governed by common disciplinary techniques. Rather, we compare (and, thus, problematize) the use of memory techniques by specific social groups and actors. Last, we also examine variations within groups by attending to the differential use of memory techniques within the same group in relation to different memories.

Obscured contestations, memorial days, and remembering in Jewish Israeli schools

Our case study is based on an ethnographic exploration of the preparations made by Jewish Israeli high school classes prior to the ceremonies held on two annual memorial days. We explored the implications of discussions held in academic tracks differentiated by students' ethnic and socioeconomic status. These classroom discussions provide a fertile context for the study of the work of national memory in the face of ethnoclass complexities for four main reasons: First, Israel is a modern nation-state that espouses internal solidarity, yet its Jewish population is characterized by acknowledged and less-acknowledged conflicts on multiple

axes between various social subgroups (ethnoclass is one major axis of conflict). Second, schools reproduce sociocultural divisions. The Israeli school system reproduces ethnoclass divides, in particular, through its academic tracking, thus creating separate social spaces within which the memory work of each group takes place. Third, studying memory practices in relation to two different memorial days—Holocaust Day and Remembrance Day—allows us to explore how the contents of collective memory affect the choice of memory techniques and their implicated citizenship modes. Fourth, these classroom discussions allow us to examine memory complexities as worked out behind the scenes and apart from well-studied—and hegemonic—narratives and ceremonies.

As we noted above, Jewish Israeli society is divided along ethnic lines that create, among other divisions, two major groups: Ashkenazim (Jewish Israelis of European and North American origin who constitute the hegemonic group) and Mizrahim (Jewish Israelis of Muslim–Arab Middle Eastern and North African countries of origin).[9] Unlike the more open national contestations between Jews and Palestinians (or Arabs) in Israel,[10] the expression of inner Jewish social divisions—although apparent in many different aspects of Israeli society (e.g., Domínguez 1989:96–123; Hever et al. 2002)—is obscured, downplayed, and at times even censored, especially in schools.[11] This Jewish ethnic configuration reflects on questions of national memory, as well. However, the dominant Jewish Ashkenazi national narrative is worked out presumably as an accepted hegemonic narrative, in isolation from any overt ethnic conflict or opposing collective memories. Thus, although critical academic accounts of a Mizrahi alternative do exist—that point out the discrepancies between the Mizrahi Middle Eastern experience and the Zionist, Ashkenazi European national project (Shenhav 2002; Shohat 1988)—they are not part of Israel's "history wars" (Linenthal and Engelhardt 1996), nor are they widely accepted, certainly not in high school settings (Al-Haj 2005). Israeli schools serve, then, as a good setting for the study of ethnic memory complexities within the majority group of the modern nation-state.

More broadly, the education system—at least in Western countries—is a productive setting for the exploration of memory work in the context of social divisions because it reproduces those divisions while serving as a site for their negotiation. Teachers are key actors in the reproduction of the social order, acting as (creative) agents of the state. Various means, official and unofficial alike, such as the curriculum and extracurricular activities, school tracking, and school culture take part in this complex process of social reproduction and negotiation (cf. Apple 1983; Bourdieu and Passerson 1990; Bowles and Gintis 1976; Giroux 1983; Willis 1977).

In the Israeli education system, ethnic and socioeconomic divisions are reproduced especially through

academic tracking procedures. Sociologists showed that, although meritocratic discourse dominates the system, Jewish ethnicity (Mizrahim vs. Ashkenazim)—and its associated socioeconomic status—continues to be highly correlated with academic records (e.g., Ayalon and Shavit 2004). In terms of academic tracking, whereas Mizrahim are overrepresented in vocational and other nonacademic programs, Ashkenazim are enrolled primarily in prestigious academic programs (Cohen and Haberfeld 1998; Shavit 1984). This academic inequality, rooted in historical and ideological formulations, is embodied in institutional and discursive practices (Mizrachi 2004; Swirski 1990; Yonah and Saporta 2002). In the schools we examined, we found that social class parts way with ethnicity in the academic tracking system only in the case of Mizrahi students, so that Ashkenazi students are concentrated in the high-level tracks, but Mizrahim are divided: A relatively small number, mostly from the middle to upper class, are found in prestigious tracks, some are found in intermediate tracks, and others, mostly from the lower social class, are found in the low-level tracks.

How do actors in the field perceive these inequalities? Studies of the U.S. education system demonstrate that students who are marginalized along race or social class are aware that they are disadvantaged in the status-attainment process; they are, therefore, less willing to accommodate to school norms and expectations (O'Connor 1999:137). By contrast, our Israeli data suggest that, despite processes of marginalization along class and ethnic lines, as analyzed by sociologists, students of all ethnoclass backgrounds and academic tracks disregard and even deny the role of ethnicity and, to a lesser extent, class in shaping their position in the structure of opportunity. The correlation of ethnic and socioeconomic divisions in Israeli high schools, together with the social denial or the downplaying of this trend, creates a public secret around ethnoclass. As noted above, this social enigma promotes our efforts to understand how social divides are played out through memory work in the classrooms during memorial days.

In addition, our case study allows us to follow the differential use of memory techniques, as we examine classroom discussions during two major Israeli official memorial days—Holocaust Day and Remembrance Day. Both are grounded in Israeli law and in Ministry of Education regulations. The Holocaust plays a constitutive role in the grand narrative of the birth of the State of Israel (established in 1948). Having taken place a few years before the state's establishment, the Holocaust is constructed as part of Israel's legitimating ethos (e.g., Weitz 1995). Holocaust Day commemorates those people, especially Jews, who died under the Nazi regime. Its observance begins in the evening with a ceremony at Yad VaShem, the Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem, attended by state officials and by survivors and victims' families. The following day is dedicated to a variety of ceremonies honoring the victims; at one point a statewide, minute-long

siren sounds and Israelis observe a moment of silence. Remembrance Day is devoted to the memory of those who gave their lives for the country's independence and continued existence: the fallen in Israel's wars and victims of terror attacks. It is celebrated one week after Holocaust Day and one day before Israel's Independence Day (Handelman and Katz 1998). On its eve, an official national ceremony is held at the Western Wall in Jerusalem. The following morning, numerous national memorial services are held. A siren sounds on the evening before and during the memorial day, signaling citizens to stand still for a moment of silence.

These two memorial days celebrate two phenomenologically different collective memories. Holocaust Day expresses what may be called "long-term national memory." Because most Israelis were not immediate participants in the events relating to it, teachers face the challenge of how to represent the Holocaust. This memory has an ethnic dimension, as well. The Holocaust is part of the history of European Jews, the Ashkenazi group, and is largely peripheral to the historical experiences of Mizrahim (except for Jews who lived in Libya). For Ashkenazi students, the Holocaust memories are tied to the suffering of their families; for Mizrahi students, the Holocaust memory is part of the constructed experience of the state and of the Jewish people, but it is detached from their family experiences. Remembrance Day expresses a different layer of national memory, of poststate experiences, grounded in what may be called "short-term national memory." The commemoration of the fallen Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) soldiers (and of terror victims) has become, throughout the years, close to all participants, students and teachers, Ashkenazim and Mizrahim, those of high and low socioeconomic status alike.[12] In this context, the subjective memories of both ethnoclass groups are presumably congruent with the collective national memory. By following both memorial days, we were able to explore how the memory techniques used were shaped not only in light of the divide between the hegemonic Ashkenazi Zionist project and a repressed, silenced, or denied Mizrahi experience but also against the complexity of each group's identification with the state, especially in the case of Mizrahim and those in the lower class.

Finally, our case enables us to explore a neglected, behind-the-scenes, and little-exposed memory site. Most studies of Israeli memorial days have explored national memory work in the classical anthropological site—the ritualized public event (cf. Rosaldo 1989:12)—and argue that such public events transfer and reconstitute the state's hegemonic (Jewish, Israeli, and Zionist) values (Azaryahu 1995; Ben-Amos and Bet-El 1999; Handelman and Katz 1998). According to this line of research, in official ritualistic events, ceremonial artifacts (the national flag, commemorative songs, and visual icons), body and emotional management, rules of speech, collective narratives, and spatial and temporal arrangements are all dictated by the state's

hegemonic narrative and are infused with its meanings. Recently, however, scholars have suggested that the evolving recognition of diversity in Jewish Israeli society and the slow deconstruction of the original masculine, heroic symbolization of the collective have opened a space for "local communities of mourners." Hence, some high schools now incorporate a new emphasis on individual loss into their Remembrance Day ceremonies and a new emphasis on feminine voices (Lomsky-Feder 2005).

Our study further problematizes the question of memory diversity by focusing on teacher–student discussions held prior to the ceremonies, thus enabling us to follow a different, albeit related social situation, characterized by the use of a set of memory techniques seldom at work in the public ceremonies. These preparatory discussions are an integral part of the celebration of both memorial days. The Ministry of Education guidelines for Holocaust Day observances explain that the people of Israel remember the six million Jews exterminated by the Nazis and their collaborators at the same time that they praise the heroic acts and rebellion initiated in the ghettos. Regarding Remembrance Day, the ministry instructs teachers to focus discussions on commemorating those who have fallen in Israel's battles and on the story of their bravery; the ministry also advises that teachers refer to "the problems of Zionism, Judaism, Israeli society, and current events." Thus, parting way with most studies of collective memories, which focus either on personal or on collective (and public) memory work, we study "backstage" (Goffman 1959), behind-the-scenes memory work (see Wertsch 2002:134–136). Exploring this social space enables us to capture fragmented and socially diverse memory work even when all the groups inhabiting that space presumably share the same national narrative and follow the official guidelines embodied, for instance, in the common commemoration celebrated in the school's ceremony. Further, we not only underscore backstage as distinct from frontstage but we also point to backstages, in the plural, that is, to the numerous separate spaces in which memory work takes place.

Our analysis is based on a multisite strategy (Marcus 1998). One high school (School A) served as our major research site during the 2002–03 school year. Students in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Tel Aviv University, were trained to serve as research assistants and were assigned to cover the main academic tracks in the schools. With their aid, we observed school ceremonies and activities in four academic tracks: two low-status tracks, Tekhnologit and Mabar; one intermediate-status track, Humanit; and one high-status academic program, Ben-Tehumit. In 2003–04, we visited two other high schools (Schools B and C) and observed two academic tracks in each, one low-status (we concentrate in this article especially on School B, the Etgar track) and one high-status.[13] Drawing on Anselm Strauss and Juliet M. Corbin's grounded theory (1990), we observed and

analyzed memory work as it unfolded in situ, involving all social actors, both teachers and students. We collected various types of data, mainly through participant-observation and detailed field notes of class discussions and school ceremonies, complemented by interviews with students and teachers and by a demographic questionnaire. In this article, we report mainly on the observations of classroom discussions. All translations from Hebrew are ours.

Because we had difficulties attending some classroom sessions in Schools B and C during the memorial days, we decided to use them mainly as complementary sites; we refer, then, primarily to classroom discussions in School A and in the Etgar track in School B. Because of internal school problems and other concerns, the Ministry of Education prohibited us from collecting demographic data in School A.[14] Still, Schools B and C did make it possible to collect systematic demographic data. All three schools are located in the same geographical area, have similar populations, and deploy relatively similar academic tracking systems, so we can infer that the ethnoclass tracking in School A is consistent with the statistical data collected in Schools B and C. This conclusion also fits firsthand impressions derived during participant-observation. Furthermore, because our demographic data closely resemble macrolevel demographic analyses of Israeli high schools, we can safely assume that ethnicity (Mizrahi vs. Ashkenazi) and, to some extent, class correlate with academic tracking in these schools. We found that students of low socioeconomic status (most of them Mizrahim) are overrepresented in lower-status academic tracks and that students of middle to high socioeconomic status (most of them Ashkenazim) are overrepresented in the higher-status tracks. Ethnicity generally goes hand in hand with class in this case, although, as noted above, a small number of Mizrahim of middle to high socioeconomic status have been tracked into higher-status academic programs.

Ethnoclass differences, national memories, and uses of memory techniques

We found systematic differences in the use of memory techniques along Jewish ethnic–socioeconomic divides and with respect to the distant and near past (commemorated by Holocaust and Remembrance Days, respectively). Social actors positioned differently (and separately) in the field rearticulated cultural diversity and stratification in terms of citizenship participation (i.e., repositioning toward the public sphere) through the differential use of memory techniques (see Table 1 for a summary).

Prestate memory: Fusing the personal with the collective versus experiencing the gap

In predominantly middle- to upper-class and Ashkenazi classes, memory techniques employed on Holocaust Day reflected the fusion of the personal with the national and

Table 1
Memory Techniques across Ethnoclass Divides and Memorial Days

		Ashkenazi, upper class	Mizrahi, lower class
Holocaust Day	Techniques	• Encoding the national ethos in artifacts, spatial arrangements and dress • Recounting Holocaust memories through personal stories • Discussing how to commemorate the national past	• Teaching the proper way to relate to national memory (lecture) • Turning memory into sets of facts or narratives • Mediating practices to bridge students' experiences and the national narrative (nationalizing, universalizing, individualizing, and moralizing Holocaust memory) • Translating the Holocaust into mundane experience (e.g., talking about the daily routine in a ghetto) • Role modeling the proper way to relate to the Holocaust • Emotion arousal and management • Exploring with students possible additional memory techniques
	Role of students	• Active (storytellers; responsible for the design of national memory)	• Passive (listeners; asked to identify with the hegemonic national ethos) • Active (questioning, hesitating, resisting)
	Role of teacher	• In the background, allowing students to manage the discussion	• Authoritative, mediating and bridging students' experiences and the national narrative
	Subject position of students	• Involved carriers of the national ethos	• Hesitant and at times detached from the national ethos
Remembrance Day	Techniques	• Discussing national identity boundaries and the proper way to commemorate the fallen	• Teaching the national memory through the narration of history (telling first- or secondhand stories) • Role modeling the proper way to relate to Remembrance Day • Teaching the moral imperatives of history
	Role of students	• Active (discussants; social gatekeepers)	• Passive (listeners; asked to express commitment and willingness to sacrifice) • Active (at times relating a narrative; deliberating, questioning)
	Role of teacher	• In the background	• Authoritative, at times challenging students' identifications and degree of commitment to the state
	Subject position of students	• Fully involved as active carriers of the national ethos	• Partially involved; at times encouraged to prove their loyalty to the national ethos

positioned students as active citizens. These techniques included the retelling of the Holocaust through personal stories, embodiment of the collective memory in dress and artifacts, spatial rearrangement of the classroom, reconfiguration of teacher–student relations, and student debate about the proper way to commemorate the victims. Such techniques reflected the involvement of the participants and their subject position as carriers of the national ethos.

The discussion in the high-status Ben-Tehumit academic track in School A (April 29, 2003), mentioned at the beginning of this article, serves as an example. Students wore white shirts, as requested by the school and the Ministry of Education, and two memorial candles were lit in accordance with Jewish Israeli tradition. As noted, tables and chairs were rearranged so that students sat facing each other rather than the teacher. The lesson was conducted mainly by the

students; their discussion began with a debate on the uniqueness of the day:

Student A: I would like to raise the question of whether Holocaust Day should be combined with Remembrance Day.
[The class perks up as a heated discussion develops.]

Student B: Absolutely not! Every type of victim has its own honor. We should not mix them all up.

Student C: Half the nation [the Jewish people] was killed [in the Holocaust]. This is important enough to have a separate day. The Holocaust should not be devalued.

Student D: Every traumatic event should have its own memorial day.

By discussing possibly merging the two events, students were positioned in the role of fully engaged citizens debating how national memory should be worked out. Spatial rearrangement of the classroom reflected the respect for nation-state discipline and artifacts but also highlighted the active role of the students, for the reorganization of space and the interactions between teacher and students deconstructed the regular authoritarian configuration.

Moreover, in the predominantly Ashkenazi and higher-socioeconomic-status classes, personal memory was conspicuously fused with national memory through the practice of oral history. Students told personal stories from their own recent visits to the death camps in Poland and, more important, stories they had heard in their homes.[15] A few weeks earlier, students had been asked to inquire whether any of their relatives would agree to talk to the class about their Holocaust experiences. Apparently, no one had agreed to come to the Ben-Tehumit class in School A. Instead, the students told stories they had heard from or about their grandparents who had been in the Holocaust. A few talked about their relatives who survived the Holocaust and about some who did not. The other students found the stories moving, and some cried. After the class discussion, they all assembled quietly at the school's official ceremony site.

The memory techniques used in this high status–academic track class—characteristic of other predominantly Ashkenazi, middle- to high-socioeconomic-status classes—positioned students as the nation's involved representatives. The regular hierarchical structure of the class was broken up, and the teacher allowed the students greater power to shape and manage the discussion. The spatial arrangement further served as a marker of students as active subjects. In addition, national memories were worked out in the first person. This fusion of the personal and the collective was also expressed by the seriousness of the discussion and was further manifested when students enacted the memories in their bodies and cried. We should also note the complexity of ethnoclass in this case. Although the class was dominated by

Ashkenazi students, it also included some Mizrahi students of middle to high socioeconomic status. At least one of the memory techniques used, oral history, limited the ability of Mizrahi students to take part in the discussion. Because their personal memories and perspectives were not directly connected to the Holocaust, the Mizrahim were silenced. As they did not receive a real opportunity to express their own experiences and memories, it was the Ashkenazi story that dominated the discussion. Still, Mizrahim participated in the lesson when the memory techniques used elicited debate and intellectual discussion of the collective's boundaries. Thus, the ethnoclass complex broke up into its separate components depending on the specific techniques used in this high status–academic track classroom.

A different configuration of the national Holocaust memory was enacted in the mainly Mizrahi, lower-class, and lower-status academic tracks—through the use of different memory techniques. In these classrooms, teachers seemed to struggle more profoundly with the problem of relevance—how to make the Holocaust meaningful to students whose families were not directly affected by it. Teachers activated a plethora of techniques, sometimes shifting between techniques within a single lesson. These included, among others, turning memory into sets of facts, telling or reading narratives (i.e., survivors' oral testimonies, testimonies of survivors recorded in a newspaper or a book, teachers' stories about their own or their relatives' experiences), emotion management, translating the Holocaust into mundane personal experiences by talking about the daily routine of living in a ghetto or a death camp or by role playing, role modeling the proper way to relate to the Holocaust, nationalizing the memory of the Holocaust (recontextualizing it within the Israeli–Arab or Jewish–Arab struggles) as well as moralizing it, and exploring with students the possible use of additional memory techniques. Although these techniques were aimed at closing experiential distances, they also reflected the assumed detachment of the participants—positioning them as passive subjects called to identify with the national ethos as a given.

In a few classrooms, teachers turned memory into objective knowledge. Keeping the regular frontal arrangement of the classroom, the (female) teacher in the Etgar-track class in School B (April 18, 2004) distributed worksheets with multiple-choice questions about the Holocaust: What did Mengele do? Who was the Warsaw rebellion's commander? Who was the highest Nazi official brought to trial in Israel and then executed? Which mark of disgrace were the Jews forced to wear? What was the Krystalnacht in 1938? Who were the Judenrat? In which country did the Nazis first establish ghettos? How did Hitler come to power? In a similar vein, the blackboard in the Tekhnologit-track class in School A (April 29, 2003) was filled with diagrams and notes as the (male) teacher lectured to students, creating an atmosphere of discipline and transmitting a clear-cut message in an

authoritarian tone. These practices transformed the national memory into a standard subject, like math, or science, or yet another history class, to be consumed as a given.

In other classes, teachers narrated memories for their students. For example, in the Mabar-track class in School A (April 29, 2003), the teacher told her own family story. Her grandmother on her mother's side was a Holocaust survivor, she said. Holocaust Day and Holocaust memory were neither distant nor alien for her. On the contrary, the Holocaust was part of her daily reality. She described how her grandmother had slowly lost her family—father, mother, and younger brother—and how she eventually had run away and found refuge in a Polish home, where she survived. The students were attracted to the heartbreaking story and were especially affected when the teacher started crying and continued her story in tears. After calming down, she described how her grandmother had continued to live by herself and struggled to survive under the burden of her childhood memories. The family tried to support her, said the teacher, and to help relieve her bad memories, but she had lost her sense of joy and had turned into a cold, frightened, and suspicious, even paranoid, person.

During and after the teacher's story, the students were very quiet. The teacher's use of a personal narrative as memory practice placed them in the role of witnesses; it held the potential of enabling them to narrow down the large picture into an experience they could more easily understand, relate to, and identify with. Teachers of Ashkenazi origin frequently used this memory technique when trying to mobilize their Mizrahi students' experiences. When the teacher in the Mabar class invited the students to tell personal stories of their own, though, there was silence; no one had a family member or an acquaintance who is a Holocaust survivor. Once again, this silence, a result of lack of memory or, more accurately, lack of a specific memory technique (narrative told in the first person), is significant in terms of how Mizrahi students participate in the work of national memory. Privileging the technique of first-person narrative is part of the differentiation in citizen membership we seek to illuminate.

Narrating the Holocaust has to do with emotion management, as relating personal stories may elicit various feelings among an audience. In the above example, the students seemed genuinely touched by the teacher's story as well as by her emotional rendering of it (although some seemed a bit bewildered). The use of emotion management as a memory technique was at times more explicit. The same teacher (Mabar-track class, School A, April 29, 2003) employed the following creative memory technique in an effort to align her students emotionally with the Holocaust. After telling her narrative and after trying to elicit similar stories from her students, she placed sheets of paper on the floor; on each sheet, she had written the names of various emotions (sadness, anger, hate, revenge, pity, and rage). She asked each student to select one term that expressed best his or her feelings and to explain the choice. Most students chose words related to revenge and anger. They explained that, although they had no personal connection to the Holocaust, they were angry about the Jews' fate.

Some teachers used role playing, inviting their students to act as Holocaust victims. In one class (Humanit track, School A, April 29, 2003), the teacher told her students, "Imagine you are at home when an SS officer steps suddenly in and orders you out, allowing you to take only one item with you. What will you take?" She then wrote on the board the various items the students said they would take. Other teachers offered themselves as role models for the students, exemplifying the proper way to relate to the Holocaust. For example, by telling the students that he had always felt a connection between the Israeli–Arab wars and the Holocaust, the teacher quoted at the outset of this article combined his personal experience of growing up in Israel and the collective message of the Holocaust. Clearly, he struggled with the same issue that bothered his students: being Mizrahi, an Israeli who was not a member of "the same Diaspora" as the people who suffered in the Holocaust.[16] This technique nationalizes the Holocaust: The teacher emphasized that he felt connected to the Holocaust because it relates to the recent national conflicts and history of the State of Israel. Role modeling and nationalizing the Holocaust offered students a way of combining their subjective experiences with the collective memory by fusing the distant Holocaust memory with the ongoing national struggle between Israel and the Arabs. As the teacher constructed an analogy between the Holocaust and current circumstances, in which the Arabs were treated as equivalent to the Nazis, he effectively transformed the remote memory of the Holocaust into the national near past and into the state's (and students') current memories. The technique was so successful that one student, from a Mizrahi family, confused Holocaust Day with Remembrance Day. Apparently, the near past (the memory of the fallen IDF soldiers) was much more real for him.

The nationalizing technique, connecting the Holocaust with Zionism and the state, was often used in these classrooms. At times (e.g., Mabar track, School A, April 29, 2003), its use was suggested not by the teacher but by students (and in harsh tones). Thus, in response to the teacher's question about the "meaning of the Holocaust," one student stated that the Nazis were like the Arabs: carrying out terrorist attacks against Jews. A heated debate erupted about the relationships between Jews and Arabs. As is heard in Israeli streets right after terrorist attacks, some students yelled, "Death to the Arabs!"; others shouted another commonly heard phrase: "A good Arab is a dead Arab!" The teacher calmed the students down; this outburst meant straying from her lesson's original aim.

Alongside the use of nationalization, teachers also tried to transcend the "Ashkenazi" and "Jewish" Holocaust experience and transform it into a global experience by using moralization—turning the Holocaust into a morality tale. In the Tekhnologit-track class (School A, April 29, 2003), toward the end of the lesson, the teacher initiated the following dialogue:

Teacher: Here is something [to be learned] beyond the Nazi ideology. The Holocaust of the European Jewry is not only in their murder but in the system, in the idea of erasing Jewish culture. It is important to me that when you leave this classroom, you do so with one understanding: The Holocaust does not belong to the Ashkenazim [European Jews] alone, or to the Jews alone. It is a world Holocaust. I am going to tell you harsh things. . . . You should know that the U.S. refused to help the Jews escape, economically or otherwise. The U.S., which is a true ally of Israel. [. . .] What is a crematorium? Is this a new word for you? It is an incinerator. The Germans, damn them, burned the bodies because they were so tidy and did not want to leave tracks. The Americans did not want to participate in bombing the Auschwitz crematories, the same goes with the British. They knew there was genocide, but they did nothing about it.

Student N: They wanted first to take care of their own matters. They could not interfere.

Teacher: I want you to be realistic. The Holocaust is about taking a people and trying to remove it from history. From the Nazis' point of view there were three cultures: a culture that builds, a culture that destroys, and a neutral culture that just passes on its traditions.

Student O: The Germans were only good in music; all the scientists were Jews.

Teacher: We can say that this is a very special day, a day in which we celebrate as a people a powerful memory that is about an event that almost succeeded in destroying Jewish culture and physically destroying its people. [. . .] In every person there is a little maniac: an evil person. [Evil is] every place where there's lack of tolerance, encouragement to hurt the other, just because he's different. Evil, just like in the Holocaust, is inside people—what hides it is the wrapper of culture. Always remember to be careful in what you do. Never act in blind obedience.

In this instance, the teacher first relocated the specifically Ashkenazi experience into the global: "The Holocaust does not belong to the Ashkenazim alone, or to the Jews alone. It is a world Holocaust."[17] Thereafter, he individualized it by turning it into a morality tale about the cruelty in every human being.[18]

Some teachers discussed memory techniques explicitly with their students. A teacher asked her students, "How can we preserve the memory of the Holocaust, as it dies out over the years and with the new generations?" (Etgar track, School B, April 18, 2004). Students suggested various techniques, especially physical and productive activities: more movies to commemorate stories of survivors (i.e., new representations), more visits to commemorative sites like the Yad VaShem museum, as many student visits as possible to the concentration camps in Poland. Only if people see with their own eyes the places where events occurred and what has been left, said a student, will the Holocaust and its consequences be engraved in their memories. (We should reiterate here that pilgrimages to the Holocaust death sites are expensive, and many students cannot afford the trips.) These deliberations and suggestions indicate that the students accepted the need to celebrate memory without questioning. The problem for them was how to remember, not whether one should remember or what is to be remembered.

Running through the various memory techniques used in classes of mainly Mizrahi lower-class students is the problem of identification with the Holocaust. In these classes, a gap between the national collective memory and the students' experiences is re-created. The lack of personal ties to the trauma is a challenge for students and teachers alike: How are students to relate to, let alone identify with, the collective memory? Various memory techniques were used, but, because they positioned students in the passive role of consumers of the national memory, they also reenacted their possible detachment and disengagement. At times, students reacted with talking, noise, and jokes, thus distancing themselves still further from the suggested memory. In these behaviors, they did not put forward an alternative narrative of the national past. Their defiance should probably be read as a marker and constant reminder of the gap teachers tried to bridge with only partial success.

In sum, the preparatory discussions on Holocaust Day exemplified systematic differential use of memory techniques along the schools' ethnoclass divide, thus articulating anew Ashkenazi, middle- to upper-class versus Mizrahi, lower-class social identities and power relations. Memory work placed Ashkenazim middle- to upper-class students in the position of active carriers of the national memory, with their subjective memories (voiced in their own words) fueling the national grand narrative. By contrast, Mizrahim lower-class students were placed in the ambivalent position of passive citizens invited to listen to others' experiences or adapt to a national grand narrative, variously transformed (e.g., nationalizing, individualizing, and moralizing it) in efforts to bridge an experiential gap. They were thus

caught up in the dynamics of belonging to and being at least partially alienated from the state. They were included in the national memory (and the dominant narrative), but their mode of membership was constantly problematized through teachers' creative use of multiple memory techniques. Thus, teachers' efforts, ostensibly aimed at drawing them in, actually implied their marginality.

Poststate memory: Discussing collective boundaries versus deliberating forms of identification

To further inquire into the dynamics of these ethnoclass complexities, we examined the use of memory techniques in relation to poststate memory. In contrast to that surrounding Holocaust Day, the memory work regarding fallen IDF soldiers and terror victims, especially during Remembrance Day, is inseparable from the life experiences of all Jewish Israeli students (excluding, at times, the ultraorthodox or new immigrants). But we found differential use of memory techniques along the ethnoclass divide in this case, as well. Whereas Askenazim and middle- to upper-class students were positioned as involved carriers of the national grand narrative, Mizrahim and lower-class students were positioned in the role of citizens deliberating on their form of identification with the state and at times examining their degree of commitment to the nation's ethos.

A memory technique central to Remembrance Day in high-status academic tracks was discussion of the nature of the day and its appropriate scope. This technique positioned students as active citizens debating national issues, particularly the nation's boundaries. Such a discussion was held in a Ben-Tehumit class in School A on May 5, 2003. The classroom was rearranged so that students sat facing each other. In a variation on a detailed activity created by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Society Administration (1988), at the beginning of the lesson, students placed notes on the board with maxims and quotations prepared in advance with their teacher. Each note reflected a different moral standpoint toward the national memory, taken from a Zionist or Israeli politician, ideologist, or writer. For example: "He was walking about and kept asking 'Who am I?' . . . because he had lost his memory with 'Them' " (quoted from *See Under: Love,* a novel by the Israeli writer David Grossman); "People who don't respect their past live in a shallow present and risk their future" (attributed to Igal Alon, Israel's former foreign minister); "We freed our thought from the burden of Jewish history, and tried to crystallize the Hebrew consciousness" (quoted from *A Manifest to the Hebrew Youth* by Yonatan Ratosh, an ideologist of the Canaanites movement); "We do not have history. From the day we exiled from our country we are a people without history . . . I want to declare . . . that I oppose Jewish history. What is there in it? Decrees, libels, persecutions and martydom" (quoted from *The Sermon,* a novel by the Israeli writer Haim Hazaz). Students were asked

to explain whether, and why, they agreed or disagreed with the quotations and statements.

Reading these citations and discussing matters in an intellectual mode thus marked the students as carriers of prestigious cultural capital. Moreover, as students debated issues of history and memory, their own identity and identification with the "imagined community" were not challenged but were taken for granted. The theoretical discussion reflected the students' sense of confidence in their central location within the national community. This confidence was reflected in the absence—during large parts of this lesson—of any reference to actual wars, battles, or dead soldiers whose memory was to be honored on Remembrance Day. The students were assumed to be familiar with the nation's history and the day's significance. Later on, the students debated the proper way to commemorate the victims, most of whom were civilians (including Israeli Arabs), who had died in terrorist attacks. Doing so further positioned these students as citizens who pondered the collective's correct boundaries and as carriers of the national ethos.

Teacher:	On Remembrance Day we remember those who were killed in wars and those killed in terrorist attacks. Is there a difference between them, in your opinion? (Students talk together.)
Student S:	Those who went into the army knew it could happen to them. Those who died in a terrorist attack did not [. . .]
Teacher:	Please explain to me the difference between soldiers who die on the battlefield and civilians who die in terror attacks. [. . .]
Student G:	The latter did not sacrifice themselves. They were sacrificed. [. . .]
Student H:	It hurts me more when a soldier dies, than [when someone is killed] in a terrorist attack.
Student I:	(furious) No!
Teacher:	Let her [talk]. Why?
Student H:	Because this [the soldier] is a child of 20.
Student I:	It's not a matter of age. The fact that a child of 19, 20, 21 is out there, going to kill [people], this is what is absolutely incomprehensible. [. . .]
Student H:	And what if that victim [killed in a terror attack] did not even intend to fulfill his obligation in the army. So it's not appropriate to remember him on the same day that we remember a soldier, a child of 20 who fought in the army for the state. It's proper actually to remember every soldier who fought, even if he was hurt in a training accident. [. . .] (Students disagree.)
Student H:	Not true. It's better to separate. [. . .]

Student S: The value of a human being is the same, but the ways to remember are different. I also think that the memorial days should be kept separate. [. . .]

Student J: If you see a person is going to die, won't you save him?

Student K: If he is a fucking [*sic*] Arab, I won't save him, never.

In this classroom, students were not concerned with feelings of sorrow or mourning; instead, as guided by their teacher, they played the role of gatekeepers of national memory, debating issues of inclusion and exclusion and charting the nation's boundaries. Whereas for some, Remembrance Day was an opportunity to blur social distinctions and to remember everyone (soldiers and civilians, Jews and Arabs), for others, it was an opportunity to mark the specifically preferred status of soldiers or of Jews in Israeli society. Students thus translated collective memory into moral dilemmas, which they discussed as conscientious citizens actively participating in the imagined public sphere. The memory techniques teachers and students used expressed their superior position within Israeli society—they were entitled to symbolically shape the Israeli public sphere together with its inner and outer boundaries.

By contrast, the memory techniques used in Mizrahi and lower-class classes positioned students as only partially involved, in particular, focusing on their form of identification with the national ethos. These techniques included the narration of history (telling first- or secondhand stories), providing students with role models and teaching the moral imperatives of Israeli history, and carefully looking into, and at times challenging, the students' identification with and membership in the collective. For instance, in many classes, teachers shared stories of historical battles or wars with students. Some (mostly male teachers) related their personal experience in the army; others told stories of heroic figures, offered as role models for students to identify with. One (Mizrahi) teacher told the students about his experiences as an officer in the army as well as the story of a former high-ranking IDF officer and hero of the 1973 war, also of Mizrahi origin:

> I promised you yesterday that unlike our regular classes, today I would tell you about a battle of your choice; a battle that will explain why was it is so important to bring life to a stop for one minute and remember. "What for [why do we stop and remember]?" I'm going to tell you the story of a man who received one of the highest military decorations, the Medal of Valor, a person who was later a minister in the Israeli government, Avigdor Kahalani. I don't know if you ever heard of him; a short, amiable Yemenite guy. [Tekhnologit-track class, School A, May 5, 2003]

The teacher went on to tell the story of the Vale of Tears (Emek HaBakha), on Israel's northern border, where the Israeli and Syrian armies clashed in the 1973 war. The battle mainly involved heavy armor. The Israeli forces, he recalled, although greatly outnumbered, managed to repulse the sudden massive attack of Syrian tanks threatening to rush into Israel.

In other classes, teachers focused on the experiences of victims of terrorist attacks, who were recently added to Remembrance Day's commemorations. In School B, the teacher in the Etgar classroom showed students a list of victims of the Intifadas (the two Palestinian uprisings) and pictures of their faces, "most of them civilians," she added (April 26, 2004). The class listened quietly. Students then responded with various cries of emotion: "Oh, my God, this is terrible," "Oy vey" (an interjection of grief, pain, or horror; a Yiddish phrase commonly used in Hebrew Israeli slang), "Everyone is a world unto himself." Afterward, the teacher read a long story aloud from *Yediot Ahronot,* Israel's most widely circulated daily newspaper, about 11-year-old Oren Almog, who was badly wounded and lost his left eye (and his sight) in a suicidal attack carried out in the Maksim Restaurant in Haifa by Hanady Jaradat, a Palestinian woman lawyer from Jenin. Oren's father, older brother, grandmother, grandfather, and cousin lost their lives in that attack. The teacher picked up the newspaper and showed the class a full-page picture of a boy, with a freckled white face and gray-blue eyes (Shir 2004: 5). "This boy is called Oren, Oren Almog," she said, "he was a regular child . . . what we call a normal child; he was a happy boy. He had a father and a mother. Until one Saturday they decided to go to eat at Maksim Restaurant in Haifa, and everything ended for him." She read:

> [The blinded] Oren Almog wants to see his mom. He does not remember her facial contours. I remind him that his mother has beautiful blue eyes and Oren smiles. He feels her palms all the time, because she sits next to him day and night. He hears her voice as well, when she begs that he opens his mouth for another small spoon of the light oily soup he must eat as part of the strict diet prescribed following the serious injury to his pancreas. [Shir 2004: 4]

The teacher read with passion, adding her own interpretations and emphases: "Think of this child, how he has suddenly turned blind; how hard it is." After reading that the boy had lost 10 kilos, she added, "And I must tell you, this is a boy of 11, how much can he weigh, after all?" The students listened attentively and quietly. One student's face became contorted with pain. The teacher gazed about the room, looking at each student. She continued reading, "Until that cursed Saturday, October 4, 2003, they were a regular family: Mother, father, two boys, and a daughter. A well-groomed house in Haifa's Vardia neighborhood" (Shir 2004: 4, 6). The teacher showed the mother's picture. A student said,

"Beautiful." The teacher read that the mother never imagined she or her family could be harmed by terrorists: "I never asked him [Moshik, her husband] if he was afraid. I also wasn't afraid because no one thinks it will happen to him. Certainly not in Haifa; an exemplar of co-existence between [Jewish] Israelis and Arabs. I don't know if those who plan these terrorist attacks know that the Middle-Eastern restaurants are owned by..." (Shir 2004: 6). The students completed the sentence for her: "Arabs."

The use of stories as a memory technique involves efforts to elicit identification with the protagonists. But oftentimes, students in dominantly Mizrahi and lower-class classrooms had trouble identifying with the protagonist and were, in fact, challenged by the "foreignness" of the shared memory. Although all students shared the terrifying experiences of the Palestinian attacks, in this case, the specific victim the teacher chose to highlight was quite remote from them in ethnic and socioeconomic terms. The story was about a boy with a white face and gray-blue eyes, a contrast to the darker skin of many Mizrahi students in the classroom.[19] Moreover, the Almog family's high standard of living—the newspaper article alluded to their computers, the father's return from a conference in the United States, trips abroad every summer with the children, Jeep trips in Israel, gym membership, and scuba diving—was in deep contrast to the experiences of these students, most of whom belonged to the lower socioeconomic classes. Strikingly, the students found it hard to identify specifically with Oren's and his mother's emotional stance in the face of their trauma and loss: According to the article, the mother claimed to have no wish for revenge (Shir 2004: 7), which the students found quite amazing. Furthermore, Oren expressed no belief in God:

Smadar Shir: Did you ask yourself why it happened to you?
Oren: Yes, I did but I don't have replies. If there's God, so why has He not helped me? And if He cannot help me, why should I believe in Him? [...]
Smadar: Can you imagine that there's a miracle and the dead come back?
Oren: I hope that there will be some miracle, sometimes I dream about it, but the olive miracle was during Hanukkah [the festival of lights celebrated by all Jewish Israelis], and since then many, many years have passed by. [Shir 2004: 8]

One student reacted to these statements by saying, "Suffers from some complexes, this kid." The teacher asked, "Why?" and the student responded, "Because. Because he says he does not believe [in God]." A heated discussion erupted, as some students argued that Oren was just a child, 11 years old, and others argued that he had "complexes." A subtle dynamic of identification and difference began to develop.

On the one hand, the students (members of the national Jewish community) identified with the personal story the teacher had chosen to read for them. They expressed emotional involvement (apparent in their facial expressions and occasional sobbing). On the other hand, the story was about an "ideal" Israeli family, of high status, far removed from their world. The differences did not appear immediately but emerged in the guise of disparate emotional stances toward the Arabs–Jews divide. Inner-Jewish ethnoclass divisions are often articulated in Israel in national–political (Left–Right) terms—and in relation to religious–secular beliefs. Especially to some Mizrahi students with a religious upbringing,[20] the boy's feelings sounded alien and untenable. How could a boy who survived the attack—the boy the students were supposed to identify with—not believe in God?

Some teachers challenged the students' ways of belonging to the collective with still other memory techniques. In particular, teachers questioned their students' willingness to follow the hegemonic ethos in Israeli society, according to which each generation must "pay its debt" by sacrificing for the collective. By challenging their students in this way, teachers thus strengthened the hegemonic moral imperative of Israel's history. In the Mabar-track class in School A (May 5, 2003), the teacher raised the issue of sacrifice through two stories, one of a father who lost his son in the Yom Kippur War (1973), the other about a soldier who had lost his friend in battle. After the presentation, the teacher asked the students about their aspirations for military service. This aroused the students perhaps even more than the teacher had planned. Many said they were interested in serving in combat units. When the teacher asked whether they were afraid to die while in the service, one student replied, "It's all from God; If He wants us to die, we'll die, that's it."

As a memory technique, deliberating about identification and commitment is tricky, for students sometimes refused to align themselves with the hegemonic ethos. Take, for example, the following discussion, which took place in the Tekhnologit-track class in School A (May 5, 2003):

Teacher: What is Remembrance Day, really?
Student A: It's about all the wars that took place ...
Teacher: When we look at the state for over 55 years [we note that] its birth was in war and from that moment on it was in war. There have been more than 21,000 killed, casualties. What does Remembrance Day mean for you, Danny?
Danny: Don't ask me.
Teacher: Why? Don't you belong to our people? So you don't want to respond?
Student A: Why do I need to go and die and defend people I don't even know? Why do I need to stand up as a sign of respect? Why do I need to remember people I don't know?

Teacher:	Do you know what it means? These 21,000 fallen soldiers, the *halalim* [the dead; also empty places] who left total emptiness . . .
Student B:	This is [like] 21,000 wars
Teacher:	The dead are like emptiness. If you had to count these people . . . Every person is like a whole world. Close your eyes and imagine what this number 21,000 means. In two years you will also . . .
Student C:	What? In two years we'll die?
Teacher:	[No. I meant] you'll become soldiers.
Student D:	How are we going [to deal] with this matter?
Teacher:	Assaf, will you also be willing to give all for the State of Israel?
Assaf:	What is "all"? (Students begin shouting.)
Student E:	I also want to serve in a combat unit. (Students laugh.)
Teacher:	(to one student) Get out. You're disturbing the class. You are cheeky. (The student moves instead to another place, closer to the teacher.) Later, as the teacher told the story of the Vale of Tears (see above), he returned to the question of willingness to sacrifice:
Teacher:	So, how come they weren't afraid to stand up against 600 [Syrian] tanks? Where does the determination come from?
Student F:	They were defending their homeland. That's obvious.
Teacher:	(irritated, shouting) What is so obvious about it? I have a wife and children. Why should I sacrifice myself for my homeland? What motivated the soldiers to stand fast? Why didn't they run away?
Student G:	Well, answer the question already.
Teacher:	I'm asking you. (A debate erupts.)
Student H:	What? Am I going into the army to die?
Student I:	Yes. Sure. [. . .]
Teacher:	For example, I may very likely be wounded on the battlefield. These are tough questions. And each one must provide his own answers.
Student J:	Come on, teacher, the bell will sound in a minute. It's almost the end of the lesson.
Student K:	Truth is, I'm afraid to go into the army.
Students:	(laughing) Coward. Teacher, what did you do in the army?
Student L:	(in a serious tone, imitating the teacher) I saw a minefield. (Everybody laughs.)

Note how the teacher stressed what he considered to be the moral of this and other memories: The willingness of soldiers to sacrifice their lives for the collective should be exalted. Reacting to students' questioning of this collective ethos, the teacher challenged them directly, asking about their own inclination to make the ultimate sacrifice. By doing so, he shifted the discussion to the personal plane, to the emotional and physical investment of the self in the community and the state, especially in the state's central apparatus for the exercise of legitimate power and violence: the military. The conversation became even more heated and immediate when a soldier, a former student of the teacher, knocked on the classroom door right after the teacher had started speaking about Avigdor Kahalani and asked to come in. The teacher welcomed him gladly, and the soldier participated in recounting the story. Later, a student turned to the soldier and asked him about his army service and whether he was afraid of dying. Visits by recently graduated soldiers are common on Remembrance Day in some Israeli schools, and as living exemplars, the soldiers serve as rather poignant vehicles for raising the issue of identification and commitment.

Thus, teachers made greater efforts in the Mizrahi and lower-class classrooms to teach historical facts and stories and to elicit emotions. Furthermore, the techniques they used on Remembrance Day positioned Mizrahi and lower-class students once again as passive listeners. National memories were reappropriated by the teachers (representing, as it were, the state and the military) and were presented for internalization by the students. Unlike the implied subject positioning in Ashkenazi and middle- to upper-socioeconomic-status classrooms, memory techniques in classes with a majority of Mizrahi and lower-class students were not aimed at cultivating a discussion of social boundaries. The main issue articulated in the latter classes was that of one's relationship with the state. This differentiation in memory techniques echoed how ethnoclass differences are refracted in Israel around motivation, or lack thereof, to serve in combat units and around the construction of this experience (Sasson-Levy 2002). Mizrahi and lower-class students were quite involved in, and expressed emotional engagement with, the discussion (certainly in comparison with their behavior during Holocaust Day). Still, the memory techniques used and the students' responses—recounting the history commemorated during Remembrance Day and raising questions about forms and degrees of identification with the state—indicated a sense of ambivalence around their membership in the collective.

In sum, on both memorial days, the two Jewish groups shared similar national memories. Still, those memories were appropriated from two different citizenship dispositions. On Holocaust Day, the dominantly Askenazi and middle- to upper-class students reiterated the national narrative in the first person and were thus encouraged to position themselves as amalgamated with the national memory. In contrast, Mizrahim and lower-class students, through lectures, were positioned in the passive role of recipients of

national memory. On Remembrance Day, students in the dominantly Ashkenazi and middle- to upper-class classrooms conducted an intellectual debate over whether terror victims should be included in the population commemorated on that day; doing so positioned them in the active role of citizens in charge of defining the state's social boundaries. Students in the predominantly Mizrahi and lower-class classrooms deliberated their form of identification with the state, at times even weighing carefully their willingness to die as soldiers. They were thereby positioned in the role of citizens who ponder their relations with the state.

In the case of Mizrahi and lower-class students, subjectification of the national ethos was conducted differently on each memorial day. With respect to the prestate memory of the Holocaust, they were cast in the passive role of listeners; many expressed alienation in response. However, regarding the current memory of fallen soldiers and victims of terror, reiterated on Remembrance Day, these same students were considered participants in the collective memory (but still—in contrast to the Ashkenazim—subjected to an examination of their ways of relating to the state).

Our interpretive account suggests that differences in the use of memory techniques on the two memorial days accentuate how Ashkenazim and middle- to upper-class students have come to represent the hegemonic national ethos and how Mizrahim and lower-class students deliberate around that ethos while caught in its grip. The ambivalent citizenship position of Mizrahim and lower-class students is worked out through a dialectical process of inclusion and exclusion or, better, at the interface of inclusion and membership (Das and Poole 2004): They were positioned within the shared national collective memory, but, thanks to the differential memory techniques applied by their teachers, their full membership was constantly negotiated. They were either forced to passively listen to reappropriated memories of the Holocaust or were questioned on Remembrance Day about their form of identification with the nation-state.

Discussion

Our analysis portrays how memory techniques are allocated along Jewish Israeli ethnoclass lines and used by teachers in distinct high school settings. We have paid relatively little attention to the use of selective memory techniques with other social categories within these schools (such as genders or immigrants from the former Soviet Union and from Ethiopia) or to detailed accounts of students' biographical experiences and the reactive strategies they apply to memory techniques in school contexts. Notwithstanding these limitations, our ethnographic exploration into classroom practices during the two memorial days offers three main contributions.

First, our study highlights the importance of the medium of national memory work when ethnoclass conflict is obfuscated or censored; in particular, it underscores the importance of the multiple memory techniques used. Studies of hegemonic–subaltern complexities in postcolonial situations have focused on the role of either discourse (esp. narratives; see, e.g., Smith 2004) or rituals (e.g., Cole 2001) in explicating subaltern memory. While continuing this line of research, we concentrated here on memory practices as the medium through which the symbolic power structure within the national majority community is rearticulated. In particular, our case demonstrates that even though groups share a similar narrative and celebrate together in the public sphere, hegemonic national memories are still processed differently by dominant and peripheral subgroups within the majority group. Our study thus joins recent anthropological practice theories of identity (e.g., Holland et al. 1998); in particular, it demonstrates the usefulness of a pragmatic approach to the study of social remembering (cf. Connerton 1989). More specifically, it testifies to the fruitfulness of Rose's (1996) notion of "human technologies."

Second, we show that distinctions and hierarchies dividing subgroups in the nation-state are re-created through the differential use of memory techniques, which recasts groups of citizens in different subject positions vis-à-vis the public sphere. Each technique configured a certain type of citizen (e.g., active vs. passive) in relation to the national ethos. Taken together, the plethora of techniques reworked complexities entailed in dominant and dominated subject positions in the nation-state's majority group. In this regard, we went beyond Rose's (1996) main concern (following Foucault 1994)—that of understanding the mechanisms of modern government of individuals and populations—and beyond other anthropological emphases on the nonideational medium of collective memory (e.g., Bloch 1998). Instead, we focused on how the use of such techniques rearticulates social differences between groups within the nation-state's hegemonic community.[21]

Ethnoclass complexities and use of selected memory techniques in the nation-state are closely related, then, especially in situations of covert intergroup social conflict or difference. When only one shared narrative exists—at least officially—channels must be found for playing out the drama of that obscured or downplayed social conflict. We therefore consider the inculcation of national narratives more than merely a neutral medium through which social contestation or ambivalence over collective memory can be observed; it is also a means by which social relations (distinctions and hierarchies) are reenacted. A "narrative" is, therefore, not solely a theoretical tool; it is also a specific medium for social positioning and privileging.[22]

We also join the recent growing anthropological interest in (real and symbolic) citizenship participation in relation to questions of identity and cultural politics (cf. Castles

and Davidson 2000; Isin and Wood 1999; Ong 1996; Rosaldo 1997). Going beyond formal citizenship rights as conferred by law, the issue becomes degrees of membership in the collective. This is especially relevant for groups that occupy subordinate social positions within the nation-state (Rosaldo 1997), evidenced in their enjoying different degrees—full, partial, or multifaceted—of membership in the imagined community of the state (Das and Poole 2004).[23]

Third, our study sheds light on the nature of historical memories as factors for understanding the delicate interface between ethnoclass and national ethos. As noted in postcolonial studies (e.g., Bhabha 1994) and reappropriated in anthropologies of the subaltern (e.g., Cole 2001; Smith 2004), collective memories are not monolithic entities; subaltern relationships with those memories are therefore ambivalent and multilayered. The marginalized are involved in convoluted dynamics of identification, engagement, and disengagement with the complexities of national memory. Our finding that memory techniques were used differentially not only between groups but also within the same social group with respect to different memories—represented in our case study by the two memorial days—demonstrates this point. However, the positions of subgroups in Israel warrant comparison with those of sub-groups in other modern nation-states, and the situation of lower-class groups, especially, should not be equated too quickly with the positions of subaltern, resisting, and alienated groups within postcolonial orders. Rather, our observations show that collective memories, as experienced by specific groups, should also be explored in relation to the internal structure of national memory. A group's position in relation to the national community is multifaceted and relates in complex ways to the specific memory at hand. Pertinent factors that may influence a group's experience of national memory include its heroic versus tragic historical dimensions, group members' social categories (e.g., gender), their shared biographies (e.g., in the country of origin), and, in the case of lower-status groups, current power relations with the dominant group or other subordinate groups (e.g., national minorities, like the Arabs in Israel).

We conclude by reflecting on our own use of memory practices. We explored memory work not at the more common "anthropological" site of shared public commemorations but within restricted and less accessible contexts. We showed that the division of social spaces (classrooms–academic tracks) allows for hegemonization and marginalization to be carried out simultaneously yet separately. In this sense, our anthropological project is not merely an analytical endeavor but relates to obscured, downplayed, or even suppressed Israeli identity differences. By using the ethnographic gaze, lecturing, and writing, we apply memory techniques in new social spaces, thus bringing together entities meant to be backstaged and set socially apart. Our efforts

at unpacking this so-called public secret should, indeed, be read as part of the ongoing politics of memory work.

Notes

1. In quoted conversation throughout this article, ellipsis points enclosed by brackets indicate omission of text.

2. The ethnic labels used (and erased) in Israeli academia, the media, politics, state procedures, and public discourse are part of identity problematics (changing, in particular, in relation to marginal groups) and should be both contextualized and historicized. For example, in religious contexts the term currently used for Mizrahim is *Spharadim* (in English, usually spelled *Sephardim*), which relates to the differences in religious law as applied to them and to Ashkenazim. Another term (less in use in recent years) to mark Mizrahim is *Edot HaMizrah* (Oriental ethnic groups; referring to the immigrants' various Middle Eastern and North African countries of origin). Scholars attempting to uncover the Zionist and Israeli efforts to erase the Arabic components in the Mizrahim have used the critical term *Arab Jews* (e.g., Shohat 1988).

3. Management of the so-called Ashkenazi–Mizrahi cleavage in the Jewish Israeli context has changed significantly over the years in public discourse, politics, media, academia (Rosen and Amir 2003), and the educational system and curriculum, in particular (Zameret 2002:155–160). In the past, expression of a particular ethnicity (i.e., Mizrahi) has commonly been depicted as working against statism *(mamlakhtiyut)* and the state's "melting pot" ideology *(kur haitukh)* of erasing differences between Jewish ethnic groups *(edot)* and emphasizing their regathering in the Promised Land after the ancient Jewish diasporas *(kibbutz galuyot)*. In recent decades, during which Israel has abandoned strong centralist policies, turning into a more openly pluralistic and fragmented society, relating ethnicity to social injustice still raises heated debates within the public sphere. Oftentimes, one hears fierce accusations and counteraccusations of "letting the 'ethnic genie' [*hashed ha'adati*] out of the bottle." Indeed, this telling idiom reflects the uncanny return of the repressed.

4. The state's Jewish educational system serves three main groups: secular (Mamlakhti), on which we focus here; religious Orthodox (Mamlakhti-Dati); and religious ultraorthodox (Haredi). Another central division is between Jews and Arabs who are Israeli citizens. Arab citizens currently number over one million, about 20 percent of the population, and are those who remained within Israel's borders, the so-called Green Line, after the 1948 war. Very few schools have mixed Jewish and Arab student populations: By and large, the Jewish and the Israeli Arab educational systems are clearly divided: Arabs and Jews study in different schools (normally located in different regions), in different languages (Arabic vs. Hebrew), and have

different curricula. Over the years, Israeli governments controlled and censored the Palestinian narrative in Jewish and Arab schools (Al-Haj 1995). After deep public debate, only in December 2006 did the education minister, Yuli Tamir, approve adding the Green Line (the 1948 border) to maps in Israeli textbooks; and only in July 2007 did she approve adding the Nakba (Arabic, "catastrophe"; see Sa'di and Abu-Lughod 2007), the Palestinian version of the 1948 war, to Israeli Arab textbooks. One should also note that in recent years many non-Jews (ex-Soviet immigrants) have attended Jewish schools. According to strict Jewish law (Halakhah), they are not considered part of the "Jewish" collective. They are still granted Israeli citizenship by the Law of Return (1950), which has more permissive identity criteria than the Halakhah (e.g., by the terms of the Halakhah one must have a Jewish mother to be considered a Jew; according to the Law of Return, by contrast, having a Jewish grandfather is enough to be considered a Jew and ensure citizenship). Exploring differences in memory work between the secular and the religious, between the Orthodox and the ultraorthodox, and, even more so, between Jews and Arabs would be instructive. Still, we chose to concentrate on social divisions within the national majority group in Jewish Israeli secular high schools. Because the boundaries between these various Jewish subgroups are much thinner than other boundaries (Israeli Jews attend the same schools and presumably remember the nation similarly), the demarcation of collective memory differences in this case is much more subtle, implicit, and barely acknowledged and thus more fitting as a case study for our purposes.

5. The first wave of anthropologists who became interested in "collective memories" (Halbwachs 1980) and in modern "memorial sites" (Nora 1996), as enshrined, for instance, in national memorial days, tended to see them as prime examples of modern "secular rituals" (Moore and Myerhoff 1977) or "public events" (Handelman 1998) that play a crucial role in nation building and in creating a shared "imagined community" (Anderson 1983). Following a Durkheimian paradigm, scholars understood these memories as vehicles to transfer and strengthen shared values and social solidarity. Whether they are conceived as a relatively coherent network of "meanings" (Geertz 1973), "models" (Handelman 1998), a complex "forest of symbols" (Turner 1967), or even as holding conflicting sociopolitical forces (Kertzer 1988:69), their function and that of their respective rituals remained similar: creating, promoting, representing (or, more critically, naturalizing) the consensus. Memories of different individuals and groups within the nation-state were thus understood as deterministically and monolithically constituted by the collective.

6. See Nikolas Rose's (1999:51–55) discussion of technologies, including the reference to the classroom as a modern human technology. Rose (1999:21) also suggests that "governmentality" can be fruitfully used not as a theory but as a perspective for thinking about the ways in which various modern authorities aim at managing and shaping—by means of new disciplines and sciences such as psychology or statistics—the detailed conduct of individuals and the population as a whole. In these circumstances, the individual is thought anew through ethical practices or "technologies of the self" (Foucault 1988b:16–49), and society is perceived anew through the "political technology of individuals" (Foucault 1988a:145–162). Rose (1996:30–35) expanded the relations between government and subjectivity along diverse axes, modes, and forms of relating to oneself and to others. In this pragmatic theory of subjectivity, the emphasis is on how the individual and the population—and their reconceptualization—are formed through detailed social practices.

7. See Cole 2001:27–29 for another use of this concept.

8. As other researchers have pointed out, missing in Foucault's formulation (and to some extent in that of Rose, as well) is the sense of

power relations, especially in the context of colonialism (see Bhabha 1994:72–74; Slater 2005:19; Stoler 1995), and also, as in our case, the power relations maintained between dominant and dominated groups within the nation-state. Furthermore, we are interested in the pragmatic ways groups are formed. Thus, we do not conceive these ethnoclass groups or social categories ("Ashkenazim," "middle to upper class," "Mizrahim," and "lower class") as essentialized, predefined, and transhistorical objects of memory techniques. Although related to other contexts, these groups are newly defined through memory techniques (like the "self," these human entities are historically evolving). We thus examine how teachers' use of memory practices is organized differentially across the social field they inhabit and how these practices reposition groups differently in relation to the imagined community.

9. The division into "ethnicity" and "class" is rather blurred in the Israeli context (and elsewhere); these two categories are not entirely separate but are socially and politically interrelated. "Class" is occasionally divorced from "ethnic" identity, but it does become salient in other contexts, as we demonstrate in this article. In addition, the "ethnic" category is constantly changing and should be contextualized. It is not easily distinguished from "class," and we thus preferred to call this complex "ethnoclass." A challenge for future research is to think of new ways to capture and contextualize these social categories, especially in second- and third-generation immigrants to the nation-state, in the context of the state's presumed efforts at incorporation and erasure of ethnic differences and inequalities. In which contexts are culture, meaning, and identities, as related to students' (parents' and grandparents') countries of origin and as related to other factors, still embodied in and worked out through various memory practices?

10. On the same day that Israeli Jews celebrate the 1948 "War of Independence," many Israeli Palestinian (Arab) citizens commemorate what they conceive as the Nakba. For example, in recent years, instead of the Jewish Independence Day barbecue celebrations in parks, Arabs (and a small number of so-called radical Jewish leftists) have made pilgrimages to the ruins of Arab villages destroyed in 1948. Although these "1948 Palestinians" may have different collective memories than their counterparts in the West Bank and Gaza Strip (Frisch 2003), and although they are presumably full Israeli citizens, Jews oftentimes construct them—as apparent in our ethnographic materials—as hostile: as a Trojan horse and an inner enemy, fifth column *(gahiss hamishi),* as indistinguishable from non-Israeli Palestinian–Arab enemies, and as an ultimate Other. The differences between these groups (Jewish vs. Palestinian Israelis) are thus overtly acknowledged socially and politically and are usually phrased in national (and racist) terms rather than in ethnoclass terms.

11. Such identity politics are reflected also in official ways of counting the population. The state privileges—as reflected, for example, in occasional Central Bureau of Statistics press releases concerning Israel's demography—the Jew versus Arab (both Muslim and Christian) distinction over other social categories. The divisions within the Jewish population, by contrast, are much more hidden. Because many students' parents were born in Israel, to follow ethnic affiliations, we asked about their grandparents' countries of origin in the questionnaires we distributed in the schools.

12. As Avner Ben-Amos (2003:189–192) points out, the national Israeli memory was narrowly defined, especially in the 1950s and 1960s, in relation to the (Jewish Ashkenazi male) 1948 hero. Jewish Mizrahi immigrants, who arrived from Arab countries after the establishment of the state in 1948, were thus initially excluded, together with Israeli Palestinians (Arabs) and women. Remembrance Day commemorates those who fell in 1948 and in Arab–Israeli wars since then; hence, it has become part of the Mizrahi experience,

as well. Transformations in commemorative emphasis have started to change women's place in collective remembering in recent years (Lomski-Feder 2005) but not that of Israeli Palestinians or of the ultraorthodox (Haredim), who are still excluded.

13. The names of academic tracks are significant. They contain various euphemisms that are relevant to the social denial of the meaning of academic tracking: *Tekhnologit* means *technological* and refers to a vocational, nonacademic track. *Mabar* is an acronym for *Maslul Bagrut Ragil,* meaning a regular academic track, although the certificate that students in this track receive is worth little when they attempt to pursue higher education. Students say sarcastically the acronym stands for *Mefagrim Ba'ale Rama,* meaning high-level retarded. *Humanit* means *humanities* and is considered intermediate in terms of academic difficulty and prestige. *Ben-Tehumit* means *interdisciplinary.* Most students register in this track. It includes the life sciences, and students enrolled in this track act as consumers who choose the academic field they prefer. *Etgar* means *challenge* and is quite similar to the Mabar track.

14. A student from School A had committed suicide in 2002, and the functionaries in charge at the Ministry of Education told us the "time is not right" for us to distribute our questionnaires, which (so they said) contained "sensitive" questions about tracking and its relation to identity, ethnicity, and class. After tough negotiations, they allowed us to enter Schools B and C the following year. This resistance toward our research is indicative of the social denial around inequality and ethnoclass divisions in Israel that we discuss in this article.

15. These visits are organized by Israel's school system (Feldman 2002), but the high cost requires families to participate financially. Hence, many lower-class students cannot afford them.

16. The teacher softened the ethnic difference by using the term *Diaspora,* marking the difference by alluding to the countries from which the Jews immigrated, rather than the term *eda,* used in Israel to denote specific (usually Mizrahi) ethnic groups.

17. The teacher noted the students' negative attitude in an interview we conducted with him. After describing his background as a Mizrahi child who had a difficult time learning and acquiring basic academic skills, he explained that he found it important to address a recurrent complaint of his Mizrahi students that "the Holocaust belongs to the Ashkenazim, not to us." Although students did not make the claim explicitly on the occasion we discuss here, the teacher made serious efforts to raise this issue and to answer Mizrahi students' questions about the relevance of the Holocaust for them. This was the gap that he tried to bridge.

18. By stating that every human being has the potential for cruelty, the teacher invited the students to place themselves in a role somehow related with Nazism or racism. This is a remarkable move, as Israelis usually equate racism solely with Nazism and reject any attribution of racism directed at them (see Domínguez 1989:95).

19. Even though the racist meanings of the white–black division are different in Israel than, say, in the United States, students—like other Israelis—are not totally blind to these and other sociocultural codes (differences in family names, lifestyle, musical taste, religiosity, political inclinations, food, clothing, language dialect, and speech style and accent).

20. The Mizrahi form of religious observance, in between the secular and the Orthodox, is termed in Israel "traditional," Masorti in Hebrew.

21. As is apparent in the ethnographic examples, although the thick (and clear) boundaries between Jews and Arabs (including Israeli Arab citizens) were usually assumed by Jewish Israeli students in clear narrative work relating to a national Other, the thin (and ob-

scured) ethnoclass boundaries within the Jewish group were rearticulated differently. In other words, in reference to the Jewish–Arab divide (or the national majority–minority distinction), differences in memory work are easily captured when attending to explicit narratives, whereas, in the ethnoclass context within the Jewish group, one needs to attend to the differential use of memory techniques and their meanings in terms of citizenship participation. This does not mean that the national narrative is monolithic in the face of the Arab Other; neither does it mean that all Jewish students shared the same national narrative stance toward the Other. For example, some students favored the inclusion of terror victims in Remembrance Day even if it entailed the inclusion of Israeli Palestinian (Arab) victims (and thus troubled the clear boundaries between Jews and Arabs). Indeed, differences toward the Arab Other served at times to rearticulate differences within the Jewish community.

22. An alternative interpretation to our own should be considered. That is, the different techniques used in classroom discussions in preparation for memorial days in Israeli schools could be attributed to instructional styles used by teachers to engage students with presumably different abilities or needs, rather than in relation to ethnoclass complexities. However, we argue that the very depiction of "abilities," "needs," and "proper" instructional styles are all connected to ethnoclass differences. Psychology and education as academic disciplines and as practices are closely related to moral assumptions about how subjects belonging to a particular ethnoclass group should be governed and guided (Rose 1999:103–107). In particular, as others who study Israeli society argue, memory techniques in Israeli schools—and presumably elsewhere—are built on preconceived and implicit psychological conceptions that differentiate between ethnoclass groups and preserve social hierarchies through dichotomies of active–passive, mind–body, abstract–concrete, and cognition–emotion (see Mizrachi 2004). Thus, notwithstanding their possible alternative educational rationales, such practices take part in the complex ethnoclass dynamics implicit in the national ethos.

23. Although we appropriate Veena Das and Deborah Poole's (2004) emphasis on the distinction between inclusion in the state and the question of (full or partial) membership, we do not espouse their adoption of Giorgio Agamben's (1998) idea of the concentration camp as the basis for political theory of the state. For us, the crucial question is not the "wilderness, lawlessness and savagery" (Das and Poole 2004:7) that lie outside the state's jurisdiction and threaten it from within but the ways different groups are included in the state and yet positioned as citizens with various degrees of membership in the public sphere.

References cited

Agamben, Giorgio
1998   Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Ahonen, Sirkka
1992   Clio Sans Uniform: A Study of the Post-Marxist Transformation of the History Curricula in East Germany and Estonia, 1986–1991. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
Al-Haj, Majid
1995   Education, Empowerment, and Control: The Case of the Arabs in Israel. Albany: State University of New York Press.
2005   National Ethos, Multiculturalism, and the New History Textbooks in Israel. Curriculum Inquiry 35(1):47–71.
Anderson, Benedict
1983   Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso.

Apple, Michael
   1983   Education and Power. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Ayalon, Hanna, and Yossi Shavit
   2004   Educational Reforms and Inequalities in Israel: The MMI Hypothesis Revisited. Sociology of Education 77(2):103–120.
Azaryahu, Maoz
   1995   State Cults: The Celebration of Independence and the Commemoration of Fallen Soldiers in Israel 1948–1955. S'de-Boqer, Israel: Ben-Gurion Heritage Center. [Hebrew]
Barton, Keith C., and Alan McCully
   2003   History Teaching and the Perpetuation of Memories: The Northern Ireland Experience. *In* The Role of Memory in Ethnic Conflict. Ed Cairns and Mícheál D. Roe, eds. Pp. 107–124. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Basso, Keith H.
   1996   Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Battaglia, Debbora
   1992   The Body in the Gift: Memory and Forgetting in Sabarl Mortuary Exchange. American Ethnologist 19(1):3–18.
Ben-Amos, Avner
   2003   War Commemoration and the Formation of Israeli National Identity. Journal of Political and Military Sociology 31(2):171–195.
Ben-Amos, Avner, and Ilana Bet-El
   1999   Holocaust Day and Memorial Day in Israeli Schools: Ceremonies, Education and History. Israel Studies 4(1):258–284.
Bhabha, Homi K.
   1994   The Location of Culture. London: Routledge.
   1998   The White Stuff (Political Aspect of Whiteness). Artforum 36(9):21–24.
Bloch, Maurice
   1998   How We Think They Think: Anthropological Approaches to Cognition, Memory and Literacy. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Bourdieu, Pierre, and J. C. Passerson
   1990   Exclusion and Selection. *In* Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. 2nd edition. Pp. 141–176. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis
   1976   Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic.
Castles, Stephen, and Alastair Davidson
   2000   Citizenship and Identity. New York: Routledge.
Cohen, Yinon, and Yitchak Haberfeld
   1998   Second-Generation Jewish Immigrants in Israel: Have the Ethnic Gaps in Schooling and Earnings Declined? Ethnic and Racial Studies 21(3):507–528.
Cole, Jennifer
   2001   Forget Colonialism? Sacrifice and the Art of Memory in Madagascar. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Connerton, Paul
   1989   How Societies Remember. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Das, Veena, and Deborah Poole
   2004   State and Its Margins: Comparative Ethnographies. *In* Anthropology in the Margins of the State. Veena Das and Deborah Poole, eds. Pp. 3–33. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
Desjarlais, Robert, and Theresa O'Nell
   2000   Introduction: The Pragmatic Turn in Psychological Anthropology. Ethos 27(4):407–414.
Devine-Wright, Patrick
   2003   A Theoretical Overview of Memory and Conflict. *In* The Role of Memory in Ethnic Conflict. Ed Cairns and Mícheál D. Roe, eds. Pp. 9–33. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Domínguez, Virginia R.
   1989   People as Subject, People as Object: Selfhood and Peoplehood in Contemporary Israel. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Feldman, Jackie
   2002   In the Footsteps of the Israeli Holocaust Survivor: Israeli Youth Pilgrimages to Poland, Shoah Memory and National Identity. *In* Building History: The Shoah in Art, Memory, and Myth. Peter M. Daly, Karl Fisher, Alain Goldschlager, and Naomi Kramer, eds. Pp. 35–63. New York: Peter Lang.
Foucault, Michel
   1988a   The Political Technology of Individuals. *In* Technologies of the Self. Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton, eds. Pp. 145–162. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
   1988b   Technologies of the Self. *In* Technologies of the Self. Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton, eds. Pp. 16–49. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
   1994   Governmentality. *In* Power. James D. Faubion, ed. Pp. 201–222. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
Frisch, Hillel
   2003   Ethnicity or Nationalism? Comparing the *Nakba* Narrative among Israeli Arabs and Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. *In* The Israeli Palestinians: An Arab Minority in the Jewish State. Alexander Bligh, ed. Pp. 165–185. London: Routledge.
Geertz, Clifford
   1973   Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic.
Gillis, John R., ed.
   1994   Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Giroux, Henry
   1983   Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the New Sociology of Education: A Critical Analysis. Harvard Educational Review 53(3):257–293.
Goffman, Erving
   1959   The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Halbwachs, Maurice
   1980   The Collective Memory. New York: Harper and Row.
Handelman, Don
   1998   Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events. Oxford: Berghahn.
Handelman, Don, and Elihu Katz
   1998   State Ceremonies of Israel—Remembrance Day and Independence Day. *In* Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events. Don Handelman. Pp. 190–223. Oxford: Berghahn.
Hever, Hannan, Yehouda Shenhav, and Peninna Motzafi-Haller, eds.
   2002   Mizrahim in Israel: A Critical Observation into Israel's Ethnicity. Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute. [Hebrew]
Holland, Dorothy, William Lachicotte Jr., Debra Skinner, and Carole Cain
   1998   Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Irwin-Zarecka, Iwona
   1994   Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
Isin, Engin F., and Patricia K. Wood
   1999   Citizenship and Identity. London: Sage.
Kertzer, David
   1988   Ritual, Politics, and Power. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Linenthal, Edward T., and Tom Engelhardt, eds.
  1996   History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past. New York: Henry Holt.

Lomsky-Feder, Edna
  2005   The Bounded Female Voice in Memorial Ceremonies. Qualitative Sociology 28(3):293–314.

Marcus, George
  1998   Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. *In* Ethnography through Thick and Thin. Pp. 79–104. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ministry of Education, Youth, and Society Administration
  1988   To Remember and to Forget. Electronic document, http://www.snunit.k12.il/minhal/word/15023.doc, accessed September 30, 2007. [Hebrew]

Mizrachi, Nissim
  2004   From Badness to Sickness: The Role of Ethnopsychology in Shaping Ethnic Hierarchies in Israel. Social Identities 10(2):219–243.

Mizrachi, Nissim, Israel Drori, and Rene Anspach
  2007   Repertoires of Trust: The Practice of Trust in a Multinational Organization amid Political Conflict. American Sociological Review 72(1):143–165.

Moore, Sally F., and Barbara G. Myerhoff, eds.
  1977   Secular Ritual. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.

Nora, Pierre
  1996   General Introduction: Between Memory and History. *In* Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past, vol. 1: Conflicts and Divisions. Pierre Nora, ed. Arthur Goldhammer, trans. Pp. 1–20. New York: Columbia University Press.

O'Connor, Carla
  1999   Race, Class, and Gender in America: Narratives of Opportunity among Low-Income African American Youths. Sociology of Education 72(3):137–157.

Ong, Aihwa
  1996   Cultural Citizenship as Subject Making: Immigrants Negotiating Racial and Cultural Boundaries in the United States. Current Anthropology 37(5):737–762.

Ram, Uri
  2003   Postnationalist Pasts: The Case of Israel. *In* States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformations in National Retrospection. Jeffrey K. Olick, ed. Pp. 227–258. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rosaldo, Renato
  1989   Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis. Boston: Beacon Press.
  1997   Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism. *In* Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor, eds. Pp. 27–38. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rose, Nikolas
  1996   Inventing Ourselves: Psychology, Power and Personhood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  1999   Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosen, Leah, and Ruth Amir
  2003   The Open Society and Its Enemies: Changing Public Discourse in Israel. *In* Traditions and Transitions in Israel Studies. Laura Zittrain Eisenberg, Neil Caplan, Naomi B. Sokoloff, and Mohammed Abu-Nimer, eds. Pp. 181–201. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sa'di, Ahmad H., and Lila Abu-Lughod, eds.
  2007   Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory. New York: Columbia University Press.

Sasson-Levy, Orna
  2002   Constructing Identities at the Margins: Masculinities and Citizenship in the Israeli Army. Sociological Quarterly 43(3):357–383.

Schatzki, Theodore R., Karin Knorr Cetina, and Eike von Savigny, eds.
  2001   The Practical Turn in Contemporary Theory. London: Routledge.

Schudson, Michael
  1995   Dynamics of Distortion in Collective Memory. *In* Memory Distortion: How Minds, Brains, and Societies Reconstruct the Past. Daniel L. Schacter, ed. Pp. 346–364. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shavit, Yossi
  1984   Tracking and Ethnicity in Israeli Secondary Education. American Sociological Review 49(2):210–220.

Shenhav, Yehouda
  2002   Ethnicity and National Memory: The World Organization of Jews from Arab Countries (WOJAC) in the Context of the Palestinian National Struggle. British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 29(1):27–56.

Shir, Smadar
  2004   "You'll See, I'll See." Independence Magazine 2, Yediot Ahronot, April 26: 4–8.

Shohat, Ela
  1988   Sephardim in Israel: Zionism from the Standpoint of Its Jewish Victims. Social Text 19–20:1–35.

Slater, David
  2005   Geopolitics and the Post-Colonial: Rethinking North-South Relations. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Smith, Andrea
  2004   Heteroglossia, "Common Sense," and Social Memory. American Ethnologist 31(2):251–269.

Stoler, Ann Laura
  1995   Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Stoller, Paul
  1995   Embodying Colonial Memories: Spirit Possession, Power, and the Hauka in West Africa. New York: Routledge.

Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet M. Corbin
  1990   Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques. London: Sage.

Swedenburg, Ted
  2003   Memories of Revolt: The 1936–39 Rebellion and the Palestinian National Past. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.

Swidler, Ann
  2003   Talks of Love: How Culture Matters. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Swirski, Shlomo
  1990   Education in Israel: Schooling for Inequality. Tel Aviv: Breirot. [Hebrew]

Turner, Victor
  1967   The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Wanner, Catherine
  1998   Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Weitz, Yechiam
  1995   Political Dimensions of Holocaust Memory in Israel during the 1950s. Israel Affairs 1(3):129–145.

Wertsch, James V.
  2002   Voices of Collective Remembering. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, James V., and Kevin O'Connor
    1994   Multivoicedness in Historical Representations: American College Students' Accounts of the Origins of the United States. Journal of Narrative and Life History 4(4):295–309.
White, Geoffrey M.
    2001   Histories and Subjectivities. Ethos 28(4):493–510.
Willis, Paul E.
    1977   Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs. Farnborough, UK: Saxon House.
Yonah, Yossi, and Ishak Saporta
    2002   Pre-Vocational Education and the Creation of the Working Class in Israel. *In* Mizrahim in Israel: A Critical Observation into Israel's Ethnicity. Hannan Hever, Yehouda Shenhav, and Penina Mutzafi-Haller, eds. Pp. 68–104. Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute. [Hebrew]
Zameret, Zvi
    2002   The Melting Pot in Israel: The Commission of Inquiry Concerning the Education of Immigrant Children during the Early Years of the State. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Yehuda C. Goodman
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
The Hebrew University
of Jerusalem
Jerusalem, Israel 91905
Tel/Fax: + 972 2 5610751
ygoodman@mscc.huji.ac.il

Nissim Mizrachi
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv, Israel 69978
nissimm@post.tau.ac.il