Title
Teaching Tolerance: Citizenship, Religious Difference, and Race in Contemporary Germany

Author
Doughan, Sultan

Publication Date
2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Teaching Tolerance:
Citizenship, Religious Difference, and Race in Germany

By

Sultan Doughan

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Anthropology

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Charles K. Hirschkind, Chair
Professor Deniz Göktürk
Professor William F. Hanks

Fall 2018

Abstract

Teaching Tolerance: Citizenship, Religious Difference, and Race in Contemporary Germany

by

Sultan Doughan

Doctor of Philosophy in Anthropology

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Charles Hirschkind, Chair

This dissertation deals with the question of citizenship in contemporary Germany. By taking the field of civic education as a site of inquiry it probes into the educational methods of civic practices geared to train youth and professionals of migrant backgrounds to cultivate a sense of German citizenship. The dissertation demonstrates that the key question of citizenship, as one of tolerant conduct, is framed by the post-Holocaust condition. Thus, the dissertation focuses on civic educational programs funded to combat Islamic extremism and to foster secular tolerance by way of relating to the Holocaust and the murdered Jews. By doing so, the research focuses on programs dealing with the Holocaust as an exceptional event, yet constitutive of liberal democracy and tolerant subjects in the political present. The unit of analysis of the study is the group of civic educators hired to target and work with members from immigrant communities as Muslims. Here the dissertation focuses on how the Muslim subject is produced and bifurcated into tolerant German Muslim vs. Islamic extremist.

The thesis argues that the wider policies aimed at incorporating immigrants as Muslims into the German nation, becomes traceable as racializing effects in civic education. The position of the Muslim is an unstable category at risk to fail to be a recognizably secular citizen. Part of this failure, as it is accounted for throughout the dissertation, is a secularization paradigm applied to Muslims as religious subjects, who are asked to shed their religiosity from public. Secularization in the sense of historicism intersects with the notion of racial historicism, a civilizational betterment of Muslim subjects. Yet the same form of secularization cannot be applied to relating to the Holocaust. Rather, here Muslims have to submit to the Holocaust as "the constitutive exception" for the post-Holocaust episteme and the contemporary political order. The failure to do so, is read by public institutions as signs of Islamic extremism or religious intolerance.

The dissertation accounts for the strategies and moments in which formal German citizens are at risk to be further racialized as Muslims only, without ever fully being perceived as German citizens. Conversely a wider effect of these educational strategies and the discourse around them contributes to a moral superiority of the ethnic German Christian-secularized majority leading up to a sense of rightful owning of the nation and entitled to discriminate against Muslims, because of their assumed religious intolerance. The thesis defines this national superiority as moral nationalism in a reciprocal and co-constitutive relation with the racialized Muslim subject.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

In writing this dissertation I have drawn on the resources of invaluable teachers, practitioners, friends, colleagues, and family. Thanking them here is the least I can do to express my appreciation and remember their generosity. I would like to express my appreciation for my advisors first, who have been a source of ongoing support. They have been also careful and caring readers of various drafts until the thesis emerged in a final shape. Charles Hirschkind has been always an encouraging presence in my graduate school years. His guidance, especially in the last two years, while writing from long-distance in Berlin and Boston has allowed me to mature with my path taken. Without his careful advice, I would not have taken certain turns in this dissertation and would not have been able to see the broader horizon beyond my ethnographic research. Many of Charles' wise and profound comments remain unrealized in this version, but I am sure I will come back to them in due time.

Similarly, my committee members William Hanks and Deniz Gökürk have commented on earlier chapters and iterations of this project, while many ideas were still in flux and not adding up to a coherent whole yet. Bill has been always there with his analytic clarity. His advice always succeeded the written pages and pushed me to think about the kind of scholarship I want to produce. Deniz's presence has always grounded me and turned me to the specificities of my research context. Similarly, Deniz's pragmatic and playful approach to various forms of texts and genres has been a source of joy. In the many moments we talked about the context of Germany specifically, I also envied her for having a more positive outlook on how things are. Her perspective helped me to relativize my own gloom hoovering over these pages.

During my Berlin years I was lucky to meet David Goldberg in a workshop on race in 2017. My initial desire to meet him had to do with the personal circumstances I was in. The readings assigned and David's presence in the room has opened my eyes to race in conjunction with the secular state in consequential ways for my intellectual project. David has since been generously present, reading and commenting on chapters, ideas, thoughts and has illuminated many of the here provided ideas with his broad and deep understanding of race and power. I cannot thank him enough for emerging in the darkest moment.

In the department of anthropology I have found friends, I would not want to miss again and who have remained close in spite of spatial distances. Here I am grateful for Hallie Wells' enthusiasm and light-hearted spirit, Victoria Massie for the many moments in which she reminded me that friendship is also sisterhood. Ashwak Hauter and Candace Lukasik have always been my place to turn to when in need to breathe and laugh. Similarly, Callie Maidhof and Patricia Kubala have offered me the gift of friendship in difficult and trying times. They cannot be thanked enough for being there and for having incredibly big hearts. I also want to thank Bruno Reinhardt and Leticia Cesarino, who remain missed, Jean-Michel Landry for being a wise mentor and companion. Cigdem Sagir and Nadia Fadil who I have met both during my first year in graduate school remain important in many ways in my formation as a scholar working on racialized minorities in Europe. They symbolize for me the search for intellectual truth even if it comes at a price of giving up comfort. Besides the intellectual spark that Berkeley ignited it remains a place of fond memories, but also brings to mind a bureaucratic jungle only manageable with the help of Ned Garrett. Ned's office has been my number one place to go to and often there was nothing to be done, or so I thought until Ned came up with an idea how to fix an issue.

In and around Berkeley and the Bay Area friends have become the family of the best kind. Elif Kale and Baris Lostuvali, their warmth and friendship cannot be sufficiently expressed with words. Yasmeen Daifallah and Mohammad Talat have breathed life into moments of academic despair. Yasmeen and Elif, I have also looked up to as two female scholars rocking the many demands of having a family and remaining intellectually engaged.

They have given me a lot by way of example and they still do. Richard and Chihoko Solomon have been parents, friends, and colleagues. Their loving care and joyful spirit have turned many low points into an encounter with what is essential in being in a world with no guarantees. Similarly, Angela Göktürk and Aleks Göllü have opened their home and welcomed me in when I felt uprooted from Berkeley and Berlin.

In Berlin I need to thank a wide range of people, who made this intellectual trajectory possible in certain ways. My gratitude goes out to Angelika Neuwirth, Kader Konuk and Martin Treml. Angelika is thanked for being a bold and heroic scholar, who has a special place in my heart for conducting herself and scholarship relentlessly. I thank Kader Konuk for being an exemplary role-model in her integrity and sincere dedication to scholarship on German-Turkish matters. Before Kader, I did not know German-Turkish literature, culture and anything else related had something of a scholarly value. Martin has always amazed me in his Freigeist. I am not sure how he does it, but he has been the person to look up to when wanting to keep spirit and courage in academia. Another person of importance is Georges Khalil. I met Georges as an undergraduate, right after having read Edward Said's Orientalism and for some reason these two remain forever coupled in my brain. Georges Khalil's EUME has been an intellectual oasis for me when it comes to critical and postcolonial perspectives on the Middle East. The intellectual debates and Georges caring presence has kept this place alive and vibrant since its inception. I thank him for having always kept the door open for me.

I am glad I could find a few scholars who took me in and provided a context of debate and conversation in Berlin. Among those scholars my deepest gratitude goes out to Schirin Amir-Moazami. Schirin has been there as a friend, a mentor and colleague who guided me in many moments. I wished I could be as elegant in talking about such difficult matters of Islam and politics. Schirin has also read chapter drafts carefully and extended her insight knowledge to some of my external observation on the Deutsche Islam Konferenz. Werner Schiffauer will remain unforgettable in how he engaged from an anthropological perspective, always reminding me to see the interactions and relations built and destroyed between the German state and Muslim communities. The many friends and colleagues in his monthly colloquium have contributed to a friendly and engaged circle. Here I want to especially thank Fatih Abay and Güzin Agca. Regina Römhild is thanked for having built Labor Migration as a scholarly vibrant melting pot on matters of migration and refuge and the question of Europe.

My Berlin years were generously funded by several stipends and fellowships. The Richard Diebolt stipend (UC Berkeley), the John L. Simpson Memorial Research Fellowship (UC Berkeley), the Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies Fellowship (FU Berlin) and the Wenner-Gren grant for anthropological fieldwork during my final year of field research have helped to realize the research for this dissertation.

The Berlin Program in particular has provided me with an office space until my departure from Berlin, an intellectually vibrant context in the form of a bi-weekly colloquium led by Konrad Jarausch, Paul Nolte and Regina Römhild and meticulously organized by Karin Goihl. Karin has been an amazing source of help during my tenure as a fellow and beyond, she remains special in many ways for her tireless care for the fellows' well-being and for my sanity. Further, the Berlin Program has given me the gift of cherished friends such as Phi Hong Su, Brandon Bloch, Brian Van Wyck, René Staedtler and Candice Hamelin.

During fieldwork I have benefitted from the expertise and insights of civic educators, social workers, scholars, activists and educational experts. Without their willingness to include me and extend their trust, I would have never accomplished this study.

Berlin has given me the chance to explore, engage and organize myself with other scholars, intellectuals and artists in various networks. Here I would like to mention Nahed Samour, Hannah Tzuberi, Adi Liraz, Armeghan Taheri and Patricia Piberger for a year of intellectual public engagement on questions of intersectional feminism and race in the shape of the NOMEN Collective. Similarly, I want to thank Giovanni Picker and Cengiz

Barskanmaz for our short-lived race and law writing group. Giovanni's and Cengiz's discussions and expertise on race and law have opened up a space I feel, I can always come back to. Also, I want to thank Zülfükar Cetin for taking the time to help during early stages of my fieldwork. His practical advice still rings true. I thank Luis Aguilar for the many insights on the DIK and for being a sincere companion.

Writing a dissertation is mostly a lonely endeavor and I have tried many times to escape it. In those moments I have withdrawn to friends and neighbors. Among those friends were Gabika Bockaj, Arjun Appadurai, Alia Mosallam and Yahia Shawkat. Gabika has taught me to listen to my gut feeling, when going through thoughts. The conversations with her were healing moments. Alia has been the friend of many walks through Wilmersdorf when in need. I thank her for attuning me into my own feelings and sense of being physically in the world.

Many other and older friends have re-appeared and enriched my Berlin years. They all have a special and individual place in my heart: Elpida Lazos, Serpil Karahan, Barbara Rühling, Ilka Eickhof, and Noura Retail. They are missed every day and yet I know that seeing them again will be as if we had never bid farewell. Last but not least at all, has been the friendship with Nada Moumtaz, who remains mysteriously connected to my Berlin imaginary. Perhaps it is the same sense of shared everyday intimacy kept alive through ongoing conversations and mentorship that Nada has provided over the years.

In Boston between various transitions, I was lucky to be included as a visiting scholar in different institutions. At the Elie Wiesel Center for Jewish Studies I have been lucky to be in conversation with Michael Zank and Alexandra Zirkle, two scholars whose expertise on German-Jewish history remains exemplary for me. Both of them have contributed to an atmosphere of collegiality and friendship in a new environment. Similarly, I count myself lucky to be in conversation with Kimberly Arkin from the anthropology department at BU. The Institute on Culture, Religion & World Affairs (CURA) directed by Tim Longman has been a place for intellectual exchange and professional advice on publishable writing. As a fellow I had the chance to present a draft chapter of my dissertation and receive many useful comments from the participants. At Brandeis University I was embraced by Sabine von Mering and included in the Center for German and European Studies.

My mother Ayşe and sisters Türkan, Mine and Serap have not always entirely understood what I was doing, but they were wise and kind enough to let me pursue what was mine. While I have rotated from my hometown to many different places and sometimes back they have remained stable and restful poles for me, especially that I can always count on my sisters. This longer path I could have not endured without the love and care of Yazan and Maia. Yazan has been always my closest and fiercest critic but also the most trusted friend and loving companion. By leading example he has demonstrated that intellectual integrity cannot do without the personal. Hence, always forcing me to stay true to what I can really claim. Maia has grown with this project and it is only through her growing presence that I know how much time has passed since I started graduate school. Her kind spirit is a source of inspiration that perhaps nothing is really lost in this world.

The loss of Saba Mahmood as an advisor and mentor has shaken my core. Saba was a demanding, yet immensely caring and warm-hearted advisor. I cannot think of one moment in which care and professionality were disentangled in our conversations. Working with Saba was a constant reminder to maintain scholarly integrity. With Saba's passing in March my ongoing grief slowly led me to accept and see something that had been finally unveiled. As with each relationship built on care, respect and love it transcends the reality of two or more people and speaks of the nature of this bond. The relationship with Saba as my advisor taught me scholarship as a committed, careful, and ethical trajectory. What remains from this relationship -beyond the many fond memories- is the aspiration for this kind of scholarship asking questions about the human condition in a fragile world. I place this dissertation as the first step towards that aspiration and dedicate it to the loving memory of Saba.

Abbreviations

AB	Antisemitismus Bekämpfen (Pseudonym for a civil society organization)
AfD	Alternative für Deutschland (Nationalist German party)
AFC	Anne Frank Center (Museum on the biography of Anne Frank)
ASF	Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste (Protestant civil society organization)
BMI	Bundesministerium des Innern (Ministry of Interior)
BPB	Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung (Federal Agency for Civic Education)
CDU	Christlich-Demokratische Union (Christan Democratic Party)
DIK	Deutsche Islam Konferenz (German Islam Conference)
EVZ	Erinnern, Verantwortung, Zukunft (German trust fund organization)
FB	Farbe Bekennen! (Pseudonym for a civil society organization)
SPD	Soziale Partei Deutschlands (Social Democratic Party of Germany)
PEGIDA	Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes (populist anti-Islam movement)

Introduction

"In a confident, reunited Germany no one turns to their history with psychotherapeutic intent. The word "normalcy" is making its rounds. History is becoming an instrument of political power again. It is acquiring its original meaning for the future of the nation. Even more meaningful is the constitution of the nation, which no longer lays half-numb in a hospital bed with the prospect of healing. The patient assumes he is successfully healed and is given leave. You know how it is with newly recovered patients. They are especially inclined to throw warnings regarding their fragile state to the wind. Only time will tell if the disease is still laying dormant, slumbering in their bodies and if it could trigger a relapse.

[…]

Through memory one thinks that he can atone for something. The operation of remembering is calculated on behalf of the victims. Remembering the victim is essential. But what were and are the consequences of this remembering? […] United Germany is a land in which four to five thousand attacks and riots against foreigners occur annually (Zafer Şenocak 2012 [2001])."

***

In his collection of essays titled *Tongue Removal*,[1] the Turkish-German author Zafer Şenocak describes Germany and the experience of migration as one of constant fragmented encounters between two personified bodies. By navigating experience and expectation, Şenocak asks if there is an eerie displaced presence of past wounds in a newly *healed* Germany. Şenocak's account re-organizes the past with the present, by pointing out possible links between the Nazi state, the Holocaust, and the opposition to cultural and ethnic heterogeneity in a newly unified Germany. Published in the fateful year of 2001, Şenocak's essay provides a lost perspective on the condition of migration and is a reminder that German nationalism is resilient, public Holocaust memorial culture notwithstanding.

The trouble with nationalism and the return of the national question in Germany has been pointed out by historians, as one enmeshed with Holocaust memory and in search of a new narrative in order to maintain national unity within a newly forming Europe (Geyer 1997; Huyssen 1991, 1992; Jarausch 2006). In this dissertation, I analyze nationalism after the Holocaust in a demographically multicultural society. I explore how nationalism thrives on Holocaust memory taught to migrant subjects in tolerance education programs in order to foster German Muslim citizens. In my exploration I am guided by one key question: What can citizenship be after the genocide of European Jewry? This question is especially pertinent in Germany facing migration and a new religious minority. I situate this question in a post-Holocaust space-time in order to point out how belonging is shaped by an exceptional time and how this orientation shapes how Middle Eastern immigrants grow into the national and social fabric as new German citizens.

In the aftermath of the attacks on September 11, 2001, public opinion has configured the foreigner through a new lens and consolidated the category of the Muslim in legally consequential ways. Since then, the German state has been engaged in securitizing former immigrants as Muslims, to the extent that religious practices of Muslim organizations[2] have come under close surveillance for signs of threat against secular liberalism. The German state understands these signs to be rooted in traditional religiosity, which provides the ground for a general form of Muslim intolerance and is therefore incompatible with secular liberalism. The relation to the figure of the Jew, transported in Holocaust memory, has structured secular liberalism since the inauguration of the post-war German state in 1949. The meaning of being

[1] Translation by Jessica Nicholl and Martina Schwalm titled "Fragments of Memory," published in *Transit*, Volume 8, Issue 1, 2012; http://transit.berkeley.edu/archives/volume-8-1/.

[2] Please note my use of the term "Muslim" when pointing out religious organizations or persons. Although many of my interlocutors were identifying as Muslim, not all of them were practicing or observant and it was not their primary identification.

a citizen in Germany hinges upon this relationship in particular ways and has also shifted with each new political constellation.[3]

Since the early 2000s, the intensification of the violence in the Middle East has shaped Middle Eastern communities in Germany. Muslim organizations in most major European cities have expressed solidarity with Palestinian communities by taking to the streets in protest against Israeli state politics. These protests have had a particular effect on the German public; verbal attacks against the state of Israel revealed that German sensibilities were not necessarily shared across immigrant communities.[4] The protests revealed at times even anti-Semitic expressions, framed in religious Islamic tropes.

Although pro-Palestine protests were triggered by the political situation in Israel-Palestine, they were framed by media and political discourse as intolerance inherent to Islam —specifically, Muslim anti-Semitism as a religiously rooted problem. European anti-Semitism, until the end of WWII displaced anti-Judaic sentiments rooted in pre-modern prejudice and myths about the Jew (Goldenbogen 2013, 33-40). Therefore, pro-Palestinian protests were also understood as a displacement of religious sentiments, triggered by the conflict in Israel-Palestine but rooted in and mobilized through Islam (Diner 2004). For the German government, specifically the Ministry of the Interior, the task now was twofold. First, to reform and incorporate Islam into the German state as a religion fit for secularism and free of extremism; and second, in so doing, to teach tolerance to Muslims in order to ensure enlightened citizens, who could keep their intolerant religiosity in check, in order to prevent jeopardizing German-Jewish relations and prove belonging.

Migration and Citizenship

Citizenship – the right to have rights and to be part of a political community – is predicated upon nationhood and particular notions of belonging. As a legal category it usually entails formal inclusion that enacts "social closure" as sociologist Rogers Brubaker argued (Brubaker 1992). According to Brubaker, citizenship confers a legal status to a social reality in order to foster a more harmonious relationship between host societies and immigrant groups. As a legal category, it enables and mediates nation-building but is also defined by particular notions of nationhood. While Brubaker's conception of citizenship has informed my approach, I would like to further complicate his suggestions in order to account for a more complex reality of migration and citizen-becoming. In this dissertation, I approach citizenship as a disciplinary tool obliging its holders to work on themselves and have a temporally ordered conduct of religion deeming their practices legible as civic, secular and above all tolerant. Citizenship then in this dissertation is a relationship with state institutions relayed through and inscribed by Holocaust memory. Reciprocally, these state institutions relate to religious difference of Middle Eastern migrants as what they identify as Muslim difference in ways that fosters an irresolvable racial relationship of "exclusionary incorporation" (Partridge 2012). Here, I point out this relationship between state and citizen, in which former immigrants remain differentiated as a threat and become racialized Muslims subjects, if they do not live up to the ideals of tolerant secularity.

The condition of Muslims in secular Europe, being present without fully belonging through political and legal representation, has been touched upon by several anthropologists such as Talal Asad (2003, 159–80), Mayanthi Fernando (2014), Paul Silverstein (2018). Asad

[3] In the current figuration, the term "Jew" can refer to an actual Jewish person, to perished victims of the Holocaust, and to the state of Israel.

[4] One slogan during pro-Palestine protests in 2014 was *"Hamas, Hamas, Juden ins Gas!"* to wish for Jews to be gassed in German constructs a direct reference to the mass killings in Auschwitz in the national imaginary. The term Jew has a powerful and at times uncontrollable effect in Europe, even positive and sympathetic references can misfire and lead to scandals as scholar Cynthia M. Baker discusses in her chapter on "New Jews in a New Europe" in *Jew* (Baker 2017).

and Fernando describe how the Muslim condition in Europe has rather to do with Europe's self-constitution through notions such as "culture," "civilization," "the secular state," "majority and "minority" complicating and even foreclosing the representation of Muslims as a "religious minority." Silverstein in particular has turned the lens onto postcolonial North African subjects in France and has inquired into the long durational aspects of colonialism and the postcolonial condition. By doing so, he has asked how race is productively shaped and transforms without losing force in the current French Republic vis-à-vis postcolonial subjects. By taking these scholar's proposed notions seriously as building-blocks for an idea of Europe, I turn to Germany as a case in which some of these notions are mobilized and shape immigrant communities without referencing the terms 'religious minority' and 'postcoloniality.' Rather, former guest worker immigrants and refugees from the Middle East become racialized as Muslim subjects and are embedded in a post-Holocaust condition. In contrast to Asad, my contention is that secular governance has reframed former Middle Eastern immigrants to Germany as a Muslim population in before they were given equal status as a religious minority. In other words, I do not take Muslims as a population to be a homogeneous religious minority to be characterized solely by religious affiliation to Islam. Rather, I suggest that Islam has become a category through which the German state itself groups people as a homogeneous entity in need of secular governance. This framing in terms of religion informs all practices deviant from the majority and has a racializing effect.

Scholars working on Germany have already noted that the guest worker underwent several political shifts and that they are regarded as a problem of Islam now (Attia 2009; Partridge 2012; Shooman and Spielhaus 2010; Tezcan 2012; Yurdakul 2008). While I share their perspective, I would further ground this perspective in the claim that racializing effects are produced through state governance, a claim that I share with other scholars working on Germany (L. H. Aguilar 2018; Barskanmaz 2011; Partridge 2010).

Being categorized as Muslims, these communities and the subjects therein occupy an ambivalent position of internal outsider similar to European Jews prior to the Nazi regime. This position is also exacerbated by the lack of religious autonomy, which Christian Churches enjoy. Furthermore, as Muslims, my research subjects become genealogically positioned in relation to a historical Jewish community - that is, they become similarly subject to state regulation and disciplining through legal and public institutions as not yet enlightened and emancipated from their religious tradition.[5]

Let me explain this briefly: from 1961 to 2000, Turkish guest-workers and Palestinian refugees in Germany were treated as legal aliens,[6] as external to the nation; the German state acknowledged guest worker presence but insisted that they would one day return home. With the change in citizenship law in 2000 and the discursive explosion of Islam as a threat in 2001, Turks and Palestinians came to be regarded as a religious group primarily within the confines of the nation-state, similar to Jewish communities between 1812 and 1933, who were gradually becoming German citizens, but remained socially differentiated as Jewish because of their religious background. The regionally diverse Jewish communities in the German Empire embarked on a multifaceted trajectory to shed religious difference through secular

[5] My reference to genealogy is informed by Michel Foucault's conceptualization of this term and allows me to focus on the institutions attached to these subjects, namely practices of citizenship and education (Foucault 1995). Furthermore, by describing this as a genealogical alignment, I acknowledge that there is a contingency in this relation, making certain phenomena between Jews and Muslims similar, while others are irrelevant.

[6] From the 1970s onwards most Palestinians came as refugees either from Jordan or Lebanon. These were mostly Palestinians, who had already been displaced in 1948 from historical Palestine. Their category was one of *Duldung* (lit.toleration) which is a legal clause for not having an official status and for having deportation currently suspended. *Duldung* could be as short as 90 days and as long as a year with no official work permit.

education *(Bildung)*, class mobility and the cultivation of a bourgeois habitus (Katz 1973; Sorkin 1999).[7]

I focus on Turks and Palestinians in this dissertation, because Berlin hosts the largest number of these two communities within one German city and because they also evince stark legal and political differences.[8] Although Palestinians were already coming to Germany in the 1960s, mostly as students in the natural sciences, their numbers were certainly lower than that of the Turkish guest-worker population. Palestinians, as refugees and not as students, began arriving in the 1970s, as a result of the various displacements they had been experiencing in the Middle East since 1948 (Hammer 2005). The two figures also merged into the concept of the Muslim, although Turks quintessentially stand for working class and Palestinians stand for Arabs in general. In the figure of the Muslim these features blend into a supposedly natural/organic whole.

Both of these communities are linked into different transnational networks: members of the Turkish community can travel back and forth between their country of origin and their new homeland, while Palestinians constitute an exiled diaspora with family ties and relatives dispersed around the world and triangulated through countries of transition such as Lebanon, Syria, Egypt or Jordan. More importantly, the country of their origin is not easily accessible to them. Even if Palestinians could travel to Israel, their village might have been levelled to the ground when the state of Israel was established in 1948. Palestinian presence in Germany is deeply entangled with the genocidal history of European Jewry, another crucial difference between the Turkish and Palestinian communities. An additional difference between the two groups is that Palestinians already have a relation to the figure of the Jew, one that is framed by their experience of Israeli state violence. Although both communities are embedded in a working class milieu in Berlin, Palestinians were legally circumvented from working until their legal status of *Duldung* (lit. toleration), another term for *deportation suspended*, was cleared. Most Palestinian families I met in Berlin had to wait 10 to 15 years for their toleration status to be cleared, during which time they were barred from the job market or from training for the job market.

Political demands that Muslims need to integrate better usually ignore the various legal and social obstacles that working class immigrants and former refugees have had to overcome and are still overcoming and are not related to being religious or Muslim. Demands for integration have been made since the early days of guest worker family presence in the 1980s (Chin 2007; Göktürk, Gramling, and Kaes 2007, 243–47), yet now they come with a different thrust of national confidence and security concerns.[9] In the current political context, which I refer to as *post-Holocaust*,[10] German state institutions regulate Muslims not simply as

---

[7] Historian Geoff Eley remarked that "citizenship was a faculty to be learned and earned" in regards to German-Jewish self-making in the nineteenth century (Eley 1991).

[8] Yet my choice is based on the fact that Palestinians are regarded as the quintessential anti-Semites within Muslims, while Turks are often cited as more secular and having a history of state *laicité* while stateless Palestinians are considered raw Muslims, who fight the only democracy in the Middle East out of a religious intolerance towards Jews. In terms of numbers, Turks in Berlin are estimated at around 250.000, although the numbers vary according to classification. Palestinians are estimated at roughly 70.000, but exact statistics are missing as Palestinians are registered through country of departure and usually have no Palestinian passport. Maybe give the numbers for Germany as well?

[9] See also the earliest memorandum written by Heinz Kühn, the first minister for integration of foreigners. Kühn's contradicted the official government line and declared that Germany is a country of immigration. Further, that most guest workers will most likely stay on and will need better education and integration into German institutions.

[10] Roughly speaking, the post-Holocaust era becomes a discernible political reality beginning after the fall of communism and the unification of the two competing German states in the early 1990s. By situating my questions in the post-Holocaust context—a political system in which liberal democracy sees itself as a bulwark against genocidal fascism—I point to the assumption that the existence of public memorials, tolerance education programs, and special relations with the state of Israel are offered up as evidence of a raceless society. Hence,

a religious minority with certain rights to religious freedom, but as a security threat emanating from their religious tradition. The security threat refers, on the political level, to the destruction of the secular-liberal order of the state, either by violent terrorist means or by long-term strategic operations in which moderate Islamists take on public positions to ultimately bend the laws towards *shari'a.* Statements such as these by the German intelligence service (*Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz*) affirm that "the Islamist" and his version of Islam as rule can only exist within its own religious-legal order and cannot tolerate religious difference and non-Muslims subjects as equals.

On the social level, the security threat refers to how Muslims talk about, refer, and relate to other minorities, particularly the Jewish minority. The atoned relation to the Jewish minority, to the state of Israel or to a Jewish individual is a measure of embodied tolerance of religious difference in Europe. In other words, the relation to this multifaceted, yet singularized figure of the Jew permits the articulation of the Holocaust as a violent, but exceptional and overcome past and evinces that the German nation-state is now immune against such forms of racial relations and discrimination. Having incorporated Holocaust history within the state project as the liberating narrative arising from the nation's dark past, certain social and political practices have come to define German liberal subjecthood—practices that openly exercise superiority vis-à-vis Muslims, who cannot claim the same degree of having come to terms with their pre-modern genocidal acts.

By coming back to the memory of the Holocaust, I see a particular relationship unfolding between the German host-majority and the immigrant minority understood as Muslims. This relationship is marked by exceptionality and closure; the exceptionality of the Holocaust and the closure of all evils and injustices therein particularly against Jews as a racialized religious minority. By virtue of this history and its cultivated memory in the German public, ethnic Germans come to own a tolerant society, one that cannot tolerate intolerant Muslims, especially if they are anti-Semitic. This refusal to tolerate Muslims, and to grant them rights as equals, is then a good right of the majority and the state that grows out of the lessons from the Holocaust.

The Holocaust, as an event that initiated an after for the contemporary world and the human rights discourse has been taken up in Robert Meister's work *After Evil: A Politics of Human Rights* (2012). Meister argues that once the evil is considered past and overcome, it does not necessarily bring the time of justice but defers it to a yet-to-come intertemporality of justice. In this intertemporal period new victims and claimants need to speak a recognizable language of human rights for further assessment and judgment for a justice to come. Both modeled on earlier genocides, particularly the Holocaust and yet differentiated from it, human rights claims gain a quality of comparability in difference.

In the case of citizenship for Germans citizens of Middle Eastern descent, this kind of speaking in comparable difference would mean to compare oneself to the older Jewish community. This kind of comparison would be considered victim-competition in Germany, because Jews have an exceptional status within German society. Therefore, my scope and case is far narrower than Meister's. Yet by focusing on citizenship and the question of becoming *eventually* recognized as equals by virtue of embodied values in relation to the Holocaust I attend to how the relationship with the new Muslim communities is neatly disconnected by the German institutions from the treatment of Jews prior to and during the Holocaust. As I will be demonstrating in various chapters, the Holocaust remains an

---

post-Holocaust is not only a temporal term marking the end of the industrialized mass murder of religious, ethnic and political groups, but it is also stands for a state and social understanding of itself as free from state violence, authoritarianism, racial ideology, racist categorization and the idea of race as such. If there appear any traces of the latter phenomena, they are usually attributed to neo-Nazis and right-wing extremists, to those who have not adequately learned their lessons from the past. But they are usually singled-out as an anomaly within society.

exceptional event in German discourse, authorizing immigration policies, citizenship tests and discrimination, for the sake of a tolerant society in which racial relations have been considered overcome.

I argue that teaching tolerance to immigrants differentiated as Muslims produces racialized Muslim subjects on the one hand, and a *moral nationalism* on the other. Addressing a subject as a Muslim essentializes certain attitudes as intrinsic to being Muslim, for example the hatred toward Jews. I argue that moral nationalism is not simply nationalism. I use this concept to articulate my observation that tolerance education programs aimed specifically at Muslims unintentionally enact and consolidate a sense of German (and perhaps European) moral superiority as having overcome a time of religious intolerance and being immune against hatred and prejudice against Jews. I call this moral nationalism, also because the tolerance programs depoliticize matters of intolerance and turn it into a problem of personal moral failure to emancipate from religious tradition that allegedly allow for these sentiments to harden in prejudice and bias. Yet race and nationalism are generally shunned as something of a radically different past political order, the Nazi-Holocaust, or as pertaining exclusively to right-wing nationalists. This attitude is partly possible because public German institutions claim that they have learned their lesson from the Holocaust and that Muslims, as subjects circumscribed by religious intolerance, need to be inculcated into this history.[11] In contrast to scholarship that has focused on Germany's nationalism and past as a right-wing problem (Mandel 2008; Shoshan 2016), I focus on nationalism as a phenomenon that is produced across the political spectrum and further effected by German Muslim civic educators and social workers.

By attending to the specific site of civic education in Berlin and centering my argument on projects funded to combat Islamic extremism, I point to a broader problem of European self-constitution as liberal, secular, and tolerant. This broader political discourse of secular tolerance is produced vis-à-vis Muslims and negotiated through a mostly abstract notion of the Jew in Germany as the local source of the European tragedy and the site of its mnemonic mastery. I have chosen the site of civic education, precisely because it is a secular site of teaching tolerance and because it has been the foundational site of civic subjecthood of liberal Germany since 1952, after Germany was re-instated as a liberal democracy in 1949. Civic education, as a state department, aimed to prevent right-wing and left-wing extremism among German youth, and immigrant youth were previously included without any special focus.

The change in discourse from migrants to Muslims has changed the field insofar as that established civic educational institutions have taken on projects funded to combat Islamic extremism and geared towards neighborhoods and schools with a predominantly lower working-class immigrant population. Migrant community organizations, hitherto engaged in social work and community efforts have jumped at the funding opportunities and started to offer trainings to combat anti-Semitism and religiously rooted intolerance among migrant youth, sometimes by simply reproducing a category of Muslim anti-Semitism. The funds, usually provided by the Ministry of Interior and/or Ministry of Family, Seniors and Youth, were also used to fund integration projects by visiting memorial sites and former concentration camps.

The two organizations at the center of my practical field research have also grown with this political and financial shift, but they had already existed prior to the shift.[12] Here, I

[11] The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance has further institutionalized the memory of the Holocaust as a European achievement for universal humanity in the year 2000. See here for further details: https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/index.php/stockholm-declaration

[12] In this dissertation, I have anonymized them by giving the organizations different names and the employees therein. The decision to anonymize is because I wanted to have the freedom to write about my work from a

will refer to these organizations in their pseudonyms *Antisemitsmus Bekämpfen* (AB) and *Farbe Bekennen* (FB).[13] Although, AB and FB were funded by similar funds to combat Islamic extremism and even had similar target groups, they deployed different strategies. AB regarded anti-Semitism as the key issue of radicalization. Further, they were convinced that the Middle Eastern Conflict, meaning Israel-Palestine specifically, was mediated in ways that fostered anti-Semitism, especially in Arab and Turkish media. I have accompanied both organizations during 2015-2016. At AB I have been more in the background observing and shadowing civic educators. At FB I was trained by the civic educators to co-conduct workshops on tolerance.

My interest in these two organizations was sparked, because they were both referencing the genocide of European Jewry, but they were not attached to a specific memorial site nor did they see themselves as teaching history. Their task was, so they assured me, to facilitate liberal-democratic agents able to intervene and participate in politics as tolerant subjects, Muslims who could be citizens.

The main task of these two organizations was then not simply to combat the political ideology of Islamic extremism, but to enable a subject who was willing to self-govern his attitudes towards a recognizably more tolerant self. In the case of the target group of mostly migrant teenagers it meant to invite them to speak about and playfully engage topics such as religion, specifically Islam, the Holocaust, Jewish life in Germany and the Israel-Palestine conflict in order to interrogate, reflect and change certain thoughts for a perspective underwritten by majoritarian norms and sentiments.

By taking two organizations as my starting point I navigate the question of teaching tolerance by civic educators and social workers, many of whom identified as Muslim or not at all, but were considered Muslim. I have taught alongside these educators and pedagogues, accompanied them to their workshops, schools, memorial sites and to former concentration camps, in order to understand the impact of their work, specifically for their own subject-position as German Muslims in relation to contemporary demands.

The Predicament of Tolerance

Teaching tolerance then is programmatic within a larger governmental project initiated by the Ministry of the Interior in 2006 as part of the German Islam Conference (DIK). Its aim is to incorporate former immigrant and refugee populations as *Muslims* into German citizenship by legal regulation and disciplinary measures aimed at shedding religious and political differences. As the former Minister of the Interior expressed it, Muslims are expected become the ideal type of citizens that the state desires: "enlightened and tolerant" (Betz, Pohlmann, and Volkery 2006). In this dissertation, the notion of tolerance will appear in two ways: first, as political practice shaping secular governance and second, as discourse disseminating into the site of civic education, where it is taught, negotiated and embodied as civic virtue.[14] In civic education and general practice, tolerance has never been a unified thing or a homogeneous concept. Depending on the context and the goals, the notion of tolerance could change and shift, even reveal religious particularity or try to hide religious particularity

---

critical perspective. Also because they did not always disclose to their target group that they were funded to combat Islamic extremism.

[13] The pseudonyms I have chosen can be translated as "Combatting Anti-Semitism" and "Showing True Colors." Indeed the first organization centered on the question of anti-Semitism particularly within schools, neighborhoods, and communities marked by migration and lower class status. The second organization had grown out of a concern for rise of Neo-Nazism in the mid-1990s. Their focus on Islamic extremism did not center a specific issue, but was predicated upon intolerance as such. Yet the projects funded to combat Islamic extremism would try to target the immigrant community, specifically youth and women.

[14] Please note that I am not strictly differentiating between speech and act, discourse and practice as I see all of these as practices guided by an underlying grammar. I am rather interested in how certain statements and declarations constitute frames, hence organize practices, constitute and position subjects as tolerant.

at all costs. As a notion of civic interaction, tolerance then structures the way of doing things—or, more specifically, as political theorist Wendy Brown formulated it, drawing on Michel Foucault's notion of governmentality:

> As consortium of para-legal and para-statist practices in modern constitutional liberalism […] tolerance is […] that which organizes "the conduct of conduct" at a variety of sites and through rationalities not limited to those formally countenanced as political (Brown 2008, 4).

The "conduct of conduct" was coined by Foucault when explaining how liberal governmentality presupposes the autonomous individual, yet regulates the person to govern themselves accordingly (Senellart and Foucault 2009). In this dissertation, the conduct of conduct refers to stances, attitudes, and statements in relation to the Holocaust, towards the Jewish community and individuals, and the state of Israel. In other words, the notion of tolerance organizes and structures a rightful relationship to a historically injured Jewish community framed by Holocaust memory; it is discursively and practically organized at various sites, but most specifically in the domain of civic education. The deployment of tolerance in secular governance invokes a notion of universal civic virtue but, in fact, it does many other things as speech act: for example, it naturalizes certain attitudes as religious, establishes 'the Muslim citizen," hierarchizes citizen-subjects by delineating a tolerant nation vis-à-vis premodern immigrants and it requires a supportive disposition towards the state of Israel, irrespective of its human rights transgressions. Further, it conceals direct and targeted state interventions into immigrant communities by compelling Muslim organizations into compliance with the state.

By drawing on Brown's insights about tolerance as a form of conduct that structures civic relations, I seek to track the work that tolerance is doing in the absence of equal communal rights for Muslims in Germany.[15] Keeping the conceptual and normative articulations of tolerance in mind, I ask 'what is the relation between citizenship—as a technology of secular governance organized by a specific modality of tolerance—and the racialization of former immigrants as Muslims?' Specifically, how does the relation to the Holocaust imbue citizenship and racial relations in Germany, now faced with a new religious minority[16] that it is asking to shed its difference? By focusing predominantly on members from former Turkish guest worker and Palestinian refugee communities in relation to the ethnic German majority within the field of civic education, I explore how tolerance is articulated through the referential frame of the Holocaust.[17] Tolerance as a form of conduct serves as an antidote to religious intolerance, as religion is believed to be the root substance of all social problems with Muslims.

[15] It is certainly true that Muslims are asked to cultivate a sense of tolerance for Jews precisely out of respect for their identity as Jews in light of Holocaust history. Muslim tolerance of Jews, however, supplements state toleration of Muslims and preconditions the conferral of 'corporation of public law,' the statute under which Muslims as a religious minority could have sovereignty over internal religious affairs. To state it bluntly: Muslim tolerance of Jews is legally and politically consequential for Muslim civic existence as equals, or so it is presented to them by the ministries in charge.

[16] Please note I use religious minority in reference to Muslims in order to emphasize their numerical and social status. Muslims are not legally codified as a religious minority with autonomy over their communities and customs. Rather, they have to assimilate their religious traditions and customs into German state law. Muslim religious traditions are then commensurated with secular-liberalism but also measured against Protestantism and Judaism. The legal status of certain Jewish practices serves as precedence for Muslim customs, such as in ritual slaughtering and circumcision, but overall Muslims have not been granted religious autonomy nor are they accepted in their practices deviating from a Protestant conceptualized form of faith.

[17] According to the Deutsche Islam Konferenz and the Ministry of Interior tolerance can be measured in relation to three major aspects: gender and sexuality, Antisemitism, and religious practice/extremism.

Race and Racialization

Given my own socialization into German history, I have only reluctantly acknowledged that the concept of race can provide an analytic lens on how certain populations can be grouped as a natural entity, hierarchized and managed through a variety of social, political and legal techniques. Another more muted part of the story is that race is misconceived in Germany, perhaps all of Europe, as completely separate from the modern notion and secular governance of religion, because race is usually attributed to personal prejudice and pseudo-science leading up to the Holocaust. Or perhaps because, race is such a contaminated term and immediately linked up with the Holocaust, it cannot be normalized as an analytic category.

Certainly, there is a substantial difference between the Nazi racist state, with its genocidal politics, and the current German Federal Republic. The ability, however, to establish and maintain racial relations is intrinsic to modern nation-states and not an exception to the rule, as scholars have long suggested (Bauman 2001[1989]; Goldberg 2002). Also, race and racial formations are not limited to one phenomenon in a particular political time, as scholars such as Geraldine Heng (2011a, 2011b) and Ann Stoler (2016) have exemplified in their works. As medievalist Heng shows in her visually informed work, the notion of a different species of man is transposed onto Jews, Moors and Africans by depicting them as devilish black and as engaging in immoral practices. In such visualizations, race converges with skin-color as a phenotype of alterity, crucial to this marking is the attached epistemology of immoral otherness visible through skin-color but not residing in it. Anthropologist Stoler has recently problematized how race is an enduring concept, because it can be embedded in a variety of political semantics and as such producing new racial truths, enabling new racial regimes and formations at times even by reassembling older ones into a new logic.

In the here provided discussion, race is attached to a religious substance, sometimes referred to as culture in order to point out how Middle Eastern subjects from Muslim-majority countries are just intolerant regardless of religious affiliation. This substance is diagnosed by the respective institutions in practices deemed intolerant and by being so as revealing a Muslim inferiority and immaturity to live in a liberal democracy. In a way there is a shift from a blood conception of race to a cultural conception in congruence with the change in citizenship law from jus sanguinis to jus soli in the year 2000.

Fieldwork and ongoing conversations with colleagues in Germany have helped me to understand how the state apparatus behind the educational programs was moreover *racializing* a religiously determined group. I came to realize how state-citizen relations are organized in such a way that Muslims are mired in a racial relation with the state and its institutions. To this day, the status of Islam as a religion is not legally agreed upon and not protected within 'corporation of public law,' the specific legal autonomy recognized religious institutions have.[18] Race and racialization as concepts provide a lens for understanding state regulation of

[18] Muslim organizations face several complications in order to be federally acknowledged as a corporation of public law: First, they have to nationalize, cut transnational ties and speak through one central organ representing all mosques and registered individuals. This challenges the national, ethnic and denominational heterogeneity among Muslim organizations. Other challenges pertain to practices either deemed illiberal, hence hurting rights of women (veil), children (circumcision), animals (ritual slaughter); these practices are taken as argument to counter-mobilize by populist groups. A federal status of corporation of public law would require the principalities to treat Muslim organizations with consideration for their role as social caretakers. In the absence of such a status, principalities select a few organizations and grant them certain special rights and state contracts. These rights and contracts do not guarantee the advantages of the corporation of public law. I should also clarify that I am not advocating a position as to what Muslim organizations should be endowed with or that being a religious minority would remedy current inequalities. I find it rather curious that the state identifies religious difference and tries to mold it into a supposedly universal shape of the citizen but ends up producing Muslims as a racial category. My aim is to discuss and account for this procedure. The lack of such a status, however, is a sign that Islam as a religion remains uprooted and cannot provide the same form of social and ethical care to Muslim communities as Protestant, Catholic and Jewish organizations currently provide.

subjects in their categorization through secular governance. Political theorist David Goldberg inquires broadly into the workings of the modern state, as the main generator of race and racist exclusions (Goldberg 2002). Goldberg argues that race is "integral to the emergence, development, and transformations […] of the modern nation-state "(Goldberg 2002, 4).

The nation-state as a modern formation is marked and ordered by race; furthermore, race circumscribes state projects at the point of their conceptual and institutional emergence. The various state apparatuses and technologies—administrative-bureaucratic procedures, policy-making and the law—constitute a racial order that ensures national and political homogeneity, creates a hierarchy and ultimately has the power to exclude certain subjects, populations and groups from the nation-state altogether (Goldberg 2002, 9). Relatedly, the racial state engenders a range of projects, practices, social conditions and institutions, rules and principles, statements and imperatives that provide the power behind racist expression (Goldberg 2002, 5). As such, modern states, in their powers, workings, and effects, are not entirely distinguishable from the order of the nation that they are heavily involved in shaping—"the national population, labor and security [that are formed] in and through articulation of race, gender and class" (Goldberg 2002, 6). I would add religion as a central category through which a racial order is articulated and intersecting with the aforementioned categories into an inseparable whole.

Yet the place of religion and religious difference is rather not accounted for in Goldberg's articulation, largely because it is folded in a self-narrative about liberalism's tolerance and openness towards religious difference. Here, Goldberg retreats to a perspective of an internal feud between members of the same European Christian family (Goldberg 2002, 15). He explains that religious difference is a recognizable difference or a difference of someone deemed the same and therefore accorded tolerance. According to this logic, religious difference does not disturb internal homogeneity in political and national terms as "external ethnoracial otherness" does (Goldberg 2002, 15). For Goldberg, internal ethnoracial homogeneity is challenged by postcolonial migration into Europe after WWII, making a racial configuration of migrants necessary.

The assumption here is that religion is dealt with in a different way, according to religious freedom enshrined in the constitution of liberal-democracies. In a recently published article (2016) he is more explicit about Europe's self-conception and constitution as a racial-religious project, excluding Jews, Muslims and blacks. By stating that "race, […] is the secularization of the religious," Goldberg claims "that raciality operates in much the same way that commentators have characterized secular modernity regarding religious ways of being and thinking" (2016). For the scope of this dissertation it matters that race is a result of state management and regulation of *migrant* religious difference remaining in tension with a desired moral homogeneity of the nation. The myriad of relations that the state establishes with citizen-subjects then are racial relations of ordering a center of the ideal secular citizen and managing, maintaining and hierarchizing religious difference of immigrants. In other words, race is a process of race-making, always incomplete and suspended in tension, the racial subject is embedded in a time of not-yet, not ready yet to self-rule or religious autonomy.

These racial relations of learning to become fully civilized have been earlier taken up by a range of post-colonial scholars in their discussion of imperial European dominance vis-à-vis colonial subjects. From Edward Said, who attested to an infantilization not just of subjects, but an entire region called "the Orient" (1979) to Ann Stoler who accounted for the identification of "uncivilized practices" in need of further disciplining according to European bourgeois norms (1995) and Dipesh Chakrabarty, who directly engaged with European historicism of the kind that David Goldberg discussed in racial state formations (2007). Chakrabarty accounted for the notion of not yet, as a 'waiting room of history,' where European modernity is always a step ahead of these others, who are catching up and not ready

for self-rule. The form of secular governance through dialogue, regulations, policies and ultimately pedagogies of tolerance discussed in this dissertation are all components of this historicist and infantilizing claim to European secular modernity.[19]

My understanding of the term *racialized* stands in an asymmetrical relation to the term *humanized* and draws from two sources on colonial rule that will be rather in the background. First, racialization is a term that comes up in accounts on race as shaped by anti-colonial thinker Frantz Fanon and refers to a relational and procedural subjugation in a colonial condition of dependency. Fanon writes about relational encounters in which the colonized subject is defined and inscribed as inferior to a civilized form of living, as yet not fully human predefined by the norms and the laws of the French-secular colonial majority (Fanon 2008 [1952]). Hence, and second, the citizen in secularism is not separable from the legal category of the human for the purpose of this dissertation. Here, I take my cues from legal anthropologist Samera Esmeir, who worked on the re-figuration of the human in colonial Egypt as an "irreversible process of transmutation" of old ways of life into a new set of being, feeling, relating within a concept of "juridical humanity" (Esmeir 2012). Esmeir demonstrates that the introduction of the legal concept of juridical humanity dehumanizes subjects prior and outside this kind of positivist law and transforms the human towards a specific understanding about justice, violence, and a relation to modern time and the state.

These two works also stand for two different takes on time in its racial effects. Fanon's reading and conceptualization of the racial relationship bespeaks a procedure of becoming, while Esmeir's human is framed by shifts and ruptures that do not necessarily link up with previous orders and times. Here, I try to account for the shifts rippled by the Holocaust as a political past that provides the episteme for citizenship and civic-subjectivity. Taken these two shifting moments together, I attend to the disciplinary procedures implemented several years later and ongoing. Racial formations within the state and of subjects are certainly shaped by a temporal order accounting for the nature of change possible or impossible. Goldberg provides an account of how two different assumptions about modern state formations articulate two different forms of racial statehood. He distinguishes here between two traditions of theorizing the racial state, the *naturalist* and the *historicist* tradition. These are not completely mutually exclusive strands of thought and have also been in conversation in certain historical moments, as he demonstrates. For my purposes here, it suffices to say that the naturalist tradition is underwritten by notions of inherent inferiority, while the historicist ascribes racial inferiority to historical immaturity. Here, I am concerned with the historicist tradition that seeks to remedy inferiority through legal regulations, policies, and disciplinary procedures after an immigrant group shifted into citizenship status but is considered not secularized enough yet.

By taking up the concepts of race and racialization in relation to a minority marked by religion, I oblige myself to center secular governance and political secularism as specific forms of state powers. Political secularism refers to the modern nation-state's production and regulation of religious difference. I draw here on anthropologist Saba Mahmood, who describes political secularism as a form of secular governance guaranteeing neutrality of the state and equality among religious groups (Mahmood 2015, 3). Yet by virtue of this guarantee, state interventions through secular governance contribute to religious tensions and to "hardening interfaith boundaries and polarizing religious differences," as she sets out to exemplify with her work on religious freedom (Mahmood 2015, 1). By calling out political secularism as a reordering principle of religious life that remakes inter-confessional relations

[19] This colonial resemblance is lost on most scholars working on Muslims in Germany. Exceptions to the rule are Iman Attia, Schirin Amir-Moazami, and Luis Manuel Hernandez Aguilar. Attia has made direct connections between Orientalism of the 19th century with secularism today. Amir-Moazami has written extensively about the regulation of female bodies, the headscarf debates and the dialogue principle of the German Islam Conference as civilizing missions. Hernandez Aguilar has explicitly worked on the German Islam Conference as a historicist state apparatus positioning Muslims and Islam in the 'waiting room of history.'

in accordance with specific norms, Mahmood invokes a two-dimensionality of political secularism.

The two dimensions of political secularism are precisely its regulatory function, Mahmood calls this "impulse," and its promise to freedom (Mahmood 2015, 21). By giving out the promise to freedom it legitimizes its interventions, these two dimensions are inseparably intertwined and crucial for its working. According to Mahmood, it is this function which is usually overlooked or not linked up with the exacerbation of religious strife, sectarianism, the ossification of religious groups, practices and difference and the creation of hierarchies among religious groups (Mahmood 2015, 20–23).

The German case provides a complication to this picture in certain ways. The immigrant population categorized as Muslim does not transition to a status of religious minority and its transition to a legal status of as a religious-legal body (orig. *Körperschaft des öffentlichen Rechts)* is preconditioned by the programs I will describe further below. Rather, the Ministry of Interior has defined various domains and sites for Muslim governance in order to make them fit for liberal-secularism. Nevertheless, the state promises religious freedom and a degree of autonomy if Muslims organizations and subjects comply with all the policies. Yet, Muslims (and Islam) are changed and embroiled in a racial relationship that requires constant proof of tolerance and secular fitness.

The procedures I will describe happen in a context and condition of *racelessness,* as if race was similarly a part of the evil past enclosed in exceptional time (Meister 2012; Partridge 2010). In a condition of racelessness, the existence and production of unequal social relations and homogenized groups cannot be traced back to the workings of the state, because race is disavowed. The conceit of racelessness is certainly not unique to Germany. I am drawing here again on Goldberg's work, who describes racelessness as a neoliberal condition, coding race as something that does not exist or has been surpassed and, in so doing, makes race *unnameable* (Goldberg 2002, 222). He describes the condition of racelessness as "a separation of race and state," in this I also recognize a race-religion nexus within secularism that has spun itself around a population categorized as Muslims.[20]

The conceit of racelessness in this case, however, is directly tied to the cultivation of Holocaust memory as an overcome evil with no resemblance to the current liberal democratic order. This kind of attitude of moral achievement vis-à-vis the Holocaust past might not be unique to Germany, but could well be a general form of living liberal democracy in the Western World, Israel included. Yet my discussion in various chapters will be limited to the national context of Germany, in order to demonstrate how the Holocaust is the episteme of civic-subjectivity and how this episteme relies on excluding certain realities, such as race, and posits others as opposites, such as religion.

The Fieldsite

By attending to the site of civic education as a field now geared to the discipline and production of tolerant German Muslims vis-à-vis an injured figure of the European Jew, I aim to show how particularly the civic educators emerged as Muslims wanting to be German Muslim. This relation between a new religiously defined minority and an older religious minority is mediated and organized by majoritarian sensibilities of guilt, shame and fear. The practice and embodiment of tolerance prompts a relational self-making vis-à-vis an absent

[20] Scholarly debates about whether Muslims are a race, a culture or a religious group (Modood 2006), whether there is racism without races (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991), whether physical phenotypes mark race (Partridge 2012) or whether religion is merely racialized through practices have informed my understanding of the race-religion nexus. Yet I would like to tread a slightly different path and bring secularism into the equation. By pointing out how former working class immigrants and stateless refugees are racialized, I will refrain from declaring as racism all forms of discriminatory treatment and attend instead to how secular governance works and produces German Muslims

Jewish subject for educators and participants alike in the field of civic education. Although all persons socialized in Germany acquire basic knowledge about the Holocaust through school education, ethnic Christian-Germans have been socialized with each new generation into guilt and responsibility through voluntary work on memorials and social projects provided by Protestant organizations in Europe, the US and Israel since the 1960s, as a form of atoning for the past (Wienand 2012). The stance of atonement is not limited to Christian circles; it has also pervaded politics and integration efforts with Middle Eastern immigrants as a universal form of citizenship.

The political landscape has changed drastically since I started fieldwork in January 2015. The ongoing wars in the Middle East, from Gaza to Iraq, but especially in Syria, have set new demographic shifts rippling across the Mediterranean. It is estimated that during the summer of 2015, 1 million refugees entered Germany alone. A popular right-wing movement emerged in Eastern Germany; the so-called "Patriotic Defenders against the Islamization of the (Christian) Occident" (PEGIDA) took to the streets by the thousands every Monday, throughout Germany. *Alternative für Deutschland* (AfD), the Euro-skeptic party formed in 2013 with a clear right-wing populist line, picked up PEGIDA grievances and successfully mobilized them against migrants and refugees to enter the German parliament in 2017.

While the AfD has remained consistently vocal about their resolute position against Islam and Muslims in Europe, they have also emphasized that Jews always belonged to Germany except for the tragic time during the Fascist regime. An exception to the party line emerged when the representative of AfD Thuringia, Björn Höcke, caused a controversy in early 2017 when he declared that there was no other nation displaying its shame as publicly as the Germans did with the Holocaust memorial, calling for an end to such a memorial culture. Although accused of anti-Semitism for this statement by the entire political spectrum, the party stood with him and did not expel Höcke. Does this statement mark the end of the post-Holocaust condition? Not quite; it is rather enabled by the post-Holocaust condition. Höcke's blunt statement and the political shift to the right are rather aggrieved produce of that condition. Certain forms of discrimination and distancing from the Holocaust past are to a certain degree expressible for the majority, because the German state condemns anti-Semitism and commemorates the genocide publicly as a bounded event that has been overcome.

Although the rest of the political spectrum would not make such bold claims about memorial culture, the political landscape has shifted considerably to the right when it comes to migration and refugee politics. This shift I believe is most strongly mobilized through the figure of the Jew. Consider this: after the elections in September 2017, it took the government six months to build a coalition. The only issue that could be immediately agreed upon was the urgent need for an "anti-Semitism Commissioner" located in the Ministry of the Interior. The CDU/SPD/Green government introduced a bill that defined anti-Semitism as a *rooted* problem in Germany against the Jewish people but also as an *imported* problem against the state of Israel (Özyürek 2015). As a problem imported by refugees and migrants from the Middle East, it required a different regulation and education, as charted in the proposed policy bill. As part of their integration and the right to stay and apply for social services, refugees will now be required to undergo Holocaust education programs specifically to prevent anti-Semitism and hatred of Israel, or they could be deported.[21]

Because the German nation-state is on the right side of history after the Holocaust, it can confront newcomers such as migrants and refugees from the Middle East with moral imperatives. What we are witnessing is the exercise of a nationalist politics of discipline or

[21] See also this report by the Berlin Senate that details the definition of anti-Semitism as proposed by the International Holocaust Research Alliance. https://www.parlament-berlin.de/ados/18/IIIPlen/vorgang/d18-1061.pdf. This definition includes criticism of Israel as anti-Semitism and as such becomes a litmus test of German sociability for Syrian and Palestinian refugees in Germany. The nationalist AfD and the conservative CSU have pled for deportation of anti-Semitic refugees.

deportation structured by tolerance. The notion of Muslim intolerance works as a diagnostic of potential Islamic extremism and terrorism, since anti-Semitism is always described as one form of intolerance that not only threatens Jews but is consequential for social peace. While there is officially no study that links "Muslim anti-Semitism" with Islamic theology, civil society organizations have claimed that the Israel-Palestine issue has triggered unjustified hatred against Jews and against Israel, especially among Muslim communities (Ranan 2018).

In 30 months of fieldwork, in various Berlin neighborhoods, I have participated alongside civic educators, social workers, school teachers and neighborhood community organizers in civic education projects, tolerance training-programs, and excursions to museums and memorials designed to cultivate tolerance. The two civil society organizations I worked with most closely assured me that they were not targeting Muslims, but rather they were funded to combat Islamic extremism within immigrant neighborhoods and schools. In other words, theirs was not a Muslim-only program, but a program going after dangerous political ideology rooted in Islam. Yet most schools that were approached to realize these programs were drawing their student body from the precarious lower working-class families consisting of former Palestinian refugees from Lebanon and former Turkish guest-worker families and a few ethnic German families. Converts to Islam, although non-existent among the target group of youth between the ages of 12-18, were similarly eyed as potentially extremist. The line between targeted Muslims youth and the cultural milieu was not only thin, it required the educators to constantly affirm, at least to me, the presence of non-Muslims, the focus on milieu and ideology and not on a specific group.

The actual target group of the organizations consisted of the first generation of German-born citizens of Middle Eastern descent, most of whom claimed an ethnic or Muslim identity. By claiming a non-German identity, the students restored a sense of pride and dignity vis-à-vis their social exclusion. As their teachers explained to me, the school and the students had been abandoned by their ethnic German peers, whose parents insisted their children deserved the *Gymnasium*[22] immediately and that the secondary school would be a social downgrade. Although I have been in conversation with teachers, parents and students, I focused mainly on the civic educators and social workers. The civic educators in these projects were usually also of Middle Eastern descent, and some identified as pious practicing Muslims who viewed their tolerance work as their duty to be good Germans and Muslims. Others claimed a clearly secular identity, stressing that they were German citizens and that their religion should not matter. Regardless of the educators' personal identification, they were hired by the organizations as cultural translators, who could be good Muslim role models for the students.

In the workshops taking place in the training-centers, schools, or museums the civic educators explained to me that the participants could learn to be political agents, who had a right to participate in public life, so long as they understood how to manage their religiosity in public. Civic educators would attend to Muslim claims of discrimination as a general problem of prejudice in society, to which other, weaker segments of the population were also subject. An engagement with structural anti-Muslim racism was usually avoided as it was thought to hinder the participants.[23]

[22]The *Gymnasium* is the only school that confers the degree of *Abitu*r and enables access to higher education in the university.

[23] Especially religious Muslim grievances, such as the ban on veiled teachers in Germany, the educators understood as the attempt to claim a position of victimhood and by doing so, engaging in victim-competition with Jews.

Dissertation Outline

I have divided the dissertation into two main parts. The first part deals with the framework of the entire dissertation political secularism and the concept of secularity. The promise of political secularism here is organized around the notion of tolerance. In chapter 1, I attend to formal shifts in citizenship since the early 1990s and in the early 2000s. By doing so, I demonstrate how the expansion of citizenship exposed a religious-racial conception of nationhood. This conception of nationhood has been in initially counteracted by a notion of majoritarian Christian tolerance. In a second moment, tolerance shifted to toleration of Muslims, in the mid-2000 after several global incidents triggered a moral panic over Islam, re-framing longer standing social and political issues with migrants as Muslim issues in need of better governance, both religious and civic, through tolerance education.[24] By attending to the political debates and discourses, I approach the question of political secularism by inquiring how the various administrative institutions of the state govern an ethnically heterogeneous population of former immigrants as Muslims in need of integration. Tolerance, as I will discuss, becomes interchangeable with a particular secular civic-subjectivity, requiring these newcomers to work on themselves.

I chapter 2, I attend to my actual field site of civic education. By centering an exceptional case of an ousted Palestinian-German tour guide/civic educator whose misconduct was read as a form of anti-Semitic Islamic extremism, I give an account of how secularity is constituted by the exceptionality of the Holocaust as an episteme. Relatedly, how the definition of Islamic extremism re-organizes certain statements of Muslim subjects as needing secularization in order to prevent radicalization. I will relate this definition of Islamic extremism to how the German state conceives of itself after the Holocaust was monumentalized and became a source of national identity and civic subjectivity.

The second part of the dissertation *Practices of Tolerance as Secularity* is dedicated to the practice of teaching tolerance in the everyday in contrast to the exceptional case in chapter two. The pedagogues combatting Islamic extremism, my main interlocutors during fieldwork, were hired because of their Middle Eastern immigrant backgrounds. Yet they needed to walk a fine line as they presented themselves as exemplary German Muslims for their students to emulate. By following them in their pedagogical work, their reasons for being active in this field, I discuss how their emergence as exemplary German Muslims was both agentive and inhibiting, making them aware of the limitations and contradictions of their aspired subject-position. The chapters aim at showing how notions of tolerance merge with secularity as constituted by and defined in relation to the Holocaust. Here, I attend to how the educators' aspiration to inhabit the state ideal German Muslim position required a policing of the boundary between Muslim religiosity and what could count as extremism in public.

The position of the German Muslim was not always stated explicitly, as I will discuss. At times, it also exposed racial hierarchies among Muslims, specifically between Muslims of Turkish versus Palestinian backgrounds. This racial hierarchy, I will point out in each chapter. The last chapter will focus on a school trip to Auschwitz memorial where there were no projects funded to combat Islamic extremism. The organizers of the trip, social workers of Palestinian and Turkish descent, framed this trip as for universal human tolerance, excluding a notion of Islamic extremism or a special pedagogy. Yet the fear of a particular kind of Palestinian-Muslim subject was present nevertheless.

By attending to how the pedagogues entered and mediated their teachings, I also point out the things left unsaid and the things feared. Teaching at times caused something akin to a *tongue removal*, the loss of speech, a lack of the right words, the entrance of silence and tension. Saying or acknowledging things deviating from a public perspective of the majority

[24] September 11, 2001 provided the frame for understanding further incidents driven by Islam and Muslims. These incidents include the murder of Dutch filmmaker Theo Van Gogh by a Moroccan immigrant who claimed, the attacks in London and Madrid as plotted by al-Qaida and local German cases of honor killings.

risked to expose that one had in fact left the national framework of tolerance education and transgressed unnamed but affectively charged boundaries.

In chapter 3, I center the work of a civil society organization that claimed to know the Berlin immigrant milieu and the problem with Islamic anti-Semitism. By working within the immigrant milieu but without wanting to stigmatize Muslims, a continuous contradiction informed their work. This contradiction was partly counteracted by hiring "Muslim peers" and "Muslim role-models" as educators. The chapter focuses on how anti-Semitism was combatted among immigrants while discrimination against Muslims as a religious group was continuously discounted as not existing.

Chapter 4 examines how Palestinian and Turkish female community organizers are required to talk about Israel-Palestine in a way that is not anti-Semitic and proof of their religious intolerance. By discussing how, I entered this workshop with a colleague in order to interrogate and separate religion from public life I set out to problematize the popular binary opposition of secularity versus religiosity. Here, I explore genealogically how a Protestant civil society organization has conceptually underwritten secular tolerance over the last 40 years with the notion of atonement. The aim of this chapter is to complicate the secularity vs. religiosity divide from within majoritarian Christian concepts that have underwritten secular concepts such as citizenship.

Chapter 5 centers on a school trip to Auschwitz memorial as a space of exception providing the grounds for tolerance in the present. The chapter asks: How does one commemorate the Holocaust, when the Holocaust shifted the way of knowing and erased the possibility to understand racial relations? By attending to how the trip was organized and how it brought to oppositional figures to the fore, the Jewish survivor vs. the Muslim extremist, I aim to discuss the difficulty of approaching Holocaust history as an exception. As part of this discussion, I demonstrate how both the figure of the Jew and the figure of the Muslim have to be made devoid of religious particularity in order to be considered human. Further, how racelessness is constantly productive of racial relations and blind to them, because race and racialization is exceptionalized and relegated to the space and time of the Holocaust.

Part I Religious Difference and Tolerance in Political Secularism

Chapter 1: German Citizenship from Closure to Task

The question whether Muslims should be considered a 'religious minority' or not has troubled the German state in the first decade of the new millennium. This question coincided with the state declaration that multiculturalism had failed and that *Muslims* needed to integrate as German citizens, in order to claim full equality.[25] However, the discursive framework of failed multiculturalism was a misleading one in this case. This was, because multiculturalism in the sense of group-differentiated rights for a religious minority, was never extended to Germans of Middle Eastern descent. Instead, this declaration initiated the beginning of new governmental procedures situated between secular governance and security concerns vis-a-vis a heterogeneous immigrant group now categorized as Muslims.

In this chapter, I set out to demonstrate how the religious difference of German citizens of Middle Eastern descent became an object of direct secular governance after the citizenship reform of 1999. In fact, as I shall show the category of "Muslim" emerged with political and governmental shifts of the early 2000s. In this "Muslim" referred not simply to a religious community, but rather to a vast and heterogeneous population with various ethnic backgrounds and varying religious practices and identifications. Thus, the category of the Muslim was also a racial category. It homogenized and essentialized a hitherto diverse group through a religious marker. This racial-religious reference and the consequential emergence of the Muslim subject -in need of becoming 'German Muslim' in order to prevent social and political disintegration- results from how non-Christians are governed in political secularism.

The literature on political secularism and religious difference, as will be discussed shortly, has illuminated how state and religion are in an asymmetrical governmental relationship as opposed to a clear separation of spheres. Relatedly, religious difference, usually that of minorities, is similarly not simply protected by the right to religious freedom but carefully governed, shaped and in certain ways ossified by the laws that guarantee religious freedom. My discussion of the German case will be in relation to this literature, but will also deviate from it in certain ways, because Muslims as a population are governed by various ministries in such a way that they cannot claim group-differentiated rights. Yet the same institutions use the category of the Muslim to to continuously prompt them to act as individual and tolerant citizens, who should not seek group-differentiated rights.

The secular governance as will be discussed shortly is framed by a discourse of tolerance. The notion of tolerance becomes a structuring principle for "the conduct of conduct" in public as a citizen. In the case of Muslims tolerance is further consequential for their own toleration as political equals. In this chapter, I argue that the discourse and politics of tolerance enables various ministries and the state-administration to govern immigrant communities directly by identifying and focusing on religious difference, specifically such that is considered intolerant of the political order. Relatedly, for individuals governed as Muslims becoming German is dependent on performing tolerance; hence they become tolerable as German while being differentiated as Muslim. As Muslims, these individuals enter a position of being tolerated, in which their presence and accordance of further rights as equals is conditional upon being tolerant.

The politics of tolerance in relation to non-Christian minorities is complimentary to how German citizenship is underpinned by ethno-national *and* particularly Western Christian secularized forms of belonging, even after the reform of citizenship in 1999. Citizenship, on the one hand a legal category with clear demarcating legal boundaries of access, on the other, also a disciplinary tool to compel subjects to emulate an abstract notion of the citizen.

[25]Here the official declaration by then Chancellor Angela Merkel: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-11559451.

Citizenship is the primary force through which political secularism comes to govern subjects, as I will try to demonstrate in this chapter. Yet contrary to what is usually implied in talking about political secularism and religious difference, here religious difference is managed by a politics of tolerance in order to tone down religious difference and to enable a German Muslim citizen to emerge.

In this chapter, I will first introduce the framework of secularism and explain the notion of secular governance of religious difference in order to shift to the primary site of Muslim regulation: citizenship. By introducing and discussing conceptions of citizenship, I seek to problematize citizenship as a telos in itself and as a form of becoming one with the state. Rather, my discussion is aimed at showing how citizenship gains a disciplinary quality when extended to religiously differentiated immigrants. In order to fully endorse this discussion, I take a step back and delineate how the change in citizenship law started with a sense of 'social closure' for former Turkish guest workers and non-European migrants. Relatedly, how the notion of citizenship changes from closure to task and disciplinary mechanism after September 11.

The shifting discussion of citizenship from closure to task is accompanied by a shift from tolerance to toleration. Tolerance the civic virtue in liberal democracies marked by multiculturalism, pluralism and diversity is now shifted to an understanding that the national majority has been too tolerant with Muslims, who have exploited this liberal benevolence for their own illiberal purposes. The antiquated notion of toleration re-emerges as a form of disciplining Muslim minorities into the right shape of citizen. A driving force of these state policies is the assumed achievement of tolerance since the exceptional time of the Holocaust, authorizing the German state confidently to make exceptions and prohibitions in membership.

1.1 Political Secularism and Religious Difference

The distinction between secularism and political secularism has been introduced by anthropologist Saba Mahmood.[26] Political secularism refers to the modern nation-state's production and regulation of religious difference, according to Mahmood. Further she, describes political secularism as a form of secular governance that guarantees the neutrality of the state and equality among religious groups (Mahmood 2015, 3). Yet as Mahmood shows, secular governance contributes to religious tensions and is in fact "hardening interfaith boundaries and polarizing religious differences," (Mahmood 2015, 1). By calling out political secularism as a reordering principle of religious life, which remakes inter-confessional relations in accordance with specific norms, Mahmood invokes two-dimensions in political secularism. The two dimensions of political secularism are precisely its regulatory function (Mahmood calls this "impulse") and its promise to freedom (Mahmood 2015, 21).

Political secularism's regulatory function is not simply neutral, according to Mahmood. Rather, by holding out the promise to freedom it legitimizes interventions into personal, private, and religious life. These two dimensions are inseparably intertwined and crucial for its working. According to Mahmood, it is this function that is usually overlooked

[26] Following anthropologist Talal Asad's intervention in the study of secularism, a new understanding took shape, which deviated from common descriptions of a separation of spheres, whether church from state or religion from politics (Asad 2003). Instead of a separation, Asad urges us to think about the emergence of a new relation, entered into by the modern state with a bounded object of tradition such as religion. In Asad's own words, what is "distinctive about 'secularism' is that [it] presupposes new concepts of 'religion,' 'ethics' and 'politics' and new imperatives associated with them" (Asad 2003, 2). These new concepts are enabled by epistemic shifts, as Asad explains, prior to secularism as a "political doctrine" through the secular as an epistemic category pointing towards a worldly telos (Asad 2003, 16). Inspired and provoked by Asad, scholars in various fields have set out to show regional nuances to his broad conceptual intervention. For the context of Germany, see Todd Weir for a more detailed account on scientific secularism and church state relations in the nineteenth century (Weir 2015).

or not linked up with the exacerbation of religious strife, sectarianism, the ossification of religious groups, religious practices and religious difference and the creation of hierarchies among religious groups (Mahmood 2015, 20–23). Following Mahmood's analysis, we can surmise that political secularism bears a certain responsibility in creating inequalities among different religious groups within the nation-state. Political secularism has an effect on the groups and things it claims to neutrally govern. To claim that the guarantor of religious freedom—namely, the secular state—is exacerbating religious strife begs for clarification as to what the nature of secularism is. For Mahmood, this hardening of religious difference happens in the moment of regulatory intervention by the state, for the purposes of creating equality. Mahmood explains that legal regulation is underwritten by majoritarian norms exceeding the legal rulings and striating in society (Mahmood 2015, 2–5).

As Mahmood notes, the question of religious minorities in the Middle East is discussed in terms of sectarianism -as if it is stemming from an incomplete secularization- while in Europe it is not. The case of Germany illustrates another dimension of contrast. Whereas in the Middle East religious groups are governed according to enshrined minority rights, in Germany these rights are extremely conditional upon acknowledging minorities as worthy of these rights. Members of minority groups receive citizenship rights as individuals, while the communal rights they would have as a religious minority with legal status are treated as conditional upon examination, ensured with further disciplinary policies acting as obstructions.

Political secularism in Germany then, is not exercised and ossified through family law, as is the case in Mahmood's account. Rather, political secularism is exercised through individual citizenship, the promise of political equality and equal access to legal rights, by managing the Muslim population through integration and education policies. These policies are premised on the idea that Middle Eastern immigrants, and Islam as a religion, is not compatible with the secular state and needs further refining before it can be fully incorporated within state structures. Until this status is reached, members of this group are individually disciplined. State administration and particularly the Ministries of the Interior, and Youth, Family and Seniors claim to govern immigrant communities in a neutral fashion without interfering with their religious faith. Rather, their claim is that they enable members in these communities to live their religiosity in a balanced and tolerant way and shed of potentially extremist practices that conflict with a liberal democracy and the separation of spheres.

The idea that modern citizenship transcends hierarchies as well as religious and social difference is the essential promise of the secular liberal nation-state; it harks back to the promise of political secularism. Relatedly, the secular conception of the human is grounded in state-citizen relations as the primary form of membership in society before religious and communal affiliations.By addressing former immigrant communities as Muslims, the German state institutions imply that there is a degree of separation grounded in religion between these communities and the state. Further, it presupposes a telos whereby Muslims must cultivate a closer relationship with the state as individuals, in order to enjoy equal status as citizens. As anthropologist Talal Asad stated, secular governance is effective not because it provides access to political participation and transcends differences, but because it governs through individual self-discipline (Asad 2003). Here I will attend to how secular governance shapes up by addressing individual self-discipline as citizenship.

At the outset, the promise of citizenship is straightforward: citizenship promises equal membership, direct access to the state, and the ability to participate in politics. The political theorist Hannah Arendt described citizenship as the right to have rights, indicating that being human in modernity depended on having legal membership in a state. Adversely, statelessness, or the loss of citizenship, was a condition marked by a kind of exposure to precarity, a life excluded from any fundamental rights. Arendt has a practice-oriented view of equality in citizenship, claiming that citizenship does not grant equality but equality must be

created through political participation in and mutual interaction on common issues. To put it in Arendt's words, citizenship granted the right to create and establish political equality. Political equality in this formulation is based on practice and interaction. In this conception of citizenship, however, becoming equal did not presuppose entrance to the polity as a differentiated body. To the contrary, Arendt warned that inclusion based on difference could introduce and harden fundamental inequalities (Arendt 1973).

The notion of transcending difference sits in tension with the inclusion of difference in Arendt's account. Arendt basically dismisses the idea of attaining equality through citizenship and focuses on political practice as a way of producing equality. How are we to understand Arendt's warning? And does it still hold in a nation-state marked by migration? Arendt's contention is that there is no place outside of citizenship. She exemplifies her warning by explaining that in a Greek *polis*, even a slave had a place, a social position—albeit unequal and dependent on his master. For Arendt, the inclusion based on difference precludes equal participation, thereby disabling participation as a generator of equality and creates a new paradoxical problem-space within citizenship (Arendt 1973). In other words, any kind of differentiation be it ethnic, racial, religious or gender-wise becomes a problem, because it displaces these members from full and equal participation. Arendt does not question, however, the normative conception of equality as perhaps already resting on particular majoritarian norms and values, thereby restricting access for certain groups and adumbrating them as differentiated.

If we connect Arendt's statement on the problematic inclusion of difference with Talal Asad's notion of secular governance as a form of self-disciplining, we can perhaps gauge what happens in that narrow space of participation predicated on religious difference in the German context. Instead of judging this as a failure of citizenship in political secularism and dismissing it, I would like to dwell in this space and problematize it, because it speaks of the reality of former immigrants in public institutions attempting to prove equality despite religious difference.

With Arendt's criticism about differentiated subjects in mind, I want to turn to scholars who have engaged with the relationship between citizenship and nationhood in relation to multi-cultural contexts such as Germany. Historians and sociologists have argued that citizenship and nationhood are co-constituted (Brubaker 1992; Eley and Palmowski 2008). Sociologist Rogers Brubaker has compellingly argued that citizenship for immigrants is a promise to national inclusion and provides a "social closure" because it grants the unconditional right to reside within a community, to work and prosper economically (Brubaker 1992, 23). Brubaker compared Germany and France in the early 1990s; arguing that France has developed a more statist model of civic inclusion, while Germany remained tied to a blood conception of civic inclusion with particular cultural expectations vis-à-vis the immigrant communities. I would like to take Brubaker's argument a step further and attend to the changes after 1998. Because citizenship is bound up with nationhood, attaining the legal status of a citizen is always informed by historical particularities. Yet the co-constitution of citizenship and nationhood remains effective even after attaining citizenship, as is the case with naturalized Middle Eastern immigrants in Germany, who are doubted in their national belonging and must always affirm it by practicing tolerance. This co-constitution of nationhood and citizenship is consequential for immigrant communities, and for national and religious minorities, insofar as their equality and national belonging is predicated upon recognizable practices.

The role of recognition in multiculturalism has been interrogated by anthropologist Elizabeth Povinelli in her discussion on court cases dealing with indigenous land rights in Australia (Povinelli 2007). Povinelli's discussion exemplifies how indigenous minorities are required, on the one hand, to present an authentic account of their belonging to the land and to be, on the other and at the same time, clearly intelligible to the white Australian court in their

understanding what a native relation to the land is. In other words, state recognition for the indigenous, just like for other minorities, is predicated upon reproducing a majoritarian language and norms in its articulation of difference. Here, court hearings become the site in which a judicial authentication is conferred on the aboriginal groups, to acknowledged their rightful ownership of the land they claim (Povinelli 2007).

This dissertation draws on these valuable insights to argue that for Middle Eastern migrants in Germany gaining citizenship is about learning to become recognizable as a tolerant subject, while incongruously, becoming the subject who occupies the slot of Muslim difference. Put differently, being included based on difference still requires the work of becoming the kind of differentiated subject that is tolerable. Citizenship, as I have tried to delineate here, is partly a promise, given as part of a larger legal-administrative structure; and it is partly the result of ongoing and self-governing disciplinary practices. Taking these two gestures together, we can understand the double work of secular governance through citizenship. Being recognized as equal but different need not take place in public moments of court hearings, as Povinelli describes. Rather, what I describe is an ongoing process of self-disciplining, policed and surveilled by various public institutions—such as schools, civic training centers and other settings organized around the notion of tolerance—and tied to the administrative state. Similar to Povinelli's account of nationhood in multiculturalism, I hope to demonstrate in the following sections and chapters, how the notion of an already tolerant nationhood plays a crucial role in framing and crafting a fitting German Muslim subject.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will attend to two different but interrelated moments of citizenship regulation for immigrants and institutional reform of Islam. The first moment is a partisan parliamentary debate on how citizenship should be changed from *jus sanguinis* to *jus soli* from blood right to birth right in the late 1990s. The second moment pertains to the beginning of the German Islam Conference (DIK) in 2006, at which the Ministry of the Interior demanded enlightened Muslims for Germany. By attending to these two political moments, I demonstrate how the notion of citizenship as social closure coupled with tolerance shifts to citizenship as self-discipline for toleration. The former assuming an end point, the latter becoming a long-term condition.

1.2 Shifting Demographics and National Politics

The early 1990s witnessed dramatic shifts in the demographic politics of the Federal Republic of Germany. Not only did former GDR citizens see their state institutions crumble, but ethnic Germans (*Spätaussiedler,* lit. late settlers) living in remote settlements in, for instance, Kazakhstan could now claim the international right of return and demand German citizenship on the basis of blood ties documented through baptism certificates from the Protestant Church. Additionally, a significant number of ethnic Russian Jews were leaving the disintegrating Soviet Union for Germany, seeking better opportunities. Their immigration was celebrated as the return of a lost German-Jewish tradition—the sound of Klezmer, the intellectual life of German-Jewish high culture imbuing German society with some lost vitality. The German Ministry of the Interior sped up their arrival and provided immediate full residence permits, as history obliged Germans to take special care of these *Jewish returnees,* although their ancestry could not be traced back to Germany (Laurence 2001). I mention these two demographic cases also to show how religion and race still intersect in Germany today: to be German is to be Christian, and to prove it with church documents,[27] and to be Jewish is to

[27] I should caution that I am not simply saying all Christians are quickly considered German. Obviously, contemporary Christian refugees from the Middle East are considered nationals of their respective states. Similarly Greeks, Spaniards and Poles are not considered German, although they represent a Christian denomination within Europe. The idea of an ethno-nationality certainly plays a role, and this is to a certain extent based in language, customs and traditions. Yet, the Protestant documents are the ultimate proof of Germanness in the case of this group.

transcend ethnic difference and national affiliation, according to the German national imaginary. By virtue of state regulations both subject positions are ossified through one marker, here religion, and remain stable, and through that re-affirm a racial relation of exceptional care.

The idea that *Spätaussiedler* were considered a tribe of the German people who just wanted to resettle in their homeland—albeit a bit late, as their categorization suggests[28]—was made possible through a *jus sanguinis* (blood right) conception of citizenship. The explicit and exclusive adherence to *jus sanguinis* in German citizenship law was stated in 1913, at around the same time that many Germans were emigrating to the US, where they sought better opportunities as professionals (Brubaker 1992, 115). It seems that population decline due to the German colonial presence in East Africa also played a role in changing citizenship laws, but in the colonies citizenship rights came eventually under scrutiny for 'racial impurity' in mixed marriages (Aitken 2014). In previous years, prolonged absence from German territory had led to the loss of German citizenship, but the citizenship law in 1913 stated that Germans who lived abroad would continue to be considered Germans, even if they extended their stay beyond ten years and even if their passports had expired. Brubaker states that approx. sought naturalization in Germany (Brubaker 1992, 119). The law allowed for Germans to hold dual citizenship and also to reclaim citizenship, even decades after they had left. It promised that all male German citizens would always be regarded as potential Germans by the state.[29]

[28] Note that these German settlements in Eastern Europe and Russia already existed in the imperial days of the Russian, Prussian, later German Empire, and they also expanded throughout the Habsburg Empire. Due to the emergence and shifting boundaries of nation-states, German-speaking groups became national minorities in those regions. During WWII, many of the Eastern European territories were reconquered and some even invaded for the first time and occupied by the German military. Ethnicity was determined partly on the basis of the German language or a dialect of it and, more importantly, on baptism certificates from the church registry (Aktürk 2012). Eastern European Jews, as former subjects of the German or Austro-Hungarian Empires, also spoke and even wrote a more educated German, though they were not considered German either by the Nazi state or by the successor states after the war. The majority of the German settlers was Protestant and thus stood out from the Catholic and Orthodox environment of Eastern Europe. After the end of WWII, ethnic Germans fled west of the Oder-Neisse line—the two rivers that mark a natural barrier between German majority and Slavic majority territories. These communities—those at least who came before 1949—were officially considered "incoming settlers" (*Aussiedler*), partly because they had been officially settled as groups by the German state in certain areas within towns and villages in the so-called Nazi General Government and partly because the term "refugee" legally implied the return to a homeland whose borders had since changed and so the term was avoided. Those communities who remained in the Soviet Union were re-settled in Kazakhstan or even Siberia, partly as a form of collective punishment for crimes committed by the German military during the war. The German communities immigrating to Germany after 1989 were categorized as *Spätaussiedler*, as "late-coming settlers" who would have come before 1949, if they could have. Indeed, Soviet bureaucracy did hinder German communities from leaving. But these same communities were treated by the Germans as the fragmentary remnants of a re-opened past that could find their rightful place in the German homeland of the present. The immigration of Jewish communities from the former Soviet Union was similarly welcomed; the German state viewed their entry as a way of becoming whole again, as a return to a natural state that had existed before the Nazi regime had destroyed it. Mehmet Daimagüler, a German-Turkish FDP politician and lawyer, recalls from the early days of reunification, how incoming East-Germans would state on public German TV that Turks better go home now, their job here was done, and that Germans now needed these jobs. The sociologist Nevim Cil accounts for the changes undergone by the Turkish guest worker communities after reunification, many of whom would describe the social loss they have been experiencing since 1989 as "the wall [falling] on their heads"(Cil 2007).

[29] German Jews had actually acquired equal status in 1871. Henceforth, naturalization law was changed to disregard religious affiliation. The law of 1913 included all German citizens; from that point on, citizenship could be passed on through the father (Nathans 2004). Although the law was universal and applied to all German men abroad, its implementation was denied in the African colonies. German men married to Namibian women in African colonies were either prevented, by the colonial governor, from passing on their citizenship to their children, or their marriages were retroactively nullified. In few exceptional cases, the colonial governor permitted the civic transmission of citizenship after having inspected an applicant's private environment, such as

The notion of blood right to citizenship was re-organized by the Nazi regime in 1935. Now blood descent acquired an additional racial quality through modern administrative procedures and codified race legally. The Nazi state introduced an additional clause concerned with Aryan purity, known as the Nuremberg Racial Laws, according to which German citizens had to prove that they were Aryan and not Jewish. Evidence of racial purity was based on the baptism certificates of the grandparents' generation, but also included the parental documents and one's own. If all of one's grandparents had already been baptized, then one could be considered an Aryan. While this suggests that being deemed Aryan was nominally equivalent to being Christian and the conception of the Aryan as a superior race did mobilize Christianity through the institution of the church and the legal apparatus, it also had philological underpinnings. Earlier debates in philology regarded Christianity in and of itself as complicating the idea of the Aryan, because Christianity had originated in the Middle East and was therefore a Semitic religion, same as Judaism and Islam (Masuzawa 2005).

It would be more productive in this context to think about secular governance in its regulatory function. State-regulated citizenship, by means of baptism certificates, did not simply burden citizenship with additional documentation. Rather, it shifted the religious category of Jewishness into a racial category and transmuted a population that was now subject to further state violence as Jews. This is all the more important to emphasize since around 200,000 people in Berlin alone *became* Jewish in the racial sense through this legal procedure, which was based on baptism certificates (Gailus 2008, 7–27).

The baptism certificates seem more like negative documentation, deployed to exclude those German citizens who could be considered Jewish. In other words, they did not simply prove pure Christian roots; by providing a genealogy, one proved that one was pure-blooded now, which meant not being Jewish anymore.[30] There is a certain civilizational teleology involved here that mobilizes the practice of baptism as a genealogical initiation rite. In earlier decades, individual members of the Jewish bourgeoisie had also gotten baptized, likewise due to social pressure, in order to fully embrace their German citizenship. With the change in citizenship law initiated by the Nazis, individual members now had to evince a genealogical process of their having become German through ancestral religious conversion. The law basically re-organized individuals within their kin and wider religious community as part of a Jewish entity. As a legal document, the baptism certificate intersects Christianity with German citizenship and Aryan purity. By doing so, it homogenizes these different elements into a conceptual whole of the citizen-subject, in the context of which being Jewish sticks out as a consequential racial-religious difference within the Nazi state apparatus.[31]

---

housing, furniture, living standards and conditions, to see whether they resembled a traditional German home, thereby ensuring that the African-born children were provided a German upbringing (Aitken 2014).

[30] Strikingly, I learned about this detail through my fieldwork and the racial category tables on exhibit at the Wannsee Memorial and the Information Center underneath the Holocaust Memorial. Although these tables mention baptism, they do not provide further information on how these certificates were received, the position of the churches and the question of state and religion during the NS-regime. A recently published book by legal historian James Whitmann deals primarily with the making of racial laws based on the American legal conception of race, disclosing how the Nazi regime modeled itself extensively after the US, but fails completely to mention baptism certificates and the role of religion as part of the administrative machine.

[31] The complexity of these documents lies in the amount of work they occasioned. First they were required for public service officers, who had to provide 7 baptism certificates in total, including their own, their parents' and all their grandparents'. Being categorized by the Nazis as 'half or fully Jewish' (a categorization that was also based on missing or impartial baptism certificates) led to an employee's suspension from work and the invalidation of their citizenship. I can currently not fully gauge how the churches complied with these laws and according to what rationale. A relatively recent edited volume by German historians traces two churches that were invested in documenting Jewish members within their congregations. Problem cases were such persons who had baptized parents and grandparents but who had never been baptized themselves and did not attend church. They were dependent on courtesy of the church and the personal judgment of the pastor or priest. Also, secular German Jews with no ties to a religious community, either Jewish or Christian, could be considered Jewish. These baptism documents were eventually required from other professional groups as well, such as

There is more to this story than the procedure of producing seven baptism certificates, on the basis of which the Nazi's would issue a document that specified the degree of one's blood purity. By legally separating between Aryan and Jew, the procedure constitutes race as a social reality enabled by secular governance. Christian heritage, church membership, blood purity and Aryanism come to appear as one natural entity that culminates in secular citizenship and the rights attached to that. Certainly one could object that the Nazi regime was never intent on guaranteeing religious rights and freedoms to minorities, nor is this a sectarian tension between different religious groups. This objection seems to hold true and points to the problem of racialization, because German Jews were not relegated the legal protection to become autonomous as a religious minority over questions of religious rites and traditions.

The emancipation of Jewish communities had been proceeding in such a way that for almost a century Jews were being given rights as individuals and not as a religious minority. The legal emancipation of the Jews in 1870 rather worked to confirm a social status quo that most German Jewish families had already assimilated and naturalized. Further, prior even to the Nazi regime, the German Empire was active in co-drafting international laws for the protection of national minorities, especially ethnic German minorities in Eastern Europe and Christians in the Ottoman Empire, even as it was denying the existence of national minorities within its own territory. The German Empire specifically denied the existence of Jews as a religious minority, by claiming that Jews were simply German citizens just like everyone else (Claude 1955).[32] Following this, the Nazi State retroactively intervened in religious legislation in order to define Aryans and Jews as two racially distinct and hierarchized groups. Secular governance then did not merely polarize Christians against Jews as a sectarian issue. Rather, it re-organized religious difference within a racial logic and transmuted majoritarian religious difference into the category of human, entitled to citizenship, and the minoritarian into the category of sub-human, who could not claim a secular humanity.[33]

While the genocidal outcome of this racial hierarchizing is known to us, its rationale remains valid even today in naturalizing *Spätaussiedler* who are granted citizenship upon registering a domicile in Germany. In their case, the baptism certificate came to certify the essence of their being German.[34] In stark contrast to former East German citizens, the recent ethnic German settlers and the Jewish returnees, the predominantly Turkish guest-workers and their families—as Turkish citizens bearing only residence permits that were mostly dependent on official work contracts—were submitted to an experience of deferral.[35] Though officially present for thirty years, along with other guest-worker communities from Southern Europe and Northern Africa, Turks were local aliens, usually referred to as *Ausländer* (foreigner). It took almost another decade and a change in government to acknowledge the

---

lawyers and educators; failure to produce them occasioned further waves of suspensions from professional service, especially in public institutions. Eventually, the documentation requirement led to a broad suspension of Jewish public servants, the boycott of Jewish businesses and the legal exclusion of Jews from German citizenship (Gailus 2008). The topic itself was taboo in Germany until the early 1990s and Gailus himself focuses mainly on "National-Protestantism," a term he coined in order to account for the nationalist spectrum within the Protestant church and not for the Protestant church as such.

[32] In a way, the German statement on the status of the Jews was not wrong. In fact, it rather reflected how the policy of acknowledging the Jew as an individual, thereby denying rights to the community, had disturbed the possibility of the Jewish community ever achieving the status of a religious minority in the legal sense. Relatedly, international laws formulated to protect religious minorities and to intervene on their behalf did not apply to European Jews.

[33] The above-cited edited volume by historian Manfred Gailus mentions that the churches complied with the Nazi state, because they had been politically and financially neglected since 1914 by the Weimar Republic and were keen to prove loyalty to the Nazi state in order to gain a better social, economic and political standing.

[34] A recent statistic by the Federal Office for Migration reveals that even in 2012 around 1,200 people migrated to Germany as *Spätaussiedler* and claimed their right to be naturalized.

[35] Please note that my use of Turkish refers to the legal categorization of Turkish guest workers, their heterogeneous ethnic and religious backgrounds notwithstanding.

reality of immigration as a more permanent part of the national fabric. The acknowledgment of immigration as a durable reality was reluctantly translated into a conditional birthright to citizenship for immigrants and their German-born children at the turn of the millennium (Mandel 2010).

The previously discussed incorporation of East Germans, *Spätaussiedler* and Russian Jews confirms a certain binary: either one is German by blood descent and therefore a natural member of the polity or one is exceptionally granted a more tolerant treatment by the German state.[36] Turkish guest-workers, as the biggest migrant group present, were neither.[37] Their presence was based on their function as labor and this function came into question now that the former East Germans were promised social and economic incorporation. In fact, the German state had always related to Turks as a singular group with a specific economic task, the presumption being they would eventually return to Turkey. In the mid-1990s their presumed return became a charged question, turning their presence into a pressing issue. Should they be tolerated until they leave—or were they not leaving at all?

The Christian-Democrats left no doubt that Germany could not under any circumstances become a country of immigration as they had stated perennially from 1982 to 1998.[38] The tensions over the Turkish presence were heightened by incoming refugees from the Balkans, Iraq and Afghanistan, who were fleeing newly erupted wars. A discourse of the useful and the useless foreigner began to spread, of the economic versus the real refugee. Meanwhile, the discourse of tolerance was non-existent, and a discourse of religious difference was similarly absent—until several arson attacks against Turkish family homes caused the death of children in 1992 and again in 1993. These attacks sparked national outrage, spearheaded by the Jewish community, claiming that unification had indeed resurrected the old specters of nationalism.

1.3 Reforming Citizenship for Tolerance

The SPD-run election campaign in 1998 had one major theme: Germany is a country of immigration and it will have to change the way it relates to migrants. One major proposal by the Green party was to introduce *jus soli* in addition to *jus sanguinis*. In the plenary session of the German parliament in March 1999, the previously debated legal reform of citizenship was on the agenda again for detailed discussion, but also for revision as petitioned by the CDU.[39] The CDU had earlier started a petition against the eased citizenship law by collecting signatures in CDU-ruled cities, propagating the petition as a "signature against Turks"—or so it was circulated in the mainstream media, since the foreigner was best described as a Turk.

---

[36] I should perhaps emphasize the relational difference. There is a legal clause called *Duldung* (lit. toleration) enacted in twilight asylum seeker cases such as Palestinians coming as refugees from Lebanon during the Lebanese civil war and staying on in Germany after the end of the war as cases of toleration. In the case of Russian Jews, it was a matter of tolerance not necessarily a legal clause but a supplemental attitude of the state to be more generous towards a certain population.

[37] Note that the first Turkish guest-worker came the same year as the Berlin Wall was built, in 1961. Germany had already established guest-worker contracts with Italy, Spain, Greece and former Yugoslavia in the 1950s. Turks were latecomers and came under slightly stricter conditions.

[38] See here for the implemented return policies attempting to attract foreigners to go back to their countries of origin. It seems that the CDU was willing to keep half the guest workers as national minorities of their respective countries. http://ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=859. Similar return programs are currently implemented for refugees in order to reduce the demographic numbers: https://www.returningfromgermany.de/en/voluntary-return.

[39] Please note that I am referring to the plenary protocol provided by the German parliament in the form of a stenographic report from Session 28 held in the former capital Bonn, on March 19, 1999. Plenary discussions and other documents issued by the German parliament can be found here: http://pdok.bundestag.de/index.php. The plenary protocol I will be referring to is registered as 14/28 and can be found here: http://dipbt.bundestag.de/dip21/btp/14/14028.pdf.

Indeed, other foreigners who earlier shared the same legal category and had also come as guest workers in the 1960s, such as Italians, Portuguese, Spaniards and Greeks, had by now a different legal status within the EU, without undergoing a formal change in their citizenship. As EU citizens, they could move and settle freely, not only between their home countries and Germany but anywhere within the entire European Community. In this sense, Turks became foreigners, not only to Germany but also to the growing European Union. According to the governing parties, spearheaded by the SPD, reforming citizenship would enable the integration of foreigners—or so they argued. Integration, then, became the endpoint of inclusion into the polity by way of citizenship. Moreover, the SPD/Green government saw this not only as a way of transforming Germany into a more Western European nation-state within a community of liberal European states but also as an act of tolerance (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2281–83).

The citizenship reform aimed at easing access to citizenship without completely dismantling *jus sanguinis*. At the time of the parliamentary discussion, foreigners could naturalize into German citizenship if they had been living in Germany for at least fifteen years, so long as they had no criminal record and could prove a regular income; proficiency in German was officially required but not examined. The new law envisioned a shorter period for naturalization—eight years—but made requirements similar to the old naturalization law with respect to regular income, criminal record and language proficiency. In addition, it guaranteed automatic German citizenship to the German-born children of immigrant parents, if one of the parents had been living in Germany for at least eight years and had a regular income at the time of birth. German *jus soli*, as one can already gather, was still conditional, and it neither automatically guaranteed any group rights to foreigners nor did it guarantee their automatic naturalization. It simply eased the conditions under which newborns could be and become German (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2288).

The CDU and others saw the main problem in dual citizenship. In their accounts, Turks and other foreigners who had naturalized could not be loyal citizens if they kept their original passports. Further, they proposed a law literally called "warranting naturalization" *(orig. Einbürgerungszusicherung)*; this would guarantee that the German-born children of immigrants would become German citizens at the age of eighteen, provided they had integrated well into society, as revealed through school examination, language proficiency and the absence of a criminal record. In other words, the CDU was extending the wait for naturalization from fifteen to eighteen years for German-born children of immigrant descent. In addition, the CDU required the full resignation of prior citizenship, and not by the age of twenty-three as the law was originally drafted.

The SPD/Green government was also not in favor of dual citizenship, though it was willing to allow for a five-year grace period until the age of twenty-three, at which point one or the other citizenship would have to be chosen *(orig. Optionsmodell)* (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2282). Another issue that was raised by the CDU was criminality. Criminality could refer to petty or usual crimes but also to 'political extremism,' such as the "imported Kurdish-Marxist militantism" that was allegedly threatening social peace on German streets. The main problem in conjunction with citizenship was that, according to CDU politician Wolfgang Zeitlman, "little Mehmets" (sic!)—meaning minors between the age of sixteen and eighteen, whose residence status was dependent on their parents'—could not be deported anymore (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2286). The term Islamic extremist does not come up, but "fanatic Islamist" is mentioned by the same member of the CDU in order to argue that these people do not want their children to be Germans either (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, Ibid.).

The appeal to greater tolerance was made several times during the debate, mostly from the SPD and Green side addressing the CDU, twice even with Bible quotes. The quotes both reminded the CDU to be real Christians, but also scolded them for not living up to Christian

values, as the other parties were. The first quote was offered by the SPD politician, Dr. Michael Bürsch, in a plea for equal treatment and for tolerance of difference:

> And if a stranger sojourns with thee in your land, ye shall not do him wrong. The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the homeborn among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself […].[40]

In this quote, God commands the Israelites to take in newcomers. The transposition is telling in many ways: not only do Germans occupy the position of the Israelites whom God is addressing, but foreigners are becoming strangers.[41] As strangers, migrants acquire a new quality—as if they had just arrived and as if they had been living somewhere else all this time. They become temporally and spatially distanced again. In a different address, the Bavarian Green Party MP Claudia Roth emphasizes that the CSU[42] does not represent all of Bavaria, that there is an alternative Bavaria which is not as bigoted; toward this end, she cites the Pharisees from Luke 18:11, in order to point out how self-righteous CDU member Wolfgang Zeitlman was behaving. The quote goes as follows: "Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men are," leaving out the rest of the verse: "extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican." Both quotes suggest that the CDU will understand a Christian language, but they also show that the opposing parties are similarly entrenched in a Christian framework. Yet, what this actually demonstrates is the Christian homogeneity in the parliament. The debate follows an unwritten rule of a "We, the Christian-Germans," as if the incorporation of Turks were not a matter resolvable in a legal debate about social justice but only in a paralegal debate of tolerance as to how one should relate to such a legal change.

Political theorist Wendy Brown offers a dense discussion of tolerance as a multifaceted account about the modern notion of tolerance in the Euro-American political tradition. While wrestling with the ambiguous meanings and polyvalent workings of tolerance, Brown clarifies that the notion of tolerance cannot be dissociated from a discourse of power, one in which the object of tolerance remains differentiated even at the moment of its incorporation (Brown 2008, 28). Here, Brown also delineates a relationship of management, between a tolerating host and a threatening heterogeneous element, emphasizing that tolerance lives off of that relationship. Brown describes how tolerance as a practice cannot be located in the law, since tolerance is not codified by the state (Brown 2008, 4). As a social practice, tolerance is an addition to the law and sometimes a supplement to a missing legal status (Brown 2008, 12). Yet, this is precisely where tolerance as a practice draws its power from, because it blurs asymmetrical relations, although the tolerating party holds a superior position to the tolerated (see also Goldberg 2004). Further, she writes that the language of tolerance is embraced for the purpose of conflict reduction—less for the protection of religious belief and freedom of conscience, as it was initially intended when it emerged as a concept during the Reformation. Rather, Brown claims that tolerance today seems more like a "telos of multicultural citizenship […] focused on identity broadly construed" (Brown 2008, 5).

---

[40] The first Bible quote is from book of Moses chapter 19, Verse 33-34 (Exodus in English) the German original is quoted as follows: "Wenn…ein Fremder in eurem Land lebt, sollt ihr ihn nicht unterdrücken. Der Fremde, der sich bei euch aufhält, soll euch wie ein Einheimischer gelten, und du sollst ihn schätzen wie dich selbst." Further, the quotes actually anchor Christianity as the cultural frame and position the legal aliens as quintessential strangers. As strangers they gain a different anthropological quality of being unknown or unfamiliar as opposed to being present for over thirty years with a socially and economically different status within a German social stratum.

[41] It is unthinkable that a German-Turkish parliamentarian would quote verses from the Qur'an without causing a controversy over the violation of secular space.

[42] CSU, the acronym for Christian Social Union is the Bavarian variant of the Christian Democratic Union. Claudia Roth is addressing a Bavarian MP but speaks against the entire Christian conservative spectrum.

In the here offered quotes, the parliamentarians supplement their legal decision over Turkish guest workers and other who fit the legal category, with a Christian tolerance discourse. By doing so, they also re-position themselves as a homogeneous unit that differentiates a group at the time of their legal and political inclusion. Hence, the first quote, rather re-affirms a Christian-rooted national ethics in politics. In other words, Christianity is not outside of German nationalism and secularism, it is intimately and historically intertwined with it. Although, approaching migrant inclusion as potential equals in the gesture of tolerance might blur the asymmetrical boundaries as Brown suggests. However, the debate provided here, exemplifies that how the legal right will be granted is an open prerogative of the Parliament and the represented ethnic-German Christian majority.

The then-president of the Central Council for Jewish Affairs, Ignatz Bubis, is also mentioned twice by an MP from the SPD, in order to emphasize that not only Turks were dismayed by CDU's anti-reform politics but the Jewish community as well. By mentioning Bubis, the MP turns the CDU case against Turks into a wider issue of xenophobia and racism, since racism becomes more tangible when routed through a German Jew (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2291). Yet he and the present Jewish community are tolerated, because of a certain historical obligation, a mercy that does not apply to Turkish and other non-European migrants. By changing citizenship law, the figure of the Turk takes on a new position as both a potential equal and at the same time differentiated and in need of tolerance.

For the SPD and Green party, it was a clear case: the old citizenship law was outdated and needed to be reformed in order to represent those who have been present in Germany since the 1960s. Further, easing access to citizenship was a form of "social closure," though that term was never mentioned explicitly; the right to reside indefinitely and to become an *Inländer* was circumscribed as an end to unjustified exclusion (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2288). Similarly, integration was regarded as a legal issue first and a social issue second, one that needed to be guaranteed through the expansion of citizenship (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2290).

The meaning of integration overlaps with inclusion through citizenship, but only partly. The head of the liberal FDP, Guido Westerwelle, clarifies that citizenship is mostly legal integration and that it will enable social acceptance (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2292).[43] Yet full integration according to Westerwelle—something that he does not specify in positive terms, but only negatively as closing oneself off in the ghettos—will require a policy that is not there yet. Westerwelle also remarks that citizenship is an offer, a promise, but that this promise entails a decision on the part of the new citizens to live up to it by dedicating themselves to the German state. He justifies this by explaining that the German passport—note the shift from citizenship to passport—"is not simply any paper but requires a conscious dedication to the German state" (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2294). The German state, as the telos of integration, is mentioned a couple more times in opposition to the parents or Turkish grandparents, thus situating the German-born child between family and state (Ibid.). Westerwelle finds these words: "It is about these children. They belong to us, and they have to be integrated" (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2295).

The change in citizenship shifted what it meant to belong and to be German. Yet German citizenship was not as radically reformed as initially announced. German-born children were not automatically granted citizenship, but their parents had to apply for it and

[43] The liberal FDP is an advocate of the citizenship reform. Yet they were the main opponent of dual citizenship and completely blocked it for the first generation of guest workers. The protocol does not mention the reason. I suspect it is for economic reasons that retired guest workers should not receive their pensions from the German government, only to spend that money in Turkey—which is something that German retirees have been doing in Spain, for example. Turkish guest worker retirees without a German passport were forced to divide their time between Germany and Turkey, making sure to reside 6 months in Germany in order to keep their residence permits and therefore also their pension allowances.

seek it actively. This change notwithstanding, the citizenship reform from *jus sanguinis* to *jus soli* marked an era of change in consciousness for the German majority, which came to see itself as having become a more liberal society.

The debate demonstrated how the discourse on tolerance structured host versus foreign element. The religiously and ethnically homogeneous parliament positioned itself as the receiver of strangers, by exposing its Christian sentiments towards ethno-racially defined Turks. Here, tolerance intersected with the introduction of a new legal status for the former guest workers. In other words, tolerance was not supplementing a missing law but, because a law was introduced, tolerance was called upon to accept these new citizens as equals when they had never been legal, political and even economic equals, furthermore, implicitly differentiated as not Christian. The debate—although fuzzy in its conception of what citizenship meant then for becoming a more multicultural nation—revealed that the German parliament anchored itself in Christianity vis-à-vis new non-Christian Germans.

The above-mentioned Arendtian notion of equality comes to mind. For Turkish guest workers equality cannot be granted by the state, but can only be enacted through participation. That kind of political participation, however, is curtailed by legal status, making entry as a non-German impossible. Within the entire debate, there was only one voice raised towards that end: Ulla Jelpke a MP from the PDS, the social left party, reprimanded her colleagues for narrowing human rights to citizen rights. Jelpke reminded the parliament, and specifically the CDU, how they have systematically cut human rights for non-Germans; this was also a direct reference to asylum rights, which were under attack in a context of revived nationalist sentiments (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, 2297). Moreover, Jelpke warned that neglecting human rights will lead to more racism and xenophobia. Additionally, a narrow focus on citizenship confirmed that there were neither full human rights nor full protection for immigrants without a German passport, she added. Ironically, Jelpke is mocked by SPD politicians for authentically embodying Rosa Luxemburg (Deutscher Bundestag 1999, Ibid.). Indeed, Jelpke echoed a more critical and liberal-leftist view comparable to Arendt's warning that the human outside of citizenship was at risk of losing his humanity as such.

The change in citizenship law aimed at a change in status for the individual. Yet, because it also included *jus soli*, the birthright of a new generation foreshadowed a legal shift within immigrant demographics. Given that Turks, North Africans and other Middle Eastern communities had been present since the 1960s and had signaled they would be staying on, they were now eligible for a communal status of 'corporation of public law' – a group right based on the right to religious freedom as a permanent religious community. The parliamentary debate bespeaks tolerance of Turks and other foreigners as they move closer to a more equal legal status as citizens. Here it was the majority having to work on itself to conduct interaction with new citizens in a tolerant fashion inclusive of their presence. In the next section, I turn to how tolerance shifted from the majority to the minority. This shift turned the duty of tolerance onto the Muslim population and subjected them to conditional state toleration.

1.4 Regulating Islam for a Tolerant Nation

The situation for the migrant communities changed drastically after the terror attacks on September 11, 2001. Now migrant communities were reframed as a Muslim population with potential transnational ties to terrorist networks.[44] The Muslim became a highly securitized and a closely surveyed subject in every European nation-state. While certain 'Muslim issues' are in fact religious issues pertaining to Islamic practices and resemble one another across national contexts—such as the headscarf, circumcision, mosque-building and

[44] See also sociologist Levent Tezcan, who argues that the German Islam Conference was initiated in order to nationalize Islam and cut off transnational Islamist networks.

ritual slaughtering—their regulation by the state can take different forms and deploy diverse rationales.[45]

The notion of tolerance as a form civil conduct in a multicultural liberal democracy shifts to legal regulation of the state. As an act of state, tolerance has a long-standing history, dealing with imperial edicts and legal rights for religious minorities and referred to as toleration. Toleration is intertwined with tolerance, insofar as the tolerated subject or group needs to be tolerant of the power granting toleration. Although this might seem archaic and removed from current multicultural contexts of liberal rights as Brown describes them (Brown 2008), in the case of Muslims as a religious group in Germany, toleration has been granted an afterlife and lurks in the background in all of this.

Political theorist Rainer Forst provides a perspective similar to the workings of the German state. He describes how limits are set for toleration when acts of intolerance begin (Forst 2004). One of Forst's examples is the headscarf ban for Muslim teachers in Germany. Forst asks if the state is intolerant by denying the right to assume a professional position to Muslim women who wear headscarves or if Muslim women are intolerant by bringing religion into the public sphere (Forst 2004, 312). In so doing, Forst also shifts from toleration as a state practice to tolerance as a public and personal attitude. While the remainder of Forst's article is dedicated to identifying the criteria applied in setting limits to toleration and the normative underpinnings of such criteria, it adumbrates toleration as moving between justice and equality. Forst also attends to the receiving of just, fair and respectful treatment as an equal in the face of difference, as in gay marriage (Forst 2004, 319). Given how closely Forst argues along the lines of legal rights, it remains unclear at times why he pursues the notion of tolerance at all. The problem of tolerance seems to lie in complex legal cases that reveal a contradictory relationship between the normative underpinnings of the state and religious particularity, something that Forst never fully engages. Rather, Forst gestures towards the Hegelian concept of *Sittlichkeit,* as a form of inner ethical life realized in the state. This is all the more interesting since he does this when citing the legal theorist Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde's dictum on the paradoxical constitution of the liberal state:

> Liberal-democratic states need "inner regulatory forces of liberty" that secure its "homogeneity," as legal theorist and former Constitutional Court Judge Böckenförde says – a concrete form of *Sittlichkeit*, to use Hegel's term. Böckenförde concludes with the important remark that "the liberal, secularized state is nourished by presuppositions it cannot itself guarantee." And he raises the question of "whether the secularized, temporal state must not also, in the final analysis, live by the inner impulses and bonding forces imparted by the religious faith of its citizens (Forst 2004, 320).[46]

Forst makes use of Böckenförde's dictum in order to acknowledge cultural and historical particularity to a certain extent—namely, that there must be a moral-cultural basis for a democratic and liberal state. Böckenförde's contestation, however, that the secular state is not neutral but rather nurtured by a "moral substance" that it cannot generate itself, is one Forst

[45] The early 2000s are also the time of radical neoliberal reform for public institutions. Especially public schools in migrant milieu neighborhoods are hit hard by the structural changes. They lose additional social and educational support for the afterschool programs, a void that is partly filled by the civic educations with their prevention programs. In addition, the welfare system is changed in hierarchizing between deserving unemployment salary *(Arbeitslosengeld)* and lesser deserving *(Hartz IV*) welfare support during unemployment. The difference being the years of full employment before receiving support and the amount of time receiving support in unemployment until one is downgraded to Hartz IV again. Being a recipient of Hartz IV exposes recipients to parochial daily labor matched up in payment of 1€ per hour.

[46] In the economy of this dissertation I cannot fully attend to Böckenförde's dictum but I should mention here briefly that Böckenförde's dictum was a warning that the presuppositions of the state are akin to a "moral substance" produced by the churches and religious institutions and that the liberal state has no way of producing this moral substance and might necessarily resort to illiberal forces in order to sustain itself. Böckenförde describes a paradox, for the liberal-democratic state, to persist it has to become illiberal, almost authoritarian.

rejects.[47] He rejects this idea by stating that norms grow out of particularities that over time assume the force of a universal. By citing Hegel's concept of *Sittlichkeit*, he urges a shift in view from the state to the citizen, who is asked to cultivate a better subjecthood in order to harmonize with the state.[48] Further, he cautions that were a state to attempt to preserve and secure its particular presuppositions, this would mean that the state would then discriminate against cultural and religious minorities in the name of toleration (Forst 2004, 321).

The basis for tolerance and a tolerant polity, then, is a shared sense of justice among all citizens. Forst refers to this as a "democratic *Sittlichkeit"* firmly anchored in the identity of the citizens. He admits that when combining different forms of good, these "will not always be free from inner tensions," but that at the basis of this rests a common understanding of the autonomous human who deserves respect "without requiring any additional reasons" (Forst 2004, 321). Forst exemplifies a liberal position and an idealized secular subject in the German political landscape—one who enters a Habermasian rational dialogue when it comes to the workings of state-citizen relations.

Forst's reasoning demonstrates the liberal rationale in Germany: for example, it is increasingly the fear that according rights to Muslims will lead to generalized intolerance in society and jeopardize social peace. Indeed, the program of teaching tolerance to immigrant communities and Muslim organizations is mobilized by a suspicion that Muslims as a religious community cannot be given equal rights yet, precisely because their partial worldview is intolerant of women, homosexuals, other religions, specifically Jews as exemplars of liberal-secularism. Thus Muslims as a community need to prove their tolerance in order to be treated as equals.

Forst engages with the German headscarf affair that sparked outrage, particularly because the teacher dared to take her case all the way to the Constitutional Court, claiming that it was her constitutionally granted right to wear her headscarf.[49] What this case exemplified, for Forst as well, was that Muslims were not tolerant of the German nation-state and would use state institutions to blur well-established national and secular boundaries. Or put differently, instead of assimilating into the legally uncodified social rules, the Muslim teacher dared to assimilate the rule of law into a rationale that would include her subject-position. She basically violated the *Sittlichkeit* Forst and the liberal-democratic state ascribes to each individual citizen.

In 2006, the newly formed CDU-SPD government, under the aegis of Minister of the Interior Wolfgang Schäuble, initiated a public dialogue with Muslim and Middle Eastern migrant organizations as well as private persons and state officials called the *Deutsche Islam Konferenz (DIK).* The stated aim was to articulate for Islam and Muslims an institutional place in state and society in order to circumvent further problems of coexistence. Precisely this promise of further equal incorporation introduced a closer governance of Muslims as a population and the reshaping of Muslim religious institutions. According to the Minister of the Interior, incorporating Islam as a religion within the German state was meant to enable German Muslims as enlightened and tolerant subjects for the sake of an enlightened Germany (Betz, Pohlmann, and Volkery 2006). The main driver of these new policies would be

[47] For Böckenförde, it is homogeneity, not neutrality, of the state that is guaranteed by this moral substance. Forst introduces Böckenförde's dictum in order to discuss whether judgments of tolerance are based on ethical, cultural, and historical particularity, just to reject that view.

[48] Here, I think lies the main difference between Forst vis-à-vis Böckenförde and Brown. Brown and Böckenförde attend to state structures as shaping conditions: political and moral, while Forst's starting point is the autonomous subject who generates the state as an expression of his ethical conduct.

[49] See above in the discussion of philosopher Rainer Forst's conception of tolerance. He is referring to the most famous headscarf case of Fereshta Ludin. The teacher is to this day not employed in a public school and has been systematically demonized in the media, also by famous German feminists, as an Islamist and a threat to society.

Muslims themselves, who would be mobilized through the DIK and who would cultivate a subjecthood and subjectivity as German Muslims.[50]

Social scientists in Germany and Europe have contributed to a growing critical literature about the DIK and its governmental techniques. The sociologist Levent Tezcan, a former academic participant, was among the first ones to publish first-hand accounts about the organizational structure and the problematic structuring of the category of Muslim in the DIK. By doing so, he pointed at the emergence of the Muslim subject caught within ever growing state structures (Tezcan 2012). An article by Islam scholar Frank Peter discusses how the DIK sets up the structures for a conditional recognition of Muslims by way of tolerance discourse. Peter's major contention is that tolerance stands detrimentally opposed to claims to equality by Muslim organizations (Peter 2010). Similarly, sociologist Schirin Amir-Moazami probed into the consensus oriented dialogue structure that glosses over dissent, producing own studies and policy papers that often pushed for one-sided policy recommendations (Amir-Moazami 2011a). In a different article Amir-Moazami voiced criticism over how governance works through regulating conduct in very specific arenas, such as gender equality and by doing so contributes to a broader civilizing project (Amir-Moazami 2011).

Other critical engagements with the DIK pertain to the conditionality and racial relation it builds vis-à-vis Muslims. The sociologist Aleksandra Lewicki inquired about the promise of social justice through citizenship and demonstrates how the DIK introduces 'conditionality' for full acceptance as equal German citizens (Lewicki 2014).[51] A recent book, based on an extended study of the DIK as a regulatory mechanism of racial relations through a temporal understanding of how Islam needs to be institutionalized has been published by Luis Manuel Hernandez Aguilar. Aguilar's work deals specifically with state racism and racial historicism. As such, it demonstrates how Muslims are mapped as a population along different temporal planes of secularism (by measuring the degree of secularism of country of origin) for the sake of making enlightened Germans out of them for the common national future (L. H. Aguilar 2018).[52] The notion of tolerance runs to various degrees through all of these works, as it is the key concept of the DIK framing the entire negotiations.

By engaging with and building on these works I aim to re-organize their findings in relation to the question of tolerance in citizenship and clarify the shift to toleration of Muslims

[50] I should mention that the year 2006 brought a major shift in emotional public expression of nationalism through national symbols such as the flag. This novelty of open embrace of German national colors and flags was facilitated by Germany's hosting of the World Soccer Cup. The German colors of gold, red and black were worn openly and playfully as in tricots, Hawaii-flower chains, and facial colorings. German fans and visitors asked about their enthusiasm expressed that they were not nationalist but rather emotional and excited. Being German and rooting for Germany was a feeling, not a political program, they explained. The German government during the DIK has stressed time and again that national belonging was a feeling and not simply a legal clause.

[51] Please note that this book has been a rich source of information on how politics of religion and integration of religious groups work in the context of post-migration. Further, its approach to social justice was refreshing, because it takes on a much needed and missing perspective on the DIK. The notion of citizenship, however, although compellingly argued in practice and interaction is premised upon a transnational notion of multi-actor engagement over the meaning of this concept. Lewicki takes special issue with "the notion of citizenship as constituted by a single, monolithic regime" and rather proposes citizenship as a multi-directional mechanism influenced by a post-national conception of belonging (see Lewicki 2014, 3-5). I completely disagree with that approach, mainly because it is the nation-state in the end guaranteeing and providing legal citizenship and not a transnational institution such as the EU. Further, the way the DIK has developed it clearly has asserted one interpretation over the conduct of religion, gender-roles, German history and relation to the Jewish community. Both the issues and their organization are also not simply issues of universal liberal interest. They starkly articulate from within historical, religious and national particularity of the majority.

[52] Aguilar's work is based off DIK publications in form of studies, policy papers, internet presentations but also media interviews. Based on the analysis of these materials in how the DIK categorizes 'the Muslim,' his country of origin, Muslim criminal categories he is explicitly calling out the DIK as a racist maneuver of integration politics.

as a conditional pre-step to political equality. Relatedly, I will describe the structure of the DIK and its rationale briefly in order to point out the promise of *corporation of public law (orig. Körperschaft des öffentlichen Rechts)* to Muslims and how the promise was tied to specific disciplinary conditions. Further, how Muslim organizations are complying with their disciplining in order to achieve a status that should be by default theirs but has been deferred through a discourse of tolerance. Most importantly, the DIK has shaped the concept of "Islamic extremism" as a symptom for various forms of intolerances, including anti-Semitism.

1.5 Dialogue as a Production of Moral Homogeneity

The dialogic structure of the DIK, so the Ministry assured, meant an entry into a dialogue of equals, between the state and Muslim representatives. The media, but also scholars, hailed the shift toward attending to Muslims as citizens and lauded the DIK for approaching Muslim organizations (Amir-Moazami 2011a). The move by the German government was comparable to that of other EU states that had set up national Islamic councils such as those in the UK, France, Belgium and Italy, to name only a few. Yet the organization of the dialogue triggered questions as to who counted as Muslim and who was granted the privilege to represent not only the religious communities but also the vastly heterogeneous Muslim population as a whole. The selected participants consisted of 15 individuals, five of whom were representatives of religious organizations and 10 of whom were categorized as non-organized Muslims.

The DIK explained its selection by stating that the majority of Muslims were not registered members of mosques and needed to be represented as alternative and critical voices to religious organizations.[53] Since 2006, the DIK has evolved in three stages, each engaging with specific themes and working groups, in order to produce and implement policies, but more importantly to produce knowledge about Muslims in relation to specific areas: a) religious life and institutional cooperation therewith, b) gender equality as a shared value, and c) extremism and radicalization. The content of this knowledge was produced in working groups, later task forces, in dialogue with the Muslim participants, who partly regarded this as an unpleasant but necessary act of improvement of their social and political status.

The DIK has continued to organize these dialogue rounds with select individuals from Muslim organizations and with non-organized individuals.[54] The DIK has mainly produced

[53] This statement is interesting in several ways and points to the paradoxical situation of Muslim organizations. Since Muslim organizations are not state funded, they do not work with exact numbers of membership and registrations. As community organizations, they are merely accountable for their organizational board, whose members are officially registered. Muslim organizations have started to introduce more formal registrations since the inception of the DIK. The missing membership records also weaken the formal application for the legal status of public corporations of law. According to Hernandez Aguilar, the DIK had concrete statistics derived from membership numbers; they explained that organized Muslims would represent only 30% of the Muslim population, while the remaining 70% were better represented by the individual participants, who would account for the heterogeneity of opinions. All 10 participants had higher educational degrees and three of them in particular positioned themselves as secular critics of Islam. One of them, a sociologist of Turkish origin, Necla Kelek, announced before and during her participation that her stated aim was to work on laws that would combat Muslim religiosity in public (Tezcan 2012; L. H. Aguilar 2018). Kelek has also been endorsing race theories about Muslims and culturalist accounts by pseudo-geneticist and former Berlin senator of finances, Thilo Sarrazin. Kelek could be best described as a racial naturalist in David Goldberg's terms, as someone who does not believe in any improvement of 'inferior' Muslims and who is therefore more of an open racist, advocating for prohibitionary laws and legal restrictions justifiable on the basis of shortcomings in Muslim culture.

[54] The individuals selected to represent the non-organized Muslims were predominantly of Turkish origin, female and Kemalist and/or resolutely against Islam as a traditional religion. These voices are positioned as autonomous liberal subjects, but in many ways they overlap with neo-conservative demands to put an end to traditional Islam. Next to Necla Kelek, there is also Seyran Ates, who is currently the first female imam of her own liberal-reform mosque. Ates is invested in reforming Islam from within and therefore travels regularly to Israel to inquire about the experiences of Muslim minorities in non-Muslim majority countries as an example of how to reform Islam in Europe. Another famous example is the self-acclaimed Islam scholar Hamad Abdel-Samad. Samad is a complex

policies on Islam and Muslims by way of initiating working groups, committees and conferences on select themes such as interreligious dialogue and religious education. Further, it has funded and fostered several studies on Muslim life in Germany, that yielded recommendations and policies in the fields of education, family, marriage, gender equality, the training of imams and national security (Aguilar 2017; Lewicki 2012). The DIK has also institutionalized Muslim religious education in schools in certain principalities and the study of Islamic theology in one university, in order to train future imams for mosques, schools and state positions.[55]

The dialogic structure of the DIK is compelling in particular ways, since it gestures toward listening and taking seriously Muslim concerns, while at the same time entangling Muslims, especially Muslim organizations, in security and policing strategies of national-majoritarian interest. The sociologist Schirin Amir-Moazami (Amir-Moazami 2011a) has pointed out how the conditions for dialogue were unequal from the outset and how certain predefined categories only produced further inequalities; these predefined categories not only stipulated in advance what a Muslim-German citizen might be, but also already interpellated these potential citizens as Muslim. For instance, Amir-Moazami describes how, on the one hand, the state initiated a supposedly neutral dialogue based on constitutional principles, to which its partners in dialogue were implicitly obliged; on the other, the state undermined this principle by openly stating that political or legal institutions will be insufficient for ensuring successful integration. According to the Minister of Interior at the time, Wolfgang Schäuble, a "deeper human level" was required to bind the heterogeneous population together—or, more precisely, ensure integration. This "deeper human level" is precisely the level where "we find religion, culture, values and identity" (Amir-Moazami 2011a, 7-8). Amir-Moazami refers to this imperative as "constitution plus," meaning that merely acknowledging the constitution is not sufficient anymore. Instead, Muslims were required to have an emotional and personal relation to the state and its laws, which meant declaring oneself as one with the "value substance" of the constitution (Amir-Moazami 2011a, 8). Participants were made to sign an additional oath that went beyond upholding the constitution, a requirement that bespoke the state's lack of trust in Muslims as citizens.[56]

As Amir-Moazami rightly notes, the dialogue round was celebrated by the mainstream media as a successful dialogue that took place within a Habermasian public sphere. Her observations, however, point to a more complex problem involving the idea of the right to have rights to equal access and to create political equality à la Arendt. First, Arendt's warning about inclusion based on difference found particular expression here. Muslims were asked to participate in order to affirm established majority-minority hierarchies in which they could become subjects of toleration. If Arendt was correct that citizenship is not a legal status but a practical achievement, then the field of practice has been unequal from the outset. Since constitutional rights and civic rights are fairly abstract, and hence needs to be grounded in

---

figure; as an ex-member of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood and as an ex-Muslim, he claims to be a liberal-democratic voice of caution. Yet he has been courted by the AfD, especially after the publication of a book of his titled *Islamic Fascism*. In his book, he claims that the prophet Muhammad was a pre-modern terrorist-dictator and any person wanting to emulate Muhammad's life as a form of piety is cultivating a form of fascism. As is the case with Samad, none of the individual participants has ever been approved by an unorganized Muslim group to represent formulated Muslim interests of any sort. As secular Muslims or ex-Muslims, these participants actually constitute a stronger anti-Islam voice than the German state itself (see also Tezcan 2012). What is perhaps more telling of the selection criteria is that the Ministry of the Interior was effectively attempting to regulate Muslims as a population—and was therefore keen on involving "non-organized Muslims"—as opposed to regulating Muslims as a religious minority, therefore there was little interest in talking with religious institutions and authorities.

[55] It might go without saying that the main aim of this Islamic theology department is to produce a liberal and reformed variant of Islam and Muslims with a national character.

[56] According to Amir-Moazami, representatives of mosques and religious organizations were singled out and made to affirm the community of values beyond the constitution.

something else. As Amir-Moazami shows, dialogue does not proceed on the level of constitutional rights. Rather, participants are recruited into a field of practice where they must relate to constitutional values, shaped by majoritarian sensibilities. Amir-Moazami demonstrates this by way of an example involving gender equality in mixed athletic settings such as swimming pools. Gender equality is discussed at the DIK in order to disclose Muslim feelings and attitudes towards such a practice. In other words, the minority is exposed as relating differently and as having to develop a conduct identical with the majority, ideally by tapping into the same so-called value substance.

The notion of *substance* is important here, since it leads us back to Rainer Forst and the above-cited dictum of legal theorist Böckenförde concerning the moral substance of the state that is not generated by the state. In a way, Schäuble's constitutional maneuver acknowledges that state law cannot provide for social cohesion, even though it asks Muslim organizations to channel their ethical-religious work towards the state. In other words, Schäuble, as the Minister of the Interior and a representative of the German state, acknowledges Islam as a source of moral substance. This substance, however, needs to be circumscribed and governed by the secular state in order to ensure an amenable and tolerant attitude among Muslims vis-à-vis the state, an attitude that should be achievable through practices of self-governance and self-disciplining. The governance and disciplining of oneself is aimed at forming the channels through which the moral substance can flow towards the state by means of practices recognizable and aligned with the German nation. The notion of tolerance becomes particularly relevant in this context, because the DIK admits that it seeks to foster a specific conduct of citizenship that is however not exhaustively defined in the law. The Muslim subject and its subjectivity are thus shaped by actions oriented towards the state and by experiences in line with national and state morals. As I shall argue in the rest of this dissertation, this state-centered morality in Germany is predicated upon a particular relation to the Holocaust.[57]

With its stated aim of producing German Muslims and a homegrown German Islam with an institutional structure adaptable to the German state, the CDU government saw the DIK as a corrective to the phony integration politics of the previous SPD/Green Party government. The DIK branded itself as creating unity, after failed multiculturalism. Declaring multiculturalism as a failed project was noteworthy, given that no previous government in Germany, even during the SPD/Green Party coalition in the years 1998-2005, had actually implemented a broad and systematic multicultural policies resembling Anglo-Saxon models of the UK, Canada, the US or Australia. Political theorist Claus Leggewie even riposted that multiculturalism was yet to come and that, in fact, an ideology of 'monoculturalism'—meaning a German-defined leading culture (orig. *Leitkultur)*—was dangerously nationalist and unconstitutional given the reality of immigration (Leggewie 2011). Yet, an idea now proliferated that multiculturalism had not only flourished but brought about uncontrollable Muslim 'parallel societies,' rife with violence against women and other minorities, rife with intolerance for liberal society and rife with religious extremism leading to terrorism (Lewicki 2014, 1).

The notions of intolerance and religious difference became interchangeable and were framed in opposition to secularism, as the universal guarantor of tolerance. These disseminating statements created an opening for the direct intervention of state institutions into immigrant communities. The German state further justified its urge to intervene by using the notion of an Islamic threat and social disintegration. The CDU had already implemented security measures in 2006, by requiring naturalization and immigration tests that specifically targeted Middle Easterners and Muslims in the CDU-governed principalities of Hesse,

[57]The DIK is currently not in session; however, the newly inaugurated first federal officer for anti-Semitism, Felix Klein, suggested that the DIK should resume with a special focus on Muslim anti-Semitism.

Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg (Van Oers in Dalceggio 2016). Amir-Moazami describes how these tests indirectly define a pre-modern, intolerant and sexualized Muslim subject by inquiring about sexual habits such as pedophilia and child marriage (2016b). Yet naturalization prep-classes and immigration tests were not penetrating deep enough for the Ministry. Youth from immigrant milieus in particular needed to be targeted more directly, since now that they had become German citizens, they did not need to undergo naturalizations tests anymore.

Religious difference then had to be governed continuously and not only at the moment of naturalization, in order to merge with the notion of tolerance as put forth by the secular state. To state it more explicitly, the representatives of the states expect the Muslim minority to prove tolerance repeatedly and continuously of the state as a worldly entity. The direction of tolerance is at issue here, moving from Muslim minority to state as opposed to from state towards minority. The state demands tolerance in order to grant political toleration. As Frank Peter writes, the DIK interpellates Muslim organizations and individuals with a promise of normalization of relations. Yet these organizations need to develop an attitude of tolerance as their condition for normalization of relations with the state (2010, 128). By holding out a promise of normalized relations and asking for Muslim self-improvement, the German state sets up a conditional citizenship for Muslims. Stated differently, before Muslims as religious individuals and as a community can claim a right to their religious difference, they first have to prove that they are nationals in a moral sense and therefore not disruptive of national homogeneity as defined by the DIK. In a way, as Peter and others have also remarked, the DIK is an institutional bulwark working in the interests of the state to govern Muslims as a population and to define the conditions on which full equality as a religious group are predicated.

While not explicitly stating it, the Ministry of the Interior aimed at creating a central legal body within the state that represents Muslims, similar to those of Protestants, Catholics and Jews. This new legal body would receive taxes directly from its registered members, in addition to state fund allocations and tax privileges.[58] Further, as a legally recognized corporation of the public, Muslims, would be allowed to establish their own welfare institutions such as schools, hospitals and care facilities and to institutionalize theology departments, provide religious instruction in public schools and fund mosques directly (Rohe in Foblets, Gaudreault-Desbiens, and Renteln 2010, 145–94). The change in status would provide an institutional power able to mediate between Muslim communities and the state. It would replace the current situation, whereby practical matters of communal life are self-organized and self-funded.[59]

The improvement in status is normally a legal-formal issue, dependent on the continued presence of the community for more than thirty years and the existence of a centralized representative structure. The premise here is that the religion has become nationally rooted by way of permanent presence and use of the national language. A centralized representative structure by Muslims was already institutionalized in 1994 and is currently working on coordinating different Muslim organizations under one umbrella by way

[58] This right is anchored in the German constitution and dates back to the short-lived Weimar Republic. Compare current German constitution articles 7 and 40 with the constitution of the Weimar Republic articles 137-141.

[59] Mosque spaces are facilitated by private donations or funded by outside states, such as Turkey, Saudi Arabia or Kuwait. In Germany, the Turkish state has a network of mosques that are state-funded and organized centrally by the government. Yet, outside funding has sparked further controversy as to what the character and function of these mosques are, especially when funded by illiberal states. Turkish mosques come under special scrutiny for not appropriately criticizing the Turkish president for his illiberal actions and the war he waged against the Kurds within Turkey and in Northern Syria. Self-funded Palestinian mosques are usually accused of having connections to the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas or Hezbollah. Muslim social welfare and care organizations are currently not funded by the state and are therefore almost non-existent. Similarly, Muslim religious instruction is currently not provided by Muslim organizations but by the federal state in certain test regions.

of German as a second language—as the de facto language of interaction among the various Muslim groups, even at the Friday sermon.[60] Beyond the issue of becoming a national institution, in this case, there is also the issue of how to become an institution compatible with the nation-state and the issue of where the separating line of secularism lies, as it is constituted in its German articulation.

1.6 Conditional Tolerance

Because Muslim organizations wanted to achieve the status of a legal corporation, they felt compelled to support the German government by integrating Muslims on the basis of the policies defined by the DIK. And lastly, the Muslim organizations had to cooperate with the Ministry in matters of security and the prevention of Islamic extremism (Aguilar 2017, 625). The DIK thus both governs and prompts forms of self-governance in specific ways, by demanding that Muslim organizations and consequently Muslims take on a specific function. In a way, this kind of transformation of Islam and Muslims is not unique in German history. Peter demonstrates that the state has historically seen itself in competition with incompatible religious powers that are most effectively undermined when they are institutionalized in certain ways, as was done with Protestant theology at the turn of the 20th century. Having been provided an institutional space within the university, Christian theology was mobilized to transform the church from within in order to align more nearly with the state project (Peter 2010, 131).

Yet the notion of conditionality points to a specific perception of the Muslim question, which is poignantly thematized by sociologist Aleksandra Lewicki. Lewicki writes that the DIK created a tense position for Muslims. They were on the one hand located within the ambit of law as citizens, while on the other they were considered socially and economically too inferior to be citizens with communal rights (Lewicki 2014, 69). Thus Muslims are seen as a problem to society and the economy, as a result of their cultural and religious difference. Further, they are described as an acknowledged terrorist threat to European liberties. The Minister of the Interior is quoted as having mentioned this as "a sad truth" evinced by their lack of contribution to social life. When asked if the German state had anything to learn from the Jewish experience, vis-à-vis Muslim integration, the minister's response was that there had never been problems with Jews to begin with (Ibid.). Here, Lewicki notes two things. First, that the Muslim presence in Germany has historically represented a cheap labor force that certainly has contributed to the economic and social well-being of most Germans. And I would add that guest-worker history does not lend itself to a narrative of the self-willed autonomous subject but still remains subject to conditions of labor and migration. Second, the exclusion of Jews from communal rights before and during WWII was a hint that the state did indeed have something to learn from its mistakes and the experiences of the past in dealing with a new minority.

[60] Here I am referring to the *Zentralrat der Muslime* (Central Council of Muslims); other organizations that claim similar representative power and that have wanted to merge with the *Zentralrat* since 2006 are: DITIB (the Turkish state Organization for Religious Affairs rooted in Turkey), *Islamrat*, *Verband der Islamischen Kulturzentren*. The legal theorist Mathias Rohe writes that these groups first organized as *Koordinierungsrat* (Council for Coordination) but then entered a phase of intense debate on the following questions: Do they in fact represent all Muslims? Who, then, is representative of a majority? How do transnational ties disturb trust and loyalty between the community and the German state? For Rohe, the problem is that these organizations cannot represent the heterogeneous Muslim population. He does not question, however, that the state requires homogeneity by way of representation. He merely states that Islamic organizations can pretty well exist and flourish by way of being a communal organization under the protection of religious freedom (see Rohe 2010, 164-165). By now a total of ten umbrella organizations exist, representing different denominations and ethno-national groups, but no central body has yet been formed. See the homepage of DIK: http://www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/DIK/DE/DIK/1UeberDIK/DIK2014Teilnehmer/dik2014teilnehmer-node.html.

The connecting positional link between minorities past and present did not seem to occur to the Minister, according to Lewicki. She further states that when she inquired about this common point with other German scholars, most of them rejected the comparison between the Jewish minority and the Muslim minority, because Muslims were suspected of terrorism. Further, given Germany's Nazi past, Jews have a special status in the German imaginary. Some scholars emphasized a common Christian-Jewish heritage, in order to say that Jews and Christians show closer ties in contradistinction to Muslims. These statements inadvertently justify the conditionality of the Muslim circumstance, explaining that legal inequality between minorities is based on historical developments and, further, that only some deserve the status of corporation of public law unconditionally, because of the majority's feelings. The Minister, Wolfgang Schäuble, himself is quoted as saying:

> For some religions it is more difficult than for others to do justice to the structural requirements of the German legal framework…the pluralization I talked about will not alter the fact that certain religions play a particular historic role in our part of the world. Those are Christianity and—in a different way—the Jewish faith, which shares a particularly painful and difficult history with us Germans. (…) For this reason, there is not just the right of a minority to tolerance and equal treatment, but there also is the majority's claim for consideration (Lewicki 2014, 82–83).

This statement speaks volumes about the national imaginary at work in granting legal justice. First off, Schäuble is openly saying that, despite a pluralization of religious life, Christianity plays the dominant role in Europe and that the Jewish faith is accorded rights as a result of the genocidal history in Europe. This is an interesting move insofar as it disregards Jewish historical presence in Europe as a matter of legal entitlement and treats it only as a case of exceptional consideration. This statement is premised on the majority's feelings toward the minority and not on what is legally codified. In a way, Schäuble delivers a historically grounded account that affirms the genocide as the driver of postwar politics in how Jews needed to be accorded rights.

The legal status of the Jewish minority is thus granted exceptionally as a right based in historical responsibility, one that has grown out of an exception in German history. As such, the Jewish case becomes isolated and inaccessible to comparative political analysis and legal promulgation in reference to other minority cases in Germany. Such policies have further implications, because they do not only socially and legally hierarchize religious minorities. It also makes it difficult to deal with the racializing effects that emerge in consequence of current DIK politics. A generally accepted 'German exceptionalism' already factors in the way the German state treats religious minorities today after the Holocaust (Barskanmaz 2018).[61] Another issue that arises out of this historical constellation is that the exceptional tolerance granted to the Jewish community secures a social and political order of supremacy for the Christian majority, legal rights for religious minorities notwithstanding. To state it bluntly, providing a legal right to the Jewish community as a form of tolerance not only undermines the promise of equality but also confirms once again that laws are underwritten by the values of the majority, who emerge as the beneficiaries of genocide. Finally, the case of tolerance vis-à-vis Jews undergirds an idea that Germany is in principle a tolerant nation-state when it comes to religious and collective rights, an idea to which the case of Muslims indeed poses a particular challenge.

These two groups offer a direct contrast in how they are governed by a politics of tolerance and this urges further discussion. Brown's engagement with the notion of tolerance shows us that it can be deployed as a substitute or supplement to formal liberal equality or liberty (Brown 2008, 9–10). In the case of the Jewish minority, however, tolerance does not substitute for legal formal equality; rather, it paves the way to it. In Brown's account,

[61] Legal theorist Cengiz Barskanmaz explains that even the term *Rasse* as a concept has been difficult to use in postwar, post-Holocaust Germany, because of the exceptional status ascribed to the fate of European Jewry.

tolerance is not a right (although Schäuble is quoted as stating that) but a right to a certain status as a religious minority. As already pointed out in the earlier discussion about Jewish returnees, a right is eased or made more easily accessible because Jews represent a historically injured group deserving of tolerance. Given that tolerance here remains within the ambit of the law, insofar as rights in this case have been granted to a deserving group. Tolerance seems to structure and organize deep-seated sentiments of a Christian nation vis-à-vis Jewish co-habitation as equals as a case of mercy, when in fact this social transaction is in legal principle already permitted.

Eased access to corporation of public law for the Jewish minority on the one hand and restrictions imposed on this legal status for the Muslim minority on the other, does not point to a contradiction. It rather demonstrates how the German state re-asserts the norms of the Christian majority by granting religious freedom to minorities as framed by Holocaust memory. The act of tolerance then moves between legal rights and majoritarian norms enacted and structured by asymmetrical power relations.

When Muslim organizations agree to cooperate in security measures within their own communal spaces, it is an show of tolerance towards the state and an agreement on the conditional place of belonging Muslims have been granted (Peter 2010, 132). Mosques and religious organizations are then not only spaces of worship but also become the meeting point of the secret service, as well as local and federal police. This allows the state to surveil mosques from within and compels its members to report suspicious activities to the police. While the agreement to cooperate with the state is a means to a higher political end, it certainly changes the mosque authorities along the way. In addition, because Muslim organizations are not corporations of public law, imams are themselves not immune to violations of privacy through surveillance and wire-tapping, in contrast to church clergy and specialists from other recognized religious communities, according to Peter (2010, 132).

In a posthumously published brochure by the DIK in 2010, delineating the achievements of the first three years, the minister reiterates that the line of tolerance is progressing, stating that just a few decades ago mosques in Germany would have been unthinkable. Insinuating both that Germany has become a more diverse place, a home for the Muslims who live there,[62] and that their presence evinces that Islam belongs to Germany, Schäuble goes on to say that incorporating Muslims as rightful citizens who accept the constitution and the values of this society will be the key task of the German state for many years to come (DIK 2009). Regardless of the fact that certain spaces have been used as mosques in German cities since the 1970s as part of a general right to religious freedom, what is left out of the address is the set of conditions under which Muslims and Islam might be considered for full equality. An affirmative statement made by the minister that Islam belongs to Germany eclipses how Islam is made to belong.[63] Amir-Moazami reminds us that the question is rather: "how is Islam nationalized and incorporated as a religion compatible with the secular state and liberal democracy?" (Amir-Moazami 2016a).

Making Germans out of Muslims involved erasing ethnic-national particularities and shaping a Muslim citizen that was oriented towards the German state. Although religious organizations and their affiliated mosques had opened their doors to the security apparatus of the state, state action and intervention was limited to surveillance. In addition, the mosques were organized around ethnic and confessional lines and, as stated earlier, they did not draw the majority of Middle Eastern immigrants. Neither did the mosques provide educational formats beyond learning Arabic for religious instruction or religious sessions on how to live a pious life as a Muslim. The Ministry of the Interior then decided to expand its purview

[62] A commonly heard phrase is: "Muslime, die bei uns leben," which could be translated as "Muslims who live with us," but which has the more literal meaning of "living at our place/staying with us."
[63] The counter-statement is that "Muslims belong to Germany, but Islam does not," a statement mobilized by the CSU and the AfD.

beyond religious organizations and approached secular institutions in the field of civic education in order to target Muslim youth populations within schools.[64]

During the second period of the DIK, the ministry made it clear that it wanted its security policies implemented softly through education, beyond the confines of mosques and religious organizations. An additional aim was to target a young population, ideally teenagers, in order to prevent them from politically radicalizing. Toward that end, the German state introduced the framework of tolerance through preventive education of the individual *(orig. Präventionsarbeit)* as well as a funding scheme to prevent "Islamic extremism" (DIK 2010).[65] The plenary protocol states that the DIK is invested in changing majority-minority relations, but that Muslims will be required to take on the major work of integration into society (DIK 2010, 1-3). Indeed, all the listed changes and policies are unidirectional interventions into migrant and Muslim organizations for their further improvement (DIK 2010, 1-3).

The defined problem field of radicalization is a challenge to the Ministry of the Interior in certain ways. Radicalization, defined as wanting to live a traditional form of Islam by becoming an Islamist, is in itself not a crime. Put differently, wanting to live one's own religion as an ultimate, truthful way of life is the respected core of all religions, as the DIK also acknowledges in its report on "prevention work with youth" (DIK 2011, 7-9). The problem for the DIK is when Islamism does not remain confined to the private sphere but extends into the public, e.g. when the constitution is regarded as subordinate to shari'a and is openly called for and referred to as the only true form of political rule (Ibid.). By declaring that the public existence of Islamism was a problem to social peace, the DIK was obligated to work against it in those instances when it erupted as a problem, such as expressing doubt in the constitution. Yet Islamic extremism meant total disregard for the liberal democratic state, grounded as it was in a theocracy.[66] In contrast to right- or left-wing extremism, Islamic extremism was not simply offering a political alternative. Rather, because rooted in religion, religious sentiment came to be seen as a resource that could be politicized and claims could be grounded that posited God as the ultimate authority before and beyond the worldly state. By way of religious practice, all Muslims had access to this resource. Islamic extremism was thus a fluid substance and an ideological mindset that required prevention before it spilled over into dangerous action, according to the DIK (DIK, 2011, 7-9).

[64] In March 2018, an AfD MP Gottfried Curio remarked that the imams were not collaborating with the state as was expected from them. Instead they were covering up for potential terrorists and not reporting them. Contrary to what imams expected—the elevation of status for their religious organizations—they were now accused of hostility toward the state. The speech can be found on youtube uploaded by a right-wing news outlet called Epoch Times. The video is titled "For the first time verses from the Qur'an in the parliament": https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=15vpBe2sf5c. Indeed, Curio cites 'intolerant' verses from the Qur'an in order to prove that "these people" cannot be integrated and that the government has been fooling itself since 2006.

[65] See here for further details: http://www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DIK/DE/Downloads/LenkungsausschussPlenum/Plenum-arbeitsprogramm.pdf;jsessionid=D723FE204487BE63678C1F25C8F6A45C.1_cid286?__blob=publicationFile.

[66] The document I will be citing from can be found here: http://www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DIK/DE/Downloads/Sonstiges/Zwischenbericht%20AG%20Praevention-2011.pdf;jsessionid=D723FE204487BE63678C1F25C8F6A45C.1_cid286?__blob=publicationFile.

1.7 Conclusion

By way of discussing the shifts in the discourse around citizenship from the 1990s to 2011, I have tried to demonstrate how religious difference and tolerance intersect within a legally defined field driven by secularization and security policies. In this chapter, I argued that majoritarian tolerance because of (Christian) religious difference shifts to minoritarian toleration of religious difference, especially in the case of Muslims as a religious group categorized as a population. The notion of tolerance as I have shown shifted in directions of who tolerates whom, who is asked for tolerance and what for. In the earlier debates of citizenship reform, parliamentarians reminded one another of their asymmetrical power position as Christians vis-à-vis Turks and other foreigners. Tolerance structured the governance of Jewish returnees and former guest workers within the ambit of law; it provided a rationale for how things should be handled within the legal possibilities.

As discussed, tolerance cannot be dissociated from a discourse of power that marks its object of tolerance even at the moment of inclusion. In the case of citizenship and formal equality for Muslims as a religiously differentiated group, I have sought to clarify that former Middle Eastern migrants come into the position of toleration as Muslims, but they do not become a religious minority in the legal sense of the term. They become tolerated citizen-subjects and mired in a racial relationship between being a German citizen as a Muslim or a potential Islamic extremist. This toleration is, however, not fully congruent with legal decrees of previous empires, rather refers to additional policies and best practices through which Muslim religious and migrant communal organizations are embroiled in a state project of security, self-discipline and self-governance in order to achieve a status of equality. The notion of tolerance is not fully decoupled from legal procedures as Wendy Brown suggests. In Brown's account, tolerance is a social telos of multicultural citizenship in which identities are respected and accepted on the basis of accorded rights.

Here, I have tried to complicate this narrative by closely exemplifying that these policies structured by a notion of tolerance have rather prevented liberal multiculturalism and a religious minority with a distinct identity to emerge. Further, tolerance has shifted to a relationship of demand from the minority to be tolerant of the secular state, as a way paying respect to the legitimacy of the state. Two tendencies emerge vis-à-vis constitutional rights: on the one hand, the Christian secularized majority claims the privilege of granting tolerance on account of historical injury, as is the exceptional case with the Jewish community. On the other, this same majority demands evidence of tolerance by the Muslim minority as the condition for their being granted a legal status. In both instances, a majoritarian conduct of tolerance inscribes itself as the natural and moral guarantor of the constitution and of the value substance underpinning the constitution. In the DIK, tolerance as a form of conduct conditions access to legal rights or formal status by conscripting Muslim organizations into a project aimed at securing moral and national homogeneity. This structuration of tolerance is transposed onto the field of civic education and targets migrant youth more broadly with the stated aim to change subjecthood and subjectivity without discriminating against them.

The conduct of conduct then becomes a matter of educating immigrants to self-discipline and self-governance in order to partake in the secular state project. The social closure initially granted by the reform in citizenship law becomes conditional again and remains further conditional in civic educational programs that seek to teach tolerance. A major moral force in in these policies has been the self-image of a tolerant nation. Here tolerance was constituted as an after-state to the atrocities of the Holocaust and juxtaposed vis-à-vis Islam. Hence, a particular dichotomy was created between a tolerant German nation founded on the lessons from the Holocaust and an intolerant religious Muslim population. In the next chapter, I will engage specifically with how the Holocaust is folded and constitutive of secularity and how that shapes the form of tolerant citizenship for Muslim minorities in the field of civic education.

Chapter 2: Secularity in Civic Education

Combating political extremism is the declared centerpiece of securing liberal democracy in post-war Germany. From the 1950s onwards the German state invested in the secret police but also in a newly established state department called "The Federal Agency for Civic Education" in order to protect the liberal democratic constitution from Nazis and Communists. Equipped with pedagogical tools to combat extremist ideology by way of re-education, this agency has over the last decades targeted right- and left-wing extremism.

In the year 2008 the Ministry of Interior and the German Intelligence Service introduced a new form of political ideology: Islamic extremism. They define Islamic extremism as the blurring of boundaries between religion and state, notably by implementing *shari'a* (DIK 2011, 7-8). According to these two institutions, this kind of implementation could also happen gradually by moderate Muslim public figures taking on public positions and slowly pushing for an Islamic understanding of rule *(legalist Islamism)* (Ibid.). Hence, according to the Ministry and GIS the main feature of Islamic extremism was not merely violence, but rather its disregard for spatiotemporal boundaries forcing a life of Islamic pre-modernity incompatible with the modern state and liberal democracy. For the Ministry and the GIS, this disregard is considered to be inherent in Islam as the religiously legitimated rule over worldly matters. From this view, traditional Islam disregards the separation of powers, people's sovereignty (democracy) and human rights (liberalism) (DIK 2011, 8).

The concern over Islamic extremism intersected with fears over a new kind of anti-Semitism in light of growing anti-Israel demonstrations in Germany since the beginning of the Second Intifada in 2000 and the subsequent wars since then in the Middle East. These demonstrations were usually organized by Palestinian, Arab, and mosque communities and brought Middle Eastern immigrants to the streets. Their perception as Muslims and potential extremists was underscored by *Hamas* and *Hizbullah* flags, heightening these various groups as potentially radical in addition to their piety. Further, chants in Arabic re-invoking classical Islamic times in which Jews were defeated as the enemy of the prophet hardened the public impression that Muslims clearly lacked a sense of history and acted from within an Islamist rationale.[67]

History in this context referred to two interrelated things. On the one hand, it meant the history of the Holocaust as a bounded but exceptional event transcending its own space-time. On the other, it meant a sense of secular temporality divided into past, present, and future. For the governing Ministries, Muslims just needed to overcome traditional Islam by relegating some of it teachings, including those anti-Semitic features, into an ordered space-time.[68] This kind of historicist ordering method was most directly implemented in theological faculties institutionalized to provide a hermeneutic study of the Qur'an and the Islamic

[67] The chants shouted either invoked the memory of *Khaybar* or called upon a theological authority to defeat Israel. Khaybar is the name of an oasis in the Arabian Peninsula, in pre-modern times inhabited by two Arab-Jewish tribes who did not pledge allegiance to the prophet Muhammad. The battle of Khaybar goes back to 7th century, when Muhammad and his followers defeated these two Jewish tribes. Another chant audible during protests against the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in the summer of 2006 was: "*Ya Nasrallah, ya habib! Udrub, udrub Tel-Abib!* (Engl. Oh beloved Nasrallah strike Tel Aviv!). Here it is the Lebanese Shi'ite Hizbullah leader Hassan Nasrallah called upon to take revenge for Israeli aggressions.

[68] Please note that these calls to tame Islam and Muslims are part of wider political efforts to reform Islam. As already discussed in the previous chapter, the aim of the government is to institutionalize Islam in a form commensurable with the Protestant-shaped notion of church-state relations.

tradition.[69] The history of the Holocaust, however, was not a subject of Islamic theological institutions or mosque circles but of civic educational programs.[70]

According to the DIK-report, the larger problem with 'Muslim anti-Semitism' was that it pointed to a deeper structural religious intolerance against liberal democracy. The reference to Israel through the figure of the Jew was basically read as a symptom of hostility against the political order as such and modernity in particular. Anti-Semitism experts in Germany hold that anti-Semitism is an anti-modernist attitude scapegoating 'the Jew' as the only one profiting from liberalism, cosmopolitanism, and a global modernity.[71] In the case of Middle Easterners, these symptoms and attitudes are explained in reference to traditional Islam as the root cause for such hostility (Jikeli 2015).

A report published by the German Islam Conference[72] (DIK) in help with declares that these insights are based on working group meetings and model projects implemented since 2006 and explains that the figure of the Jew has a particular scapegoat function for youth and young adults in general (DIK 2011, 6). Accordingly, Muslim youth feel particularly marginalized and assume a position as victims of society, they tend to blame an abstract figure, which has traditionally been the figure of the Jew in contexts where Jewish communities have already been negatively stereotyped (DIK 2011, Ibid.). The report claims to focus on Jews in order to combat a form of pre-modern communitarian ideology that constitutes a dangerous we (Muslims) against them (the rest) with Jews as the model minority for liberals.[73] Anti-Semitism is then approached as the central symptom of Islamic extremism.

Combatting Islamic extremism meant to prevent radicalization and to foster a tolerant German Muslim (DIK 2011, 2). This double move introduced a paradox, because in contrast to targeted political ideologies such as right-wing or left-wing extremism, Islamic extremism required a different work of taming the politically unruly subject, namely one that would *secularize* what was perceived as religious intolerance by way of *Bildung*. The desired outcome would be a German Muslim who upholds a sense of *secularity* by knowing how to draw boundaries between religion and politics, past and present. Yet this kind of historicist boundary-drawing posed a contradiction to the Holocaust as an exceptional event. As an exceptional event, the Holocaust underwrites secularity, secular state-citizen relations and yet transcends secular temporality.

By attending to the case of a German-Palestinian civic educator, I aim to illustrate how the shift introduced by the notion of Islamic extremism in civic education affected her case in certain ways. Because secularity is intertwined with the exceptionality of the Holocaust, it creates a tension for those participants who are addressed as Muslims in this space. By discussing how the civic educator failed to live up to the ideals of secularity, by comparing the Holocaust to the Palestinian Nakba, I discuss how this re-organization of the field around an Islamic threat has brought certain contradictions of secularity to the fore. As part of my discussion of secularity, I will point out how the *monumentalization* (Partridge 2010) of the Holocaust has further inscribed it as an exceptional event, contradictory to what was sought

---

[69] See here for the first model Islamic Theology Institute, funded by the German state to provide instruction into Islamic theology compatible with the German state. The institute also trains teachers for the instruction in Islam as a religious subject in public schools https://www.irp.uni-osnabrueck.de/institut/ueber_uns.html. Historicizing Islam usually happens in the spaces of academic learning not so much in civic education.

[70] My focus is mostly on how the Holocaust is related to, not so much Islam. Yet Islam as a problem to tolerance and liberal democracy made its appearance in the educational programs as well.

[71] See here for a full report by anti-Semitism expert Werner Bergmann in German. Bergmann explains on the page of the Federal Agency for Civic Education that anti-Semitism is an fully fledged ideology against Modernity: http://www.bpb.de/politik/extremismus/antisemitismus/37945/antisemitismus?p=all.

[72] Please see chapter 1 for an extended discussion on the German Islam Conference.

[73] Historically, anti-Semitism (as opposed to anti-Judaism) emerged with the modern nation-state and nationalism (Germany) or other national projects (Spanish Reconquista). In this report, communitarian ideology refers to a premodern, pre-nation state form of aggressive community building, as in the ideology of an Islamic extremism organized around the figure of the Jew as the main enemy to the community.

by the civil society groups and movements who fought for its public commemoration. Further, I seek to situate the combat against Islamic extremism in the anthropological literature of extremism combat and race (Shoshan 2016; Stoler 1995; Goldberg 2002; Theo Goldberg 2016). By doing so, I will point out the specificities of combatting Islamic extremism and how it is connected to a longer genealogy of secularizing non-Christians for citizenship through *Bildung* as a racial historicist project. I walk through these steps in order to argue that secularity as a form of civic-subjectivity is predicated upon a certain epistemological paradox. Secularity, as I draw on anthropologist Saba Mahmood's definition, is rooted in history as the epistemological ground for being and knowing truthfully in this world (Mahmood 2015).[74] By drawing on Mahmood, I add that the Holocaust as an exceptional event in public memory constitutes the post-Holocaust episteme and escapes historicizing.

The post-Holocaust as the *episteme* of the current political order means that it grew out of a historical event and introduced a shift for the conditions of possibility of what can be known, said and experienced. A crucial part of this post-Holocaust episteme derives its force from the Holocaust as a structuring foundation. Characteristics of this structuring foundation are its exceptionality, its violence, its uniqueness, its singularity, its incomparability and its unspeakability. Or put differently, part of the current condition of possibility is not to be able to fully know what the Holocaust is other than knowing that it is an exceptionally violent and gruesome event in history not fully retrievable for accurate representation in knowledge, image or written form. As that which is the ultimate evil, it also is what is removed and cut off from the current political condition, while providing its "constitutive exception" (Meister 2012, ix). As an episteme it inscribes civic-subjectivity as in how to relate and experience events and phenomena of the public order now. Allow me to exemplify this kind of civic-subjectivity especially in Germany today. Pointing out sub-standard living conditions of refugee life today in camps or between border crossing, one always points to the camp as a an institution closely related to Nazi camps. Or the inability of refugees to move freely between border and to remain stuck even between borders and/or be attacked by state forces is another instance of state violence against an almost lawless entity of humans, similar to that of Jewish refugees and stateless Jews in Nazi concentration camps. Yet the post-Holocaust episteme excludes such comparisons, because it goes against its foundational structures.

By demonstrating and discussing Naima's case, I argue that those subjects who are interpellated as Muslims have a double task to fulfill as citizens. They have to historicize and draw a temporal boundary when it comes to Islam while they have to relate to the Holocaust as an exceptional event in history. Only by doing so, can they be perceived as German Muslims. I will first discuss how Naima's case is understood as Islamic extremism in the way it is negatively defined vis-à-vis liberal democracy adumbrating a notion of secularity predicated upon the exceptionality of the Holocaust; and then I will embed this in the longer genealogy of Bildung as a secularizing project intersecting with racial relations. By historicizing the incorporation of former immigrants into the post-Holocaust episteme, I seek to demonstrate how being German was positively re-defined vis-à-vis Muslims.

2.1 The Exceptional Case of Naima

Like many other civic educators, Naima was dividing her time between different organizations, coming in whenever she was booked to do her share in combatting extremism.

[74] The term secularity *(Säkularität)* has a fairly established meaning in German legal theory, as the essence of the modern state predicated upon the separation of religion and politics in the written word of the constitution (Dreier 2013). This usage is common in German debates about the public place of religion and is often used when the character of the state is described. In reference to Islam, as I already pointed out above, the German state believes extremism to be inherent in the traditional and non-historicized structure.

Naima and I had met in two projects combatting Islamic extremism, but Naima was also involved in the Anne Frank Center (henceforth AFC) as a Muslim tour guide. Located in very close proximity to the *Hackesche Höfe* in Berlin-Mitte, the AFC had found itself an exhibition space in the former Jewish neighborhood. Next to actual historical spaces and museums, the AFC did not claim to be a historical space. Rather, it meant to represent Anne's short-lived biography in juxtaposition with the wider political history of the Nazi regime.

The space provided by the AFC in the new and glittery center of Berlin was one that reminded visitors of an evil past still pressing itself onto the newly found normalcy after national re-unification. Excerpts of Anne's handwritten diary, photographs of her family and school life as well as a miniature model house of the Franks' hiding space in Amsterdam exhibited a life aspiring for a future that had been foreclosed forever, at least for the Franks and the civilian victims of Nazi genocide. Anne's questions and aspirations, however, as written in her diary, collected and edited by her father for publication were on display and for sale in the small museum book shop. The shop was advertising several different versions either with a new foreword or additional pages that had been removed and now added again or with a new afterword. Each edition had been published and made sense of in light of new wars, massacres, genocides and political crises. As such, Anne's words and the Holocaust were approached from different historical perspectives but as providing an eternally valid frame for other calamities and the lived political times.

The AFC had not developed projects to combat Islamic extremism, it rather remained focused on liberal democracy, human rights, and combatting right-wing extremism. Naima was hired as part of a new multicultural line, whereby the tour guides would represent a more diverse Germany and embed the life story of Anne Frank in the current political context while maintaining the focus on human rights and democracy. As a veiled German Muslim, Naima represented a new Germany in this space, one that had accepted to be a country that embraced its new status as a country of immigration.[75] Her presence indirectly confirmed that Germans had become more tolerant because she represented a successful incorporation of former immigrants and Muslims as part of the nation by way of engaging with Holocaust history. Incorporation by way of history spoke a different language of integration, by providing grounds for creatively owning a difficult chapter in German history it was meant to open up history and the new Germans relationally. As civic educators, historians and pedagogues had drafted as a policy recommendation in the mid-2000s, German history and particularly Holocaust history had been successfully mastered by Germans, who now knew how to approach this difficult history as a liberal democratic society. According to these policy drafters, Holocaust history prompted a civic-subjectivity that could be easily expanded onto former immigrants and new groups. The Holocaust then was not so much about content; i.e. how much one knew or how involved one's family was, but about the form of approach to the Holocaust as an exceptional and overcome event that needs to be prevented from happening again. As that approach, it was a task for everyone who wanted to live in a liberal democracy (Motte and Ohliger 2004; Ohliger et al. 2006).

I first met Naima at a workshop against Islamic extremism held at a lower-tier middle school in Berlin-Kreuzberg in June 2015 during fieldwork. Naima had not accompanied the group I had observed, but she had come in when visitors from the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington arrived to see how Muslims combatted anti-Semitism, as this model project was advertised and communicated as a Muslim peer-project by the director of the organization. She would later join the team of Muslim peers trained to combat Islamic extremism by way of combatting 'Muslim anti-Semitism.' On that day, the core team of five

[75] Naima born before 2000 had not really benefitted from the shift to conditional jus soli. But she was eligible to become a German citizen and naturalized with 21. Also, her parents, although present in Germany for over 30 years, were still stateless refugees on extended legal toleration *(Duldung)* at the time of our last interview in March 2018.

civic educators was expanded to include three more educators, including Naima. At the end of the session, the civic educators stood up, introduced themselves and explained why they were doing this work and what it meant to them. All the civic educators were of Turkish or Palestinian descent, including those that came as additional support on that day. While several of the civic educators mentioned that it was their duty to be engaged specifically against anti-Semitism, given their own background as Muslims, Naima, the shortest of all, in a long black dress and wearing a bead-embroidered pink veil, made it a point to say that she identifies with her work because she comes from a family of Palestinian refugees and knows what discrimination is. I could see that she was leaving quite an impression on the visitors from the USHMM; the visitors were raising eyebrows and nodding while trying to catch one another's gazes.[76]

As a student of Islamic studies and education, Naima was appreciated by the organizations she worked with, because her piety did not interfere with her work and public participation. She represented very well that Islam and modernity could be perceived as being neatly reconciled. In her work as in projects funded to combat Islamic extremism, Naima's actual task was not to reference Islam in any way as a method. One of her trainers told me that her task, the task of all Muslim peer educators, was to execute radicalization prevention work as majoritarian Germans did, but only as visibly marked religious Muslims. There was nothing specifically Islamic about their work, other than being done by Muslims.

Naima's work at the AFC followed a similar logic but had a twist to it. The museum, established in 2000 to communicate human rights as an ongoing task against right-wing extremism, juxtaposed Anne Frank's personal life with the larger Nazi political history. In addition, it offered a second space with new audio and visual installations on the meaning of Anne Frank in multicultural society today. Naima was asked to relate Anne Frank's questions to her own life, mostly in the second space on multicultural society. This method asked of all tour guides to read the latest edition of the Anne Frank diary and to think about some of the questions still relevant today: the freedom to move, to live free of state violence, to express one's opinion freely. The AFC, same as most museum and memorial spaces dealing with Nazi crimes, emphasized the Holocaust as an exceptional event with long-lasting questions for liberal democracy. In her reading of Anne Frank, Naima discovered the language of liberal human rights to talk about discrimination on a more structural level. Reading through the diary-novel and going through photos and documents helped her understand how laws and racial exclusion were intertwined.

Although Naima was hired to speak from the position of a German Muslim who could live her religion freely, she emphasized being from a Palestinian family of stateless refugees. Groups of all ages, from all over Germany and internationals would come in and would be surprised to see her, a veiled woman as the tour guide. Naima would start by stating that Anne Frank's questions are relevant today, because refuge and persecution are still a reality in the world and that she herself had grown up as a Palestinian refugee. The groups would be puzzled at first, not knowing where this tour was headed. By always coming back to the experience of belonging to a family of Palestinian refugees, Naima broke the temporal distance and forged a relation between Anne Frank and her own experience. She would make the Holocaust past come to life in some structural continuity in the present. The visitors would leave generous tips, would return with little gifts and hand-written cards, thanking her, because she had given them hope. I could see that Naima's story induced hope, given that she forged her narrative as a home-coming to Germany, where she had citizen rights and the freedom to talk about her experience. During her three years at the center, so she said, her

[76] In a personal conversation, Naima told me that a female member of that group approached her afterwards, thanking her through tears for not hating Jews and for not hating her. When I asked Naima w
hat she responded, she said she was just surprised but also touched to know that her words made a difference.

style as tour guide was not only known but was also appreciated, because it opened new perspectives.

Encouraged by the positive reactions, she communicated her work on social media and received attention by media outlets. She would receive interview requests from English-language channels and Arabic-speaking media. They would also press her on her positionality as a Muslim-Palestinian woman in a German-Jewish space. She would say that Palestinian history and German-Jewish history are connected and that especially Arabs and Palestinians should book a tour with her, so they would understand what happened to the Jewish communities in Europe, before they settled in historical Palestine. Naima took these occasions as teaching moments, inviting a larger audience to think Palestine with Europe.

One day she received a call from the *al-Arabiya* media network in Dubai. The journalist who interviewed her pressed her on one question in particular: Where do you see the parallels between Holocaust history and the current situation in Palestine?[77] Naima answered that some of the mechanisms used to terrorize and exterminate Jews were indeed similar to the way the Israeli state treats Palestinians under occupation, such as night raids, forced deportations, imprisonment with no civil rights. The interview was published online with the headline "Holocaust Suffering like Palestinian Strife." The next day it was taken up by the online journal *Times of Israel* and framed as Muslim educator comparing the Holocaust to Palestinian Strife. Within hours of publication, the Anne Frank Center was inundated with emails and had received direct calls from the Ministries of Justice, the Interior, and Foreign Affairs. All of these institutions expressed that this was unacceptable and said that they had received calls from the Central Council for the Jews who saw their suffering relativized.

A colleague of Naima's sent an email to all team-members with a link to her interview, insinuating that such statements were anti-Semitic, because they were forging a *victim-competition*, hence relativizing the Holocaust. He had also inserted a quote of Naima's from the news outlet that read as follows: 'We must be open-minded toward different people, especially if you live within their societies.' He used this statement in the email to prove that Naima related to her surrounding as alien and non-Muslim, hinting that ultimately she was intolerant and driving an Islamist agenda, but for the time accepting, because she was still overpowered. Naima was presented as a Trojan horse, a common trope to discredit public Muslim figures or Muslim attempts to gain rights.[78] Within three days of the publication of her interview, Naima was fired for relativizing the Holocaust and for denying Israel's right to exist. The tipping point for the museum management was an image on her Facebook page advertising *Al-Awda*, an annual conference for the Palestinian Right to Return from 2012. The poster showed hand prints in the colors of the Palestinian flag all over historical Palestine and was therefore considered as wanting to establish a Palestine cleansed of Jews.

The same day Times of Israel published an interview with the director of the AFC, who affirmed the AFC's distance from her comments, saying they were "incorrect and painful and do not represent the center's official position." In the same article, another coordinator of a different memorial site was cited as saying that she disliked comparisons and that the Holocaust should simply not be compared because comparisons miss the point. Further, adding that, even if there were structural similarities between historical events, a tour guide in a Holocaust museum had to stress the differences. Both statements repositioned the Holocaust as an exceptional event and dismissed Naima's approach.[79]

---

[77] Here is the original article; the headline was changed upon Naima's request. http://english.alarabiya.net/en/perspective/features/2017/07/19/The-Palestinian-woman-who-works-in-a-Jewish-Museum-by-choice-.html

[78] This trope is not limited to Germany and pops out in other European discourses about Muslims as well: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/sep/01/trojan-horse-the-real-story-behind-the-fake-islamic-plot-to-take-over-schools.

[79] https://www.timesofisrael.com/berlin-anne-frank-center-guide-says-holocaust-suffering-like-palestinian-strife/.

Although, the AFC was not part of the Islamic extremism funding scheme, it was still discursively embedded in it and the museum understood the danger Naima's presence posed for the museum space. Thus, Naima's failure to recognize the exceptionality of the Holocaust could only be read as an Islamist transgression. In addition, Naima's words were not simply judged as politically misguided, but they were considered *painful* and *incorrect, harmful* and *missing the point*, because the Holocaust is not simply history but a paradigmatic shift for understanding liberal democracy. Instead, Naima had historicized the Holocaust as a past event with present significance because it provided structural similarities for other contexts and particularly Palestine.

The case of Palestine further aggravated Naima's comment, because it not only subverted the Holocaust as an exceptional event, but also centered the state of Israel as a nation-state engaged in activities similar to that of Nazis. As such, Naima had indirectly also pointed to the figure of the Jew as being able to commit genocidal crimes, while in most of her own work in civic education and in German national discourse the place of the Jew was that of the victim. By historicizing the Holocaust, she failed the kind of secularity expected of German citizens, one that does not question the exceptional status of the Holocaust. But instead of engaging with her comments from a historically shaped political point of view, the Holocaust memorial experts *moralized* her statements. They both knew Naima and her Palestinian refugee background well, but did not thematize this. One of them also told me in private conversations that she did not know how to talk about Israel-Palestine when it came up in the exhibition space, so she avoided it altogether.

The story of Naima's alternating embraced inclusion and hastened dismissal from the museum illustrates Germany's treatment of its Middle Eastern migrants as citizens. Citizenship status notwithstanding, several global and national shifts have discursively produced the former foreigner, briefly hyphenated as German-Turk, German-Palestinian and German-Other into a threatening Muslim subject. The emergence of the Muslim subject re-inscribes the majority as tolerant and morally superior while those with Middle Eastern background ossify into ambivalent Muslims. This re-inscription of the majority hinges upon how well the Muslim subject takes on the memory of the Holocaust as her own *or* fails to take it on and disturbs certain national affects and moral sensibilities. In taking on Holocaust memory, the Muslim subject re-affirms a universal citizen-subjectivity as defined by the policy drafters and assumed by the majority. By failing, she provides grounds for the majority to re-affirm a moral superiority not yet achieved by Muslims, as was the case with Naima.

2.2 Secularity and the Holocaust Episteme

Naima's case brings to the fore that a relationship to the state is relayed through the Holocaust and by being so it inscribes the notion of secularity. Further, her case bespeaks this intertwined complexity as a contradiction by showing how a problem arises when the German Muslim subject indeed follows the logic of historicism, but that of the Holocaust. Indeed, Naima emerged through this generative contradiction as a potential Muslim extremist, with the involved institutions urged to ostracize and oust her. In light of her public treatment as an dangerous aberration to the rule, I want to examine how secularity as a form of citizen-subjectivity is constituted, relatedly how secularity and the exceptionality of the Holocaust are intertwined. Given Naima's case, I approach secularity from the lens of personal embodiment when debating issues of public interest. In other words, my focus is not so much on state institutions and the separation of powers, but how the liberal democratic citizen-subject is constituted in relation to the Holocaust as that which remains exceptional and outside of history. I should add that I see this form of subjectivity not independent of state and secular powers but as an extension and effect of those, re-affirming and strengthening the state-citizen relations in a liberal democracy.

The notion of secularity I mobilize here is less straightforward than the one in local German usage, as described in the introduction. This I hope will shed light on the ambiguity of secularity itself in the German context and provide an example beyond this particular site and case. Anthropologist Saba Mahmood's discussion and conceptualization of secularity is instructive in this matter. By discussing a cultural controversy ensuing around the publication of an Egyptian novel set in the historical context of early Christianity, Mahmood unravels the various aspects of secularity emerging in that particular debate (Mahmood 2015, 181–207). Mahmood defines secularity as:

> [T]he shared set of background assumptions, attitudes, and dispositions that imbue secular society and subjectivity. Secularity entails a certain judgment about, and appreciation for, what religion should be in the modern world. Its predicates are found not so much in state edicts and policies as in culture at large, where they are disseminated, reproduced, and embodied as sensibilities. We encounter them, for example, in the modern emphasis on individual conscience and experience as the proper locus of religiosity and in the relative diminution of the phenomenal forms of religion (rites, rituals, attire, and scriptures). Because secularity exists at the level of sensibilities, its assumptions are difficult to grasp. However, they often come to the fore when controversies erupt over works of cultural production that engage religion […] (Mahmood 2015, 181).

Here, secularity is not a set of rules but is predicated upon internalized assumptions enabling judgment about the place of religion in the modern world. Hence, religion is not simply absent from secularity but personally managed, relegated to a particular place based on a specific experience on what the modern world is or ought to be. Further, religious articulations or explanations need to be commensurate with historical truth in order to gain validity at all (Mahmood 2015, 183). In addition, while religion is given a particular place within a secular order, it is also deemed too particular to make universal statements about cultural production outside the domain of religion (Mahmood 2015, 188).

In her discussion, Mahmood centers the controversy on two figures—the author of the historical novel and a Coptic bishop who oppose one another on the historical nature of the novel. Here, she notes that the author claims expertise by virtue of being a historian, whose method is to trace historical origins in order to demonstrate how these inform the present, by contrast with the bishop, who is clergy and not a historian. By describing how the bishop produced historically grounded counterstatements informed by Christological debates and scholarly works, Mahmood concludes that the controversy between the two opponents remained limited to a secular conception of history. This, she concludes, "is emblematic […] of the inordinate weight secular conceptions of history and temporality command in religious narratives today" (Mahmood 2015, 196). In other words, history is the epistemological ground on which truth can be decided upon, even religious truth. Ultimately, secularity is the embodiment of sensibilities, sentiments and assumptions towards a worldly telos as a citizen guided by history as the epistemological ground as to what can count as truth.

The Holocaust complicates this notion of secularity in certain ways. On the one hand, secularity in this context is predicated upon the memory of the Holocaust leading to a better and more tolerant German state and a new Europe purged of anti-modernist nationalism. On the other, the Holocaust is the history that cannot be historicized but only understood as the shift of everything before, as such establishing an *after*, a post-Holocaust. This post-Holocaust is a shift from the previous political time and a cut from it, as such transmuting Holocaust history into a state of exception. It is as that state of exception that the Holocaust inscribes background assumptions, attitudes, and dispositions as an evil that cannot exist in the current world. In other words, the Holocaust as an exceptional event is the episteme of secularity as such, and not only its epistemological ground.

If the Holocaust as the exceptional event itself is the episteme for secularity, where is the place of religion in this? According to my interlocutors and anti-Semitism experts in the field of civic education, the Holocaust as a moral-political failure is the result of unrefined,

un-secularized, religious and particularly Christian sentiments misplaced within a state form. According to those expert views, Nazis were traditionalists, using the modern state to forge an Aryan-Christian romantic world purged of Jews. Thus, religion is the anti-modern element within the state coupled with nationalism. Because anti-Semitism, prior to the Holocaust is understood as an anti-modernist attitude stemming out of misplaced (Christian) religious sentiments, the atrocious history of the Holocaust is an antidote to such prejudiced sentiments (Bergmann 2002; Erb and Bergmann 1989). Additionally, a better secularism and a fully embodied secularity grounded in a relation to the Holocaust is the antidote to intolerance, currently diagnosed among religious Muslims. In a similar vein, Muslim chants of the battle of *Khaybar*[80], when protesting the conditions and wars in Israel-Palestine, are understood as misplaced religious sentiments finding a foil of projection in contemporary conflicts. In this case, Muslim sentiments are believed to express an excessive religious intolerance reproducing old and deep-seated religious hatreds anew in a more political guise. While the Holocaust as an episteme can never be fully historicized, religion needs to be historicized and subsumed to the continuous workings of the state.

But Naima's case reveals another issue complicating the notion of secularity and its organizing principle of religion. Naima herself did not make a religious argument or advance a religious reason for why she compared the Holocaust with the Palestinian Nakba. Rather, Naima was understood by the online news media and her colleagues as speaking from a position of Muslim intolerance. Her statements were embedded in a larger discourse of Islamic extremism and she emerged as the Islamist. This is perhaps not so surprising given that the AFC had hired her to speak from a German Muslim position, already explicitly referencing her religious background. Her entrance into the museum and the field as such was predicated upon representing Muslimness while being able to guide, narrate, and teach about the Holocaust as was publicly done by ethnic Germans. Her entrance as a German Muslim, as interchangeable with being tolerant and respecting secularity collapsed after her interview became public. Yet her statements, regardless of intention or facticity, were never understood as a Palestinian position, but could only be read as violent Islamist transgression. Her failure to historicize provided further grounds for racialization and re-drawing a line between a tolerant civic-subjectivity constituted by the assumed right kind of relationship to the Holocaust and the one that was ascribed to Naima as a pre-modern Muslim subject.

Naima's case demonstrates a conundrum and invites us to reflect how the Muslim subject emerges as ambivalent and ossifies into a threat when engaging with Holocaust history as history. The case discussed here, also illustrates and complicates the analyses proposed by anthropologists Damani Partridge (2010)(2010) and Nitzan Shoshan (2016) (2016) in their works on nationalism, memory, and race. For Partridge, monumentalizing the Holocaust has not only excluded relevant subjects and potential participants; it has further severed connections between racialist memory and contemporary racism (2010). Partridge accounts for the exclusive, yet overcome German guilt discourse that creates a barrier for students of Turkish and Palestinian descent, who avoid memorial visits as not addressing them. He also points out that the monumental display of Holocaust memory presents itself at times as morally superior and effects a distancing from the past as a necessary mode for normalized racial exclusion in the present. In Partridge's words:

> More pointedly, contemporary monumentalization of, and distancing from Holocaust memory is necessary for contemporary modes of normalized racial exclusion. Europeans gain contemporary legitimacy by signifying a historical break from a genocidal logic, despite their building new (asylum camps) (see Agamben 1998). In other words, the technology of the camp has not been banned altogether, only in its particular historical use. […] I want to draw attention to the ways in which a

[80] The chant usually goes as follows: *Khaybar, Khaybar ya yahud! Jaish Muhammad sa-y'aud!* It could be translated as: [Remember] Khaybar o Jews! Muhammad's army will return!

> nationalist logic persists, not just in Germany, but also in Europe, the United States, and beyond which differentiates types of citizens and qualifies the universality of rights (Partridge 2010, 826).

Partridge expresses how a relationship to the Holocaust as one of being distant and having broken ties from such a political mode in fact normalizes contemporary forms of racial exclusion vis-à-vis German subjects with a hyphenated identity. Relatedly, the forms of population management that come to mind when one thinks of Nazis, such as internment camps, are still in in place for refugees, albeit for a different kind of purpose. Partridge is careful to state that he certainly does not want to equalize Nazi camps and European refugee camps as the same kind of political violence. Yet he adds that a nationalist logic persists, but Germans find solace in referencing Holocaust memory and monumentalization thereof as providing legitimacy and normalcy to exclude non-Europeans as citizens, migrants, and refugees (Partridge 2010, 827).

In Partridge's account, racial exclusion in Germany is wrapped up in *refusal* (2010, Ibid.)*;* the refusal to accept that racism and racial exclusion persist, albeit in a different guise. Further, here refusal is combined with a "finger-pointing mentality," blaming racialized subjects "for their refusal to integrate" (2010, Ibid). Partridge's discussion of pupils in a lower-tier secondary school follows the same logic. He observes how school excursions to various memorial sites, including the Auschwitz memorial, are accompanied with ongoing teacher comments about students of Turkish and Palestinian descent as not really being interested, as refusing to engage with Holocaust memory. By accounting for how students in fact disengage with Holocaust memory by simply not showing up for the scheduled excursions, Partridge problematizes the space of social interaction in which ongoing everyday racism against these students is never acknowledged. In other words, Partridge interprets student disengagement not simply as a form of refusal to engage the Holocaust but as exhibiting a problem-space produced by monumentalizing and maintaining the Holocaust as a historical artefact of a past that is no more (Partridge 2010, 856).

The case I have discussed here and my fieldwork findings in general, complicate Partridge's reasoning in certain ways. Naima, same as most of my other interlocutors, who were older than the teenager pupils Partridge writes about, were in fact eager to engage the Holocaust. There was no refusal on their side to engage with Holocaust memory. Naima's case rather demonstrates that she failed her task because she did not relate to the Holocaust as a bounded historical artefact of a past that is merely an exception to the rule. The fault line of incorporation and racialization I have discussed here is rather constituted around the modality of Holocaust engagement.

The modality of Holocaust engagement, the one that the teachers in Partridge's account master and the civic educator Naima fails, also provides grounds for a specific inspection of right-wing extremists. Right-wing extremists usually refuse openly to engage with the Holocaust. In recent years, right-wing parties have come out in public to say that they want German victims of the war to be commemorated as another form of Holocaust.[81]

[81] Another effect of monumentalization I see, related to what Partridge describes, is the idea of "we have commemorated enough the suffering of others and need to attend to our own." Around the same time the Holocaust Memorial was inaugurated, the National Party of Germany (NPD) started a memorial counter-movement by bringing to attention the bombing of Dresden by the Allied Powers. They called it the Bomb-Holocaust referring to the civilians killed by the bombs mostly by burning in their apartment buildings and basements. Anti-Semitism experts have called this move a shameless form of victim-competition. Similarly, one of the main speakers of the new nationalist party AfD has called the Holocaust Memorial, a memorial of shame in 2017. He added that no other nation would display their bad deeds as openly as the Germans did. His contention was that such a memorial culture should be restricted from now on, because it was counter-productive to having a positive relationship to the nation. See here for a full transcript in German of Höcke's speech. The memorial itself is only a detail, while the speech is mostly about maintaining a healthy nation and a strong state. Thus, the memorial is a problem, because it weakens all the good elements of Germany, according to Höcke and

Anthropologist Nitzan Shoshan problematizes how the German state governs right-wing extremists in order to manage a "bad nationalism" the kind that triggers the national imaginary as being haunted by a past that cannot be anymore (Shoshan 2016, 1–7). While defining Neo-Nazis as haters, the state both re-socializes these Eastern Germans through social programs, but also performs and rebrands itself through these governing institutions as a tolerant nation in constant battle with its "bad doppelgänger" (Shoshan 2016, 5). By accounting for how the German state is invested in combatting right-wing extremism, Shoshan, argues that the intended objective of the German state is to exclude the "internal adversaries" from the national project. This national project targets the right-wing extremists as they live and engage with their life-worlds in the margins of the post-Fordist political economy disenfranchised both from access to economic prosperity and political participation (Shoshan 2016, 15–21). Shoshan's account is exemplary of how the combat of right-wing extremism was re-organized after re-unification, after the first brutal attacks against Turkish guest worker families and refugees and in a time of German neo-liberalization. Exemplary of this time is that young neo-Nazis are closely observed and accompanied in their milieus. Further, they are trained to self-governance and responsibilization by way of specifically institutionalized social organizations located between youth clubs, schools, juvenile courts, juvenile prisons and the police.

Partridge and Shoshan demonstrate how the German state locates a bad nationalism in the historical past or in the social margins of the nation-state. Right-wing extremists, same as former Nazis, are then not fully outside of the German nation but tamed enough to be maintained in a certain place. In other words, their exclusion from the political community Shoshan declares to be "the constitutive outside" as an always real possibility for the inside (Shoshan 2016, 9). Put differently, right-wing extremists, although externalized from the political norm as disturbing remnants of the Nazi past, are in fact familiar and point to an intimate genealogy within one's own kin, such as the Nazi Grandpa or any other politically discredited elderly relative, who causes embarrassment but is still part of the family.

The kind of intimacy felt towards right-wing extremists is not extended to Islamic extremists, Muslims or Middle Eastern immigrants. From this perspective, right-wing extremists are merely ideologically misguided nationals and remain perceived as German citizens. In contrast, German Muslims are doubted in their ability to be German citizens at all, as such triggering and mobilizing a wider disciplinary regime to integrate them as secular members of society. By wanting to secularize them a *racial historicism* (Goldberg 2002, 2016) is unleashed upon them as in *not-yet* secular enough to be citizenly. As a religiously differentiated group, their non-Christian element lends itself to further scrutiny and an epistemological apparatus that racializes former immigrants, now citizens as Muslims in the moment of their civic incorporation. While this form of secularizing is currently a project of civic education framed by the memory of the Holocaust it points to and connects with the pre-Emancipation efforts to secularize Jews by way of *Bildung.*

2.3 *Bildung* as Secularization

Here, I want to provide a brief genealogy of Bildung in how it shaped the institution of citizenship and how it mobilized Jewish communities living in the German lands and Prussia. Bildung as a form of moral self-cultivation emerged before the legal concept of citizenship. Yet it shaped the way how the right kind of citizen-subject is conceptualized and how Jewish communities became a mission for the Protestant shaped educational and administrative institutions of Prussia.

By pointing out the shifts of Bildung from its emergence until the Jewish Emancipation, I aim to embed this genealogy within the theoretical literature on race and

---

the AfD: https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/hoecke-rede-im-wortlaut-gemuetszustand-eines-total-besiegten-volkes/19273518.html

education. Here, I engage the works of anthropologist Ann Stoler (1995) and political theorist David Goldberg (Goldberg 2002) in order to discuss how citizenship and race are co-constitutive of one another in secular education when extended as a universal to a religiously differentiated group. Thus providing the terrain on which, in this case, Christians become German citizen-subjects and Jews remain further Jewish. Bildung defines citizenship as "a faculty to be learned and a privilege to be earned" as historian Geoff Eley (1991) noted about nineteenth century bourgeois Europe, which produces Jews as a racial category at the time of their desired incorporation within the secular state.

In her work on the Dutch East Indies, Ann Stoler argues that the making of a European bourgeois self in the colonies was not only relational vis-à-vis the natives who had to learn the right kind of child-rearing, sexual practices and forms of house-keeping it was also underwritten by a racial grammar (Stoler 1995, 10–12). Focused on the domain of education in the intimate private sphere, Stoler accounts how European practices of refined personhood and racial purity are established in ongoing instruction, distancing and inspection of native and mixed households (Stoler 1995, Ibid.). Similar to Stoler, in my account on Bildung as a secularizing and racializing process, I will point out how education of Jews is both instructed and demanded by the ruling principalities, the nationalizing state and the Protestant elites, but also always deemed incomplete and not yet-secular enough to be acknowledged as fully embodying universal qualities.

The genealogy of Bildung I am delineating here until the Jewish Emancipation in 1871 can be best described as marked by a *racial historicism.* This term coined by David Goldberg stands for the benign liberal version of engaging difference as something that can be molded and developed until it withers away, as opposed to an inherent naturalist inferiority (Goldberg 2002, 74–80). Yet this approach to religious, cultural, class, and ethnic difference thrives on governmental techniques and close governance through education and administration in order to develop "the racially immature" (Goldberg 2002, 96). As that it further enables a racializing relationship and re-inscribes inequalities à la Stoler. Yet there is more to racial historicism in how it intersects with secularization. By treating Jews as lacking universal humanity, i.e. a secular personhood compatible with the secular nation-state, attempts to secularize Jews by way of Bildung are driven by an open-ended racial historicism. As I will show below, attempts to erase Jewish particularity from the space of Bildung has not fully homogenized Jews, but gradually turned them into ambivalent subjects.[82]

The task of Bildung is not simply to transfer content or a certain set of knowledge but to change sensibilities and to cultivate a different understanding of the self. As a concept that emerged in Germany, Bildung has been discussed by a variety of German thinkers and folded into different political and philosophical projects since its emergence in the fourteenth century (Horlacher 2015). Generally speaking, Bildung stands for an inward development of the self, the perfection of personality and character, and therefore it was first considered an emancipatory process, as emancipating from external worldly structures.

The term itself was coined by the medieval Christian mystic Meister Eckhart, who sought to translate the Latin Bible into Old High German. Meister Eckhart tasked himself with translating the mystical experience of immersion in Christ while meditating on having been made in the image of Christ. This theological concept of becoming one with God, in

[82] The Jewish Question, most famously rendered in the exchange between thinkers Bruno Bauer and Karl Marx looms large in the background here. Whether Jews need to relinquish their religious difference or the state needs to abolish its religious underpinnings are not the questions I engage. Yet these two positions constitute the tense problem-space in which Bildung as a technology of secularization and racialization emerges. Attending to this irresolvable paradox between secular state and religiously differentiated minority enables me to account for racial effects in this particular time and in the context of secular education for religiously differentiated groups within the nation-state as such.

order to transcend natural existence and reach a truer humanity, was translated as Bildung (Horlacher 2015, 7–19). Bildung is based on the Old High German word *bildunga* and originally signified the creative production of objects such as pottery. Through Meister Eckhart, the word gained an additional theological and spiritual meaning.

From the second half of the eighteenth century, the term Bildung is used to describe the mastery of language, culture, and ongoing personal development based on introspection and self-examination. Johann Gottfried Herder, a Lutheran pastor with Pietist leanings and a student of Immanuel Kant's, proposes an educational theory based on Bildung. Herder holds that the goal of the educated man is to be "the preacher of the virtue of [one's] own age" (Horlacher 2015, 12). Herder is thought to have understood Bildung as a counter-concept to the rationality of Enlightenment. His emphasis is on sentiments and feelings rather than knowledge because, as he argues, human beings are guided by virtues. Bildung in Herder's sense is not concerned with the outer world, such as political processes of deliberation, but with inner processes that take place and shape the human interior. The aim of Bildung was thus to develop the soul, which Herder saw as the moral, individual, and infinite potential for perfectibility (Horlacher 2016, 12).

As a modern concept, Bildung has clear Protestant roots; it defines for man the way he should craft his self beyond the institution of the church. This detail is all the more important given that the Prussian educational system of compulsory schooling established in 1763 was modeled on the Pietist movement. The Prussian monarchy allowed Pietists in return "a foothold within the universities, the civil service and the pastorate that enabled them to exert a sustained influence over the organizational life of the state" (Horlacher 2015, 12). In the Prussian State of the late eighteenth century, work on the self was structured by the public school and oriented toward the power center of the Prussian state.[83] Bildung as a form of individual self-cultivation designed to carefully craft the soul is rooted in the Pietist understanding that each individual has the potential to maintain and reform belief and thus to regenerate the virtues of Christianity beyond the institution of the church—and within the institutions of the state. As an educational principle in the newly established compulsory school system, the cultivation of the soul is oriented towards the regeneration of the state by each individual citizen. This bond between state and subject is predicated upon the ongoing internalization of the state as a form of individual duty that one needs to ensure the maintenance of the state form, inculcated during the formative years of schooling.

This form of self-cultivation merged Protestantism and German statehood in a time when a legal conception of citizenship had not yet been established. It also gave birth to a bureaucratic Protestant elite who regarded Bildung as a form of salvation, not just for Christians but also for Jews. According to historians of German-Jewish education, from the perspective of the new elite, Jews' inferiority was a moral problem and not a theological one. Improving Jews meant improving their *Sittlichkeit* (morality) through education (Eliav 1960, 5). Morality, as a form of being rightly attuned with the state, was upheld as a universal ideal of man—but one that Jews could not develop if they remained confined within their own communities and subject to religious instruction only.[84] Correcting Jewish morality meant to

[83] See here for a detailed discussion of the Prussian School system and the successful incorporation of Protestant clergy and practices of learning: Yasemin Nuhoglu Soysal and David Strang, "Construction of the First Mass Education Systems in Nineteenth-Century Europe" *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 62, No. 4 (Oct., 1989), pp. 277-288. Published by: American Sociological Association.

[84] Jewish communities, despite the segregation and legal restrictions in feudal society, also enjoyed autonomy and communal rights to religious life, organization, rites, and education, see Shulamit Volkov, *Das jüdische Projekt der Moderne*, Beck'sche Reihe, 2002. To a certain extent, one can claim that Jews enjoyed a collective kind of freedom to live life according to their own social norms and judgments. With the change of the political order into a modern secular nation-state, Jewish segregation and traditional particularity was read as a withdrawal from society that was rooted in religious intolerance of non-Jews. The inequalities between Jews and Christians also became more visible by virtue of changed mobility and occupation laws for Christians within a

radically re-educate Jews in public secular institutions because, as the new elite claimed, the Jews had nurtured "segregationist, greedy, and fanatic features" on account of their attachment to their religious tradition (Eliav 1960, Ibid.). Just as the new elite had been educated by the state, they advocated for the re-education of Jews by the state, so that Jews might prove themselves worthy of acquiring rights. The improvement of Jewish life became a political mission of enabling Jews to participate in a common secular humanity. Lutheran pastor and state clerk Christian Wilhelm Dohm addressed the living condition of Jews in his work *On the Civil Improvement of the Jews*,[85] published in 1781 (Dohm and Seifert 2015). The conception of man and citizen originated from the idea of a common humanity, an enlightenment ideal that Dohm summarized as follows: "The Jew is even more man than Jew!" (Dohm and Seifert 2015, 20).[86]

The Jew could become (universal) man if his conditions of existence were improved gradually by granting him civic and political rights. Dohm's vision for civil improvement was exceptional because he advanced the idea of rights and privileges first, in order to establish favorable conditions for Jews. According to Dohm, granting those rights was a prerequisite for developing a common humanity and improving social status. The term improvement *(Verbesserung)* gained a new meaning at the Congress of Vienna in 1814. While Dohm had aimed at improving conditions for Jews, the newly unifying German states under Prussia sought a betterment of unified regulation vis-à-vis the Jews within the German states. Unified regulation of Jews within the German territories gave birth to the precondition that the Jew first had to improve himself before he could gain any equal rights. The onus was on the Jews to prove that they were capable of self-reform in order to gain rights at all (Katz 1998, 114).

Self-reform of Jews coincided with the establishment of two public institutions. One was Prussian citizenship codified in 1812 turning subjects into legal persons beyond their residence in a particular principality. The other was the establishment of public schools for Jewish education as Bildung. Both institutions operated from a top-down national level with regional variations. Citizenship was given out as an administrative tool of state power in order to bind subjects to the central over-arching order of the Prussian State (Brubaker 1992, 57). The Jews within the Prussian State, however, were classified differently; they had a special status without being citizens of the principalities or the Prussian State.[87]

Jews remained subject to movement restrictions between the principalities until 1870. For Jews to have equal access to territory, residence and economic prosperity they had to

---

wider national territory. See also Jacob Katz, *Assimilation und Emanzipation der Juden*, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt, 1985.

[85] Please note that I am citing from an annotated version published in 2015 by Wolf Christoph Seifert.

[86] Dohm argued in favor of Jewish emancipation by lifting the legal and political restrictions that had created conditions of existence usually mistaken as the essential way of Jewish life. By suggesting improvements in all areas that encompassed the social life of the Jewish communities—such as linguistic, professional, educational, religious, and ritual practices, as well as the enshrinement of Jewish laws within state law—Dohm aimed at extending the ideal of man to the Jews, carried by the concept of the citizen endowed with rights. Inspired by liberal humanist debates in France and later the French Revolution, Dohm's suggestions were neatly organized around the logic of the nation-state. On the one hand, he wanted the German nation to expand and make use of all residents within its territory. On the other hand, as a liberal advocate of the modern state, Dohm saw it as a natural and necessary development that all residents of the national territory would become equal members of the state.

[87] The Jewish individuals had to naturalize within the German principalities. The principalities, however, upheld their right until 1848 to refuse or to complicate the naturalization of Jews within their own state by asking for naturalization tests (Nathans 2004, 67–69). Jews had to prove that they were equal members of the principality by proving financial wealth and by paying a certain percentage of their asset as a naturalization fee. Further, they had to demonstrate knowledge of a trade that was useful to the principality (Nathans 2004, 69). In order to become a native of Prussia and a citizen of the principality Jews had to demonstrate their rootedness in German practices, most importantly language. Citizenship status notwithstanding the principality could refuse settlement within certain areas for Jews, as not being German enough yet.

prove that they were fully assimilated equals. Full assimilation into German manners was assessed as a form of maturity, as the rightful state of being a citizen. In addition, for Jews to be regarded as rightful members and belonging to the national body, they had to enter and build secular educational institutions. Most importantly, Jews had to renounce their traditional communities and schools as these were seen as a hindrance to becoming universal man.

The case of German-Jews exemplifies how German citizenship was on the one hand opened up for the Jewish communities within the German territories and yet was used as a benchmark to declare Jews as not-yet German enough. Similar to how Stoler described the making of European selves vis-à-vis colonized natives, Christians within the same territory come to define and make the claim as what counts as German. To state it differently, incorporating Jews as fellow Germans is organized by a religious-racial grammar what Germanness is in the first place and in interaction with Jews. In contrast to Stoler's account the relational self-making of Christians as Germans citizens is not marked by excluding Jews, but by continuously engaging with them as not like Christian-Germans in order to be fully included. As a result, not only do Christians understand themselves as superior, but also Jews come to regard themselves as inferior.[88]

Bildung as a racial historicist and secularist project enabled the Jewish communities to internalize the majoritarian shaped state structures and Protestant norms. Becoming man, then, was to become akin to a German-Christian man. The sociologist Zygmunt Bauman writes how the time after the Jewish emancipation exposed a new contradiction with regards to European Jewry. As mostly assimilated and secular Jews, a question emerged as to how they were Jewish and not simply German or French. Being Jewish was reorganized again as a racial category and could be ascribed to traits, attitudes and features considered immoral, improper and indecent. As German Jews or other hyphenated European-Jewish identities Jews posed a threat of ambivalence. This ambivalence, as Bauman points out, in how European Jews can never be fully categorized within their national citizenship, something about Jewish subjects triggers further differentiation, especially when they are not visibly or practicing Jewish (Bauman 2001).

2.4 Integration before Islamic Extremism in Civic Education

The notion of Islamic extremism is an addition to the established forms of radicalization combat. In a way it is a conceptual extension of other forms of radicalization, triggered by the event of September 11, located in specifically institutionalized organizations working similarly between youth centers, community centers, juvenile prisons and courts and funded by the Ministries of Interior, Ministry of Family, Senior and Youth. Yet there is a crucial difference to the combat of Islamic extremism, partly because it emerged in a time in which the memory of the Holocaust becomes monumentalized as Partridge captured.

The first half of the decade after the citizenship reform, civic education and civic educators do not have specific programs for *Muslims* or youth from migrant backgrounds. A debate emerged how these new German citizens could be incorporated and how Germany could open up its history as a form of liberal inclusion as opposed to a blood conception of nationhood. The idea of opening up history and combating Islamic extremism, however, intersected and merged in ways that come close to the Bildung paradigm of the previous century. In this section, I will briefly outline the history of civic education as a state

[88] The sense of inferiority is internalized by a Jewish elite called *Maskilim* (literally: the enlightened). The literature on the Maskilim describes them in terms of generationally defined followers of Moses Mendelssohn's ideas of the Jewish Enlightenment, the Haskala. They were concentrated in urban areas such as Berlin, Königsberg, Frankfurt and Hamburg. For the period I am discussing, I am mostly describing second-generation Maskilim, who were radically opposed to traditional practices. Similar to the Christian Deists, such as Christian Wilhelm Dohm, they believed in religion as a universal moral principle that were binding for all in good conduct, but not in observing religious practices.

department and how it merged with Holocaust memory in certain ways. In discussing how Holocaust memory emerges as a field of integrating new Germans in parallel to the discourses of Islamic extremism as a new object of combat, I aim to show how these two strands intersect and regain an older quality of Bildung as secularization.

The *Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung* (henceforth BPB) was instituted in 1952 in Bonn in order to continue and professionalize denazification programs introduced by Western Allies. The BPB's stated main task is to foster liberal democracy.[89] The field of civic education is divided into several branches, but its two main aspects are historical *(historische Bildung)* and political education *(politische Bildung)*, as such it also supports educational programs at commemoration sites and memorials. Re-education had been introduced by the Western Allies in order to "denazify" a large population of male bureaucrats and soldiers during the late 1940s and early 50s.[90] Nazi state crimes were partly condemned as aberrations and exceptions in German state history, in an attempt to salvage what remained of the administrative body of state bureaucrats in order to build a new and better state (Jarausch 2008).

The aim of re-education programs is to break with Nazi ideology and yet retain loyalty to the state, by ensuring continuous democratization of politically unruly groups, from right-wing to left-wing extremists.[91] Its main funders are the Ministry of Family, Seniors and Youth and the Ministry of the Interior.[92] The two civil society organizations, I conducted my field research at, had secured funding from the BPB in the past and for current projects, but they were also directly funded by the Ministries. As such, they were not NGOs, they were state funded organizations intervening in the space between public institutions (such as schools) and state institutions (police and legal, penal institutions). Similarly, their own location was in an intersecting field between historical and political education (*historisch-politische Bildung*). In contrast to many other civil society organizations funded for the same purpose, they were not a community or religious organization.[93] Thus, they had no standing in the communities. Similarly they were not rooted in a traditional or communal form of Islam that worked as a positive role model in opposition Islamic extremism. My main interlocutors in both organizations came from a liberal milieu and had either professionalized in memorial sites or had been previously engaged in preventing right-wing extremism.[94] The trajectory from

[89] See webpage for detailed information: www.bpb.de.

[90] Denazification was more complex than can be described here; it included court cases for Nazi functionaries, but also public tours of concentration camps for entire towns and villages, and public screenings of footage created when concentration camps were liberated or emptied. The historian Konrad Jarausch provides an extended discussion of the multi-decade task of denazifying and re-civilizing German citizens, including merging older concepts of citizenship and German subjecthood.

[91] The BPB is the educational arm of the Ministry of the Interior, but it has also been in touch with social movements and churches and at times incorporated or supported tendencies that ran counter to the state regulation of civic education. The BPB expanded its scope beyond political education in the 1980s by including historical education. Dealing with and facing the past lies at the heart of instilling a sense of duty to uphold liberal democracy against fascism.

[92] For further insight on the re-organization of the German (political) educational system after WWII, see Führ, Christoph and Furck, Carl-Ludwig, *Handbuch der deutschen Bildungsgeschichte, Band IV, 1945 bis Gegenwart, Erster Teilband Bundesrepublik Deutschland,* C.H. Beck Verlagsbuchhandlung, Munich, 1998.

[93] A look at the provided funding list by the Ministry of Family evinces how a variety of migrant social organizations set up for communal purposes or social help have become channels for extremism combat: https://www.demokratie-leben.de/bundesprogramm/ueber-demokratie leben/radikalisierungspraevention.html#t-1. The organizations funded by this funding scheme, those I could talk to in Berlin at least, usually maintained that they were mostly engaged in preventing radicalization, not really combatting it. My interlocutors at the two civil society organizations also assured that the teenagers they worked with were not extremists. In the worst case, they enabled them to participate in liberal democracy.

[94] There was one main exception to the rule. Recep, the director of the civil society organization in Kreuzberg had previously worked in a community organization. His co-founders and most of his colleagues had come to

memorial site to combatting right-wing extremism or combatting right-wing extremism in the memorial space had become more common especially after re-unification. With the national shift to a re-unified country, older specters and fears of nationalism emerged. Simultaneously, the changed German government made stronger concessions vis-à-vis the memory of the Holocaust.

The Claims Conference, an organization founded in the 1950s to seek justice and compensation for former forced Jewish labor, filed a new class action in 1990 given that the former GDR included Jewish property and lands formerly not claimed. As of 2000, a fraction of the proceeds from the class action suit brought against the German state has been invested and entrusted a German trustee institution located in Berlin called *Erinnern, Verantwortung, Zukunft (EVZ)* (lit. Remembrance, Responsibility, Future).[95]

In one of my first conversations with the director of EVZ, Ulla Kux, I asked why there were these funds to investigate more Nazi and Holocaust history and to prevent extremism but hardly funds to combat discrimination and racism for those who were affected by it. It was as if one always needed to do the detour to history first in order to speak about the present condition of discrimination. Her answer was telling and clarified a certain shift I had not been aware of. Kux described the 1980s as a turning point; back then she was part of a social movement that was demanding a broader coming to terms with the consequences of history.[96] Kux told me that one of their main slogans was "*Auschwitz is everywhere. Auschwitz is here!"*

The slogan was supposed to express that state officials had been planning mass murder in the regular course of their daily business in German cities and towns and in certain institutions that were still operational even after the war. To claim Auschwitz was omnipresent was to demand that crimes be confronted and that systematic responsibility be taken for the ways in which the factors that made Auschwitz possible were still present in state power. She explained to me that many of the institutions and memorials I see now as a natural part of the cityscape, such as the *Holocaust Memorial for the Murdered Jews*[97] or the *Topography of Terror*,[98] were simply wild and radical ideas back then.[99] Additionally, the focus of the movement was often on how a particular institution worked and how it had organized Jewish victims. They were engaged in what felt like a battle to get the right information to come out, in order to know how this genocide had come about. It was not until the 1990s that racism was thought of as a broader social problem, after the first asylum homes were burnt down and the homes of Turkish families attacked, she added.[100]

---

this work by way of professional experience in a memorial site or by way of being engaged in an organization for democracy, human rights and against right-wing extremism.

[95] See here for foundational history and the sum available each year to fund memory and education projects: https://www.stiftung-evz.de/eng/the-foundation/history.html.

[96] Scholars have noted that the kitschy and historically inaccurate American TV miniseries "Holocaust," which was broadcast in Germany in 1978, sparked feelings of guilt and discomfort. The public TV station recorded many viewers calling in to report that they had witnessed deportations or even aided in some. The screening also triggered a debate among historians about the representability of mass genocide in TV format.

[97] See here for further details: https://www.stiftung-denkmal.de/startseite.html .The location of the memorial is telling right next to the Brandenburg gate and the American Embassy it is in the heart of old Berlin connecting and embedded in various layers of political history.

[98] Topography of Terror is a public museum and information center located in the ruins of the former Gestapo, Nazi Secret Police, and opened in 2010 is also an information center how a police state works administratively and by use of state sanctioned violence. See here for more details: http://www.topographie.de/en/

[99] From interview during field research.

[100] Kux pointed me to the declaration of the Jewish Claims Conference explaining that the focus on Holocaust victims also only shifted in the early 2000s, when Jewish groups acknowledged that Roma and Sinti were likewise victims of the Holocaust. The notion of the victim was expanded, but only slowly does it materialize in the political landscape, including designated memorials for Roma and Sinti. For many years the field had been dominated by a German state–Jewish victim framework and did not see a need to engage with a demographically changing society. Holocaust history, however, was much broader and systematically making use of all kinds of

Re-unification had opened up a space for regained national sentiments. The violent actions of Neo-Nazis against migrants, refugees and phenotypically marked non-European pointed to a continuity of racism, according to Kux. Yet this kind of racism was also placed in a different political order and was understood to be a specter of the national past, as pointed out above. Kux's narrative and also the self-presentation of the foundation documented one thing very clearly for me. The notion of historical justice and the position of the state had overlapped after the 1990s, pointing to a good and morally just state. The drive and demands of the social movement had teleologically progressed into the state project. EVZ was a private foundation, but it was basically managing funds from the state extracted through forced labor. Although authorized by the Claims Conference to use this money for public education on the Holocaust, it made the German government look generous.[101] The German state had successfully incorporated this history into its current political fold and by virtue of that created a political present that initiated a positive time of the post-Holocaust.

Around the same time, the question of what it means to be a German citizen was in flux given that the new German government under the aegis of the SPD/Green party coalition had taken bold steps to reform citizenship. A task emerged as to how to be German beyond an ethnic-blood conception of Germanness? Or more directly, how could descendants of Turkish guestworkers and other migrants gain a sense of German citizenship and be included in the national fabric? The field of civic education—which had previously been a site for difficult and painful encounters with German history, where nationalism would be expunged in exchange for liberal-democratic self-governance—was now under revision by established academic voices in the field, with the aim of integrating immigrants and enabling an agentive political subject (Ohliger et al. 2006).[102] In the early discussions of turning Holocaust memory into a resource, the notion of Islamic extremism was completely absent and so was the idea that there is a particular form of anti-Semitism among immigrants.

The actors reframed German history as a resource with a positive outcome. Emboldened by the current political developments in how the new government faced its past, the Holocaust could provide values and identification beyond the legalistic German constitution. As central as the Holocaust has been for the cultivation of liberal subjectivity in Germany, a question emerged as to how this particular event in German history could be further universalized in order to provide a point of reference and a common national object for a society marked by migration (Ohliger et al. 2006, 21). Guiding questions in this debate were: Should Holocaust history be transnationalized to include the Israel-Palestine conflict and/or should it be de-ethnicized by shifting the approach from German guilt to universal responsibility? These moves were ultimately not undertaken, but it left the door open for re-thinking how this history could be connected to other histories, similar to how Naima was at first encouraged to relate Holocaust history to other contexts.[103]

---

populations including many Eastern Europeans, who were similarly enslaved and exploited. The foundation then, although initially guided by a narrowly German-Jewish case, was engaging history and claims to justice in a more universal and inclusive manner.

[101] During field research, I have also encountered civic educators who were quite critical of the EVZ and the funding scheme. One civic educator explained to me that the funds were communicated as if the German government was generous, when in fact it was based on exploited labor. Hence, the money belonged to someone who had already died and was now strangely white-washing the German state.

[102] I am referring to this document, published as a PDF book in German: https://www.stiftung-evz.de/fileadmin/user_upload/EVZ_Uploads/Publikationen/Studien/2006_migration.pdf. The document is based on a conference, a quantitative study, and best practice recommendations for the field of civic education. The document is exemplary insofar as it refers to the DIK and the ongoing security concerns in relation to migration, yet it does not mention Islam or Muslims specifically. Rather, it remains within the frame of migration, as a political task for society as such. Interestingly, the document refers to ethnic majoritarian Germans as "autochthonous."

[103] Literary scholar Michael Rothberg has compellingly argued how Holocaust history in Europe could be thought in multidirectional ways, as that including and juxtaposing colonial history, such as in French-Algeria

The gesture to open up Holocaust history from German guilt to universal responsibility was initially premised on an idea that all humans would feel empathy for the victims. A side effect of this inclusion qua universal humanity has been that immigrant youth included in this, in turn also abstracted the victims as humans, as such not necessarily differentiating between Jewish and other victims.[104] My interlocutors in the two civil society organizations would also emphasize that the abstract notion of responsibility referred to the specific responsibility for a liberal democratic society as such and not for the responsibility towards any specific group. In parallel with the operations of the DIK, and eventually with great financial and ideological support from it, the field of civic education has been revived as a site of intervention for Muslim re-education.

The first scholarly works in German dealing with immigrants in the field of civic education were written by pedagogues who had practical insights and teaching experience before the discursive shift to Islamic extremism. They were trying to prove that migrant students relate to Holocaust history empathetically (Georgi 2003; Gryglewski 2013; Fava 2015). The works were always underwritten by the same question: Do migrants and new Germans relate to the Holocaust and to Jewish victims as we do? One of the first scholars to address the problem was intercultural pedagogue Viola Georgi, who noticed at a memorial site that students of Turkish backgrounds would be particularly interested in Jewish Holocaust survivors and that they would even stay on after the official event had ended to inquire more about life during Nazi regime. Georgi noticed that migrant youth took on the burden of the past in order to legitimize their presence as fully German (Georgi 2003, 302).[105]

A second book published in 2013 by Elke Gryglewski *typologized* Arab and Turkish visitors in their perceptions of the Wannsee Conference Memorial site. Gryglewski describes how empathy was established on the basis of perceived similarities. Although she cautions that the Holocaust cannot be compared to other cases, there were nevertheless situations that could provide access to an understanding of the violence that Jews and others had suffered. For Gryglewski the key in having migrant students relate to Holocaust history in an embracing way is to acknowledge their family histories and position in society.[106]

Both works provide a practical guide for working with immigrant groups, as if these researchers had worked with them singularly, though it turns out that they did focus-group interviews and worked with questionnaires in order to generate immigrant responses from

---

with that of the Holocaust (Rothberg 2009). These forms of 'multidirectional memory' to use Rothberg's term seem far away in the German context. The presence of Palestinian refugees (or migrants in general) and the question of Palestine has so far not triggered a multidirectional approach. Relatedly, German colonial history has been avoided over decades, although Hannah Arendt already wrote in the 1950s how German colonialism had provided a laboratory for genocidal ventures (Arendt 1973 [1951]). So far the only German historian who has provided a multidirectional perspective on the genocide in the German colonies and the European continent is Jürgen Zimmerer; he argued that there is a racist trace in politics leading from Windhuk to Auschwitz (Zimmerer 2011). Zimmerer has been attacked from the German right and left, the right criticized him for producing anti-German polemics and the left criticized him for relativizing the Holocaust.

[104] Especially students of Turkish background are usually cited as referring to the victims as humans regardless of ethnic or religious backgrounds.

[105] Georgi told me in a personal conversation that she was touched by this sincere engagement and she thought that writing a book about this might be hope-inducing. Her aim was not to single out Turkish students as relating differently but to demonstrate that they empathize with Jewish victims, perhaps more than their German peers.

[106] In a personal conversation, Gryglewski told me that one photo in particular would often trigger veiled girls, because it showed a group of German soldiers surrounding an orthodox Jew and laughing while cutting his side-curls. Veiled girls would claim that they know this feeling of being publicly shamed and even attacked for their visible religiosity, according to Gryglewski. Here again, Gryglewski told me that she felt it necessary to intervene by pointing out that this Jewish man was not simply discriminated against by extremists, he was about to be killed by a state power. Yet she would allow for these initial comparisons, because they provided access.

within a typically heterogeneous group.[107] Also, both works approach Holocaust memory as a stable entity; this stability would imply that when approached by newcomers, who may find different take-aways or make sense of Holocaust history from a position of difference, but majoritarian positions would not be substantially departed from.

Rosa Fava's book on school visits to the concentration camp memorial Neuengamme near Hamburg makes a slightly different intervention (Fava 2015). Fava observed that most teenage students, regardless of ethnic background, had the same starting point when it came to distance to Holocaust history. They had no personal memories or accumulated knowledge of their own. Yet, the older generation of school teachers would insist that foreigners do not understand and cannot relate to that history as ethnic Germans do, simply because they have no family ties reaching back to the Nazi generation. Fava's argument is centered on the ethnic German school teachers and how they reproduce a blood descent-based understanding of German history. Similar to Georgi and Gryglewski, Fava does not see any major difference or resistance to Holocaust history among immigrant youth, but she acknowledges a challenge that she attributes to the project of nation-building. She claims that nation-building, although triggered by the entry of a new demographic and the emergence of a new political situation is nonetheless marked by a shutting out of these newcomers and the drawing of a boundary around the natural insiders of German history.

All three works can be read as a document on the political climate during the first decade of the new millennium, namely that the Holocaust is the central element of becoming a German citizen. Similarly, all three of them ascribe to this history as a resource. As a resource, the Holocaust is both overcome and yet still effective and valid for new generations. By centering the migrant in the memorial space as the newcomer, the scholars also center the German gaze as the one establishing the norm for how to approach this history. None of these works deal with multiculturalism or migration from the lens of religion or extremism. Rather, wrapped in an older language immigrant youth are perceived and referred to as Turks, Arabs or with a German hyphenated identity. Yet all three authors would take issue, if the same youth would not relate to the Holocaust as the ideal citizen does.

2.5 Conclusion

When I last saw Naima in April 2018, she told me that except for one colleague no one from the AFC had contacted her. She had also lost her job at one of the other civil society organizations and was not sure, if she had any future as a professional civic educator in this field. When I asked, what she was planning to do, if she had tried to seek a conversation or had contacted some of her old colleagues, she explained that several of them had unfriended or blocked her on facebook. Naima was discouraged from explaining herself or correcting her image, it was as if it was somehow decided forever that she is an anti-Semite Islamist. Instead of pursuing a career as a professional in civic education, Naima had opened a bakery with her partner in Berlin-Spandau. The bakery job was less exciting, but she was her own boss and it provided an income. In describing the different moments since the incident, she remarked that one door after the other was shut on her, as if she was simply toxic for her environment. As if she had a substance that was destructive, she said in disbelief over her abruptly ended

[107] Gryglewski states that her book might give the wrong impression that her research was organized around Turkish and Arab only educational groups. Her research only addresses Turkish and Arab students and does not take other ethnicities into account, but the groups are more heterogeneous. Yet her selection is telling about the group currently described as a social and political problem.

professional trajectory and the sudden fall from model German Muslim to anti-Semite extremist.[108]

By centering the exceptional case of Naima, I have attempted to trace several shifts. The first major shifts pertain to how Germans of Middle Eastern descent are incorporated in memorial spaces as sites of becoming German and representing a tolerant Germany. As the early 1990s introduced several shifts in national self-perception and citizenship, the establishment of several public monuments and memorials went hand in hand with a liberation narrative finding its telos in the state itself. The post-Holocaust episteme and the German state merged into one by virtue of the state taking on this narrative in order to reference itself as liberal, democratic and tolerant through these memorials. The presence of German of Middle Eastern descent in those memorial and museum spaces provided initially a way of incorporating non-ethnic, non-Christian Germans into the polity as equals, who can forge their own civic-subjectivity vis-à-vis this history. Holocaust history, in this case, was a resource for positive self-fashioning as a citizen.

In parallel to this development and mobilized by the discourse on war on terror, the security apparatus has institutionalized the working notion of Islamic extremism for the field of civic education. Yet because the definition of Islamic extremism exceeded the notion of political ideology and also included elements of unrefined Islamic religiosity it was combined with secularization efforts. These secularization efforts aimed at two things simultaneously: first, fostering a sense of secular temporality for Islam, so Muslims do not chant religious anti-Semitic slogans in public. As these slogans were understood as an indirect attack against the liberal-democratic order as such, they were similarly a feature of Islamic extremism. Second, secularization was also sought by fostering closer ties with Holocaust history in order to attune Muslims into the right sensibilities. The second form of secularization did not follow a historicist temporalization of the Holocaust as an event. As I argued, relating to the Holocaust as the structuring foundation of the post-Holocaust episteme is what inscribes and constitutes secularity in this context. Conversely, historicizing the Holocaust by comparing it and/or by discounting its exceptionality provides grounds for suspicion and inspection. In Naima's case it was read in reference to her visible religiosity and stigmatized her as being an extremist with anti-Semitic views.

The relation to the Holocaust turned now into the constitutive site of citizenship. While immigrant youth are addressed as needing to engage in order to become Germans, their incorporation is also predicated upon a secularization narrative. Relatedly, majoritarian Germans and those who identify as such in this generative site gain a positive subject position vis-à-vis these newcomers. Now that secularity and the post-Holocaust merged, citizens and immigrants of Middle Eastern descent ossify into an ambivalently anti-Semitic non-citizen racial subject-position.

[108] This was a metaphor that Naima used several times in the conversation with me. I knew from earlier conversations that she had a racist encounter as a teenager, where she was denied a job on the basis of her headscarf. The owner of the place told her that she had "the thing to destroy livelihoods" therefore he could not hire her. From personal conversation in field notes.

Part II Practices of Tolerance as Secularity
Chapter 3: A new kind of Anti-Semitism for new Germans?

When I first met Recep in 2013 during preliminary fieldwork, he was two hours late to our meeting at his office in central Kreuzberg. When entering the office, he apologized explaining that he was busy coordinating a demonstration in Berlin in solidarity with the Gezi Park protests taking place in Istanbul at the time. Unlike most professionals in civic education his generation, Recep grew up in Turkey, moving to Germany in the 1980s when he was in his late 20s. He remained engaged in Turkish politics after the move. For him, the political situation in Turkey and the wider Middle East, specifically the conflict in Israel-Palestine, was the root problem why Turkish and Arab youth radicalized. As such, he advanced and popularized an idea that there was a particular anti-Semitism among Muslim youth stemming from the political situation in Israel-Palestine and the Islamization of politics in the Middle East.

The position that Recep took was that of the intimate insider to the Middle Eastern communities he worked with in and around Kreuzberg, but he would never identify as one of them or as Muslim. In private conversations, he emphasized that he was simply not practicing religion, nor identified as Muslim. *Antisemitismus Bekämpfen* (AB), the organization he directed was explicit about going after a kind of anti-Semitism specific to the Middle Eastern immigrants, who harbored Islamic extremism. In contrast to right-wing extremism, this kind of anti-Semitism was sometimes called *imported, new,* or *Muslim* (Özyürek 2015). By the time I started my fieldwork, Recep and colleagues would prefer to call it "Israel related anti-Semitism." Yet even this label could not fully eclipse that there was a specific referent (Middle Eastern migrants) and reference (Islam) implied here. Recep had founded AB with four other friends to combat anti-Semitism in 2003.[109] His prior work as a social worker in Kreuzberg prompted him to be engaged against anti-Semitism among the community he knew best, a neighborhood in the *Wrangelkiez.* In his work, he was dedicated to enhancing immigrant families' social life with afternoon courses, events, and help therein with their bureaucratic paperwork. The aim was to help people in the neighborhood integrate into German society. His decision to found AB came while organizing a summer festival for the neighborhood. During the festival he got into a fight with a Palestinian mother, who was furious about her fourteen year-old daughter dancing *dabkeh*[110] in public.[111]

The mother insisted that her daughter cannot dance in public. Recep insisting that she could. The angry mother responded "I'd rather send my daughter to Tel Aviv to blow herself up than allow her to partake in the *dabkeh* performance." For Recep, the mother's response expressed her deep-seated hatred against Jews. When I asked what it was exactly that so disturbed him about the comment and whether it could be understood as another way of saying that dancing *dabkeh* in public is as taboo for her daughter as sending her to her own death? Recep responded that he was just shocked that she was willing to sacrifice her

[109] None of these friends remained in the organization, partly for ideological and partly for personal reasons, I was told. I met some of them by coincidence during my fieldwork and noted how they had split off—some were doing more critical work on racism, while others had developed more right-wing views on Islam as a threat to European values. The organization consisted of two main teams. One team was led by Recep and his mostly German-Turkish group of students and pedagogues. The second team was a more homogeneous group of leftist Germans. There were rumors that they were anti-German, an anti-Fascist splinter group. The second team has not completely allowed me to work with them and has generally avoided me.

[110] A form of traditional folkdance known in different variants across the Middle East.

[111] The mother was known to the social workers as having an abrupt style of communication, being very pious, and veiling in a very strict manner. He described her as having scars all over her face and some female social workers exchanged rumors that her body was scarred from a bombing attack in Lebanon. When Recep told me this origin story of his initiative, he added that now he would think differently about the incident and acknowledge that perhaps she had been traumatized by war.

daughter to kill Jews. For Recep the mother's was a call to: "Killing Jews, again?! This is impossible, he exclaimed, it should never happen again!"[112] While making his statement, he put his palm on his mouth as if he was trying to censor what he just said. Recep's expressed panic was genuine; he was at a loss for words when he had to explain to me where the problem with that particular statement actually resided. Given that he took the mother literally at her word, his worry over the idea of killing Jews was greater than his worry for this concrete girl possibly dying in the course of such an act. In Recep's mental image, the mother's words printed directly to the Holocaust, even though the mother had not even mentioned the words Jew or Holocaust. The incident with the Palestinian mother, as Recep explained, happened at the height of the Second Intifada and he would see the young boys in his group expressing fascination with combat against the state of Israel. He described this as a form of creeping radicalization that was invisible otherwise. This mother's statement then ultimately led him to conclude that there must be a deep subterranean hatred for Jews within the migrant communities; something he thought should not be, especially since they were living in Germany with the history of the Holocaust.

By centering Recep's origin story and his position in the field of civic education, I want to explore how he was a driver of imported "Muslim anti-Semitism" a notion that he propagated when talking with the Ministries about how to think about the symptoms of Islamic extremism in conjunction with funding requests, especially in the early years of his organization. But Recep, although engaged in a racializing language about Muslims, usually claimed that Muslim youth were only susceptible to such political ideologies, because they were not acknowledged as Germans. As such, he provided a bifurcated account about immigrant youth *as discriminating, because discriminated against.*[113] By exploring this organization's work through the figure of Recep and his team in the way they defined religious intolerance and how they worked against it as German Muslims, I seek to demonstrate what this position entailed.

The kind of Muslim religiosity, Recep propagated through his team, was one that was defined as tamed and tolerant. In fact, it overlapped with a notion of secularity both in the way it was constituted in Germany through the Holocaust episteme and in the way it kept religion out of political and cultural questions by detecting transgressions of a religious logic. Educators interpreted aggressive statements concerning Israel and Jews in terms of Muslim religiosity. Detecting Muslim anti-Semitic speech was something the peers had to learn in their work, from the materials they studied together and from Recep's instructions for the workshop setting. It was, however, not always clear what exactly was Islamic about the kind of anti-Semitism detected, as I will show. By focusing on AB here, that centered Islamic extremism as an ideological problem and Muslims as the solution to the issue of anti-Semitism, I discuss how the organization tried to combat religious intolerance without wanting to stigmatize Muslims as a religious group and by performing German Muslimness. Thus, the initiative still defined Muslims as a population, one that could be incorporated into the liberal democratic project.

---

[112] This is my translation from the German original: "Juden töten? Das geht doch nicht, nie wieder!"

[113] Although Recep presented himself as an insider of the immigrant and Muslim milieu, he never positioned himself directly as Muslim, though he was assumed to be one by virtue of his Turkish background. Quite the contrary, he would emphasize in personal meetings that he is an atheist with no feelings for any religion. In workshops with the students, when asked—and the students were not shy about asking, given how central Islam was in these sessions—Recep would avoid answering or say that the question is in fact irrelevant. In front of the students, he would not openly say that he is an atheist because it would have jeopardized his speaker-position and perhaps it would have also exposed his statist agenda—since Recep's avowed aim was to have a good relationship with the state and to enable direct civic relations for *Muslims* as a population. Ultimately, however, addressing the students as Muslims and then focusing on anti-Semitism among Muslims and within Islam would become an issue because there was nothing positive that Recep and his team provided other than talking about Islam and Muslims as a problem.

A paradox marked the incorporation of civic educators as Muslims. The paradox was that Muslims are just like everyone else and can therefore teach tolerance just as well, if not better, because they came from these communities. Yet because they came from these communities, they were not just as any other German educator, but dangerously close to being part of the problem. In the discussion provided here, I account for the frictions generated in the act of teaching in the space of sameness-in-difference. In order to do the work of the civic educator in the same way, Muslim civic educators related to ethnic and historical differences among Muslims in conflicting ways, but mostly ignoring it. Similarly, Islamophobia or what is called anti-Muslim racism in Germany, was similarly abjured by the civic educators as non-existent, while they were hyper-aware of anti-Semitism. I argue that by replicating certain concepts of anti-Semitism, as it has been pre-defined by secularized Christian norms and the retroactively institutionalized experience of German history, migrant civic educators were unintentionally complicit in their racialization as Muslims, because they applied those concepts as if they were similarly present or stemming from a Muslim religiosity. The last section will focus on one particular teaching session on anti-Semitism in order to discuss how Christian-secularized tropes of anti-Semitism misfired when they were transposed to explain Muslim anti-Semitism in relation to the state of Israel.

3.1 Framing Jews in Islamic Extremism

The initiative's claim was that Islamic extremism exploited Islamic anti-Jewish sentiments and spread its messages through Arab and Muslim communities and media. The organization understood its work to be combatting Islamic extremism where it appeared in the guise of anti-Semitic rhetoric projected onto Israel. In fact, they prided themselves in having a more innovative method than the usual and rather ineffective memorial visits. They would reach out to the students in their own milieu where these aversions against Jews were lingering and latent by going into their schools or community and youth centers to provide day- , week- or months-long workshops.

The initiative's main point of distinction was their focused approach to the problem of anti-Semitism in the present by addressing the Middle Eastern conflict. This address, however, was warped because it was wrapped in two intellectual positions hard to identify and differentiate in practical education. The first position was that there was something inherent to Islam wanting to see Jews as lower-status *dhimmis*[114] as such denying Jews their human equality, similar to how the German state eyed such statements. From this perspective, the Middle Eastern conflict was rather a catalyst for such feelings of frustrated religious-tribal chauvinism. The second position was that because of the Middle Eastern conflict, such old tropes would be mobilized and enmeshed with hate-speech but could fully recede in times of pacified relations. AB did not take a clear position on where they stood with these two positions in their practical work. Rather, it was presented as two possibilities of understanding the underlying structures of hostility against Jews in conjunction with Israel-Palestine (Goldenbogen 2013, 32-40).

The task for AB was to address the Middle Eastern Conflict in order to see what kinds of statements were made and positions taken vis-à-vis Jews and Israel. They did however elide the question of occupation and settlements in the Palestinian territories. Similarly, they would not discuss the wars that ensued in the last ten years in the Gaza Strip. When I asked why that was, I was told that the problem with 'Israel-related anti-Semitism' did not start with the occupation in 1967 but went all the way back to the establishment of Israel. Instead, the organization deployed a method called 'time beam,' where they juxtaposed the Middle Eastern Conflict in historical stages from a two-sided perspective (Palestinian vs. Israeli) starting with the Jewish Aliyah in 1882 until shortly after the establishment of the Israeli State

[114] The text I am citing from is written in a style of report. The term dhimmi is referenced by historian Dan Diner in the text and denotes a non-Muslim subject, here Jews, who is treated according to Islamic law as unequal.

in 1948. Here, they told a story of colonial Palestine as one dominated by the British, resisted by Arab-Muslim ideologues such as the Grand mufti of Jerusalem Hajj Amin Al-Husseini, who collaborated with the Nazis, and the Holocaust in the background.[115] Although, the focus was on the Middle Eastern Conflict, it was still closely connected to the Holocaust and remained historically limited to the 1950s.

The narrative presented followed the logic of "a land without people, for a people without land." Recep's outline was both acknowledging a Palestinian perspective, mostly by stating how Palestinians think of the same event in contrast to Jews, such as the British White Book (the policy paper for the partition of Palestine) or the Jewish settlements, yet he would also state that there were actually no Palestinians. He clarified that most Palestinians who fled to the neighboring countries were in fact seasonal workers from elsewhere. The real Palestinians then were a few feudal landlords who hailed from wealthy Cairene, Damascene or Beirut families. Most of them had gradually sold their lands to Jewish organizations, according to this narrative. By way of conclusion, Recep stated that this conflict produced refugees on both sides, Jewish and Palestinian. The Jewish refugees fleeing from Europe and later Arab countries were incorporated as citizens of the Israeli state, while the seasonal workers were not given citizenship in the respective Arab countries and became Palestinian refugees. This was the tragedy of the Palestinian people; according to Recep they had been betrayed by the neighboring Arab countries and lived in refugee status for so many decades and had numerically multiplied. The Palestinian Right of Return was untenable for Recep, because it would destroy the character of the Jewish state, something that had to be maintained given the lessons of the Holocaust.

According to Recep and his team, Israel-related anti-Semitism denied Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state and therefore expressed willing aggression against a Jewish collective. This view was not specific to this organization and circulated in public debates about Islamic extremists as well.[116] The educators' main aim was to build a narrative connection between the Holocaust and the existence of the state of Israel, lest the participants misunderstand what was at stake for Jewish life. As professionals with master's degrees in history, sociology, and political science, they would assure me that of course they knew that the connection between the Holocaust and the state of Israel was more complicated. But a workable story was needed in order to transmit the message to a fourteen year-old teenager.[117] What was also provided in these narratives was the moral frame of the Holocaust through which the establishment of Israel as a state for Jews gained an additional exceptional quality. As such, they did in fact not engage with the contemporary conflict in Israel-Palestine, but with the establishment of Israel as a political necessity given the events in Europe. Factually known or exposed in this time beam was that the creation of Israel had caused Palestinian refugees, but one had to acknowledge the Holocaust first as the worse catastrophe. The real conflict then was about the right concepts, patterns of thought, frames of mind and sensibilities when engaging with Israel-related anti-Semitism, as provided by the educational methods. Relatedly, these factors would decide and expose, how one related to Jews, Israel, and the Holocaust as a liberal

[115] Please note that the method is explained in the theory-practice handbook published by the same organization, as 'Method 4' on pp. 71-73. See here for further details: http://www.kiga-berlin.org/uploads/KIgA_Widerspruchstoleranz_2013.pdf. The method itself was developed in Israel-Palestine for Israeli and Palestinians textbooks and translated by Berghof Conflict Research into German: https://www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Other_Resources/PrimeTextbuch.pdf.

[116] In a response by the German parliament from 2015, a similar picture emerges. The threat to Jewish and Israeli institutions by "jihadist groups" is discussed and then juxtaposed with statistics categorizing the threat as originating in right-wing, left-wing, foreign, or 'other' groups. Out of 1,275 anti-Semitic crimes in the year 2013, 1,218 are attributed to right-wing groups, 0 to left-wing groups, 31 to foreigners, and 26 to other. See here for details in German: http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/18/041/1804173.pdf.

[117] The methods outlined in the handbook were also given to teachers and other educators. In that sense it was not simply a workable story for teenagers, but one that circulated as the authorized version of how things were.

democratic citizen in the case of all and as a secular citizen in the case of those individuals who were addressed and perceived as Muslims.

A crucial part of what counted as intolerance in civic education referred to speech: sentences, statements, but even words in themselves, such as in the origin story with the Palestinian mother, who said "I'd rather sent my daughter to Tel Aviv to blow herself up." These words could also provide a frame of reference through which a position became marked as either tolerant or intolerant, even hateful. The workshops themselves started with how one talked about Jews, the Holocaust or Israel and what certain statements revealed about the speaker, what kind of relation could be deduced from certain statements, what kind of affects these statements triggered and transported, and what kind of objects they produced and released for further negotiation. When Recep recounted the story to me, he described the problem as residing in a religiosity that he thought had nationalist and fascist features.[118] Not only did he experience the statement as a form of hatred of Jews, he also felt that this was only explicable through the mother's strict religiosity, a reading that was rather revealing of his own secularist subject-position.[119]

Recep did not let the mother pass with this statement but tried to rationalize it by relating it to her religiosity as something that can be fixed by way of civic education. I presume that ethnic German social workers in the same situation would have reacted slightly differently, given how encounters with Palestinians always a trigger a sense of avoidance for Germans, a sense of shame, perhaps even guilt that Palestinians have become stateless, because of the Holocaust. Recep, however, holds this Palestinian mother accountable to the norms of secularity that he has both internalized and can consciously refer to. Yet what he mobilized is the security apparatus of the state. Given my interactions with Recep, I doubt that he was mindlessly reproducing social structures, although he acted from naturalized assumptions of what a modern secular citizen was. Yet he was also aware that he had started something he could not fully control anymore vis-à-vis the migrant communities he sought to civilize with the support of the state apparatus.[120]

3.2 Dancing Muslims and Dying Jews in Co-Presence?

The wider discourse on Islamic extremism certainly informed Recep's understanding of this mother's statement. Yet the direct encounter and the effect that her proclamation had on Recep urge me to be more specific about the work language was doing here. By drawing partly on sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, linguistic anthropologist William Hanks states that language is not just a tool of description, but the use of language is the vehicle of habitus

[118] Another employee pointed out to me that Palestinian claims of their ancestral lands was a territorial strategy rooted in Islam with the concepts of *Dar al-Harb* (region of war) and *Dar as-Salaam* (region of peace). By referring to Islam scholar Gudrun Krämer, he explained that Islam was a territorial religion trying to conquer land outside of its sovereignty and establish its own reign.

[119] Recep himself was from a liberal-left secular-Kemalist family, although he had migrated to Germany as a student. He could hardly be labelled a Turkish migrant or of migrant background, as these terms always carried the working class within them. Although he never finished his second university degree in communication studies, it had deepened his acquaintance with German history and with critical Marxist theory and some would say that he too used to be a leftist anti-German in the leftist student circles in Berlin. Yet, he used the term leftist more as an insult.

[120] In one of my preliminary fieldwork periods, he allowed me to be present during an objective evaluation by the funding Ministry. The objective evaluator questioned their gender-segregated methods when they talked about sexual liberties, while Recep and his assistant explained that this was the best way to enter a conversation about sexuality, the evaluator seemed not convinced and asked them how this could be changed and if this was generally the case or specifically with this group. During the evaluative conversation she could remember the name of one student who had said that homosexuals should be punished by stoning. She insisted that he was an Islamist and asked what Recep and his assistant had done about his declaration. Recep and assistant struggled to explain that he is not an Islamist but a teenager, who likes to compete with others in the class over a pious image. Observing this conversation, I understood how difficult Recep's position was and how he was active in exposing these teenagers to state institutions and protecting them from the state simultaneously.

because it generates access to the world (Hanks 2005). As such, "language embodies and routinizes social orientations which are constitutive of habitus" (Hanks 2005, 192). Speaking is not extrinsic to the socially constituted habitus but is established and regulated by it. Hanks directs our attention also to *how* we speak about things, what kind of objects we turn them into, and what kind of meaning we thereby ascribe to them in the act of speaking that constitutes a "here-now-we," a reciprocally produced and shared context (Hanks 2005, 192). Hanks cautions that speech, based in structure, uttered in a context, is based not only on large-scale forms (discourse and structure) but also on interaction and co-presence (Hanks 2000, 2013). Hanks eventually reconceptualizes context as a social field and points out that context is a multilayered, dynamic and emergent process.[121]

Further, Hanks exemplifies the dynamism of context as a social field through the concept of *deixis* and the deictic field. The category of deixis includes, pronouns ("I," "you," "he," etc.), demonstratives ("this," "that," "those) spatial ("here," "there") and temporal adverbs ("now," "then") (Hanks 2005, 194). He formulates the deictic field as follows:

> the deictic field is composed of [1] the positions of communicative agents relative to the participant frameworks they occupy (that is, who occupies the positions of speaker [Spr], addressee [Adr], and others as defined by the language and the communicative practices of its speakers), [2] the positions occupied by objects of reference, and [3] the multiple dimensions whereby the former have access to the latter (Hanks 2005, 193).

By virtue of the multiple dimensions speaker and addressee have access to the object of reference, wider non-linguistic and non-present aspects can be brought in the situated context of interaction. For Hanks the deictic field is a situation of referential interaction present in all social fields "in which agents communicate with language" (Hanks 2005, 194). The actual situation of the speech, Hanks calls 'embedding,' meaning that these general expressions of deixis become converted into their specific social field. A consequence of this conversion is that the "space of positions" organized by the deictic field "is invested with much more specific values and relationships" […]. In other words, embedding a deixis discloses the values of other social fields. It is through this embedding that the force and meaning are "reshaped by the field to which they articulate," so Hanks (Hanks 2005, Ibid.).

In addition to what Hanks calls *spatialist* co-presence of speaker, addressee and object of reference substantiated by the gesticulating body, there is also a non-spatial background that endows deixis with a wider reference, Hanks calls this the interactive background. This interactive background exceeds the speaking individuals and the moment of interaction, because it draws on:

> background knowledge, memory, anticipation, and all that is part of a social setting and the relations between participants but not embodied in physical objects. Nonspatial aspects of deictic speech assume a secondary position; they are either ignored or derived from other, nondeictic principles […] (Hanks 2005, 196).

Based on social interaction, speaking to one another can involve these above stated wider factors that work as modes of access. While Hanks points out several factors that further inform the space of positioning among speakers and lead to further negotiation of meaning, I will only point out one, namely "relevancy structures." Here, Hanks draws on several other linguistics anthropologists, in order to systematize "relevancy structure" and to bring it to bear

[121] For that purpose, Hanks attends to various conceptions of field and integrates them into a whole in his definition of the deictic field. Three of those grow out of linguistics and refer to a semantic field, symbolic field and demonstrative field. The fourth refers to Bourdieu's concept of field as a more abstract and encompassing site embedded in a dynamic process by virtue of speech relations and agentive action.

in the deictic field. Let me turn to these points quickly in order to come back to the encounter between Recep and the Palestinian mother. Hanks states that "any utterance has a 'relevancy structure' according to which certain things matter and others do not" (Hanks 2005, Ibid). As a consequence, utterance meaning is not given in advance or "fixed in advance by the intentions of the [speaker]," it needs to be worked out by the speaking parties (Hanks 2005, Ibid). Further, he writes that the "participants display their sense of the current situation, the relevancy structure they are assuming, and their current relation to their own speech" (Hanks 2005, Ibid.). Crucial for this display is deixis, because it points into the situation and positions the speaker. Key here is that the speakers, although present as individuals, draw on a wider background knowledge shaped by the negotiation of a relevancy structure and by virtue of that constitute a space of interaction exceeding the individual persons in action. Nevertheless, the relevancy structure, once it is worked out, provides the participants with coordinated relations to certain objects. Hanks writes that:

> relevance overrides spatiality by determining whether or not space is what counts in the given utterance. Under many circumstances, what counts most for proper construal of the referent object is not its location but its accessibility in memory, anticipation, perception, or prior discourse (Hanks 2005, 197).

To continue this thought, relevance is based on what is going on in the moment of utterance and how the deictic field is embedded socially. In the first instance, relevance grows out of the context. In the second instance, relevance is established through embedding of the deictic field in a broader social field, not necessarily present and most likely exceeding the present, but available to the speaker. In the case of embedding, the social condition of the speaker and speech shape the effect and felicity of utterances. Hanks further specifies this social condition into more minute aspects of *where, when*, and *to* and *by whom* and states that these aspects are also socially conditioned.

In the direct encounter between Recep and the Palestinian mother then, the mother's statement left the context of the neighborhood festival by virtue of her reference to Tel Aviv. Or stated differently, by 'embedding' the act of dancing publicly as a social taboo similar to sending her daughter to her own death, the mother spoke from her background as a pious Palestinian refugee from war-torn Lebanon, who obviously was aware of the ongoing cycle of violence in Israel-Palestine. I assume that it was also her way of stating that her word is final and should be respected, as she is the mother who decides on her daughter's behalf, not Recep. By mentioning Tel Aviv, as the Israeli city she included a locale that was in fact absent in the situation of discussing a dance performance. Yet Tel Aviv was accessible to her through her Palestinian refugee heritage and probably mass media reporting on Israel-Palestine and suicide attacks during that time. It might have been a minor comparison for her in order to say: my daughter dancing in public in the neighborhood is as wild as sending her off to Tel Aviv for a suicide attack. But it also reveals what was on her mind, what was present and relevant for her. By uttering these words to Recep, she might have assumed that he will understand how serious the situation is for her. Yet in comparing dancing in public with blowing herself up in Tel Aviv, she exchanged life with death and the preference to rather kill her child than to let her dance. For Recep, who had difficulties understanding the mother from earlier encounters, and who construed her as a simple religious-conservative woman, this was a case of anti-Semitism, because it stated a literal wish to kill Jews. He also did not read it as a potential (literal) sign of child abuse, but as hatefully threatening Jews.

The statement entered a frame of reference for Recep in which it was embedded with killing Jews and therefore judged as inappropriate, bad, and hateful. Moreover, it connected with the time of genocide and the Holocaust for Recep, as he was recounting the story to me ("killing Jews, *again*?"). Both of the participants in this encounter, the mother and Recept left the space of the neighborhood and entered the space of Israel, connected for the mother to a Palestinian struggle and for Recep to the Holocaust. By doing so, the mother maintained her

focus on her daughter in sending her off to do a criminal act. Recep, in contrast lost sight of the daughter and envisioned killed Jews. I assume that the mother's utterance was infelicitous, but yet it effected something for Recep, the beginning of his career as a combatant of Islamic extremism and anti-Semitism.

Simultaneously, the mother, as one representative of the community for Recep, has been framed by him as potentially extremist similar to the environment in which he saw her emerging from. This context then that emerged for Recep out of this space of interaction could be easily aligned with the wider political discourse of Islamic extremism and the political structures to prevent radical Islam. By virtue of his understanding, that could be easily re-embedded within the discourse on war on terror, he in turn reproduces state structures through his own position of having to fight against what he understands to be Islamic extremism symptomized in an utterance as this one. At the same time, he finds himself in an environment that he perceives as hostile and dangerous for his own social position. Or put differently, given that he himself could be associated with this milieu by virtue of ethnic and religious background, but also by proximity through work and residence, Recep himself could be a potential target, to the least considered sympathizing, if he let this statement pass. Recep told me, he never asked the mother to clarify what she actually meant, explaining that he was too shocked by her statement. In this encounter, he also draws on a wider knowledge background and mobilizes a German understanding of Israel as a Jewish collective threatened by religious haters.

Recep's description of the mother and the lack of information to clearly socially situate her and her utterance, made it hard for me to assess what Recep meant by hate. Hatred of Jews or Israel was completely interchangeable for Recep and his colleagues. On a basic level it meant that there was a one-sided and singled out scapegoating of all things Jewish. In the specific language of the programs it was called '3D': demonization, double-standards and delegitimization (specifically of Israel)--these were the indicators of anti-Semitism with hate at its core.[122] In that sense, one could be religious and religiously intolerant, but being hateful was a whole different level for Recep. In other words, religious intolerance could lend itself towards hatred of Jews and other markers of liberal democracy, but anti-Semitism as Recep cautioned me during fieldwork was a hardened ideology and would show itself in exceptional moments. In the same vein, this is how he approached the migrant youth in his work as being embedded in a religiously intolerant environment, but not yet fully socialized into a hardened ideology of hateful anti-Semitism.

By claiming an insider position, he dared to say things that his ethnic German peers were uncertain how to formulate appropriately.[123] Also, he saw his work as part of his civic duty for the German state, given that he was entirely funded by the state. In a couple of conversations with me, Recep reacted with fear and said that *those* were things he could not

[122] During my first weeks in the office, one of Recep's colleagues told me that all demonstrations against Israel were anti-Semitic if they were organized by Arab or Palestinian communities, explaining that "they" do not demonstrate for or against anything else and just single out Israel. Here, he was exemplifying what was meant by double-standards, that other states were not measured by the same standard for similar violations. The 3D analysis is not mentioned in the handbook, but would come in conversations how to recognize Israel-related anti-Semitism.

[123] Although always very cordial with his colleagues, Recep was constantly engaged in distinguishing himself from others: the Leftists, the Protestants, and the Memorialists. It was as if these other agents were still embedded in an ideology or clouding belief system, while he was approaching things without such a filter. His attitude was also indicative of how the field of civic education had been structured and how he as a Turkish latecomer was successfully navigating it by claiming a civic position. Indeed, the other established agents in the field of civic education who were, like Recep, in their late to mid-forties had a different trajectory. They had come to this work after having been active in the church or having done a year of civil service at a memorial site or with the Protestant reconciliation organization ASF in Israel. His positionality was enabled by his ability to criticize Islam and name Islamic extremism without himself being liable to accusations of racism or discrimination against Muslims.

do or say, he had to think of his relation with the state. It was as if certain words contaminated him, or attributed a different subject-position. One trigger referred to saying *Palestine* or *Occupied Territories of Palestine*. In a conversation between the two of us, he was showing me the planned teaching program for the Muslim peer project that would conclude with a trip to Israel. When I asked why Muslim peers should travel to Israel, he explained that it would be a trip to Jerusalem and to Bethlehem, in order to visit holy sites. The idea was that Muslim peers would see with their own eyes how well kept traditional religious sites (Muslim & Christian) are in Israel, in contrast with the image portrayed in the media. I suggested he should perhaps specify this in the title: instead of "trip to Israel," write "visiting religious sites in Israel-Palestine." Recep seemed fearful all of a sudden, saying that Palestine is not an official state and that perhaps academics could make such radical claims, but he had a relation with the state and he could not jeopardize this for a title in a program.[124] Recep also stood up right after this sentence and asked me to leave his office. Again, I could see how I had him made feel uncomfortable, because he had gained a certain standing within certain departments of the state administration that he wanted to maintain and cultivate as a good citizen, a term like *Palestine* could jeopardize that relation and dislocate him from his carefully built position, while the term Israel strengthened the bond by speaking the official language.

Although Recep had a privileged position in this professional field, he was exponentially caught in a racial relationship with the state, continuously trying to distinguish himself from contaminating elements that would taint him as Muslim or Leftist, such as the word Palestine. In a way, Recep was managing several social fields and he had to strike a balance between the actual target milieu, his professional field, and the ministries. This balance consisted of being an expert of Muslims, but not being like them, knowing their language, but not speaking like them. The term Palestine, something that was circulating in the immigrant neighborhoods by virtue of present Palestinian subjects in the guise of students, could indicate a disregard for Israel, and hence be read as anti-Semitic. Recep's fearful reaction, however, also showed me that he was not simply mindlessly reproducing power structures, he was aware of them and he complied with them in order to gain more access to funding, political networks and power.

The position that he had taken vis-à-vis state agencies in his work exposed him as being close to a dangerous milieu. By distancing or exposing certain words, such as Palestine as "that" or "those" he created deictic field and occupied the position of the public Recep, who does not even utter certain words. Although, embedded physically in the milieu, by way of linguistic performance he embedded his self within the state structures, as someone who was enabling tolerant German Muslims.

3.4 Preventing Islamic Extremism with German Muslims

Recep engineered the idea of Muslim peer-education in league with a new colleague, Dursun. Dursun, who was at least ten years younger, trained as a history teacher, German-Turkish, Berlin-born, and a practicing Muslim with access to the Turkish Muslim community

[124] In a different incident about a year later, he told me how, on a previous trip to Israel-Palestine, a participant of Palestinian descent had stated his wish to meet his relatives. The relatives would pick the boy up for dinner and bring him back later. Recep told me that he panicked because he was responsible for the teenager and he was not sure whether the teen's story was true or whether he might be involved in illegal activities. Recep's description ended with: "I am accountable to the state, what if he does something!?" Although I am convinced that Recep genuinely believed in improving social and political life for these youth, his teaching efforts were also about his own positionality as a good citizen, one who was fighting against the stigma of being Muslim and who was fighting the perception of being Muslim. His close alignment with the state and the way he sought relations with politicians and policy-makers seemed like an attempt at creating a buffer-zone of extra security in order to fend off potential suspicion.

in Berlin. The Muslim peers would be civic educators from ethnically diverse backgrounds but all of them would identify as religious Muslims, thus they would be visibly marked by headscarves and beards and would enter the schools as insiders of the migrant milieu. Recep's idea was bold because it pushed the limits with respect to conventions and laws governing the display of visible signs of Muslim religiosity in public; for instance, Muslim teachers in Germany were not allowed to wear headscarves.[125] Deploying German Muslims in the role as civic educators would send a message to the teenage target groups that Muslims were not discriminated against and excluded at all in Germany.

The school chosen as a test-site for this new model project was located in the middle of the Kreuzberg 61 neighborhood.[126] While the peers would be trained over a year, they would simultaneously get the chance to practice their teaching in a school with the actual target group of migrant teenagers between the ages 12-18.[127] The school itself had earlier hosted other projects and workshops by this civil society organization. The teachers I talked to and who supervised this model project were confident that this project could once again support them in their routine daily school business. More importantly, it would help them to deal with the students from Middle Eastern families who seemed adamant about their intolerant, even anti-Semitic claims, which would flare up whenever another war broke out in Israel-Palestine or when the teachers just wanted to talk about National-Socialism and the Holocaust in Germany.[128]

The Muslim peer project that Recep and Dursun envisioned would bring together a group of students in their early twenties to be trained to do the same work that Recep was doing, but from a Muslim position. When I later inquired what exactly the 'Muslim position' was, the project coordinator explained that there was nothing specifically Islamic about the peers in their role and in their teaching other than that they identified as Muslim. They would be trained on a weekly basis to teach the content and methods. Some of the male peers I met

---

[125] In contrast to Recep, Dursun spoke from a position of the Muslim representative. He also enjoyed that role as Muslim in various settings, including as a tour guide in the Jewish Museum. His take on the question of Muslim anti-Semitism was more professed and strategic. He was advocating for cooperation and interfaith collaboration and was also known for having mended strained Israeli-Turkish diplomatic relations during the Gaza Flotilla affair in 2010. In the various interactions I had with him, he presented himself as a well-connected businessman who trafficked with diplomats and religious leaders alike, explaining to me that he was trying to foster better relations between Muslims and Jews in Germany and that religion was a key component for him because this was where Muslims and Jews shared the most commonalities.

[126] Kreuzbergers usually differentiate between Kreuzberg 36 and Kreuzberg 61. The area around Kottbusser Tor used to be registered as Südost 36 (SO 36) and it was walled in on three sides until 1989. The area developed a famous alternative scene and was known for its squatted buildings, anarchist, anti-fascist, and punk scenes in the 1980s. In contrast, Kreuzberg 61 has always been closer to the western parts of Berlin, such as Schöneberg, Wilmersdorf, and Charlottenburg. Both Kreuzbergs were predominantly settled by guest-workers and their families. Kreuzberg 61 was faster to gentrify after the historical fall of the wall (Hinze 2013).

[127] The school, somehow central, but located in an area with many high-rise buildings dating back to a time when less desirable populations like Turkish guest-workers and Arab refugees from Lebanon, Jordan and Syria were settled in social welfare apartment complexes located at the periphery of bourgeois West Berlin during the 1970s and '80s. After 1989, the residents of these apartment complexes suddenly found themselves shifted from the periphery of a divided Berlin to the center of the capital of the New Germany (Hinze 2013).

[128] The teachers explained that they understood anti-Semitism to be expressed through minor things that carried wider effect. For example, one student had ripped off all the pages in his school books showing the map of Israel. When asked why he did that, he had no real answer, and the teacher added that he was also known for being cognitively slow. Yet his parents were called in to talk about the destruction of the books, and in that conversation the parents insisted that the map was showing Palestine, only it was wrongly labelled as Israel and that this was upsetting, so perhaps the student had projected his frustration onto the word Israel where Palestinian territory was depicted. The teachers took this as an anti-Semitic comment, but the parents insisted that both of them were Palestinians originally from the territory now within Israeli borders, which was something they openly talked about in the family. For the parents, this was a truth that could not be denied. They saw no anti-Semitism in that. In the end, the school and the parents agreed that this was a case of destruction of school property and that the family was responsible for replacing the books.

by coincidence when they came through to smoke a cigarette with Recep, who they referred to respectfully as *Ağabey* (Turkish for older brother).[129] Sometimes it was just about having this space to hang out for a moment and being allowed to smoke a cigarette on the balcony with Recep before running errands. Given that the office was centrally located in Kreuzberg, several of the young men would come by regularly and I had the chance to catch them during their down time and exchange casual conversations. By comporting himself towards them as an older brother, Recep would sometimes tell me minor details about how they had changed since he met them.[130]

The young men and women between the ages 18 and 25 were called peers because they were generally younger than regular teachers and educators. But more importantly, they were from immigrant families and even displayed religiosity by wearing headscarves and beards, which is something that teachers and regular educators rarely do. By arguing that Muslim students could be better taught in non-formal educational contexts if they were provided role-models they could look up to and identify with, the initiative secured five years of funding from the Ministry of Family, Seniors and Youth for this project, which they began in 2015. The Muslim peers were not substituting teachers of course. They were just running an additional civic education program to combat Islamic extremism, which was presented as education on liberal democracy.

Conversations with the peers revealed that they acknowledged Recep as an authority, not just in the field of civic education but also generally, as someone who understood how things worked in the world of politics. In one of my earliest conversations with one peer-educator called Ibrahim, I inquired about his work, what brought him to this organization, why he stayed on. Ibrahim, whose mother was German, felt strongly about working here and with Recep specifically, because he said his experience here had changed him for the better and had helped to ground him. His first encounter with the organization had been mere coincidence. He had accompanied a friend who had been invited by her uncle Recep to attend a public workshop. Ibrahim said that he did not know what it was about but that the methods and explanations of how anti-Semitism worked had opened his eyes. In a way, Ibrahim was confessing that he had felt prejudice against Jews. He explained that after the Lebanon-Israel war in 2006, while mingling with his Lebanese and Palestinian friends in southern Neukölln, he would vent his frustration by using commonplace insults against Israel and Jews. He did not think his words were anti-Semitic, and he also did not know what the problem with such statements could be—namely, that by speaking them, one created the Jew as a singular enemy. He later got two of his Turkish friends involved as well and they began to distance themselves from what they started to perceive as an anti-Semitic environment. All three of them were studying together at the college level and were being trained together as Muslim peer-educators.

Ibrahim had strong attachments to Kemalist views and Turkish *laïcité.* A picture of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of modern Turkey, adorned the cover of his I-Phone. When I inquired how that correlated with his religiosity, he explained that his religiosity was a private affair. For example, he would never say that he was fasting or that there was an Islamic holiday he was observing. Ibrahim told me in minute detail how he practices Islam

[129] Barbara, a female colleague in the office, explained to me that some of these young men were so fond of Recep because he gave them a new perspective on who they could be, how they could make a difference, and he gave them a space.Barbara, who became a good friend, certainly made reliable observation, but she also spoke from a position of frustration with Recep because he tended to treat men differently from women.

[130] As Recep always emphasized in personal conversations and public talks, these young Muslims were not a foreign element but an important part of Germany's diverse composition; they were a representative part of Germany and, more importantly, they were German. Sometimes, and specifically in conjunction with the Muslim peers, he would stress that Muslims were part of the solution. This statement indirectly indicated that there indeed was a problem with Muslims.

privately because he decided to and not because anyone forced him to. He went on to say that he is a proud Muslim and German-Turk but that he would not make his religion public because this was disrespectful towards non-Muslims. He also explained to me that no Muslim in Germany could legitimately claim that he was discriminated against, that in a liberal democracy everyone was free to practice his religion, as guaranteed by the state.

Indeed, I could see how Ibrahim was speaking Recep's language: Muslims were already free and not discriminated against at all; it was just a matter of coming to understand that. In my first meeting with Recep, he described how he really did have to tell Muslim students that they had been given a gift, the gift of liberal democracy, and that they had rights; but these kids would only complain and claim discrimination and disadvantage. They liked being victims and competing over their victimhood with Jews, Recep would explain in disbelief. In a similar vein, Ibrahim was giving me the same account and, given that he had just told me how he learned so much from Recep, I could hear Recep speaking directly through Ibrahim to me. I was also surprised to hear that, as a Muslim, one never felt discriminated against.[131] Ibrahim explained that he had experienced discrimination, but not on account of being Muslim. For example, he was regularly stopped by the police because he fits a certain profile and his car is the type that is usually used by drug dealers in Berlin. His profiling, he assured me, had nothing to do with religion.

A couple years later, I discovered an online publication on young Muslims in which Ibrahim featured prominently. It had been printed in conjunction with the first project that the DIK had funded in 2009 in order to combat Islamic extremism among immigrant youth with Recep's organization. The brochure includes personal details and family photos and describes attitudes about being uprooted in Germany. The Ibrahim of back then tells a different story: he says he does not speak Turkish, that his family has always communicated in German, that his mom left the church and his father did not care for religion, so he cannot really say that he is Muslim or Turkish, but that he also never feels acknowledged as German because of his name and his looks.[132]

Reading through the brochure, I could see how Ibrahim had come to define and position himself as Muslim after having been interpellated by such stark, pre-defined categories. He had gained a position for himself by taking on a German Muslim subjectivity. Ibrahim was a poster-child of the organization, whenever a brochure or media photo was needed there was one showing Ibrahim, in a classroom setting or among other educators. Like many of the other peers I met over the course of my research, he had internalized a position of tolerated difference as a German Muslim. This position allowed for a social and public space to speak from, but also meant that they now had to demonstrate that they were also German in a sense that was recognizable through tolerant practices, combatting anti-Semitism was the best proof.[133] But in order to attain that subject position, the peer-educators first had to become Muslim, albeit a tolerable form of Muslim vis-à-vis the perspective that eyed them as potential extremists. In consequence, as Muslims, it was up to them to fight Islamic

[131] Making a mental note, I started wondering whether I had a gendered view on the matter, because my own thought was centered on headscarf debates.

[132] I found the brochure only after I had left the initiative and could not ask about the project and Ibrahim in more detail while working together. The brochure also features a group of Turkish and Arab teenagers as German Muslims, albeit unacknowledged as such. The brochure raises the alarm that these teenagers need to be acknowledged as belonging before they radicalize. The group is pictured while on a trip to the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam.

[133] Several of the Muslim peers, especially the women, would figure prominently in media as religious and active in combatting anti-Semitism within their own communities. Another volunteer of Turkish descent in a school told me that he is travelling to the Auschwitz Memorial twice. When I asked, why that was he responded that it just so happened, but that he would include this in his CV and it would help him to shed the stigma of Muslim intolerance.

extremism and everything potentially extremist, including anti-Semitism.[134] The stated aim of the project was to combat Islamic extremism through positive Muslim role models.

The project consisted of several modules with weekly sessions, including on populist and right-wing movements such as *PEGIDA*[135] and how to counter anti-Muslim discrimination coming from the right-wing. Funded to combat Islamic extremism, the project started with the history of *jihad* and ended with the question of anti-Semitism. All these different modules were framed by a notion of Islam that lends itself to politics and violence all too easily. The project kicked off with a five-day retreat in a location hitherto unknown to the participating teenagers but of symbolic importance for the framing in a small village called Wünstdorf.[136] The trip to Wünstdorf also served the purpose to confront students with a bad chapter in German-Turkish history concerning Islam, akin to concentration camp visits in order to prevent right-wing ideologies. The students were told that Islam was a peaceful religion but that it had been mobilized to overstep the limits of acceptable private belief and practice and become a political tool. This mobilization could happen at the hands of a nationalist state, such as Turkey,[137] or it could happen through individual radicalization by attending a Salafi mosque, by attaching oneself to an extremist imam, or by watching *jihad* videos and connecting with *jihadists* online. These were all deceptive and violent forms of Islamic extremism that were incompatible with liberal democracy.[138] What mattered then was to cultivate a personal Islam, because personally everyone had the right to practice his religion.

The trip had several purposes. One reason for the trip was to take them out of their everyday lives and provide a distance for self-reflection. Relatedly, the trip was supposed to trouble the students' views of the right form of Islam and their own community. Each day, a

---

[134] The Muslim peer-project was official directed by Recep with Erol as his assistant. Erol, had come to Germany ten years ago from Turkey where he earned his first degree in pedagogy, he was also holding a master's in social work from Germany. Selma, a BA student in social work was the coordinator between Muslim peers, school and Erol. She was responsible for the minute details in teaching and would always distribute the program among us. The peers were a group of approximately eight students currently doing their BA. The group was led by Ibrahim, Hakan and Zeki. Other peers would join, male and female, but they were usually in the background. Generally, we were a group of six plus the two teachers, who had booked the workshop

[135] Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamization of the West (PEGIDA) emerged in 2014 as a mass movement against Muslim immigrants during a mass rally against the war in Northern Syria between Kurds and ISIS in Kobane. The rally ended in several cities with clashes between Kurdish Marxists and Sunni Muslims, when the Kurdish Marxists took the rally to nearby mosques and chanted slogans against Islam as such. The Kurdish component and the context of the Syrian war disappeared and PEGIDA emerged as a rightwing mass movement mobilizing successfully since 2014. AfD, the populist right wing party, is the party associated with the movement.

[136] The location of Wünstdorf confirmed two things: First, that Islam had a place in Germany, because the first mosque in Germany had been built here as a collaborative project between the German and the Ottoman Empires during WWI. Second, the mosque was built in order to accommodate North African and Middle Eastern prisoners of war, former soldiers for the French and British armies. The accommodation had a special purpose: the Germans and Ottomans were trying to indoctrinate the prisoners by way of instilling in them a sense of Muslim duty to fight alongside the Ottoman and German armies against the infidels, i.e. their own commanders. The Muslim subject, as represented here historically, provided a frame of reference for the entire workshop—namely, that of Islamic extremism.

[137] Interestingly, nationalist ideology was here attached to the Ottoman Empire and to the Turkish state. Germany, by contrast, was only considered nationalist up to 1945; after that, it was only within the fringes of Neo-Nazi organizations that nationalist ideology was identified.

[138] Please note that I did not accompany the team on this trip, but Erol, Recep's assistant, briefed me afterwards. I was at first shocked to hear that they thematized *jihad* so strongly. When I asked Erol what the purpose was, he explained that *jihad* is a fact and that they, these students, should familiarize themselves with this part of history. Another interesting feature was a method called the "time beam" to explain the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from a two-sided logic. The only Muslim mentioned in this method was the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin Al-Husseini, who was basically described as a close Nazi collaborator. Al-Husseini became the authoritative icon of religion merged with politics, the figure of Muslim anti-Semitism in the workshops.

guest would come who would talk about his personal Islam. Among those guests was also a very pious Muslim believer who told them how he had been in trouble a lot as a juvenile and had been about to drift into a criminal career but that he regained his life through piety. He was invited in order to show that Islam is a substance, moldable and, if appropriately adapted, even capable of enabling a stable life. Another guest speaker was a gay Muslim who spoke about how he had been a conflicted believer and tried to suppress his homosexuality. Now he was openly gay and still a believer; he even attended mosque for Friday prayer sometimes.[139]

The students comprised an ethnically heterogeneous group, including third generation German-Turks, second generation German-Palestinians, but also Kurdish, Bosnian, and Afghan youth, whose parents had probably come as refugees and a minority of ethnic Germans. Yet all of these ethnic and consequently legal differences are cast away once the students have been addressed as Muslims. In the remaining weekly sessions, the Muslim peers would mainly confront the students with issues of a social nature and discuss how they might deal with a particular challenge. [140]

The issues thematized in the workshops centered on religious practices, such as building a mosque or having a 'women only swimming day' in a public pool. The issues presented were embedded in a 'legal rights vs. social prejudice' frame or, put differently, as state versus society.[141] The peers' task was to explain that the state was in fact enabling Muslims with rights and opportunities, while social prejudice on the conservative and extremist fringes was mobilized against Muslims and their basic rights. As challenging as the situation could get, Muslims had to learn to make rational arguments or resort to creative means in order to deal with social prejudice. Therefore, the sessions were dedicated to role plays where the students rehearsed arguments in a legal language but also acted as 'concerned citizens' in order to develop an understanding of why an entire town would mobilize against the building of a mosque.

The students were being asked to develop empathy for the perspective that cast Islam and Muslims as a threat to secular liberalism, because the fear of Islamic extremism was not unfounded. They were asked to see themselves from the outside as a problem and to find a way to reflect on their own frustrations and anger without resorting to violence.

All workshop modules referred to workshop participants as Muslims and the presence of Islam in Germany, except for the one which I will describe below. This module referred to the Holocaust and anti-Semitism as phenomena of hatred that had no place in liberal-democratic Germany. In contrast to the unnamed examples of Islamophobia, anti-Semitism was announced, emphasized and presented as an abstract and irrational form of hatred against Jews that would attach itself to actual Jewish persons and those associated with them, but also things and phenomena not Jewish could be perceived as a problem pertaining to Jews—i.e., it had a contaminating effect on the entire social sphere. Anti-Semitism thus was a form of hatred that was aimed at liberal democracy as such, and not just at Jews.

3.4 German Concepts of Hatred for Muslims

The workshops had a particular order. Students as usual make a circle of chairs, creating a space of equal access, while waiting for the workshop to begin. The peers usually sit with them, while I take a seat at the tables behind the intimate circle and concentrate on

[139] A woman spoke about her decision to remove her headscarf and how she regained her personal freedom and agency after a divorce from an abusive husband. Erol, a team members explained that he was born into a liberal Muslim family, that he does not believe in any conception of a deity and that he considers himself an atheist. The underlying idea was that Muslims come in many forms and that one can be both Muslim and part of a liberal society.

[140] I think the class consisted only of two non-Middle Eastern kids. One of them was Afro-German and the other a white German kid.

[141] The headscarf ban and neutrality law were not discussed, for example. I assume that the headscarf affair cannot be presented without discussing state discrimination.

how the educators convey their messages. Further, I pay attention to how students respond to the content, how they interact and argue with the educators. I try to understand whether the civic educators consider they have achieved their teaching goals when the students are discussing and agreeing or when the students are arguing and disagreeing. The sessions are usually short. We start at 1:00 p.m. and leave around 2:30 p.m. The students are also usually excited to see the peers: cheers, handshakes, and clapping are very common when the peers enter. There certainly is a shared intimacy between them, and the students are also very curious about what the peers study, how they found this job, which mosque they go to. They do look up to them.

The workshop begins with a recap. Zeki asks the students about their field trip to the Jewish Museum a week ago. Within 5 minutes Zeki and student exchange impressions on the museum space, exhibition and exhibited history. The students, those who joined, really enjoyed the trip and participate well.[142] It was a particularly hot day and the tour guide could not meet us before 3:00 p.m. Instead of releasing the students from their weekly duty with us at 2:30 p.m., we obliged them to stay another three hours, not all students could participate. One boy who had come all the way with us kept saying that he actually did not want to enter. This particular student was of Palestinian origin, something I figured from his name and from the silver necklace he was always wearing. The necklace had a pendant that showed all of historical Palestine in the colors of the Palestinian flag.[143] Other than that, he was just a typical teenager, wearing jeans, a hoodie, and a cap. Given his style, he was certainly into hip-hop. The other students tried to convince him to stay and he seemed extremely undecided, saying that he should go yet at the same time not actually leaving. When we stood up to finally enter, the indecisive boy also stood up and raised his hand in a gesture that said he was leaving.[144]

Now, a week later and with the entire class present in the intimate circle, we start today's session. As Zeki announces the actual topic of the day—"anti-Semitism"—he is quick to add that this term means hostility against Jews. Anti-Semitism, he explains in broad strokes, has different motives, structures, and manifestations. With their eyes glued on Zeki, all the students seem to be interested and following along. Hakan distributes two newspaper articles from the German daily *Die Welt*. The students are asked to do an analysis of the news clip. One article is from the year 2012, about a woman in Friedenau, a bourgeois district in Berlin, who is the regional coordinator of the *Stolpersteine* project. One day she discovers that her mailbox had been destroyed and a note had been left in which she was accused of being a "Jew-lover." The second article is from 2006, about a teenage Jewish girl who goes to school in Kreuzberg. A fight with a classmate turns into a case of bullying, where a group of other students keep insulting her by calling her a Jew. The class now splits into four smaller groups, each group works on either article. Reading through both articles, I notice that they are each only one-page long. The educators tell me that they simplified and shortened the articles because it helps the students to identify the key elements in the text. The task is indeed

[142] The trip to the Jewish Museum was aimed at familiarizing students with Jewish history in Germany and how it was interrupted by the genocidal and racist politics of the Nazi regime. As this was a ninth grade class, they had not yet received a systematic education about the Holocaust as part of their history curriculum. But since the Holocaust is central to anti-Semitic narratives in Germany, the museum visit had to happen before this session on anti-Semitism. The Jewish Museum itself is actually only ten minutes away from the school. While walking there, some students pointed proudly at their apartment buildings. The museum was basically built into their neighborhood, but it turned out that none of them had been inside before.

[143] This pendant was considered anti-Semitic by some organizations, because it had the Palestinian national colors all over the territory known today as Israel and the Occupied Territories.

[144] The tour itself was provided by Dursun, who had a good handle on the students. He also emphasized on Jewish life and rites. The students were fascinated by the architecture, the flight stories, but especially by all the ritual details of living a Jewish life.

simple; students are asked to answer: "a) what happened, b) who is the victim, c) what are the causes/what is the background of this act?"

Ten minutes later, Hakan has already collected the written answers and pinned them on the board. The questions were answered correctly and through close engagement with the sources it seems. The students are eager to discuss their findings. Hakan asks about the second case in Kreuzberg: "What was this actually about?" One boy raises his hand and explains that in the beginning it was a normal fight among classmates, but then the girl was insulted because of her religion; that she was bullied and beaten up by a group of other girls. "Exactly," exclaims Hakan, "because she was Jewish, she was the target of the attacks!" And the other case, what happened here? Some students describe the situation and what the causes could have been. One boy states: "Because she was a Jew-lover!" Zeki is seemingly disturbed by this answer, but he knows that the student is only repeating the term used by the vandals. Zeki explains to him that this is a problematic label but that, yes, this was mentioned as a reason for the warning she received. Another male student raises his hand and offers the explanation that the woman was attacked because she was Jewish. But the answer is wrong in this case and the peer-educators shake their heads.

The students seem to be perplexed as to how they are supposed to identify anti-Semitic attacks if the targeted person is not actually Jewish. Is this about Jews or not, they ask. Hakan and Zeki explain that the woman was engaged in combatting anti-Semitism, but in order to engage in that you do not need to be Jewish. "Anti-Semitism concerns all of us" is the core message of their clarifying statement. One girl, Reyhan, who is always described as "the one with the veil, but really smart,"[145] responds that it would be wrong to believe that only Jews in Germany are active in this kind of work, but still many people do believe this is so. That seems to satisfy both peer-educators, who nod and smile.

It is time to take a five minute break before we resume with the last half-hour discussion. The peer-educators approach our table and Recep, who is present for this session, starts to give them feedback. He clarifies for the peer-educators: "We do not engage in this work because we love Jews, but because we love democracy and liberalism!" The peer-educators are told to discuss democratic values through these cases and not the Jewish victims. According to Recep, what needs to be clarified is the undemocratic behavior of the culprits and not whether a person is Jewish or not. He emphasizes again that this is not a Jewish advocacy project: "We work for a liberal democratic society! This needs to be made clear, guys!"

The break is over, the students pour back in. They are told to go back to their groups and to discuss for five minutes who the culprits are—where they could be from, what political or ideological context might drive them, and what are the motifs in these acts? The students are told to refer to the articles and to brainstorm. The peer educators also encourage them to think about contexts rather than single individual criminal acts. The students discuss loudly and write quickly and come back to the circle of chairs. They submit their handwritten notes to the peer-educators.

Hakan and Zeki seem a bit anxious now and forget to pin the answers on the board. They immediately start reading them out, a task that the students should have done in order to own their statements. Zeki reads: "Kreuzberg case: ignorance, coolness, perpetrator wanted to impress other Muslim students by insulting a Jew." The second statement about Kreuzberg reads similarly but has a certain twist: "Ignorance, they think that anti-Semitism is part of Islam." The answers do not openly reveal a culprit profile but rather adumbrate the contours of someone who wants to impress a Muslim milieu. The culprit is not identified as Muslim,

[145] There are only two veiled girls in class. Reyhan is one of them. She is very outspoken and critical of the teaching strategies. She is also a good discussant and has argumentatively won over the peer-educators, once provoking a minor crisis among the educators who began to doubt whether their teaching material was actually as solid as they had thought.

but as someone who knows Muslims and misperceives Islam.[146] The peer educators do not comment on it but move on to the second case. "Friedenau: perpetrators all German, white, Neo-Nazis, have German names, hate Jews."

Hakan explains that anti-Semitism is a catch-all term and that it can be easily explained as hostility against Jews, but it is actually not only about Jews. He goes on to say that the two articles depict two forms of anti-Semitism and their different manifestations. The case in Friedenau is a typical form of what he calls 'secondary anti-Semitism,' in that it comes after the Holocaust. There are different forms in which it manifests, for example in the *Schlußstrichforderung*[147], whereby certain people claim that it is time to put an end to commemorating the Holocaust and being made to feel responsible. Others who express secondary anti-Semitism simply deny the Holocaust and don't want to be reminded of it. A girl with long dyed-blonde hair asks shyly: "But is it proven that the Holocaust actually happened?" "The Jewish Museum should have proven that to you already, but also former concentration camps and the memories of survivors are all proof of the Holocaust," responds Hakan. "What matters here," Hakan sums up, "is that these anti-Semites reverse victim-culprit relations. They think that Jews are the actual culprits, that Jews are to blame, even for the Holocaust, and that they, these poor Nazis, are victims of a big Jewish conspiracy." A silence sets in.

The second case, the case of the Jewish girl in the Kreuzberg school, is discussed as 'Israel-related anti-Semitism.' Israel, they explain, is used to speak about the collectivity of Jews. Jews are not being differentiated anymore but are lumped into one big homogeneous mass. I am a bit dumbfounded because the edited article they handed out did not mention Israel. But Hakan goes on to explain that this homogeneous mass has nothing to do with real Jews, it has to do with imaginary Jews, with some fictitious imagination of who the Jew is, what he does, and how he is allegedly guilty of certain things.

The silence in the room becomes uncomfortable. The students give each other strange looks but they continue to observe Hakan and Zeki. One boy raises his hand and asks carefully: "Is this about Israel because many Jews are from Israel?" Zeki and Hakan listen but do not respond directly. Instead, Hakan asks if the students know what "the Middle Eastern conflict" is. The students all nod but no one responds verbally. "Can you explain it?" asks Hakan. No answer, but palpable anxiety as if something is boiling underneath the silence that has cast the room while we are all waiting for an answer. One girl raises her hand, but then declines to speak, saying: "Better not, I would not know how to explain it." Hakan takes the lead again and explains how Jews are made responsible for the deeds of the Israeli state. The reversal of victim-culprit relations is discussed again, as a schema that fits with "the Middle Eastern conflict."

It turns out, according to this schema, that the Palestinians represent themselves as victims while the Jews are represented as culprits. Zeki has completely retreated into the background and is quiet. Hakan is struggling to choose the right words, he keeps stumbling, he even stutters. But he goes on to make his claim: that it is not Jews killing Palestinians, but the Israeli military. And the Israeli population is not the military, though they do have to serve in the military. But, more importantly, the Palestinian organizations such as Hamas attack Israeli cities. His last sentence is: "They are also culprits!" With his eyebrows pulled together and a blushed face, he looks extremely strained and desperate. I wonder if he wanted to say "they are *the* culprits" and instead said "they are also culprits."

[146] Yet the statement reveals also that being anti-Semitic is actually a code for being cool and can become a form of passing. This statement is quite telling, as the usual frame in media and public discourse is that the term Jew is commonly used in Berlin schools as an insult. Here it seems that the term Jew is, albeit a pejorative term, not simply an insult but a code to negotiate coolness.

[147] A concept that can be translated as: the demand for drawing a line under the past.

His last sentence introduces *Hamas* as a Palestinian organization with no difference made whatsoever with Palestinians as a population, a difference he consistently made when he referred to Israel and the Jewish population. Yet Hakan also narrowed down the frame from Muslims to Palestinians. By introducing the Islamist movement Hamas, however, he kept the wider frame of preventing Islamic extremism viable for the workshop session. Because of the silent co-presence in the room, I assume, Hakan experiences uncertainty and does not dare to say that Palestinians are culprits and Jews are victims. Instead, he says they are *also* culprits. It remains unclear, whether *also* refers equally to the Israeli side and is supposed to perform a both-sided liability in a conflict situation. Or, whether *also* meant to state that same as Germans who remain culprits vis-à-vis Jews when it comes to the Holocaust, Palestinians are similarly culprits vis-à-vis Jews when it comes to the Israel-Palestine conflict. Or whether the *also* was simply a softening of what he was supposed to say. Although Hakan made the above stated claim, he failed to drive his point home. By failing to say that Palestinians are *the* culprits, he also revealed that he could not fully embody the position of the German Muslim.

But is this really a reversal of victim-culprit relations? Does this schema fit both manifestations of anti-Semitism, I wonder. The male student who did not enter the Jewish Museum a week ago mumbles something but I cannot hear him. Zeki encourages him to speak up. "Please," he says, "share it with us!" The boy remains silent. Instead another boy raises his hand and states that, if he understands the collective blaming of the Jews correctly *(Kollektivierung der Juden),* then it is similar to all Muslims being blamed for each terror attack. The time is up and we have to stop.

This session was unusual in many ways. First off, in previous sessions we talked about Muslims as real persons, law-abiding citizens and potential terrorists. Thus, social fear of Muslims was justified and understandable, something the teenagers had to learn to live and engage with. Unjustified or exaggerated hatred was relegated to the social fringes to Neo-Nazis and right-wing extremists, but even then, the students were asked not to lose their cool. Now, that the topic shifted to anti-Semitism announced as hatred of Jews (*Judenhass*) several deviations from previous sessions were introduced but not explicitly named.

Anti-Semitism as hatred of Jews is considered to be a problem of prejudice rooted in the individual, according to this approach. The mechanism of anti-Semitism then, is helpful in gaining a sense of superior selfhood vis-à-vis an imaginary figure of the Jew (Goldenbogen 2013, 31).[148] According to this logic, Jews are constructed as inferior and imaginary subjects. The Jew as an abstract figure in this context is conceptualized by the anti-Semite as a group *(orig. Kollektivierung der Juden)*. The official brochure of the organization states that in regards to being seen as a homogeneous group there are no differences to other forms of prejudices pertaining to other groups, same as the student had pointed out by asking if this was comparable to how Muslims become categorized as a homogeneous population after each terror attack. Hakan did not respond to his question, perhaps because he was unsure if this was already 'victim competition' or simply because we ran out of time.

Yet anti-Semitism bears an epoch-specific mark, according to German anti-Semitism experts and their sources, because it emerged in nineteenth century as a reaction to modernity. Put differently, because Jewish Emancipation and the modern German state intersected, Jews were historically considered the exclusive beneficiaries of liberalism and modernity, while the "real Germans" were losing out. In this sense, anti-Semitism works as an individual 'interpretive pattern' *(orig. Deutungsmuster);* the constructed Jew becomes a foil of projection and a personified explanation for complex procedures of modern state and society

[148] Please note that I am here specifically citing from one publication of the civil society organization, in order to convey their understanding and conceptualization of anti-Semitism and their take on the Middle Eastern Conflict. The publication can be found online as a PDF here: http://www.kiga-berlin.org/uploads/KIgA_Widerspruchstoleranz_2013.pdf.

(Goldenbogen 2013, 34). Following this line of thought, anti-Semitism has idiosyncratic features and can be projected onto things and persons non-Jewish and is not based in real characteristics, facts or events. Thus, anti-Semitism is the hatred of the common man, who cannot grasp his own marginalized position in society, but feels disadvantaged because of "the Jew."

The notion of anti-Semitism emerging from this is telling in certain ways. First of all, anti-Semitism becomes an individual pathology. Second, political structures are not accounted for in exacerbating social prejudices vis-à-vis Jews as a religious and minority community. Historically, Jews were not only seen as a phenomenon of modern life and a group that advanced in secular modernity. In Europe, Jews were also considered a religious problem to secular modernity, because of traditional practices such as ritual slaughtering and circumcision, just to name the most prominent examples (Judd 2007). Traditional and religious practices of Jews, usually do not find a mention in this working notion of anti-Semitism, because it would disturb the narrative of anti-Semitism as a fictitious and pathological problem of anti-modernists and point out the aversions Liberals had vis-à-vis Jewish communities, similar to Muslim communities in the contemporary.[149] The concepts, with which the civic educators operate and teach tolerance, are already stripped of features that could be best described as religious difference.[150]

Teaching anti-Semitism in the above outlined logic to teenagers of lower-class immigrant neighborhoods follows a particular rationale. As stated earlier, Recep and the organization would argue that *Muslim* students engage in anti-Semitic speech, because they feel not acknowledged as Germans. This kind of rationale is not limited to the practitioners of tolerance education and anti-Semitism prevention. Anthropologist Matti Bunzl argued along the same lines in an article on Islamophobia and anti-Semitism in the New Europe (2004). Bunzl argued against the label of a "new anti-Semitism" that seeks to other, exclude or kill Jews as Europeans did in the previous century, explaining that Muslim youth in France and Germany in fact see the Jewish communities as part of the establishment and not as foreign to it. Similarly, Bunzl separated between anti-Semitism and what he calls Islamophobia, by explaining that anti-Semitism emerged as a problem of the nation-state and Islamophobia emerged with the construction of Europe as a transnational entity. Hence, Islamophobia will have a longer lasting effect on the Muslim communities and become the feature of the new Europe according to Bunzl.

In the above described workshop session an additional specificity is at work. The Muslim peers as civic educators act and address the target group as if they were similar to ethnic Germans. As the entire project is about teaching immigrant youth that they are same as everyone else and have rights as everyone else and just need to embrace and claim their Germanness in a civil manner, their anti-Semitism becomes also same as everyone else's in the way it functions; although it mostly comes from a different place, their religion. This was most obvious when Hakan introduced the concept "victim-culprit reversal" in secondary anti-Semitism. Secondary anti-Semitism, as Hakan was trying to explain to the students, is a label to explain the phenomenon of being resentful against Jews, because of Auschwitz, i.e. the stain of Auschwitz is not only shameful but also angering, persecuting, and stigmatizing, "because Jews profit from it."[151] The explanation is that Germans were disturbed in their national sentiments to relate to their nation-state in positive terms, because of the association

[149] In the biographies presented in the same handbook some religious and traditional customs are mentioned. But the individuals interviewed make up a more secular segment of Jewish survivors.

[150] In a different, but related vein, the mechanisms and workings of the Nazi state are not included either, as they would clearly exceed the notion of prejudice and lay bare state regulations and the secular modern nature of anti-Semitism. Yet the Nazi state and the Holocaust lurked in the background as the most evil form of anti-Semitism.

[151] Secondary means that anti-Semitism takes Auschwitz or other political events as a detour to find expression.

with Auschwitz. Instead of shame, empathy or remorse, feelings of rejection and hatred prevail when talking about Nazi crimes, because WWII is associated with the broken German nation (Goldenbogen 2013, 34). Secondary anti-Semitism takes on different forms from denial to relativizing the Holocaust, but also the demand to draw a line under the past (*Schlußstrichforderung*) or reversing the roles by claiming that Germans were the victims of the war and not Jews, as in the victim-culprit reversal.

By taking up the concept of victim-culprit reversal in the context of Israel-Palestine, Hakan spoke from the position of the German Muslim educator who acknowledged the figure of the Jew as a victim and the present students as equal to other Germans. He disregarded historical and contextual differences and treated speech about Israel-Palestine as if it follows a well-known anti-Semitic pattern. In the case here, the students are first understood as Muslims, but then treated same as everyone else. They are acknowledged as Germans stuck in a religious-traditional milieu. Claims to difference, discrimination on grounds of being perceived as Muslim, or violence inflicted by Jews against Palestinians is merely considered 'victim competition' a strategy that can be grounded in the legitimate desire to be acknowledged in one's own identity, according to this organization. Victim competition is bordering anti-Semitism, because it relativizes Jewish suffering (Goldenbogen 2013, 35).[152]

In this particular moment and by virtue of his speech, Hakan accesses the context from the position of a German subject provided by the larger structures that require his teaching tolerance in the first place. Yet the context of his speech, based on interaction and co-presence, seems to be more decisive for his access, and ultimately disturbs it, because the students, same as his colleague do not engage with him. Put differently, they do not enter a conversation with him and close off the possibility for another context to emerge. Namely, to understand Israel-Palestine from a logic of German anti-Semitism, this would in fact confirm that the students take this on as German Muslims, same as Recep and Hakan. Hakan's attempt then to leave the context of the school and create a relevancy structure to talk about Israel-Palestine collectively fails. The students confirm that they know what the Middle Eastern-Conflict is; it is not that they are confronted with something unknown to them. Yet Hakan's framing of the conflict as a case of anti-Semitic victim-culprit reversal troubles the subject position of most Palestinian students present in the room and causes uncertainty, and silence.

The silence of the students and Hakan's strained delivery turned the context of education into a courtroom in which Hakan became a judge and the students stood trial. The structure of the courtroom clearly outlining relations and positions has perhaps always been there, but is usually concealed by way of the students' participation. The actual aim of the workshops is to trigger self-reflection and self-policing about oneself and one's own community as potentially radical. In this session, however, the ability to take on any position other than a culprit was curtailed by two concepts: 'victim-culprit reversal' and 'victim-competition.' Whatever the students would have said, it would have resulted in a discussion that they are deflecting from their own biases against Jews. Recep once reported in a workshop for educators that whenever he starts the unit on anti-Semitism, migrant students want to talk about their own discrimination. For Recep, this was the first indicator of victim-competition. Lesson number one was not to compare oneself to Jewish victims, because Muslims were not discriminated against in the same way, they were in fact equal Germans.

3.5 Can there be Hate-Silence? – A Conclusion

The educators and I go to our usual place, a café-bakery across the street. Now it's time for the regular reflection session. Each teaching session was followed by a reflection, where each one of us would do an additional internal take stock of the workshop. Each one of us was

[152] The role of the state is also evaded in the case of Israel. It is usually discussed as an object oscillating between anti-Zionism, anti-Semitism and (legitimate) criticism. Here, it is clarified that there is anti-Zionist anti-Semitism, especially when it is expressed to demonize Israel as particularly evil, or delegitimizes its constitution as a nation-state by discounting Jews as a nation or by claiming the territory of the Israeli state as illegitimate.

asked to bring up what they had noticed, what was surprising or challenging and most importantly, what they had learned today. Bringing up what we had learned, was helpful because it was then shared with everyone and could be further scrutinized, how the methods could be adapted. Reflections were a common component in the civil society organizations providing a form of teaching closure. Reflections could also happen with the participating students in order to get a sense of what they had learned. Our reflection sessions usually happen alone, because this is the test-run of the Muslim peer project and we figure out weaknesses and inconsistencies.

The reflection session would usually start with the peer-educators speaking about how the workshop was for them. I can see that they are troubled, nobody starts. "Why were the students so silent this time?" asks Zeki. "It seemed to go well and they were participating fine, but then they refused to speak. Maybe it was because of the heat and most of them are fasting," he adds. Hakan starts by describing how he experienced a dilemma when he had to explain Israel-related anti-Semitism. He explains how the victim-culprit reversal is an important schema for understanding anti-Semitism, not only because it explains actual attacks on Jewish people but also because anti-Semitism structures how we think about social and political phenomena as such. But then he stops talking, and he seems in search for the right words. "But okay," he bursts out, "it was also hard to explain this, because I felt uncomfortable. I think unconsciously there was something going on for me. Standing there in front of these Palestinian kids, I felt who knows what they have heard from their parents or relatives?" "What do you mean?" I ask. "Some might be traumatized, some might have seen or heard about the war and now I tell them how they have to think about it," he ends abruptly. Zeki nods, "Yeah, like the boy in the front who said: 'Are we to blame now?!'" I remember the boy with the Palestine pendant who had mumbled something, but did not speak up.

The session exposed several issues with the category of the German Muslim. The category of the tolerant Muslim subject, who would embrace his own or communal-traditional biases and prejudices reflexively vis-à-vis Jews, was performed by Hakan and given out as an inviting gesture. Yet it was not accepted nor rejected. The gesture of the workshop rather exposed that the civic educators and the students were not simply equally German and Muslim. A racial hierarchy was folded into the category of the German Muslim and required different subjects to do different kinds of work in order to gain the position of the German Muslim.

The work of becoming German Muslim entailed to take on the German concepts of anti-Semitism as a universal and applicable for other national and traditional contexts. For the civic educators, such as Recep, Dursun, Ibrahim, Hakan and Zeki who were mostly of Turkish guest worker descent or from Turkey, addressing Palestinians as culprits and Israelis as victims was a litmus test of how closely positioned they were to a liberal democratic German narrative of Jewish victimhood. Put differently, it was proof of how German they were and how emancipated from a Muslim narrative that could solidarize with Palestinians against Jews. Another difficulty with the category of the German Muslim was that it required an acknowledgment of anti-Semitism as rooted or to the least mobilized through Islam. By doing so, it was omitting historical and regional particularity of why Palestinians in this case could not embrace and perform the same subject-position as Turks did. In public discourse the difference is captured by religiosity vs. secularity. Hakan and Zeki, however, who had themselves grown up among Palestinians in Berlin, knew that there were traumatic stories to being Palestinian circulating and shaping the figure of the Jew as an enemy independent of religiosity. Hakan and Zeki failed their task by being unable to say that Palestinians are *the* culprits, same as Germans are *the* culprits and similar to how Muslims are *not* discriminated against. By virtue of this rightfully owned statement, subjects such as Hakan and Zeki gain the position of the German Muslim, because it erases the racial hierarchies and centers the figure of the Jew as the only violated minority in German history. A violation that is passed

and has been overcome, deeming ethnic Christian-Germans the beneficiaries of a tolerant success story.

The work of becoming German Muslim for Palestinian subjects includes a betrayal of one's own community. To the least, it would mean to own the victim-culprit reversal by taking the position of the culprit. Even if innocent as individual subjects, it would still imply to take on a condemning position vis-à-vis the Palestinian communities one is affiliated or associated with. In this setting, as it was created by the civic educators in co-presence with the students, the students were asked to leave their communities and their background knowledge, their memories and their relevance structure and to enter the context as it was carefully outlined by the civic educators. If they had entered the context by way of verbal engagement, they would have made one step towards becoming the German Muslims the prevention project desired them to be. Instead, the students remained eerily silent causing a crisis for Hakan and Zeki.

The student's silence was active and performative and not disengaged. They also were not angry, passionate or visibly emotional in any way. They rather refused to enter any conversation. Perhaps their refusal was a form of preserving a part of their personal family and communal life from governmental scrutiny and regulation. Perhaps the way the session has been conceptualized worked as a 'tongue removal.' I am saying perhaps, because I never asked the students why they almost all descended into complete silence. A tongue removal then in this case, can account for the violence enacted by these disciplinary acts. It is perhaps not so much the inability to speak, but the insight that speaking will cause further scrutiny. By not providing any word, any hint, they affected a sense of grave insecurity for the civic educators. It was as if their silence veiled thoughts and while the educators believe themselves to be rationally working against intolerance and hate, they themselves were confronted with unbearable anxiety.

The educators' anxiety was exacerbated by the fact that they know they are talking to youth of Palestinian descent. In the reflection session, Zeki and Hakan implicitly acknowledged that there is a difference between Turks and Palestinians with respect to perceiving Jews, but neither of them elaborated on how this could be related to the history of Israel-Palestine. Hakan's expressed frustration in the reflection session we held after the workshop indicates how he feels troubled imagining that these students grow up with different narratives that he then tries to deconstruct. Although the students did not counter-narrate their own or their families' versions of Israel-Palestine, Hakan assumes and knows that the story he is trying to tell them is not simply explaining anti-Semitism but it is in effect putting the students on the hook as potential anti-Semites. In a way, the educational program tiptoes around this issue by implicitly assuming that the students hold anti-Semitic views and by trying to bring them to condemn this implicitly imputed point of view.

The expressed frustration is also telling that the civic educators somehow could not catch or really get the students, whom they assume to be unfree within their traditional communities. It is as if the discourse of Muslim intolerance is supposed to lay bare something and help these students to step out to being German, but the students found a pocket or space within that discourse that covers them up. By remaining in silence, the students changed the context and provided an eerie experience for the educators, and especially for Hakan, to reflect on what they are producing in this setting. When hate was earlier assumed to be in speaking and acting in certain ways, now the civic educators wondered if hate was residing in silence. The silence, however, was so upsetting that the educators fell back on themselves and were doubtful about their own position.

Chapter 4: Recycling Atoned Guilt, Triggering Palestine

It was a cold and foggy November morning when I met Mohsen, the civic educator, in front of the Protestant Church located on the main street in Neukölln, a predominantly migrant and lower working-class neighborhood. Located amidst all the one-euro shops and ethnic super markets, the late nineteenth century red brick stone church building seemed like a relic from a different time. We were scheduled to meet a group of 15 female Muslim community organizers from the district for a two-day workshop on the Middle Eastern Conflict. Mohsen and I work together in the training center of *Farbe Bekennen*! (henceforth FB), a civil society organization dedicated to combatting all forms of extremism—right-wing, left-wing and Islamic—as part of broadened security policies put in place after September 11, 2001. While right- and left-wing extremism are considered solely political ideologies, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Family consider Islamic extremism a political ideology rooted in religion, specifically traditional Islam.

The combat against Islamic extremism has taken on different forms, including wider efforts to reform Islam and to domesticate a version that would be compatible with a Protestant-shaped conception of religion. In addition, state funds to combat Islamic extremism have been channeled towards civil society organizations since 2009 to fund educational projects for immigrant communities, in order to domesticate individuals within these communities as more tolerant citizens. Tolerant citizenship is interchangeable with a diminished religious orientation. As tolerant citizens, Muslims are set up as the vanguard to combat religious radicalization within their own social milieu. Both objectives, reforming Islam and enabling tolerant Muslims, suggest a historicist solution to a problem defined as an Islamic religiosity that is not quite in synch with the requirements of modern secular life. In the first instance, the state has been active in institutionalizing an Islamic theology based on a historicized hermeneutics that situates the study of religious Islamic texts within a certain historical time.[153] In the second instance, the one that I engage with in this thesis, historicism works as a method of re-aligning and in effect constituting German Muslims in relation to Israel and the figure of the Jew through the lens of the Holocaust, as a historically exceptional event. In the field of civic education, the notion of tolerance becomes inseparable from a particular relation to history and from particular events in history. In addition, any deviation from this particularly informed relation signals for civic educators a lingering Islamic extremism.

Tolerance, as the organizing structure for the rightful "conduct of conduct," has come to shape citizenship after the introduction of conditional *jus soli* in addition to *jus sanguinis*, the right of blood. In other words, citizenship as a form of rightful belonging is not simply relegated to identifying with national history in order to build a common nation and to include new members as nationals. Rather, the notion of tolerance regiments a specific relation to history and has come to define and shape the ability of subjects to be German per se. While this conduct of tolerance is a general requirement of being German, former Middle Eastern immigrants and their children have been inspected specifically with an eye to managing and disciplining their religiosity, such that it might be commensurable with tolerance. For this purpose, civil society organizations have hired educators such as Mohsen specifically to provide tolerant Muslim role models to the target group, role models who are able to address

[153] These efforts have been part of making a German Islam compatible with secular-liberalism. The German state has invested in the training of imams and the establishment of an Islamic Theology program, in order to circumvent a proliferation of Islam with claims to public morality, ethics and a broader perspective on how to inhabit daily life. The desired aim of the theology programs is to forge an Islam commensurable with the liberal nation-state. These efforts are certainly not unique to Germany. Similar efforts have been undertaken in other European countries and the US and are always informed by security concerns that conflate traditional Islam with terrorism.

religiosity—i.e., Islam—as insiders in specific ways. Previously, when ethnic Christian-secularized German educators had inquired about religion and religious attitudes among migrants, they had felt uncomfortable, not least because the students spoke up and wanted to know whether the educators were themselves religious.[154]

Part of Mohsen's job was to help primarily immigrant youth of mostly Turkish and Palestinian descent to see that they are equals, same as everyone else. In addition, Mohsen and his colleagues tried in playful ways to train youngsters to think of themselves first as secular citizens and second as Turks, Palestinians and Muslims. Tolerance in the civil society organization meant that one subordinates one's religious identity to a civic identity, to being a German citizen. Further, that one regards religious practice as a private matter, to be lived in privacy. Similarly, that one does not argue from a particular religious point of view that could be felt as excluding others. In short, being equal meant deemphasizing religious difference, because religious difference produced hierarchies and inequalities *(Ungleichwertigkeit*[155]*),* which the educators judged to be a form of intolerance.

By focusing on a two-day workshop on the "Middle Eastern Conflict" offered to a group of female community organizerss of Turkish and Palestinian descent and booked by the Protestant civil society organization *Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste* (Action Reconciliation, Service for Peace, henceforth ASF), I am situating the encounter in a triangulated fashion, among Mohsen and I as civic educators, the female community organizers and a representative of the ASF. I do this in order to point out the moral frame of secular citizenship rooted in Protestantism. Contrary to how Mohsen and I, as civic educators, operated by separating religious attachments from politics and public issues, it turned out that secularity was in fact constituted by religious sentiments, Protestant atonement being the constitutive moral frame converged with secular citizenship and was carried through within political secularism. My broader argument is that secularity is not only dependent on relating to the Holocaust as an exceptional event that constitutes the post-Holocaust episteme, as discussed in chapter 2 and as enacted by civic educators in their daily work with Muslim participants. In addition, there is an *atoned* way of relating to the figure of the Jew underwritten by a Christian notion growing out of Protestantism and converging with secular governance. Rather, the case of German citizenship demonstrates that secularity is not in binary opposition to religiosity, as is usually argued when it comes to Muslim minorities in Germany. In fact, secularity is informed by certain religious norms having found their way into the mechanisms of state and having been re-oriented towards a worldly telos, meaning the state-form itself. Relatedly, I inquire into the subject-positions assumed by the female community organizerss and by Mohsen, as a civic educator. In relating these positions to one another, I demonstrate the racial gradations between being German-Muslim and being merely Muslim. In the workshop, the issue of (Muslim) religious intolerance towards Jews boiled down to Palestinian intolerance towards the state of Israel. A focus on this detail from the perspective of the Palestinian community organizers enables a more complex political and ethical picture to emerge. However, within the moral frame of German citizenship, the Palestinian position only confirmed anti-Semitic attitudes and therefore remained outside of German citizenship, as I will clarify below. My claim is that because German citizenship is intertwined with a Protestant morality of atonement which is linked with the state of Israel as

[154] Note that my use of 'ethnic German' refers to the national majority of Germans who claim German as their language and who are Protestant or Catholic, even if not practicing. What matters in this context is that members of this group pass as natural members in public institutions. This is not to say that this is a homogeneous group nor that I'm taking ethnicity as a stable category; there are certainly regional variations among Germans and stark class differences.

[155] The notion of hierarchized inequality (orig. *Ungleichwertigkeit*) undergirds the basic ideology of discrimination. It is commonly used in civic education to refer to a form of exclusion based on one group identity assuming a higher value than a downgraded group. As such, it has a broader definition than racism, though it also discounts asymmetrical power relations.

a Jewish collective, among the spectrum of Muslims, Palestinians specifically will be excluded from citizenship unless they emulate atonement as part of their secularity. In other words, the articulation of Palestinian anti-Zionism can only be understood as anti-Semitism and thus as detrimentally opposed to being German. This is because Protestant atonement is what constitutes secular morality, as a universal way of inhabiting the German public sphere.

In order to substantiate my claims here, I will first attend to the interactions in the workshop setting and how we, as civic educators, organized the workshop with a view to fostering a more tolerant outlook for Muslim subjects. By premising the workshop on religious intolerance, we tried to apply a method that would separate religion from politics—or, more specifically, religious sentiments from being a citizen, a political subject.

Hence, in the latter half of this chapter, I will attend to the foundation of the ASF as a civil society organization with Protestant roots and inquire into the longer genealogy of Protestant atonement and the trajectory it followed to become interchangeable with secular morality and citizenship. Here, I will discuss how Protestant atonement was initially conceptualized as a form of reconciliation with God that was counter-oppositional to legal-worldly justice. By drawing attention to the shift in discourse when it comes to anti-Semitism and several laws that were passed in the last years, which re-defined anti-Semitism by focusing on Israel as a Jewish collective, I aim to demonstrate the legal consequences for Middle Eastern and specifically Palestinian communities.

The aim of this chapter is to complicate the national and popular narrative that casts political secularism as the separation of state and church, relatedly secularity as separated from religiosity. Not only does the state maintain and manage religion and define what religion is in the first place, as is already common knowledge in the literature on secularism. But religious sentiments and norms do in fact find entrance into public and state institutions and there give shape to secularity. This reciprocal relationship between German state organizations and those of the Protestant Church constitutes the frame entered into by Middle Eastern migrants, who are often unaware of the state's religious underpinnings and of the racial consequences thus entailed for their own subject-position, as will be demonstrated here.

4.1 Telling Religion from Politics

Mohsen usually works in the training center at Tiergarten, a central location within Berlin. Workshop participants typically come to the center from schools, professional groups and community organizations. This time, however, we were asked by ASF, the leading Protestant civil service organization, to come to Neukölln. ASF provided the space in this particular church in order to accommodate the female community organizers[156] from Neukölln. The theme of our two-day workshop is the "Middle Eastern Conflict," a title that circumscribed the underlying anxieties of civil society and state institutions vis-à-vis potential or lurking anti-Semitism among Middle Eastern immigrants. In the case of these social workers, anti-Semitic attitudes can have grave consequences for their professional lives. As public employees, they are required to represent the position of the German state, not only when it comes to the Jewish community but also in relation to the state of Israel. Additionally, in contrast to regular social workers, who usually have undergone formal education in social work in Germany, these community organizers consist of first-generation migrant women for whom this training is an entryway into the job market. Although they work full-time as community organizers within various neighborhoods in Neukölln, and specifically with other migrant families, the city of Berlin considers them 'in training' and therefore does not provide a salary comparable to that of official social workers. Basically, the city pays an hourly wage of €1. Additional funds to supplement living costs are provided to these workers by the *job*

[156] The community organizers are officially called *Stadtteilmütter*, or "district mothers," which is a way to circumscribe their slightly improvised entry into the job market as helpers who provide the hands-on work with migrant families.

center, the social welfare department for the long-term unemployed.[157] As part of their training, the community organizers are required to undergo a 10-week history education, also called tolerance training, in order to develop social skills and a cultural sensibility for their national environment.

The tolerance training usually organized by the ASF consisted of meetings with Holocaust survivors (Jewish, Roma and Sinti); visits to memorials, museums and synagogues; and research and readings in the biographies of victims. While undergoing training, the social workers stumbled over various details and certain of these triggered a contentious debate over what the nature of this tolerance training was. Several of the survivor biographies mentioned *Palestine* as a destination for refuge, not Israel. For roughly half of the community organizers, this proved to be an entry point to connect the Holocaust refugee experience with their own fate as exiled refugees, although it also opened the door to condemn the state of Israel. In addition, when organizing a synagogue visit, one of the Palestinian community organizers inquired if the synagogue was funded by the state of Israel; if so, she would refuse to enter it. Other social workers chimed in and said they did not want to be associated with the state of Israel. These moments added up to a question of how to approach the state of Israel, and underneath this another lingering question: were the community organizers actually anti-Semitic and not just potentially so? Without wanting to address this suspicion directly, ASF organized two additional workshop days with the civil society organization where I was conducting my research.

The question of anti-Semitism attached itself almost naturally to the Palestinian community organizers as it was attached already to the district of Neukölln. The district of Neukölln stood for failure in the public imaginary, specifically the failure of multiculturalism. As such, the district was paradigmatic of similarly plagued immigrant neighborhoods and districts all over Germany. Although Neukölln had a general problem involving underfunded public institutions and long-term unemployment even among its ethnic German population, Neukölln *as a problem* referred to the presence of immigrants from Muslim countries. These "immigrants had wrecked the social-system," as several politicians proclaimed publicly, either to defend financial cuts to the district or to argue for a public funding increase.[158] The district had also made national headlines as a no-go zone for Jews. This reputation was due in part to the massive anti-Gaza war protests taking place with each new war in Gaza since 2008, which condemned the state of Israel as a killing machine. As a formerly neglected West Berlin neighborhood adjacent to East Berlin, Palestinian refugees from Lebanon and Lebanese from Southern Lebanon had been settling here ever since the early 1980s after

[157] The 'district mothers' project was started in Berlin-Neukölln by the mayor of this district in 2002. Since then, it has become a model project for other districts and cities that have chosen to emulate it in order to make productive use of long-term unemployed migrant women. The city favors their work because a) the district mothers speak the language of migrant families, b) they usually have closer access to these families or know them from their own social networks and c) while being trained as a district mother, the long-term unemployed women disappear from unemployment statistics and provide cheap labor at the same time.

[158] The most famous of these politicians is Thilo Sarrazin, a former minister of finance in Berlin. Sarrazin became famous for his neo-Darwinist, not to say racist, line of reasoning. He accused "Muslims" in Neukölln for the decrepit and run-down state of public institutions and even entertained a genetic argument for their cultural inferiority. The book he published in 2010 repeats tropes and stereotypes from last century, applying to Muslims those that had once been applied to Jews. He writes about Muslims as a homogeneous group, though he emphasizes that Muslims should not be understood as a religious problem, but rather a cultural one. The author also describes Jews as having a certain gene that increases their IQ; thus he would have preferred Jews over "underachieving Muslims" in Germany. The book triggered an outcry for being too harsh, although it did address a standing problem. Neukölln is currently also the fastest gentrifying district in Berlin, and ever since the 2006 World Cup it has been attracting many US-Americans and a significant number of Israelis, who wanted to live and work in Neukölln specifically because of the Middle Eastern flair provided by bakeries, restaurants, coffee shops, street markets and comparably cheap rents.

having escaped the ravaging war in Lebanon.[159] Two other incidents had further contributed to this image: a tourist wearing a yarmulke had been attacked by youth on the main street of the district; and, during the last Gaza war in the summer of 2014, a German SPD politician who had been driving through the district with a huge Israeli flag tacked onto his car had been attacked with stones and spit on at several traffic lights. These two cases, which circulated widely in the national media, evinced to the German public that there was a problem with anti-Semitism in relation to Jewish individuals and the state of Israel. Civil society organizations approached this phenomenon of anti-Israel rallies as though it emanated from Islamic extremism, a dangerous amalgamation of religion and politics leading to violent outbreaks against non-Muslims and specifically Jews.

When Mohsen and I enter the church, we are led to their main event space: a huge barren hall clad in light-colored wood, with a gigantic cross in one corner and a piano on the stage. There is a circle of chairs arranged for us on the audience level. We sit down and wait for everyone to join us. Several veiled women, including the community organizers' coordinator Nazan and the ASF coordinator Judith, prepare a table with snacks, coffee and tea. The social workers arrive gradually. They exchange hugs and kisses on the cheek. They obviously share a certain sense of intimacy among themselves. I notice that they are ten women in total and not the 15 as registered. The rest will join next week, Judith later explains. Except for one, all are veiled. Some could be in their late 30s, but generally they are older, on average in their late 40s and early 50s. Judith, Mohsen and I are the youngsters here and we are in charge. We introduce ourselves with name and role. Mohsen states that we will have two full days together to reflect on and talk about the Middle Eastern Conflict and he then goes on to ask:

> "What do you want to know?"
> "The truth, we want to hear the truth. We just keep hearing lies," responds one community organizer.
> "You have engaged with this topic for some time," states Mohsen, ignoring the part on truth and lies.
> "Yes, but we are not allowed to say everything. We will keep talking about this topic, we cannot do otherwise," the community organizer defends herself and the rest of the group.
> "No, you are allowed to speak about this topic, but it depends on *how* you speak about it," clarifies Mohsen.[160]

Two things remain unspecified in the above exchange between Mohsen and Salma, the community organizer. Mohsen did not ask her what lies she had heard about this topic, since our aim was not to get the facts straight but to provide a different perspective. And this was the second unnamed thing, the *how* to talk about this topic meant for us civic educators ridding them of their religious positioning since it was veiling their view of the situation. Salma takes the lead again. She looks at me and Mohsen with her glasses pulled down to the tip of her nose and explains that she already knows this history inside and out, from her grandparents and parents, the books she has read and from her own experience growing up in a Palestinian refugee camp in Jordan. "There is really nothing new you can teach me here," she adds in her grammatically impeccable albeit accented German. Yet she also tells us that she had enjoyed learning about the Nazi history of Germany and specifically the history of the Roma and Sinti; these had been new and unknown elements for her. The other women nod but do not speak. Mohsen and I look at the others and encourage them to contribute their views. But there is no response. I can sense that they are checking us out. Mohsen starts a new round:

[159] Note that there are three districts in Berlin that comprise the highest concentration of former Palestinian refugees: Berlin-Spandau, Wedding and Neukölln. All three districts border the former German Democratic Republic and were thus considered less desirable areas with lower market value and accordingly lower rent. Exact numbers of Palestinians are hard to determine, since most of them came as stateless refugees through Lebanon, Jordan or Syria, and they are registered with their country of departure.
[160] From fieldnotes, original in German.

"So what does 'Middle Eastern Conflict' mean? Are we talking about Israel-Palestine or are we talking about all countries in the Middle East? What exactly are we talking about?" This time all of them start talking, but none of them raises their hand. They speak as if they are throwing words at us and we are being buried under a pile of speech. But we let it happen, because it breaks the ice and gives them the space for expression. They speak so fast that I cannot even keep up with my note-taking. Salma takes the lead again and explains that this is an issue that concerns all countries in the Middle East, from Turkey to Egypt, but that Palestine is the hot spot affecting all neighboring countries.

> You know up to 15 years ago we did not see wars on such a scale of violence in Palestine and the Middle East. What is this about? What do they want? And why do they have the right to do all these things? This is what we want to talk about!

We do not respond to Salma, but nod as if we wanted to signal that these questions are well-taken, even if put aside for the moment. Mohsen had warned me that the session with the community organizers could get emotionally tough and that I should be prepared. In contrast to Mohsen, I was not employed as a civic educator. As a researcher, I could take on a different role than Mohsen and our other colleagues in the training center. Usually, I could be more sympathetic and less pedagogical with the participants. In contrast to the educators, who usually acted as instructors, I was sometimes also just a participant; in some cases I would act as a co-instructor, especially with multi-cultural and multi-religious groups, when the training center was short on civic educators or when appointed educators refused to do this job.[161]

Mohsen's position seemed more distant than mine. He was executing a script he had rehearsed so many times with other colleagues. The training center had hired Mohsen because he was more comfortable with talking about religious issues from the position of a Muslim insider.[162] Having grown up in Cairo in a well-off middle-class Egyptian family, he had been educated in the private German school. After graduating with the German *Abitur* in Cairo, he studied Islamic jurisprudence at al-Azhar University, and then came to Germany to do a B.A. in history and philosophy. When we first met in 2013, he had been living in Germany for five years and had been working for two years in the training center. His role was to challenge the students in their assumptions about Islam and what it means to be Muslim, but he was mostly challenging their internalized racism. He would tell me how he had to specifically encourage the Palestinian students to say that they are German, because they had been born in Germany and had never been to Palestine or any other Middle Eastern country. What went also amiss in these "Muslim encounters" between Mohsen and the rest of the immigrant student body was Mohsen's privileged status in terms of class and valid passport. As descendants of stateless refugees, most Palestinian kids did not travel outside of Germany until they came of age and acquired valid papers that permitted them to travel independently of their parents. Mohsen

[161] Usually the civic educators did not refuse a job. In this case, the ASF booked the workshop with one Muslim and one Jewish educator in order to represent a balanced view on the Middle Eastern Conflict. The only Jewish educator at the training center refused to take on that job of the Jewish representative, explaining that it was highly problematic to narrow down the varied Jewish perspectives into one single position. Mohsen and other educators of Middle Eastern descent could not afford to refuse to participate in the same manner. The refusal of a Muslim educator would have caused suspicion, to say the least, and would likely be considered intolerant.

[162] When I joined the team of civic educators in spring of 2015, I encountered diverse educational and ethnic backgrounds. The training center had a general line of tolerance education and the focus on Muslims was more of an undercurrent. At the same time, the civic educators for the Islamic extremism project had different contracts and were employees. The rest of the team of approximately 30 self-employed civic educators was working in various museums, memorials and pedagogical settings around Berlin and were between the ages of 25-40. After several weeks of shadowing them, Mohsen encouraged me to participate actively as a civic educator. Tom, the director of the training center, approved of the idea and I was trained by Mohsen to co-guide groups in games and role plays.

also complained that the students would claim a Palestinian identity or even tell Mohsen that he was not Arab because they could not understand his Egyptian Arabic.

In our initial meetings in 2013, Mohsen would express disbelief over the unassimilated Arab children in Berlin. When we met again during my fieldwork in 2015, Mohsen had become more disillusioned with living in Germany. He told me that he had had several experiences with the German secret police questioning him at the airport about where he had been in Egypt and whether he had been meeting Islamists in certain mosques. Encounters such as these made him see another side of Germany. Simultaneously, Mohsen began expressing more frustration about being an Arab and did not emphasize his Arab identity so much in his work anymore. Once during a workshop, he had been attacked by ethnic German teenagers from an upper-class district, who accused him of being a potential Muslim terrorist. I asked Mohsen how he reacted, considering that his job was to teach tolerance and because I was wondering whether he would have called this out as a form of bias or racism even. His response was to interrupt the workshop and later, when he told the center coordinator, he was told to get professional counseling, so that he could receive support and learn how to deal with this in a professional manner, rather than taking it personally. After hearing about this, I brought it up to Sabine, the co-director of the organization, telling her that Mohsen had experienced discrimination in the actual space for being an Arab-Muslim man. Sabine explained that she had heard about the incident and that she was very sorry about it, but she also said that this had more to do with Mohsen and his lack of experience with the groups of ethnic Germans. He had mostly been working with migrant students and now he was getting a sense of the majority. The issue was dealt with on a personal level, as something that Mohsen had to learn from in order to become more professional in his interactions with ethnic German students, who in turn were not considered intolerant for suspecting Mohsen to be a terrorist.

Indeed, Mohsen and his colleagues had specifically focused on migrant students as a problem population. In my early encounters with Mohsen and his colleagues, they would also tell me about needing different methods, ones designed specifically to interrogate Muslim religiosity. For that they had developed a game called the "Freedom Game," which could be adapted for other groups, but with migrant students the target was religion. The game would start with a conversation about religion. The conversation would then evolve into a question as to why religion should matter at all: "How does religion matter in doing things you like to do, in being how you like to be and also participating in society?" Opening questions like these were meant to solicit a more systematic engagement with the students. But the questions would trigger an even more defensive and reactionary stance among the participating students. Some would say: "My religion is everything for me," or "Islam is my life." These sentences were already received as a sign of disturbance in the educators' eyes.

Separating religion from politics was the stated aim of the prevention project. The maintenance of a personal secularity is here practiced as a stripping away of layers of religiosity. As defined above, the notion of secularity expected of subjects who are categorized as Muslim is organized around a distinction between private and public, though it also has a temporal dimension, separating the past from the present, when it comes to their own lived tradition. In both instances, spatial and temporal, the idea that Muslims cannot respect boundaries, because of their traditional religiosity, heightens the need to police these boundaries in order to discipline a tolerant Muslim subject. Part of the problem with keeping these boundaries in check is that the subjects in question were invited and inspected *as* Muslims. Therefore, most of what they expressed as political opinion is framed by the civic educators as religious in the first place. As a consequence, it was made explicit and inquired into in order to subsume it under a logic of individual freedom and cultural sameness.

The target group, comprised of teenagers between the ages of 12 to 18, was usually unprepared to have an intellectual conversation. In most cases, they did not even know why they had come to the training center in the first place. It was presented to them as a space for

training youth in general social skills. It was usually their teachers who called in to book a workshop and they would specify the problems they saw in their classrooms, such as intolerance, anti-Semitism, rough manners—especially among the boys—or general forms of discrimination or bullying. In prior conversations with Mohsen and his team, I found out that schools also booked workshop sessions with them because they did not know how to understand disruptive behavior. According to the civic educators, the teachers were unsure, even terrified, when students left class in order to perform prayer. The teachers would ask whether this was already a sign of radicalization. Did their religion oblige Muslims to conduct ritual prayer at strictly set times? Or, when the students talked about Israel as if it were committing Nazi crimes against Palestinians, was this just religious intolerance or was it already political ideology? Even if the students' religion allowed such statements and practices, the teachers nonetheless found them publicly unacceptable because of their perceived intolerant and anti-Semitic nature.

The civic educators relied on several games that they deployed in a particular succession, in order to start a reflection process on how to relate to religion and where to place it. Sometimes reflection would start with a physical exercise aimed at team building goals or with the inspection of one exhibition item in the training center. One of the more popular spaces at the center was the 'destroyed room,' because it exhibited a destroyed youth space and triggered a sense of violation that everyone understood immediately. The seven-room exhibition/training center was underwritten by the notion of one's own individual freedom to realize oneself fully in a liberal-democratic society. The notion of violence would either appear as Nazi state-violence or GDR state-violence or as the violence committed by mobs and bullies. While the space was designed to be open for exploration, students who had been booked for workshops combatting Islamic extremism would be separated by mobile walls and disconnected from the general exhibition that usually connected the Nazi past with the political present. The co-director Sabine explained to me that this was a strategic move, because Muslim kids over-identified with Jewish victims and it was better to separate these things.[163] Here again, the assumption was that Muslims failed to respect temporal boundaries and that they related to the Jewish fate simply by talking about their own discrimination. The further assumption underlying this one was that the students were guided by a religious rationality which, as I would add, lacked secularity.

Although the term secularity was never explicitly used by the civic educators, it seemed to structure how religion was managed and how the participants had to be pushed to self-discipline. It was as if Muslim religiosity were a substance needing to be formed into a solid shape and put in a secure place, or else it risked spilling over. Secularity here meant the proper form of conducting oneself in relation to history, religion, the public and the murdered European Jewry; by virtue, then, of proper conduct one became a tolerant member of the social sphere, in other words a German-Muslim.

The central game used in Islamic extremism sessions was the "Freedom Game." The aim of the game was to pose religion and freedom as asymmetrical opposites, whereby freedom became the overarching frame and religion merely pointed out as one item under its umbrella, one bounded object among many. By initiating the game, the civic educators would ask the students to draw a table on a piece of paper, containing six separate fields, and then write down six items they could not imagine living without. The educators might suggest

[163] I was quite perplexed to hear this at first. Sabine, referring to the German-Turkish pedagogue who had advised her to separate the space in the first place, pointed out that she, the German-Turkish pedagogue, was someone like me an insider who know these things better than most ethnic German. Sabine also told me that confronting the students with Jewish persons could open the door to conspiracy theories. In the same conversation, Sabine explained to me that the Muslim kids lacked authorities and the project tried to provide them with exactly this through the figure of the civic educators.

concepts such as family, school, friends, music, books, religion and freedom. Once a set of six items had been decided upon, the students were asked to cross out the item they believed they needed the least. The educators would help them by acknowledging that this is a hard exercise but it is only an exercise, a fun game to help rethink our priorities in life. The students were encouraged to cross out the items they could easily do without. In the end, the students were allowed to keep only one item out of six. Some would keep family, or music, but there were also some who kept religion, or specifically Islam. The educators would also reveal what they had kept as their most prioritized item: freedom. Freedom in this context in fact meant freedom *from* religion, specifically from Islam, as I found out in conversations with Mohsen and his colleague during preliminary field research. For the game was supposed to reveal that the participants already inhabited a state of freedom, as promised by the liberal nation-state, but that this freedom was in many ways obstructed by Islam, which prevented them from enjoying it. This form of obstruction and inhibition, was partly reproduced from the general discourse on Islam in German society as a problem, partly it was identified by comments students made, when they entered the training space. Sometimes the students would recognize objects and comments as pointing to Holocaust history and make judgmental comments, such as "Oh is this about Jews again!" Or as Mohsen's female colleague Gizem told me, she had been told many times by the participating teenagers that she was not a real Muslim, because she was not veiled or she appeared in mini-skirts and tank-tops. The civic educators, albeit also of Muslim background, read these statements as emanating from a traditionally lived religiosity. During fieldwork I made similar observations, but what I thought was revealing was that the teenagers were often times surprised to find a person of Turkish or Arab descent working in the center that was exhibiting German history with no traces of migration. In addition, there was usually a class difference between the students and the civic educators.

The aim of this playful exercise was to provoke a conversation about why freedom mattered more than anything else, even more than religion. The educators would stress that if you have freedom, you have everything—the freedom to exercise your religion or to have a family or listen to music and to become who you like and still be Muslim, in private. The students were pushed to think of themselves as already embedded in a political order that grants the freedom to be Muslim and to live their religion, but that this gift was something they had to live up to and embrace. Ultimately, it was about becoming the kind of subject who could simply privatize his religion and thereby prove that he was also German. Privatizing religion in the training context meant specifically that students should keep their opinion on what true Islam or a real Muslim is to themselves. When I inquired if this game was also played with ethnic German students, the educators responded that ethnic German kids usually do not claim a religious identity or find religion to be that important in their lives.[164]

In the setting of the Protestant church in Neukölln, the freedom game is the first exercise we do with the community organizers. The district mothers are encouraged to write down the six most important things in their lives, things they cannot do without. The district mothers are busy writing down their items. After presenting them briefly, we then ask the community organizers to cross them out again, one by one. In the end, most of them have to decide between family and religion. None of them choose freedom; in fact, most of them

[164] All the educators in both civil society organizations with which I worked would stress that they are never sure how much the students take away from their workshops. All in all, it was also difficult for me to determine what the students made out of these educational interventions. I noticed, however, that some students who had participated years ago would return and apply to become educators, even as pious and practicing Muslims. Another thing that was not fully disclosed to the participants was the stated purpose of these workshops. The teenage participants were neither aware of the funding scheme nor the implied prevention from certain "creeping" ideologies. As described above, it was usually teachers who booked these workshops for their students when they observed what they deemed to be suspicious activity or just common rough interaction that had become hurtful and seemed to indicate intolerance towards homosexuals, women, and/or Jews.

vacillated between racism (sic!),[165] family and religion, often settling on family as the last and most important item. Only Mohsen chose freedom and he explained that he decided many years ago to leave his parents' home in Egypt in order to follow his individual path in Germany. He chose freedom then and still chooses it now. The women listen silently but seem unimpressed by Mohsen's liberation narrative, since they do not engage with it.

In order to start the conversation anew Mohsen asks, "Well, all of you chose your religion in the identity game, it is very important to you. Do you think you can live without your religion? It was hard for some of you to cross that out in the game." Salma speaks up again and explains that one could even live without religion, because it is about good behavior regardless of what you call it. "Prophets were always sent down when people were wrong. Yeah, it is about being a good person," she ends. Mohsen approves of her answer and affirms, "Yes, it is entirely irrelevant if you're Jewish, Christian, Muslim or even Atheist." He wants to make the point that one does not need to be religious at all in order to be a good person. Salma somehow gets excited and exclaims, yes, exactly, maybe as an atheist you really are a good person. Mohsen does not engage in a discussion with Salma about what a good person is or might do. Mohsen's method does not rely on defining virtues or ethics; rather, it is built on reflecting on religion as a bounded object that should not be central in defining one's way of living.

The other community organizers nod in agreement with Salma's take on what religion is, and no one objects to Mohsen's statement, either. In a way, Salma's statement made it hard to discuss religion as an obstructive element, because here there was no resistance like there usually was with the teenagers. We decide to leave it at that and take a short break for now. I was not sure whether Mohsen was happy about how the session ended. From previous conversations with Mohsen and his colleagues, I know that these games are not exhaustive and often times imprecise. There is never full evidence whether any change of rationale is achieved by the end of the workshop day. What matters more for the civic educators is to initiate an ongoing process of reflexivity among the participants or, as they used to tell me, "Our job is to scratch the surface, in order to create an opening for self-reflexivity." They hoped that these playful acts would instill a sense of ongoing self-disciplining. Paradoxically, because it was difficult to gather any conclusive evidence of having fully dismantled religious rationality, a sense of suspicion about Islamic extremism also remained. Muslim subjects remain ambivalent, even if they are fully assimilated and claim a secular identity, such as Mohsen and his other colleagues of Middle Eastern descent have done.

4.2 The Thin Line Between Anti-Zionism and Anti-Semitism

The task of separating religion from politics remained crucial for us in the next exercise as well. Partly, because our assumption was that these two spheres needed to be separated by establishing boundaries as to how each phenomenon could and should be approached. More crucial to our approach, however, was the assumption that Islamic extremists deliberately confused religion and politics or mobilized religion in order to tackle a political issue. Mohsen and I had agreed to successively approach the topic of anti-Semitism first by inquiring whether anti-Israel sentiments were grounded in hatred towards Jews, on account of religious difference. From Mohsen's previous encounters with groups of community organizers in the workshop, he could not confirm that they were anti-Semitic, since they had visited Holocaust memorials, met Jewish survivors and had been very

[165] This was an interesting discovery. Racism, was not a term we had offered in the game. Several of them had opted for racism as a thing they cannot live without. When I asked what they meant by it, one social worker responded that she experienced racism and discrimination on a daily basis and that she just did not know how to live without that anymore. Instead of triggering a longer conversation on religion, the game triggered everyday racism testimonies and we just listened to those testimonies without questioning them for some time. By allowing the social workers to speak, we hoped to build some trust and also gain some insight into their life-worlds.

sympathetic with them. But when the topic turned to the state of Israel, he noticed the community organizers would shut down, as they would with persons who identified as Israeli. By the end of the day we wanted to have a clear sense of what it was about the state of Israel—or Israelis—that triggered the most aversion. In agreement with Mohsen's report about the community organizers, I had concluded that the community organizers were basically harboring anti-Zionist sentiments because of their own Palestinian backgrounds. Hence, for the second workshop day, we had planned to make political history the centerpiece of our engagement, applying a historically informed 'both-sides' frame.

The first game after the break prompts them to talk about themselves and the difference they make in society. The community organizers pair up and interview one another and then present one another to the group. During the presentations, the community organizers open up and explain how they came to Germany and how they became community organizers. The Palestinian community organizers all grew up in refugee camps in Lebanon or Jordan. By contrast, the Turkish community organizers came with their parents or were even born in Berlin. The latter have very different life trajectories, ones that move between Turkey and Germany, the former being the vacation destination where family roots are maintained, while the latter is their declared home. Except for Salma, who studied English and journalism in Jordan and who came to Germany after marrying her husband, none of the community organizers has a high school diploma. Salma is also the only one among the Palestinians who visits Jordan regularly and thinks of it as a second home. She stood apart from the other Palestinian women. Although a Palestinian of refugee descent, she was also a Jordanian citizen and had been spared the experience of direct state violence. Yet she seemed more bitter and aggressive than the rest. In this round, she complained that she spoke and wrote in three languages fluently, had a university degree and yet had never been hired for a job in Germany. She suspected that her headscarf put her at a disadvantage and that she was discriminated against for practicing her religion.

The rest of the Palestinian women from Lebanon had not returned to Lebanon after they or their families fled massacres in Palestinian refugee camps. Their stories were heartbreaking; several of them had seen their closest relatives shot in front of their eyes. One of them, Wardeh, who was the quietest of all, spoke very slowly of her mother's death. A sniper had aimed at her when she wanted to step out of the house door, and they could not take her to the hospital because the refugee camp had been under siege at the time by the Israeli army and the Lebanese Phalange. She described how her mother bled out over two long days on the living room floor, all the while trying to breast-feed her infant, Wardeh's youngest sibling. We all listen, no one interrupts her. Wardeh concludes her story by telling us that her father had already fled and applied for asylum in Germany and so she and her siblings were all re-united with him. This is how she came and how she started a new life in West Berlin in the 1980s as a teenager.

After Wardeh's account, a silence sets in. Mohsen and Judith also seem to have taken this story in; they seem smaller in their chairs. I thank Wardeh for sharing such a painful story about her loss, but feel the urge to remark that she seems incredibly strong and calm about it. Wardeh smiles and responds that she cried out all her pain many years ago. Salma adds, "There are no tears left for us. You see, you came here to teach us and now you learn that we can teach you something." Mohsen announces a short break and the session is dissolved. During the break, the Turkish community organizers approach me and confess that whenever they hear these stories by the Palestinian women, they get enraged and feel empathy for them. But whenever they watch German news about attacks in Israel, they understand the Israeli side and become unsure what to believe altogether. Who is right?, they ask me, adding that they know these women tell the truth, but no one talks about it publicly.

What crystallizes out of the first session with the female community organizerss is that there is no unified Muslim position vis-à-vis Jews, Israel or the conflict. Among all of us

present in the room, Judith excluded, who were considered Muslim simply by virtue of ethnic descent and heritage, there was no shared resentment or grudge against Jews or Israel. The Turkish community organizers' question perfectly demonstrated that they in fact did not know what to believe about Israel-Palestine nor what position to take. The positions could similarly not be mapped onto the schema religious vs. secular. Several of the Turkish community organizers seemed pious but had no position on Israel like the Palestinian community organizers did. And yet, we were all considered potential anti-Semites because we were primarily categorized as Muslims, Islam being the unrefined traditional religion that we each carried within ourselves to differential degrees, on a scale from pious to cultural to secularist.

My own thoughts were taking me back to Salma's statement: "There are no tears left for us." I was assuming that her "us" was spoken from a position of being Palestinian and from a shared Palestinian fate. Yet I was not sure whether she meant that "they" as Palestinians had no tears left to cry or whether those around them, meaning non-Palestinians, had no tears left to cry for them. In a way, this was a remarkable statement, given that these women were undergoing tolerance training for roughly 3 months and had been learning about Jewish, Roma and Sinti genocides and were expected to cultivate a sense of empathy and tolerance. Was there no space for their suffering? From a longer conversation with Judith I knew, because the ASF tolerance program focused on the Holocaust and Jews, that Palestine had come up and triggered memories for the Palestinian community organizers. In other words, the care for Jews and Israel was not separable from the question of Palestine, at least for those Middle Eastern immigrants who had fled historical Palestine or had come to Germany from a neighboring country. But I doubted that Judith—likewise the ASF and the district of Neukölln—believed that the Palestinian stories should not be told or heard. Yet I could see that these stories triggered anxiety for these institutions, the anxiety that their telling might justify anti-Semitism or at the least anti-Zionism and thus become a dark stain of tolerated intolerance. It seemed as if these stories could be told, but the only way they could be heard was as fostering anti-Semitism. Consequently, they could not be told publicly without shaming Germans. There was, after all, no public space for their suffering.

In announcing our last exercise, Mohsen and I are more explicit. We ask everyone, Judith included, to brainstorm over the term Israel-Palestine and to write down what they associate with it. The district mothers look completely befuddled: "Do you mean Israel *or* Palestine?" they ask. I explain that we do not separate these two terms, but that they are free to separate or write about them together. After 5 minutes, Salma is the first to speak. Her first sentence is: "I hope we will not be arrested for what we say! Ok, then Palestine: pain, origin, land, olive oil, sad stories of district mothers, unforgettable, suffering children." The terms are repeated several times by other district mothers and Israel does not come up much; if it does at all, it is in the context of its having been founded on the wrong land. In other words, most Arab community organizers obliterate the Israeli side by not even mentioning it. Some delegitimize its existence by pointing out that its territory is misplaced. Esin, one of the Turkish district mothers, comments on Israel-Palestine as a single entity:

> I started to have my own relationship to this topic, a relationship not dominated by the media. I definitely think that there is oppression, traumatized children, war, and suffering on both sides. But I wonder who has the right to do this?

All the district mothers of Turkish origin who are present comment on Israel-Palestine in a similar fashion—as a tragic story that keeps unfolding and that is hard to grasp ethically and legally. From this perspective, there appears something fundamentally wrong with a state that has so much power over people. Judith is among the last to read her statement. She also did not separate Israel-Palestine. She reads: "Media wars, very emotional, beautiful country,

diverse and colorful, but also racism and anti-Semitism, occupation, Zionists." In contrast to the rest of the participants, Judith has spent two years in Israel as an ASF volunteer in a *kibbutz*, and she also speaks Hebrew. Judith, very much in line with the ASF, regards Israel as one country including the *occupied territories.* Her move to speak about one country is similarly obliterating of the other side, but it is a move that is accepted by now and not policed as hateful in the same way. Then again, perhaps Judith could be also considered cautious, because emphasizing Palestine could be read as anti-Zionist. She could lose her job by such a label, since she already works with the immigrant district mothers who are considered religiously intolerant. She was genuine in her description. As much as the ASF volunteers go to Israel to atone and take responsibility for the German past, they are also cultural ambassadors for Israel in Germany (Wienand 2012, 222). From Judith's perspective, from that of the ASF and the German public, Israel is not simply another state but the homeland of the Jewish people to which the German nation is morally committed to. From the German perspective, the existence of Israel has a moral justification in excess of any legal justifications.

The workshop session is coming to an end and we have to sum up the major themes in order to plan for the second day on Israel-Palestine. We try to zero in on the terms, those most commonly mentioned being Zionism and Zionist; perhaps we should talk about that, we suggest, but Salma raises her hand and states:

> [W]hy should all people who belong to one religion live in one country? Why is this logical? This is illogical! Does it mean we all have to go to Saudi Arabia and live there, because we are Muslims? Religion has no country; this is not a convincing argument.

Salma disputes the concept of Zionism as illogical and unworthy of discussion from the get-go. Zionism could have provided an entry into discussing Israeli nationalism, the way it took shape in Europe and materialized in historical Palestine, as a way of grounding the two-sides perspective we are tasked with. But Salma is challenging this form of nationalism altogether. She was unaware that not only is Zionism a child of the nineteenth century *Volksgeist*, a concept amalgamating people with religion and nation, but so too is German nationalism. Yet saying that Germany is a country shaped by Christianity is usually not read as incomplete secularization but a civilizational achievement, allowing for Germans to see themselves as non-religious and secular. Related arguments—like the idea that Europe is a Christian continent and Turkey should not be a member of the EU, or that the Middle East has produced authoritarian states, or that the district mothers are intolerant towards Jews because of their religion—were all informed by the same logic, that conflated religion into an essential category of a people -not to say racialize them- with a special inherent characteristic. This was the main reason why we were all able to sit here together and work on their assumed intolerance, because their personhood had been defined as a problem by the Christian secularized majority by virtue of their (non-Christian) religious membership.

This line of thought, however, I do not bring up. We just let Salma vent a bit, since she seems irritated. Finding a term to work with proves to be more vexed than anyone had anticipated. How do we want to approach this? Why should we even talk about this in the next session? Several district mothers say that this is about justice. Nazan explains that, as district mothers, they usually talk about children who have been killed and they wonder why no one intervenes. She argues that it is the perspective of the caring mother that they bring to the Israel-Palestine discussion and that they also carry with them as they go about their work. Mohsen and I had earlier agreed not to choose topics that get too emotional, children who have been killed is certainly such a topic. But we are also aware of the blood libel theory that posits Jews as monsters who kidnap and kill non-Jewish children. While this is an anti-Semitic trope from the Middle Ages, a statement such as "Israel kills children" is read by anti-

Semitism experts in Germany as motivated by the blood libel. It is read as a deep-seated (Christian) expression of anti-Semitism that conflates the figure of the Jew with the state of Israel. If "Israel," so the argument goes, is just another term for "the Jew," then the statement "Israel kills children" can only be thinly veiled anti-Semitism.

Eventually Judith spoke up, demanding that we talk about anti-Semitism. Why?, I asked. She explains that because this conflict is mostly perceived through media, it gives rise to anti-Semitism.[166] Judith was the only one who mentioned anti-Semitism explicitly. As she was also the person who had booked the workshop, she was basically trying to reassert the actual aim of our job—namely, to combat forms of anti-Semitism that might be veiled in talking about Israel-Palestine. Even more specifically, her concern was that these Palestinian community organizers were talking about Palestine in a way that could be understood as anti-Semitic. It seemed kind of odd that, on the one hand, the Middle Eastern Conflict was regarded from this point of view as a thinly veiled proxy for the expression of anti-Semitic statements, while, on the other hand, we were expected to talk about the same conflict solely in order to reflect on anti-Semitism—but anti-Semitism understood as a misguided myth or conspiracy theory about Jews that somehow attached itself to the Israel-Palestine conflict as opposed to a real conflict situation that gave rise anti-Jewish/anti-Israel hostility and sentiments. Precisely that logic enabled anti-Semitism experts to avoid addressing the contemporary conflict and to concentrate on the perception of Jews or on what had happened to European Jews prior to the establishment of Israel.

Given the composition of the group in the workshop, we, as civic educators, felt it necessary to speak about the conflict through a single contemporary aspect and then to dig into that history. Further, we had decided not to talk about the conflict in abstract and general terms but to start from one specific issue. An aspect could be for instance, the status of Jerusalem and its inhabitants or the right of return and its practicability. Instead of defining a taboo, we wanted to enable participants to speak without framing it as anti-Jewish hate-speech, without even concentrating on a Jewish person but instead focusing on the conflict as a form of state violence and counter-violence. I wanted to explain this to Judith and started to say, "But my sense is that this perspective of anti-Semitism is not really present here currently." Before I could finish and Judith could respond, Salma interjected addressing me: "Well, Judith is German, she is afraid that we will say something anti-Semitic." Judith gasped and sank back into her chair. She did not speak again until the rest of the group decided to talk about the Gaza Strip in the next session

4.3 Protestant Atonement as Secular Morality

From Judith's perspective, as I understood much later, anti-Semitism had in fact been present all along in the way the state of Israel had been referred to throughout our discussion.[167] In a follow-up interview with Judith, I brought up the question of anti-Semitism again. I asked her if she thought that the community workers had made anti-Semitic statements. Judith's answer was that they were not anti-Semitic per se, but that they had questioned one Holocaust survivor about Israel's actions. In this, Judith had seen a conflation of Jewish persons with the state of Israel as one homogeneous entity. Also, she added, she had

[166] Judith did not specify this further, but my guess is that she was referring to two things. First, that Israel's image is dominated by media representations about the conflict. Second, that Arab media was reporting one-sidedly about Israel-Palestine. The latter was a common explanation made by those, who claimed that anti-Semitism was being imported by Middle Eastern migrants. One form of import was their Arab media consumption.

[167] Relatedly, the way some social workers talked about Israel as being founded on the wrong land was in itself a form of anti-Semitism not only for Judith, but also from the point of view of the ASF and the current law against anti-Semitism passed by the Berlin Senate in March 2018. The Berlin Senate has taken on a definition by the International Holocaust Research Alliance. This definition considers criticism of Israel as anti-Semitism if it follows a scheme of the 3Ds: Demonization, Delegitimization, Double Standards.

noticed aversions to Israeli individuals among the group. I responded that it would be understandable that there would be aversion to Israelis, given their history of displacement from historical Palestine. Judith responded that this was understandable, but that Israelis were no devils.

Just like anti-Semites were accused of failing to distinguish between Jews and the state of Israel, so too did German institutions, such as the ASF, fail to distinguish any more clearly between Jews, as a varied and heterogeneous religious community, and the state of Israel. In the case of the ASF, this fixation on the Jewish collective and the Israeli state as a single inseparable entity had to do with their post-war theological efforts to atone for Nazi crimes. This form of religious atonement has become a social force permeating state and society and, as I will demonstrate in the remainder of this chapter, it has also underwritten the legal regulation of migrants and citizenship in recent years.

The ASF was founded on theological principles of guilt, atonement and salvation for the original sin of the German people. By turning atonement for Nazi crimes into the worldly task of labor-service, the organization's aim was to restore national and church morality (Kammerer 2008, 12–15). Founded by the former state judge Lothar Kreyssig, the only judge to openly criticize and legally and morally condemn the Nazi T4 euthanasia program at the time of its establishment, the ASF based its mission on the notion of collective guilt and on the moral bankruptcy of both the state and the German people. As a man of the legal order, Kreyssig had been utterly disappointed by the failure of the judicial system to prevent systematic murder. Further, he had been disappointed by the lack of spirit among civilians to counteract Nazi crimes. In the literature on the ASF, Kreyssig is described as a man of inner conviction, who had not given up on the idea of justice, but who had declared legal measures for seeking justice to be futile if they were not grounded in moral principles. In spite of his open criticism of the Nazi euthanasia program, Kreyssig was not imprisoned. He retired from his post and became the *praeses* of the Protestant Church of Saxony. After the collapse of the Nazi state, he went on to institutionalize his notion of justice by organizing a sustained civil society institution, which has had wide-ranging and ongoing consequences for the shape of law and citizenship.

According to Kreysssig a restoration of morality and Germany's soul could only happen through non-legalistic means. Thus, atonement as a civil service has underwritten secular morality and what it means to be a citizen in Germany, thereby collapsing the distance between moral attitudes and the legal regulation of anti-Semitism in the last years. In certain ways, Kreyssig's Christian salvationist take on Israel had become the general secular way of talking about Israel as a Jewish state that requires a particular relation with the German state. In contrast to us civic educators, who operated in a way that tried to distinguish between religion and politics, the ASF was intent on insinuating Protestant theology into politics. In fact, they had been quite successful in imbuing both Germany and Israel with Protestant notions of, respectively, a Christian Self and a 'Jewish older brother' (Kammerer 2008, 25).

As an elected member of the umbrella organization of the Protestant church in Germany, the *Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland* (EKD), Kreyssig founded the ASF as a labor-service program for *atonement* in the late 1950s (Legerer 2011a). Earlier, Kreyssig had thought of calling his organization "action for reconciliation." Conversations with Protestant interlocutors, however, clarified that reconciliation needed mutual and equal partners, while atonement put the burden on the guilty culprits. The Germans first had to actively seek repentance and pay for their sins, in order to find reconciliation with others and to be forgiven by God (Kammerer 2008, 14). Indeed, Kreyssig had observed how post-war Germany and Germans had pronounced their guilt, but he could not recognize a moral transformation. Most Germans had not really paid a price or made a sacrifice for either self-betterment or forgiveness, according to Kreyssig. Similarly, the courts and legal hearings organized by the Allied Powers had been instruments of punishment, swiftly enacted for the victors' own

purposes (Kammerer 2008, 25). At best, worldly courts could lay bare guilt but they could not help overcome the past nor achieve divine forgiveness. More importantly, the *people* who had suffered under Nazi aggression had not been provided any form of compensation nor any form of proof that the Germans had changed and meant it (Kammerer 2008, Ibid.).

In the letters and documents discussed by historians of the ASF, one recognizes how Kreyssig conceptualized "the people" *(Volk).* Peoples were for him interchangeable with nation-states. In his letter of intent read out to the synod of the Protestant Church in a meeting in Berlin in 1958, Kreyssig is documented as stating that:

> As a sign for [asking for forgiveness] we ask those people, who suffered violence through us, to allow us to do something good in their country with our own hands and our own means; a village, a settlement, a church, a hospital or whatever communal service they want, we want to erect as a sign of reconciliation. Let us begin with Poland, Russia, and Israel, as most probably we have hurt these the most (Kammerer 2008, 13).[168]

While Poland and Russia were brutally invaded and violated by the German military, Israel as a nation-state was not founded until after the war in 1948 and was not territorially violated by the Germans. In a theologically-inflected twist, however, the murdered Jews of Europe and those Jews who might have survived German atrocities in addition to other Jewish groups already living in Israel are considered to be one people and are referred to as Israel. Kreyssig's point of reference is the newly founded state of Israel, located on a particular territory. In that sense, doing good for Israel becomes interchangeable with doing good for historically violated Jews. In his theological vision, Jews are the people of (biblical) Israel, which is represented by the modern nation-state of Israel. The Jewish people, and the Israeli state then are intrinsically intertwined in this formulation as the figure of biblical Israel. Consequently, harming or attacking the state of Israel is similarly an attack against a historically violated Jewish community, because the people and nation have been conflated. Indeed, Kreyssig is described by fellow clergy and theologians as someone who believes that God has chosen particular peoples, here meant in the modern sense of the nation, for particular divine purposes (Kammerer 2008, 28).

The chosen people in Kreyssig's elaborations about atonement are not the Jews, or even Israel for that matter, but the Germans themselves. Each single member of the German people—faithful Christians in particular—is called upon to accept God's offer of forgiveness. Kreyssig is quoted as saying the following in this matter:

> Forgiveness, as it was procured for us once and for all by Christ, is being offered to us [again] as reconciliation with God, salvation and peace for a renewed life; this in turn [shall have] a healing effect for humans and creatures among one another (Kammerer 2008, 14).[169]

---

[168] My own translation from the German original: "Des zum Zeichen bitten wir die Voelker, die Gewalt von uns erlitten haben, dass sie uns erlauben, mit unseren Haenden und mit unseren Mitteln in ihrem Land etwas Gutes zu tun, ein Dorf, eine Siedlung, eine Kirche, ein Krankenhaus oder was sie sonst Gemeinnuetziges wollen, als Versoehnungszeichen zu errichten. Lasst uns mit Polen, Russland und Israel beginnen, denen wir wohl am meisten wehgetan haben." The letter further specifies how healthy German men and women of ages 17 and older are asked to come forward to provide voluntary service for one year. Accommodation, food, travel costs and basic expenses will be provided through private and church donations. Further, this call was scheduled to be announced in the national press and media (radio and television) and further support was to be sought from the German states (FRG and GDR) as well as the respective embassies or official representations. Kreyssig emphasizes that this form of voluntary service is not aid or redress *(Wiedergutmachung)* but a plea for forgiveness. (Kammerer 2008, 13).

[169] The German original reads as follows: "Uns ist in der Vergebung, die Christus ein fuer alle Mal fuer uns erworben hat, Versohnung mit Gott, Heilung und Frieden als neues, urspruengliches Leben angeboten, und das wiederum mit heilender Wirkung fuer Menschen und Geschoepfe untereinander."

Atonement, then, comes in the form of a call to renew the bond, as a German people, that Jesus Christ initiated between sinners and God by dying on the cross (Kammerer 2008, Ibid.). Further, atonement can only be experienced through labor itself, on behalf of those who have suffered at the hands of the Germans. Kreyssig's Protestant-inflected atonement project could be dubbed the first transitional justice program of the post-WWII era. Yet there is a crucial element in Kreyssig's conception of atonement that makes any temporally defined idea of *transition* rather irrelevant. Atonement, as a peace building project, is not intended to arrive at a certain end point. In the theological sense, as it's used here, atonement is directed towards God's mercy. A Protestant individual is never certain of being forgiven, and this uncertainty compels a good soul to continue seeking atonement through faith and good deeds.

The labor-service provided by the ASF is the means of atonement; it is not an act of reconciliation or worldly redress, according to Kreyssig. Reconciliation can only be delivered through God's mercy; other human beings and *peoples* such Poland, Russia, and Israel cannot confer this forgiveness nor God's mercy. The crucial element in Kreyssig's conception of atonement is that it will never transition to something like an endpoint but must renew itself with each new generation of Germans who take up the burden of guilt and practice atonement anew. Hence, Germans as a nation remain forever guilty. In the last instance, this is not even about Jews or about Germany's neighboring states, but about clearing Germany's bad conscience through labor.

The act of labor is at the same time a reminder that one is still indebted to God. Implicit in the act is the notion of guilt. Kreyssig argued for a notion of collective guilt that also included those who had not committed any crimes but had failed to act to prevent crimes from happening during the years of the Nazi regime. Therefore, everyone was guilty and no one should be tried by the worldly judicial system alone. The better option was to be given a chance to atone in order to undergo a moral transformation and find reconciliation with God. In this vein, it is perhaps not surprising that Kreyssig is utterly disappointed by "older brother" Israel for having executed Adolf Eichmann (Kammerer 2008, 25). His disappointment stems from two principles that deserve a closer look. First, Kreyssig is disappointed because he thought the "older brothers" would themselves understand that worldly law would not be sufficient to bring about justice. Second, Kreyssig is disappointed by "mother Germany" for having betrayed her son. In Kreyssig's words, this is simply moral bankruptcy and displays how Germany is avoiding responsibility by not confronting its own guilt and its guilty children. Eichmann, then, is a cheap sacrifice for a sin that cannot be forgiven or punished by worldly means.[170]

The notion of collective guilt deserves closer scrutiny, since this was never embraced by the judicial system or liberal intellectuals. It remained a notion in the Churches, and eventually inscribed a social form of conduct in relation to the National Socialist past. Liberal intellectuals and political theorists, such as Karl Jaspers and Hannah Arendt, were suspicious of this concept of collective guilt because it relativized the particular responsibility of acting individuals. According to these intellectuals, guilty individuals should be tried individually, based on the degree of their crimes. Because, writes Arendt in her essay on collective guilt, "If everyone is guilty, then no one is guilty." Arendt is referring to the general plea entered by lower Nazi clerks, who argued that they were simply doing their jobs, just like everyone else (Arendt 2000). Arendt's main point is that even in a bad system that warps its members into criminals, individuals still must be tried for their deeds. Hence, for Arendt, collective guilt can

[170] Kreyssig's position was in no way unique. The entire Protestant Church propagated forgiveness of crimes committed by former Nazis, mobilizing a similar notion of collective guilt and the idea that humans are sinners by nature. The difference, however, between the stance of the Protestant Church and Kreyssig's own was rather procedural. While both welcomed court interventions, public trials and judicial hearings, they did so mainly as a way of re-socializing Germans into public institutions as credible organs of state. Yet Kreyssig regarded atonement through labor as the logical next step in repenting and seeking forgiveness.

only be *symbolic*. Both Arendt and Jaspers were still in favor of the rule of law and even for advancing collective guilt, but strictly as symbolic coinage.

Jaspers specifically held a university lecture on "The Question of Guilt" (orig. *Die Schuldfrage*) in the post-war context, in order to name and acknowledge guilt in various ways. He explained that guilt could be categorized in four ways: first as legal (criminal), as in breaking the law; second as political, as in policies upheld through governance; third as moral, by following orders without questioning their righteousness. The fourth category he calls metaphysical and it applies to all three previous categories, in so far as one stands by and does not prevent evil or injustice from happening in the legal, political and moral realms. Although Jaspers's systematic differentiation and his inclusion of the metaphysical also functions as a form of a pluralized guilt, he sets two defining boundaries on his conception of guilt. First, metaphysical guilt can only be absolved by God and not by a court, by another political regime or by one's own conscience. Second, guilty are those who were witness to crimes and in a position to act but failed to do so for some reason. In other words, Jaspers does not advance a theory of collective guilt that can be extended to the younger generation and the generations born after the war (Jaspers 1946).[171]

The notion of guilt that both liberal thinkers engage and the one that is practiced by the post-war German state is temporally bounded and specific to particular places and people. In contrast, Kreyssig mobilizes a Protestant rationale for his conception of a collective guilt that transcends time, place and a particular people in order to work towards German national salvation. By referencing the New Testament, he constructs an analogy between the death of Jesus Christ as an act of atonement for the original sin of mankind and the action of the social volunteers, who are atoning for the sins of their parents. In other words, Kreyssig understands the Nazi regime as the perpetrators of an original (collective) sin that can only be overcome by the individual efforts of each and every member of the German nation.[172]

The first exchange project with Israel is established in the summer of 1961 and coincides with two historical events. One is the public and televised Eichmann trial in Jerusalem and the other is the construction of the Berlin Wall.[173] In order to avoid emotional challenges for Israel and Germany, the first trip is postponed until after the summer of 1962. Out of the approximately 3,000 *kibbutz* settlements, only ten agree to host German volunteers. But even those welcoming *kibbutzim* prefer not to have the Germans present during the summer, when school children come for camp (Legerer 2011b, 207). A breakthrough moment for the ASF has to do with an unfinished school for the blind in Jerusalem. Previously funded with financial support from Argentina and South Africa, the money had dried up and the school was in dire need of financial help. The ASF provided (voluntary) man power and 50,000 DM to finish building the school within three months. The school is financed and supported by "the committee of service providers for Israel in the German Protestant Church." Protestant officials within the church and the ASF agree that managing this project well would establish solid bonds of trustworthiness (Legerer 2011b, Ibid.). They are proven right and several new projects follow after this one, with Israeli delegations asking the ASF for direct support (Legerer 2011b, 209).

---

[171] According to a Jaspers expert, political theorist Carmen Dege, Jaspers opened his first university lecture in October 1945 with the question of guilt. The book was published a year later and sold poorly in Germany. It was nevertheless translated into English the next year, because it provided a perspective on discussions and debates about German guilt in the immediate post-war context. Based on personal conversation in June 2018, in Berlin.

[172] Legerer describes this as a theological-psychological process, I would add that it is a fundamentally Protestant way of inculcating one's interior life with a certain Protestant ethic. See Legerer, Anton (2005): "Preparing the Ground for Constitutionalization through Reconciliation Work" in 6, *German Law Journal*, 465-471.

[173] According to Legerer, Kreyssig perceived the physical separation of the two Germanies as a form of divine collective punishment that needed to be accepted as an ongoing reminder of committed crimes in the name of nationalism. He also chose to stay within the GDR. See Ibid.

While the first young Germans to go to Israel were presented as the new, innocent Germans, they are also represented to the Israeli partner organizations as seeking conscious atonement for their parents' generation (Wienand 2012). They are presented as having never forgotten their fathers' crimes. In a conversation with Werner Schiffauer, a German anthropologist working on migration and Islam in Germany and a former ASF volunteer, a more complex picture emerged about atoning. Schiffauer explained to me that most young volunteers, especially of his generation, had no personal or family memories of the Holocaust, partly because personal complicity was usually denied within German families (Welzer, Moller, and Tschuggnall 2002).[174] Nor did they feel especially guilty. The ASF labor-services were an ethical alternative to compulsory military service. Conscientious objectors, such as Schiffauer and most of his middle-class academic peers, enrolled because they had to perform an alternative form of civil service. A sense of guilt and of atonement sank in gradually, since one was continuously reminded of the good service one was doing both for the host country and for Germany. It was through actual labor that one was socialized into guilt, responsibility and atonement for the duration of service, which could last up to two years.[175]

4.4 The Emergence of the Both-Sides Logic

The ASF initially sent around 15 volunteers per year to Israel and spent on average 200,000 DM annually to build social and communal institutions there.[176] With the Six-Day War between Israel and a coalition of Egypt, Jordan and Syria, and with the ongoing occupation of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, several critical questions emerged as to what the ASF's position was in all of these conflicts. Based on diary entries and letters from ASF volunteers, two positions emerged. One position identifies with the Jewish people and the state of Israel and views them as under attack yet again, likening the Arab armies to the German Nazis and presenting the German volunteers as sharing a position with their Jewish hosts.[177] During the Six-Day War, German volunteers referred to the Israeli Defense Army as "our soldiers" and participated in combat-survival exercises within their *kibbutzim*. Some of them even played with the idea of enlisting in the reserve army, something Kreyssig is informed about and does not find improbable or objectionable (Kammerer 2008, 122). What emerges out of the situation, at least for one contingent of the ASF volunteers during those years, is a strong identification with the Israeli side as a form of producing solidarity with and

[174] The ongoing practice of denial is understudied in Holocaust memory studies. Welzer et al. point to the fact that after the 'memory boom' in the 1990s, third and fourth generation post-war Germans confronted their parents about their grandparents. The conversation usually shifted from the individual to the grandfather's entire generation, deflecting from the specific grandfather in question.

[175] Based on personal conversation in Berlin in March 2018.

[176] By now, 180 volunteers are sent out each year to various European countries and the US and Israel. See annual report for more updated information on organization and finances: https://www.asf-ev.de/fileadmin/Redaktion/Dateien/Publikationen/Jahresberichte/Jahresbericht_2017_web.pdf.
Kreyssig's first project idea was to build a 'house of faith' in West Jerusalem in order to bring together Catholics, Protestants and Jews in Israel. The project did not materialize for various reasons, among them because the Jewish community that was interested in sharing such a house with the Protestants and Catholics in Jerusalem was a rather minor and marginal one. Another objection was brought by the Protestant representation in Jordan, who urged Kreyssig to support a similar project in the Jordanian West Bank. The West Bank was part of Jordan until 1967, with Bethlehem comprising the biggest and most significant Arab-Christian community in the region. What strikes me is that Palestinian Muslims who were present within the borders of 1948 Israel are not taken into consideration at all for this project. The project was given up altogether and the ASF moved to work mostly with secular *kibbutz* organizers.

[177] One volunteer writes in a letter that only a week ago their *kibbutz* had been on the Jordanian border, but now the Israeli territories have expanded all the way to the River Jordan and there is so much more work to do. Atonement then can simply expand into the newly conquered territory and the Germans can plan new projects and help build settlements. Neither the Palestinians living under occupation nor their fate are mentioned in those letters.

protecting the Jewish victims. This identification extends to the volunteers' own feelings of being similarly under attack by the Arab armies.[178]

The second position vis-à-vis the Israeli-Palestinian conflict first emerges after 1973, with a clearer picture of the military occupation, and expressions of this position peak during the First Intifada in 1987. A conscientious objector, who had decided to go to Israel in 1973, describes his labor-service as a dilemma involving what it meant to aid a warring party in the Middle Eastern Conflict. He adds, however, that, given the emigration of Jews from Europe, Germany was partly responsible for the situation. On the basis of this responsibility, he claims that Germans are obliged to a "critical sympathy" vis-à-vis Israel and the Palestinian people (Kammerer 2008, 123). Slowly, a position expressive of the both-sides logic emerges within the ASF, partly because the territorial expansion of Israel facilitates more direct contact with Palestinians living under Israeli occupation. Yet ASF does not extend its labor-service to the occupied territories, though it does support Israeli-Arab[179] projects within the Israeli national territory of 1948, as part of extending its mission of reconciliation to the Palestinians.

This turn toward the Palestinians living in Israel is primarily guided by the idea of facilitating a peaceful Jewish homeland. It is by no means a counter-position to the active search for atonement for the crimes committed against European Jews nor does it signal a turning away from atonement per se. Rather, it is an extension of this moral mission. The work of ASF with Palestinian communities, however, is eyed critically within Jewish circles in Israel, who would like to see a more determined stance for the Israeli-Jewish side. Critical voices among the volunteers within ASF urge the organization to take a more active role in criticizing Israel's actions during the Intifada uprisings. An official letter penned by the advisory board in 1990 emphasizes once more that during these difficult times it is even more crucial to continue the labor-services for atonement in Israel (Kammerer 2008, 239–41).

For most supporters of the ASF in Germany and Israel, this gesture of continued support for Israel by way of atonement is not a sufficient alignment with Israel but merely lip service. Thirty years after its official foundation, the ASF is tightly knit with German governmental institutions and representative civil society institutions, but it is also undergoing a crisis with its most important people of atonement, Israel. The close relation to state politics is partly due to its organizational structure, since it is part of the Protestant Church[180] networks; but it is also partly because ASF volunteers mostly come from middle-class bourgeois Christian families and this eases their access to politics, media and civil society organizations.[181] Several SPD politicians with prestigious positions within the German

[178] This notion of being under attack as a German when Israel is being attacked also showed itself during the Gaza Operation in 2012. The most widely-circulated populist German newspaper *Die Bild* printed on its cover page a map of Berlin and compared it to Israel under attack by rocket missiles from its neighboring states. The image was accompanied by the question: What if Berlin were Israel? The newspaper claims a daily circulation among 4 million Germans. Part of *Die Bild*'s corporate identity requires employees to sign a contract in which they agree to the six "essentials" of the company. These essentials were first introduced in 1967, then slightly changed in 1990 after reunification and supplemented in 2001 after the attacks of September 11. The second of six essentials declares support for Israel. The German original states this as the *Lebensrechte* of Israel, or 'rights to live,' which seems to be broader than just the right to exist. See link: http://nachhaltigkeit.axelspringer.de/de/grundsaetze/unternehmensgrundsaetze.html.

[179] Palestinians living within the official 1948 borders of Israel are categorized as Israeli-Arab, hence my use of the term to signal the status of Palestinians, both Christian and Muslim, living within the Israeli state as citizens, as opposed to those Palestinians who remain under occupation and who were not offered any services by the ASF.

[180] The Protestant Church and the SPD have historically close ties. The Christian Democrats emerged as a Catholic counter-position to the SPD and its Protestant milieu. Throughout the post-war years, the Christian Democrats built a profile of general Christian conservatism. Angela Merkel is not only the first woman to take a leading role in the party; she is also the first Eastern German *Protestant* chancellor of the CDU. In contrast, the SPD has always downplayed or deemphasized its Protestant features.

[181] ASF Volunteers are treated as honorary ambassadors of Germany when traveling abroad. As such, they are invited and endorsed by the respective embassies of the countries of service. Similarly, they are considered

parliament have been former volunteers with the ASF or have served as members of the advisory board.[182] By virtue of their direct access to politics, the ASF published a declaration in 1991 in the *Jerusalem Post* in which it urged the German CDU-run government to provide means for Israel's secured defense against Iraqi aggressions until all Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and Iraq's capacity to build such weapons were successfully destroyed (Kammerer 2008, 241).

The declaration, which was mostly written by one contingent within the ASF, has been criticized by various other groups within the ASF for not sticking to the pacifist line and for not having sought authorization by the advisory board to publish it. In Israel, however, the letter signaled commitment to the Israeli nation-state, as a Jewish project, and it helped organize a harmonious 30th year anniversary celebration of German-Israeli relations. The internal crisis nevertheless had a ripple effect, causing the re-organization of labor-service within Israel when it comes to Israeli-Arabs in 1994. From then on, the ASF will stop sending volunteers to work solely with Palestinian communities. Volunteers who work with Palestinians will be assigned a second duty to work with Holocaust survivors and/or Jewish social organizations and they will divide their time between these two projects. Further, projects with Palestinians will only be supported if they involve dialogue, encounter or collaboration with Israeli Jews. In other words, the both-sides logic is also extended to the Palestinians living within Israel (Kammerer 2008, 242–44).

As part of renewing "solidarity with the Jewish people" starting in the mid-1990s, all ASF projects within Israel combine work with Jewish Holocaust survivors with another social project. Relatedly, solidarity with Israel is redefined within the other European target countries and the US; now it becomes a matter of emphasizing and mobilizing support for Israel in those countries, while ASF fashions itself as Christian advocates and facilitators of Jewish networks that support Israel from abroad. In the same vein, social work with non-Jewish groups in those countries is always combined with commemorations of the Holocaust, the fate of European Jewry and solidarity with Israel.

Stemming from a sense of national guilt in need of atonement, the ASF expands its labor-service projects in the early 2000s to immigrant community organizers, such as the district mothers, or to European youth. In addition to previous programs in which Germans travelled to other countries, now youth from those countries are invited to work in concentration camp memorials and related institutions in Germany, in order to get a sense of how Germans deal with the traces of the Holocaust. Instead of collective guilt, it is responsibility for a common future that mobilizes these new target groups in providing their labor force for atonement. This common future is posited on two levels. Nationally, it refers to the future of a multiculturally diverse Germany that carries forward its responsibility for the historically injured Jews in the form of solidarity with Israel. Within Europe, it refers to a synchronized form of understanding and supporting the German-inflected project of national atonement as one of *eternal* European responsibility vis-à-vis Jewish Israel.[183]

The Protestant Church (EKD) writes in its annual report in 2006 that the ASF and its engagement within civil society is "the trademark of Protestantism" (Kammerer 2008, 220).

---

ambassadors of peace for the country of service once they have returned to Germany. In this sense, voluntary ASF work is intertwined with access to political channels and church-politics networks.

[182] The list seems incredibly long and is not collected on one particular page, but I gathered this information by scrolling through former and current SPD parliamentarians. Historians of the ASF just mention prominent politicians and the influence the ASF had on German politics by virtue of shaping the hearts and minds of the political elite, without going into detail.

[183] See also Chancellor Angela Merkel's latest speech given in October 2018 at the Holocaust memorial Yad Vashem. Merkel emphasizes the *eternal responsibility* of Germans for Israel, because of the Holocaust. The rest of the speech is about aiding Israel's security by circumventing Iran's nuclear program. Original in German: https://www.bundeskanzlerin.de/bkin-de/aktuelles/rede-von-bundeskanzlerin-merkel-bei-der-begegnung-mit-dem-praesidenten-des-staates-israel-reuven-rivlin-1533970

Perhaps it is not surprising that this kind of religiosity was never viewed as violating the separation of state and religion, since it is neatly commensurate with the workings of the state as a secular organization. The ASF, because rooted in history in this way, becomes the declared motive force behind the actualization of a new post-WWII German national consciousness, one that is capable of grasping in a real way the consequences of National Socialism. The interventions of the ASF make it such that these consequences can "only be engaged with through hands-on and concrete practical labor in dialogue" with the violated peoples (Kammerer 2008, Ibid.). Over the years the notion of guilt was taken over by the notion of responsibility. Now, the notion of collective guilt underwrites the notion of collective responsibility. Further, it underwrites the conduct of citizenship in several, legally consequential ways.

The same year in which the EKD declares ASF the trademark of Protestantism, three different German principalities—Hesse, Baden-Württemberg and Bavaria—introduce specific citizenship tests for Muslims. Applicants needed to answer half of the 30 questions correctly. Failing certain critical questions such as these two above, however, could open the door to the applicant's further scrutiny for potential extremist ideology. While ethnic Christian-Germans might similarly fail such questions or harbor anti-Zionist sentiments, so far they have not been scrutinized using the same legal and policy means.

By turning guilt into "responsibility for the future," a wider German multicultural demographic could be addressed and made accountable for failing to relate to Israel as the historically violated Jewish people. In a petition formulated in January, 2018, by all parties in the parliament except for Die Linke and the AfD, this responsibility for the future is exchanged for a "special responsibility to combat anti-Semitism."[184] I should add that the EKD was the driving force in drafting this petition, by way of their SPD representative Kerstin Griese, who is also on the board of the EKD and represents the Protestant Church within the SPD in the parliament. The petition itself was submitted to the parliament after the last federal election in November, 2017, before a governing body had been formed.

[184] Please note that I will be citing from this petition, which was presented and accepted on January 17, 2018: http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/19/004/1900444.pdf. The decision of the parliament was later included in the contract of the coalition parties (CDU & SPD). In a presentation on February 19, 2018, at the Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung (the political think-tank of the SPD), Kerstin Griese was invited to speak as the ombudsperson for Protestant Church affairs in the parliament along with a scholar on anti-Semitism Juliane Wetzel, the speaker of the Jewish Central Council Daniel Botman, and the vice president of German-Israeli Relations Christian Lange. The conversation, although foregrounding so-called imported Muslim anti-Semitism, crystallized around a problem many found with the mostly Palestinian anti-Israel demonstrations. The most recent one, ignited by Trump's decision to move the American embassy to Jerusalem, had just taken place in December and had caused outrage because homemade Israeli flags had been torn and burnt. Yet all speakers, except for Juliane Wetzel, agreed that anti-Semitism—or, more precisely, hatred of Israel—as expressed by Middle Eastern immigrants in fact emanated from Islam. The meeting was exclusive and only accessible by way of direct invitation; my inclusion was facilitated by a member of the Muslim caucus within the SPD. Yet no official Muslim or Palestinian organization was present at the meeting, as I pointed out to the speakers as a way of also questioning their frame of an anti-Semitism rooted in Islam. Kerstin Griese argued that her work includes dealing with both sides and that she always attends to the Palestinian side as well as the Protestant and other denominational Churches in the West Bank when visiting Israel. Other attendees, mostly those of the Catholic and Protestant Churches, murmured that my comments were annoying and disturbing. The speaker of the Central Council for the Jews explained that Jewish organizations were the only ones to stand up to xenophobia and racism, that they had always defended immigrants in Germany from violent attacks. The issue of Israel-Palestine was not engaged. The vice president of the committee on Israeli-German relations was the only one who had something 'positive' to offer regarding the problem with Israeli-related anti-Semitism. He insisted that Israel just had an image problem. The best way to solve this was by organizing Tel Aviv Beach parties in Germany and by marketing all the goods that are imported from Israel or companies owned by Israelis in the most research-driven arenas, such as the pharmaceutical and technological sectors. The anti-Semitism expert, however, disagreed with such a PR strategy, explaining that announcing that Jews own such important companies even within Germany could fuel conspiracy theories and ultimately anti-Semitism.

The timing and content of the petition is interesting in several ways. First of all, the AfD had managed to enter the German parliament in 2017, as the largest opposition party with a clear anti-immigration and anti-Islam agenda. In contrast, the traditional, established and conservative parties had lost the votes and the trust of their electorates; the CDU especially, with Angela Merkel at its helm, was accused of politicking on behalf of refugees and Muslims but not on behalf of Germans. The petition first declares combatting anti-Semitism as the task of the entire society, not just the German state or Jewish organizations. It then proceeds to describe a new form of anti-Semitism taking shape in the wake of immigration from the Middle East and North Africa, regions depicted as "fertile grounds" for anti-Semitism and hostility towards Israel. While the petition declares all forms of anti-Semitism *shameful* (orig. *beschämend*)—including right-wing nationalism, the BDS movement and criticism of Israel by immigrants to Germany—it notes that not all of these are legally punishable yet. It then clearly outlines that refugees and new immigrants will be held to certain moral standards, if they want to reside permanently in Germany. Integration and immigration are then dealt with as the central issues of the entire petition. The petition even urges the parliament, and consequently the policies that would grow out of it, not to shy away from dialogue but to engage with groups from different backgrounds and religious affiliations when it comes to strategizing how to combat anti-Semitism among them.

In the petition's following paragraph, special responsibility for Israel is emphasized yet again, this time adding that this responsibility also pertains to securing Israel as a Jewish and democratic state. "Israel's right to exist and its security are not negotiable for us." Thus reads the sentence that literally demarcates a "we" consisting of the parliamentary representatives of all Germans. The text has a bold and combative tone. It even goes on to declare that every person who steps foot on German soil is entering German constitutional territory. Any attempt to violate the dignity of a Jewish person is an attack against the liberal commonwealth and will not be tolerated. What can be detected by reading the text closely is how seamlessly it shifts between the state of Israel and a Jewish person. By mobilizing the first article of the German constitution—"Human dignity is inviolable"—in reference both to Israel and to Jewish persons, the German parliament declares both forms of attack as a violation of human rights, which then gets cast indirectly as an attack on Germany's core values. The conclusion to the first part of the petition again addresses migrants and their rightful integration. Here, migrants pose a task for Germans—namely, German are obliged to teach migrants about this special responsibility. Further, the unrestricted acceptance of Jewish life, which in this context also refers to the state of Israel, will be the measure for successful integration.

The above-described conflation of the Jewish people, Israel as a biblical figure and the modern state of Israel by Lothar Kreyssig in his atonement efforts gains a new political and legal quality. Kreyssig's notion of guilt underwrites this petition of special responsibility for Israel, by demarcating spaces and actions that are yet not legally punishable yet similarly intolerable within the framework of this special responsibility.

The petition further welcomes the redefinition of anti-Semitism proposed to the German parliament in September, 2017, by the International Holocaust Research Alliance (IHRA). The previous working definition, adopted from the United Nations formulation, had not included opposition to Israeli politics and anti-Zionism as forms of anti-Semitism. The new working definition is formulated and adopted as follows:

> Anti-Semitism is a particular perception of Jews and can be expressed in the form of hatred. Anti-Semitism can target, by word or deed, Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, as well as Jewish communal spaces or religious institutions. [. . .] Further, the state of Israel can also become target of such attacks, because it is considered to be a Jewish collective.[185]

[185] The original in German can be found here, on page 2: http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/19/004/1900444.pdf. The German original states the following: "[…]

The petition asks the judiciary and the executive branches to adopt this new definition into their penal and surveillance systems. Specifically, it asks these bodies to reconsider the right to assembly and free speech when it concerns the state of Israel and the violation of Israeli symbols such as the national flag.[186] Several points in the proposed policy to combat anti-Semitism refer to immigrants specifically, mostly in terms of how to include the special responsibility for Jews and Israel within integration curricula. One point, however, clarifies that immigrants and refugees who engage in anti-Semitic demagoguery can be deported or rejected in their asylum cases.[187]

Legal applicability of all policy points is still under review. Yet the newly institutionalized secretary for cases of anti-Semitism, Felix Klein, already announced that he will push for the broadening of legally punishable anti-Semitic acts, including verbal attacks and hate-speech against Israel. Klein started his career by expressing doubt that Muslim anti-Semitism only amounted to 5% of all annual anti-Semitic attacks.[188] He also stated that he would like to continue the German Islam Conference by latest 2019 with a particular focus on anti-Semitism. Atonement, guilt, and responsibility previously conceptualized in order to point out the limitations of secular law when it comes to overcoming the crimes of nationalism, now have become the moral frame of German nationalism by way of underwriting the conduct of citizenship and permeating immigration laws.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have tried to demonstrate that tolerant citizenship did not simply mean to shed religious sentiments from certain public, social, and political matters but to embody a secular morality underwritten by a Protestant notion of atonement, guilt, and responsibility. The notion of tolerance that works as the rightful conduct of civic conduct is implicitly defined in certain Protestant ways that have find their way into secular governance of citizenship and migration.

When the notion of tolerance is discussed in relation to Middle Eastern immigrants and descendants thereof, it is considered to be in a state of lack, and a problem of unrefined and unbounded religiosity grounded in Islam and spilling over into the public. Here, the common assumption is that Islam was not entirely reformed and secularized to fit a diverse nation-state where one encounters and interacts with members of other religions and communities. More importantly, Muslims are perceived to be still drenched in their traditional communities and religious way of life, hence, displaying raw forms of intolerance and rejection of liberal-democracy in general and Jews in particular.

The usual antidote to the Muslim problem is a historicist approach and/or one that tames religion as a bounded object into a secure place. Both ways of working against traditional Islam is by assuming that it takes up too much space and legitimacy over questions better resolved by a worldly logic. One declared goal of counteracting traditional Islam, especially in civic education, is to circumvent Islamic extremism and intolerance by way of enabling a more tolerant Muslim, a German Muslim.

In the workshop encounter, I discussed in the first part of this chapter, most female participants were practicing their religion as pious Muslims. Yet the issue of anti-Semitism as it was detected by the ASF was not grounded in a religious intolerance against Jews, but in biographical details of some of the Palestinian community organizers. These historical

---

Antisemitismus eine bestimmte Wahrnehmung von Juden [ist], die sich als Hass gegenüber Juden ausdrücken kann. Der Antisemitismus richtet sich in Wort und Tat gegen jüdische Einzelpersonen und/oder deren Eigentum, sowie gegen jüdische Gemeindeinstitutionen oder religiöse Einrichtungen." "[…]Darüber hinaus kann auch der Staat Israel, der dabei als jüdisches Kollektive wird, Ziel solcher Angriffe sein."

[186] See same petition, p.3 onwards: http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/19/004/1900444.pdf.

[187] See p. 4, point 6.

[188] Please note that Muslim anti-Semitism refers to ethnic-immigrant descent of the assaulter, not to his motifs.

reasons for anger at the Israeli state was not addressed or allowed to be discussed. In other words, the Palestinian community organizers had in fact historical-political reasons for their aversion against the state of Israel; they did not draw on a religious explanation.

The major religious notion present in the workshop and in the structuration of projects combatting anti-Semitism has been the Protestant notion of atonement in the way it is expanded as a special and eternal responsibility for the state of Israel that stands in for the 6 million violated and murdered Jews during the Holocaust. By demonstrating how in fact the notion of tolerance has been shaped in Germany, I have argued that German Muslims are not simply asked to shed their religiosity, but to cultivate a secularity deeply inscribed by Protestant morals for the figure of the Jew. In other words, German Muslims are those who themselves embody and are incorporated within a Protestant morality in the way they relate not only to Jews as individuals or a religious community, but to the state of Israel. Jewish people and individuals and the state of Israel are conflated in a Protestant-theological understanding of what a Jew is and what the Jewish people offer for the salvation of Germans as a mostly Protestant demographics, but also for Germans as a people of the nation-state, the German nation. This Protestant shaped relationship, as I tried to show in the last section of this chapter, in fact transcends secular and temporal dimensions of guilt and responsibility, and claims an eternal obligation beyond actual and ethnic perpetrators.

The special responsibility growing out of the Holocaust then re-inscribes the German nation as an eternal Protestant-Christian nation tasked with transforming and converting newcomers as well to take on that project. Yet this task, although grounded in Protestant morals, is not argued as a Protestant, Christian or a religious task but a secular one. Here, I also want to be clear that I am not producing a counter-polemics as in describing Protestantism or Christianity as the real problem with religion. Rather, as I tried to demonstrate throughout the chapter, Protestantism and certain notions thereof have entered and permeated the public through social- and state-institutions by way of provided labor-service through organizations such as the ASF. Further, the EKD as a church organization represented also in the parliament has been pushing for a certain morality to take shape and find ground in legislation, policies and opinion-making.

I have tried to demonstrate here that secularity is not only productive boundary-making between public and private or the set of norms that go into defining what religion is and where its place should be, as discussed in chapter 2 in relation to the Holocaust. Secularity is also about the ability to translate religious notions into a state form, the most literal of these translations is the eternal responsibility for the state of Israel, because of the Holocaust. In this chapter, I have taken on a different direction by showing how tolerance is underwritten by Protestant atonement. I aimed at showing how this particular notion of guilt and reconciliation shaped secularity and what it means to be a German citizen. In the last instance it is about majoritarian norms and values channeled through various state institutions and procedures that can find their way in shaping secular institutions, in this case citizenship and the regulation of migrants. It is almost ironic that the ideas of a former state judge, who was utterly disillusioned by the German state to bring about justice through worldly means, are neatly incorporated in regulating and governing immigrant and religious minorities today.

Chapter 5: Fearing Muslims in Auschwitz, Remembering Humanity

How does one talk about race after Auschwitz, when the category of race was erased from German public discourse with the destruction of the death camps? What is the pedagogical legacy of the Auschwitz memorial, when race is disavowed yet still effective in structuring social relations? Moreover, what if the public relation to the Holocaust structures current racial relations in such a manner that certain ethnic and religious particularities become threatening and others invisible?

This chapter focuses on an educational trip to Auschwitz for students enrolled at a secondary school in a low-income neighborhood in order to discuss the simmering anxiety over visible ethno-religious differences as a social and political threat. For the two main organizers of the trip, two social workers of Middle Eastern descent, Auschwitz was a place of universal human learning, where lessons about moral-ethical failure could be taught. Their stated aim was to situate Auschwitz as a teaching ground, where students would learn about being tolerant citizens, irrespective of education, class, ethnic background, legal status, or religious affiliation. As a memorial site, Auschwitz could teach the students to ask questions about state violence and crimes against humanity, executed by ordinary people. As such, this school trip was not funded by the Ministries to combat Islamic extremism and the social workers disavowed such anti-radicalization projects as counter-productive for the purpose of the trip.

Here, I attend to how the school trip to the Auschwitz memorial was prepared by the social workers as a *secular pilgrimage*[189] in which humanity is remembered free of threatening difference of any sort, but specifically religious difference. By doing so, I will describe and discuss how two racialized, opposing (but never juxtaposed) positions emerged and how they were related to by social workers, volunteers, and students; these two positions can be described as "the Jewish survivor vs. the Muslim terrorist." These two positions, I claim, were both racial configurations and embedded in an ordering mechanism of *racelessness.*[190] This ordering mechanism either heightened religious and ethnic difference, as was the case with Muslim difference, or it erased Jewish difference. Further, this ordering effected a sense that one was under attack by Muslims just like Jews had been by Nazis. Racelessness is conditioned by the post-Holocaust episteme, turning race and other elements of the Holocaust into exceptional phenomena. Yet other and at times unrelated phenomena or groups are read and likened to the elements of the Holocaust. Hence, the Holocaust as the paradigmatic case of genocide and state violence provides a lens.

---

[189] This was a term used by one of the social workers while walking through the 'cleansed' old Jewish neighborhood of Krakow. It was not used at any point during the preparation for the trip, but the term secular pilgrimage captured the purpose of the trip poignantly.

[190] Please note that Goldberg refers in his later work to the condition of the *postracial*, as a condition in which race is thought by social movements as something that has been overcome and should not be mentioned anymore, because it disturbs anti-racism efforts (Goldberg 2015, 2009). For the issue I will discuss here, I have chosen to go with the concept of racelessness and not postracial for various reasons. The term postracial acknowledges the existence of prior racial relations, be they governmental or social. In the German case, race is tied up exclusively with *Rasse* as a pseudo-scientific Nazi concept and has been completely banned from public discourse. Hence, Rasse stands for the wrongful categorization of certain subjects marked as inferior, as opposed to an analytic category that can explain how state structures and social relations create inequality and effect race. In other words, race simply does not exist in German public discourse, and when it comes up it is attached to the Holocaust immediately as something that is misguided and genocidal. The problem that this causes can be best described in how Muslims as a racialized group are talked about, as a religious problem or as inherently inferior because of their culture and not their biology. This kind of speech, when called out as racist, usually is defended with the assertion that one is not talking about Muslims as a race but as a religious/cultural group and that one just wanted to state a problem.

In this chapter, I situate the earlier introduced concepts of race and racelessness within the context of preventing Islamic extremism and the post-Holocaust condition. Race, as the product of racial rule and racial relations emanating from state powers and its effects, has been excavated from European political theory in two distinct forms by theorist David Goldberg (Goldberg 2002, 74–96). In the introduction of this dissertation, I had pointed out these two forms as naturalist and historicist; the former founded on the assumption of an inherent inferiority of certain grouped populations, the latter merely assuming a civilizational lag, one that can be developed according to certain pedagogical measures and political procedures. In the bulk of this dissertation, I have attended to the historicist workings of the state vis-à-vis Muslims primarily through tolerance education as a form of preventing traditional Islam to harden as political extremism.

In the context of the here discussed trip, the concept of race became legible in its *naturalist* form, in for instance the way the Nazis had practiced racial differentiation through racial science, racial laws, and a politics of genocide. This kind of reading and understanding race, is not limited to the trip and this school, it is indicative of how race in the context of Germany is understood, as I will demonstrate in my discussion on Auschwitz as an exceptional space-time for liberal democracy. By contrast, race in its liberal *historicist* formation—a seemingly more benign form of inclusion through education of those groups who are deemed inferior because of their civilization, culture or religion—remained illegible. The workings of race in its historicist logic were related to as a necessary means to prevent radicalization and to foster integration.[191] By mobilizing these two racial relations in the way the participants related to Jews and Muslims after Auschwitz, I try to point out how a notion of racelessness in the context of post-Holocaust Germany organized these two racial logics of naturalism and historicism, respectively as evil and racist or benign and necessary.

The term racelessness requires some explanation, as I am drawing from theorist David Goldberg, in order to talk about the specificities of a particular context and in conjunction with secularity. For now it suffices to say that racelessness in its global emergence is a phenomenon that emerged in various forms as a reaction to racial segregation, colonialism, and the racial atrocities of the Holocaust. Racelessness is a reaction to racial naturalism endorsed by liberal racial historicists in order to redress racial inequalities (Goldberg 2002, 200–203). As a state project, it is endorsed as the modern state's rational identity after irrational racial pasts (Goldberg 2002, 203–6). In the US-context racelessness finds expression in colorblindness, by treating "de facto unlike as de jure alike" (Crenshaw in Goldberg 2002, 212).

In the political context that I am situating in a school trip to Auschwitz, racelessness does not even exist as a term or as a conscious practice. Racelessness can be best described as carrying a difference that is not consequential for being a citizen, because it is either not made public or remains an identity otherwise grounded in some cultural sameness to the norm. Relatedly, those who discuss certain groups as a problem, do so without being aware of the racial reference they are reifying or the racist language they are deploying.

By discussing how racelessness structures relations among the participants in the trip, I will demonstrate what kind of racial references racelessness makes possible. What comes to the fore is how religious difference should be related to and managed in order to maintain racelessness. At this conjuncture, racelessness and secularity, the notion of knowing where to place religion as a secular-liberal subject, converge to give shape to the ideal subjectivity of the citizen, who is required to complete the work of the state by self-censoring and excluding religious difference that cannot be commensurable with the secular nation-state. By attending

[191] I am referring here to the longer genealogies of race within European political thought as first outlined and systematized by Goldberg in *The Racial State* (2002). Goldberg discusses these two strands of racial thought (racial naturalism vs. racial historicism) in the ways they effected racial hierarchies and relations, racelessness being a later neoliberal and hybrid of these two.

to how ethno-religious particularity produced anxiety for and on the trip, I argue that, because of the relation to the Holocaust, both the figure of the Jew and that of the Muslim remain asymmetrically racialized and together work to confirm a Christian-secularized subject as the universal human on which German citizenship is predicated. As part of my argument, I demonstrate that Auschwitz, construed as the exceptional space of heightened religious-racial difference, is approached by the social workers from the perspective of universal humanity. Paradoxically, by hiding any kind of ethnic and religious particularity, the social workers practiced racelessness as a form of redress for the earlier violence unleashed precisely on grounds of religious-racial difference.

By centering the Auschwitz memorial as an exceptional space—whereby Auschwitz, understood as "the margin of the state" (Das and Poole 2009), provides the episteme for the current political order—I aim to show how the relation to Auschwitz in fact enables a new racial ordering of different groups for the German state. Thus Auschwitz is always folded into the order of liberal democracy, as an exceptional space, further emphasizing that 'after Auschwitz' is a time of racelessness.

5.1 Visiting Auschwitz for Humanity

One morning at the training center for tolerance, a social worker from a school called in to book a workshop in a preparation for a memorial trip to Auschwitz. Tom, the director of the training center, told me then that the social worker was of Palestinian descent and his brother, the head of the Berlin Social Democrats had accompanied this Auschwitz trip last year as the patron. When I looked up the trip online, it turned out to be a trip with mostly immigrant-Muslim students, who were described as "outside of German history." Since I was curious to know if this was an exclusively Muslim or immigrant student trip and what the motivation for this trip was, I contacted the coordinator, which resulted in my accompanying the students and the social workers for the school year. Neither the trip nor the school was drawing overwhelmingly from a migrant milieu. Although, the online news had further emphasized the Palestinian-German SPD politician as a role model for immigrant integration.

The school trip to Auschwitz remained officially outside the frame of Islamic extremism. Instead, the two organizers of the trip told me that it was about humanity and universal ethics, about what it means to be a good person and a tolerant citizen and was thus for all students. Yet these two male social workers in their mid-40s were descendants of first-generation immigrants. Majd and Ahmet were, to my knowledge, the only employees from immigrant families on the social worker team.[192] Majd's family, originally from the West Bank, Palestine, had moved to Berlin in the 1970s, while Ahmet was born to Turkish parents who came as guest workers to West Germany in the 1970s. Both had studied education and social work or psychology and had specialized in working with youth of immigrant and low-income families. The purpose of the trip, Majd explained:

> […] was to demonstrate to students that evil things can be done by very educated people and that civilizational achievement does not grant immunity from barbarous deeds. Conversely, very simple people could act morally and ethically right; therefore, the trip is really about showing that human responsibility is not a privilege of the educated class.[193]

In Majd's view, the trip was not geared to any specific "problem-group." Rather, Majd's take was that youth in general must learn that their education is incomplete without a sense of ethics. This he defended as a universal value, not a prerogative of the educated elites. Majd's emphasis on the moral righteousness of simple people was perhaps not fully surprising, given that the school catered to a predominantly working-class, low-income, and chronically

[192] A research couple from the Department of Social Work at the University of Michigan was also collaborating with the social workers. They were the other international research team that I encountered during my research.
[193] From fieldnotes; original in German. All translations from German into English are mine.

unemployed population. But there was more to it. The trip was taking place with the graduating 10th grade. Some of the students were successful enough to receive a diploma and then transition to vocational training. There were also students who would be leaving the school with no diploma and no future prospects. A very small and select group would be nominated to move on to the *Gymnasium*, the actual gateway to higher education. The school itself was also in the midst of restructuring and was expanding their college prep track, in order to teach students until *Abitur*.[194]

In a personal interview, the school director told me that she was happy the students were able to take such an important trip to visit the Auschwitz Memorial, because a trip engaging the Holocaust was usually only afforded to students at the *Gymnasium*. She was affirming to me that the projects undertaken by Majd, such as this one, had elevated the school's reputation; it was now a school with a profile attractive for middle-class families. I could certainly see that, beyond the abstract ideals invoked, there was also a concrete usefulness in this visit to the Auschwitz Memorial and in engaging with Holocaust history. Holocaust engagement had enormous 'symbolic capital' for educational institutions and could endow the school with an elevated image of being enlightened and tolerant. And even though the trip did serve a concrete purpose for the school, the students, and the social environment, in Majd's view the trip was about maintaining universal human dignity regardless of national particularity:

> What could we learn from this history to apply to other contexts, such as Syria, the Middle East, and Africa? This trip is not about guilt. It is about responsibility and dismantling racist prejudices. We want the students to grow, to become more confident and achieve *Bildung*[195] through social work. The students are encouraged to think about their world as something they have a responsibility for. […] We don't want to moralize; we offer a platform for more tolerance, democracy, freedom. We want to approach this history as a universal human history. A history that is not about one designated group of victims and one designated group of culprits; we also do not have a specific ethnic or religious group in mind that needs to be targeted specifically.

In this statement above, same as in most statements made by Majd, the negative notion of guilt was exchanged for universal human values such as tolerance and individual responsibility. It was as if Majd had decoupled Auschwitz from its historical context in order to say that this could happen anywhere and at any time and that anyone would inevitably feel the same about this place, once they knew something more about it. By doing so, he also turned Auschwitz into a frame of reference for "racist prejudices," making Auschwitz into a symbol for racism. But Majd's narrative also acknowledged that actual Holocaust history had itself been removed and that the students were busy thinking about other wars. Most importantly, Majd denationalized Holocaust history by disregarding the historical culprits and victims and turning it into universal human history.

The sense of responsibility, as opposed to guilt, was a recurring theme that Majd translated into direct and concrete action within the school. He showed me that the school had a *Schule ohne Rassismus/Schule mit Courage*[196] plaque right at the main entrance to the

---

[194] *Abitur* is the name of the diploma conferred on German high school students when they graduate from the 13th or 12th grade after a ritualized state examination; it signals a general qualification for university level study.

[195] *Bildung* is the German term for liberal arts education. It aims to make better citizens out of students and goes beyond a conventional understanding of education. The concept of Bildung had been the driving force of Jewish assimilation in the nineteenth century. The historian Geoff Eley described German citizenship as a faculty to be learned, for Jews mostly (Eley 1996). As such the term carries a longer genealogy of the civilizing mission embedded in it. Perhaps not surprisingly, Muslims today are talked about in public discourse as lacking Bildung (education in the sense of civility) alone, which they must acquire in order to become fully accepted members in society. Please note that chapter 2 includes a section on Bildung as a civilizing mission.

[196] This is a nation-wide educational project to combat racism within German schools. The school applies and invites the "school without racism/school with courage" team to host educational workshops and to survey how

building. This plaque, he explained, served as a constant reminder that the school and students have to live up to the practical ideal of an inclusive environment working against racism. Indeed, Majd showed me files containing photos of himself engaging the students in refugee aid work and an environmental project around the school. These ongoing social activities around the school were performed in tandem with his daily business.[197]

The school drew overwhelmingly from low-income families and the student body was mainly ethnic German. Students of immigrant parents comprised a minority in this school. When I compared it to the other schools I had worked at or had been working with in Kreuzberg, Neukölln, Moabit, and Wedding, this school felt ethnically homogeneous. Located in the working-class district of Reinickendorf, the school also drew their student body from a nearby low-income neighborhood originally built as a high-rise social welfare project called *Märkisches Viertel*, usually referred to as *MV*. Although Reinickendorf was a historically Western sector neighborhood, it bordered Eastern sector districts such as Pankow and had seen a mass influx of former GDR citizens in the early 1990s.

The few students of migrant background were of Turkish, Palestinian, Iraqi-Kurdish, Lebanese, Russian, and Senegalese descent. When I inquired about their presence in the school, it turned out that some came from *Märkisches Viertel*, but that their parents had enrolled them at this school because the immigrant proportion was lower and the school had a better reputation. It was a way to get out of the MV milieu and to be better prepared for the *Gymnasium*. Other students of migrant background lived nearby and this was the secondary school they were assigned to. The student body was homogeneous in terms of class status.

The social workers' main job in the school was to reduce conflict between youth and empower them to find non-violent forms of expression. In contrast to the teachers, they could reach out to students as buddies and solve social problems among students without impacting their grades. The students also related to the social workers in this way and visited their basement office regularly during breaks in order to check in, tell a story, borrow a table-tennis ball, or buy some cereal for the break. Sometimes a student would be brought down for a conversation by a teacher, which basically meant that the student had caused trouble in class and was being put in detention downstairs with the social workers. The social workers' task was not to teach the students better manners but to try to get them to reflect on their current—usually petty violent—behavior.[198]

---

successfully the schools are implementing the anti-racism strategies. The plaque is given out as a kind of award; once awarded, it is not monitored, nor can it be revoked. See also their webpage: http://www.schule-ohne-rassismus.org/startseite/

[197] Majd was a major driving force in these activities. He would never thematize his ethnic or religious background, similar to Ahmet. He would take sincere interest in the students and engage them in conversation about whatever they were up to. In my presence, he always addressed each student by name, always asked how they were doing, and always signaled reassurance. Similarly, he would encourage me to join him on recess supervision to meet more students. Sometimes he would stop students and introduce me, explain that I was doing research on the school and that it was important I get the right impression of the student body. He would ask students to talk about their elective school project and explain why they chose it. The projects varied, from organizing solidarity events for refugees to collecting bottle caps and sending them in to help crowdfund a disability project. The students would emphasize that these projects helped them to learn about things they had never thought about before. Although the school was predominantly ethnic German, the social projects were mostly organized by students of immigrant backgrounds.

[198] *Bildung* through social work was another principle that guided Majd's engagement with the students; it was also a guiding principle for the trip. When I inquired what that meant, both social workers explained that they were providing a *Bindung* (a bond) first and, through that, a form of educational engagement. The encounters I observed between students and social workers showed me what *Bindungsarbeit* (working by building a social relation) meant and how the social workers practiced it. They reached out to the students as reassuring supporters and as helpers in social matters. By providing a different kind of care, in which they had no power over and did not inquire about the students' grades, they could build a relationship with the students, in which the students could be regarded as social persons irrespective of school performance expectations. They tried to include students in projects and activities regardless of their actual performance in class. As social workers, they were

The trip was organized in a specific order. Majd and Ahmet would advertise the trip to the student body, by going into the classrooms, saying that this would not be an easy trip and that not everyone could bear going to such a horrible place, but that it would be meaningful, because this history had a lesson in it for everyone, even today and for very different contexts. Anyone who believed they saw the value in engaging with Auschwitz as a universal history was welcome to join. Interested students would be asked to write a motivation letter in which they had to state why they thought they should go on a trip to the Auschwitz Memorial. Majd and Ahmet assured me that no one would be rejected; they simply wanted to see an effort put forth. The next stages included additional meetings, usually after school or during official breaks. Morals and ethical practice and the concern for personal political action stood at the center of Majd's preparations. Toward that end, he had even read parts of Hannah Arendt's *Eichman in Jerusalem* with the participating students in order to demonstrate how a well-educated and hard-working man had been orchestrating mass murder, without ever feeling guilty about it. A portrait of Adolf Eichmann would be juxtaposed with one of Anton Schmid, a simple Nazi soldier who revolted on the battlefield and refused to engage in mass shootings. Schmid's very obvious Nazi looks would be juxtaposed with Eichmann's, who came off as a smart-looking, cheerful young man, by contrast.

Ahmet explained that the Arendt text was actually a bit overwhelming for the students, but they would eventually come to understand that looks can be deceiving and that evil can be done through mundane acts. The social workers would encourage the students in their reading of difficult texts and poems by telling them that these were highly sophisticated texts that one usually does not encounter until the college level, but that they (social workers) trusted the students to understand the gist of Arendt's argument because it is about humanity and not about an abstract theory. "This is usually the moment when students get hooked," Ahmet explained, "because they start to recognize a puzzle, a question that is deeply troubling."

The term *banality* is mentioned, so the students have a word for the trouble they are sensing. "But some are hearing this word for the first time, they don't know what it means. We point at the desk and say: Imagine someone killing by simply sitting at his desk and writing! *Ein Schreibtischtäter!*" (lit: a desk criminal).[199] Majd assures me that really this is not about working through German history but about humanity, about a wager that some might perhaps understand society differently afterward, after the readings and after the trip. When the students read Hannah Arendt, they do not read it as a text about a by-gone German past; they read it as a text about a human issue, he explains. Although Majd was engaging with the heart of modern German history, he took this as a way of forging a more universal, inclusive and secular form of citizenship. By constantly emphasizing humanity and voicing a "we," it was as if he was fleeing German particularity and his own Palestinian background. Or by universalizing this history, he could access it as a German of Palestinian descent.

5.2 Residues of German Guilt

One morning as the trip was nearing a teacher enters the office and introduces herself to me as the history teacher who would be joining us on the trip to Poland. We have a conversation about how she had prepared for the history class. She tells me that her class is relatively heterogeneous and that having a hybrid Afro-German or Muslim-German identity is a big theme. The question comes up: "How can Germany be my home country, if it was involved in such horrendous crimes?" The class watched a documentary called *Meine Heimat,*

---

aware of the students' profiles in the classroom setting, because they were in conversation with the teachers, but they built a new relationship.

[199] Basically someone who is the mastermind of a crime but who does not get his hands dirty.

deine Heimat (Engl. my home, your home) in order to help them approach this question from a certain distance. The teacher explains:

> It is not an easy and comfortable question given the history and they also are curious about this history. They are fascinated by Hitler, by the organized industrial mass murder and the possibility of such a crime, but they are easily overwhelmed and none of this is limited to any ethnic group. The whole theme of WWII is so present, especially in Berlin, it is hard to escape and they are adolescents trying to make sense of their own position within society. We try to approach the question of being German without any judgment *(urteilsfrei)*.[200]

I listen and get hung up on this idea of approaching a German identity without any judgment. Majd, who had joined us, takes my silence as an opportunity to ask about the students' payments for the trip.[201] He tells the teacher that a few students have not paid yet and that one of them also did not return his parents' consent form. "Oh yeah, you mean Muhammad right?" the teacher responds. "He will not join, he keeps losing the consent forms," she says with an air of annoyance. "He is not serious and keeps talking about the way he would like to walk into the memorial, if he were to join the trip at all," she explains. "He heard that some visitors bring Israeli flags and he wants to bring a Palestinian flag and wear a Palestinian *kufiyah*. He just wants to provoke," intervenes Majd. "You know, he is someone who likes to do the opposite of what he is asked to do. But he is important, he has charisma and he is taken seriously by his peers; when he speaks, his classmates look up to him," Majd concludes.

The break is almost over and the teacher has to go upstairs to her class. Two female social workers come in and I recognize Angela, who is doing an internship and is responsible for the paperwork for the trip. Ahmet follows shortly after and sees me jotting down notes from my conversation with the history teacher. I have to think about the teacher's comments, what would it mean to approach the question of being German *without any judgment,* given the Holocaust. Ahmet and I start having a conversation about this task and how I have structured my research question around Holocaust education. I explain that the memory of the Holocaust triggers various affects that make an approach without any judgment almost impossible. Ahmet affirms and reports how last year's trip had triggered guilt for some ethnic German students. He recalls that he was able to recognize how this blocked them from formulating any thoughts about their experiences on the trip, so he decided to approach guilt as empathy. He affirmed their feelings, stating that what they were feeling was a sign of empathy and that they needed to channel this empathy productively. Ahmet clarified his point by stating:

> Germany offers a form of participation, namely guilt, otherwise you cannot become part of the German identity. One has to assume the identity of the guilty. Of course this is all unconscious, but the discourse of guilt is still very dominant.[202]

---

[200] The teacher also told me that she had recently watched *Look Who's Back!,* a satire about Adolf Hitler re-awakening and trying to reconquer Germany but failing to do so. She assured me that it is ridiculous and satirical and that the students would have understood how problematic his language is, how it can slip through, pass as the speech of a crazy person in the movie. The movie might have helped the class to speak about how racism can seem funny even, when in fact it is hazardous and violent, she explained. While listening to her, I could hear this longing to normalize this episode in German history. Making jokes about Hitler was then also a way of showing that one had overcome this evil in all its nonsense, as if it was simply the nonsense of fanatic minds.

[201] The entire trip, including accommodation and food and entrance into the memorial cost €80. Majd told me that some students were exempt from paying because they were already receiving social welfare.

[202] „Deutschland bietet eine Form der Teilnahme an, nämlich der Schuld, sonst kannst du nicht Teil der deutschen Identität werden. Die Identität des Schuldigen muss angenommen werden, alles unbewusst natürlich, aber der Schulddiskurs ist doch sehr dominant," original in German from my fieldnotes.

Majd riposted that this is only one perspective. "Why should we feel guilty to begin with?" he asks. Although Majd is asking politely, there is a sense of discomfort in the room, perhaps because Ahmet has now contradicted the purpose of the trip that was stated in the earlier weeks. Ahmet responds, "Because we are a torn country, not a united one; we are *Schleswig-Holsteiner*[203] first and Germans second. There is this conundrum." Angela and I are listening and I notice that the conversation taking place between Majd and Ahmet is somewhat ambiguous, especially since both are invoking the national "we." When Ahmet first started to talk about the identity of the guilty, I thought he meant it in a general sense: that for everyone who wants to identify as German, feeling guilty would be somehow obligatory. But when Majd questioned Ahmet's claim, I thought that Majd was making a particular claim of his own, asking why migrants and Germans of immigrant descent in particular should feel guilty in the first place. I was even expecting one of them to say: we are Muslims first, Germans second. Yet this statement was not made, ever. Judging from Ahmet's response, I could see that guilt could function as a binding agent for being German, because a German national identity was an abstract ideal and not realized or perhaps not realizable in the concrete by itself. But neither of the two social workers invoked the position of the immigrant, the stranger, or the Muslim as a newcomer in order to say that, historically, these persons are neither guilty nor responsible for the Holocaust and that the discourse of guilt emanates from a legal framework that requires the designation of a perpetrator.

The question of guilt seemed to lay bare national particularity, in the form of a moral-political crime, and, in so doing, the question contaminated the narrative of universal humanity. In this conversation, the disturbance was not so much that guilt defined ethnic Germans as perpetrators who ought to feel guilty, but that it excluded non-ethnic Germans and immigrants such as Majd and Ahmet. Nevertheless, both positions dodged the question of guilt systematically. Ahmet, though he acknowledged it, turned it into empathy for his students; he could do this, because he did not feel guilty. Majd simply excluded guilt from the commemorative act by focusing on responsibility, not just for the crimes of the Holocaust but for society as such and for similar crimes elsewhere.

The discourse of responsibility was not specific to Majd or to this memorial visit. Since the early 2000s, a new political space has emerged for commemorating the Holocaust. First, a policy was suggested to include migrants in Germany's genocidal history in order to build in them a sense of responsibility for liberal democracy (Georgi and Ohliger 2006). Albeit an atrocious history, the way it was dealt with could be expanded in the effort of multicultural inclusion. Second, a study by the Berlin Institute for Research on Integration and Migration showed that many German millennials had no personal memory or emotional attachment to the Holocaust as previous generations did (Foroutan et al. 2014). All ethnic groups in the same age range needed to be similarly educated to feel a sense of inclusion in and responsibility for the German past. By turning guilt into responsibility, which the discourse about the German national past had done over the course of the preceding decade, younger generations and immigrants could be included using the same model. Yet, the conversation among the social workers never once invoked ethno-national particularity, religious difference, or migrant genealogies as explanations as to why they dodged the question of German guilt.

When going through the students' motivation letters for participating in the trip, I could confirm that there was no immigrant vs. ethnic German student divide. Some students had written that they would like to know about WWII, they had only seen movies about it. Others expressed fascination for a visit to a real concentration camp as opposed to a statue or memorial in the city. Some students had written that they simply could not understand why people would commit such horrendous crimes. None of the letters expressed guilt, shame, or

[203] Schleswig-Holstein is a northern German state bordering Denmark. The region has had historically more villages and towns with Danish speaking residents, officially recognized as a national minority.

responsibility. Some letters expressed fear of being overwhelmed at such a site and a preference to be in a guided group. I tried to see if there was any ethnic divide in the statements, but there was none. There was certainly a gender divide, with many male students expressing a desire to know how war works systematically. Given Ahmet's and Majd's framing of the trip, I could see that they tried to maintain the focus on responsibility and empathy, perhaps already knowing that the visit itself in fact triggered guilt, particularly so for the ethnic German students.

I noticed that there was no letter by Muhammad. I asked Ahmet why Muhammad's letter was missing and expressed my interest in knowing what exactly makes him controversial. Ahmet stated that Muhammad is a fifteen-year-old who is extremely skilled in arguing against his teachers' efforts to educate him in the actual class materials. He added that all teachers agree that Muhammad is extremely smart and capable but at the same time unruly and lazy. He is currently in the tenth grade but it seemed he would most likely leave the school without a diploma. Muhammad had managed to remain in school because he is a minor and this is the law, but he had never cared to do homework or submit project work like the other students did. Ahmet explained that Muhammad's father was a Palestinian from Lebanon but that the parents were divorced and he was now living with his mom and her German boyfriend. On his maternal side, his grandmother was German and the grandfather Turkish but Muhammad was not raised in any Muslim tradition, he spoke neither Turkish nor Arabic. Yet he did use a certain language to stylize himself as a Muslim ghetto boy.[204]

Majd, who was coming in and out of the room, overheard our conversation and explained that whenever they visited the classrooms to talk about the trip, Arendt, the poems, Muhammad was always excited and participating. Yet he never submitted any written assignments, no motivation letter, and no consent forms. Majd shrugged it off. Just when we switched the topic to my research again, a young man entered the office. Majd jumped up from his chair and offered it to the tall youth who, despite his size, has a childish face and wears a shy expression. "Please sit down, Muhammad! I would like to introduce you to Sultan," says Majd. So this is Muhammad, I thought. He seems embarrassed and does not even make eye contact with me. "I just wanted to buy something to drink, did not mean to come for a visit," Muhammad responded. Majd insisted that he sit down. I say hi and stretch my hand out to shake hands with him and to introduce myself more formally. "No, please no handshake," he says apologetically. I understand and withdraw my hand. Majd ignores this failed encounter, but I can see that Angela is in shock that he refused my handshake.

Ahmet, Majd, and I sit around Muhammad's chair, staring at him; he does not look up, just looks down at his shoes. Majd starts off by explaining that we would all be very happy if he joined the trip. He explains that Muhammad would be a great participant and also important for my research, since I too ask questions about historical responsibility among young people with diverse backgrounds, and that someone like Muhammad is also important in many ways for his community. Further, Majd goes on telling him that he has a task to fulfill in society and in his community, to take responsibility and to shape a future for himself. Majd uses big words, but he genuinely addresses him. Muhammad seems even more embarrassed and I am also not sure if this is not too much. Has he not been put on the spot? Majd's address is unswerving: "We also know that you will be a challenge, but it is important to engage with the challenges you bring to this trip." Majd also mentions that some of Muhammad's friends will be joining. Muhammad looks up and brings himself to say, "Well, if it's ok that I bring my Palestinian flag," just to look down again. "We'll see about this as we go along," says Majd and hands over the consent forms. Muhammad nods and smiles,

[204] During my year-long presence at the school, I came across several students of immigrant descent in the tenth and ninth grades. None of those students emphasized being Muslim as Muhammad did, although most of them were born to first generation immigrant families.

promising to return the forms soon. Majd tries to tell him that there is a meeting with a Jewish survivor and he should not miss that, but Muhammad is already running out.

Angela and the other colleague in the room seem petrified, and I wonder why. What is it with Muhammad I ask, wondering if I missed whatever it was that seems to shock Angela and her colleague. Now he's discovered religion, you know, states Ahmet with an ironic facial expression, reminding me again that Muhammad did not want to shake hands with me. Ahmet explains that Muhammad divides his free time between two mosques, one in Wedding and one in Neukölln. "The one in Neukölln is called An-Nur, have you heard of it?" he asks. I affirm that I have heard about it but never been. I knew that some saw it as a more orthodox mosque for German converts, others thought that it was a hotbed for Salafi radicalism. Majd intervenes that Muhammad's religious piety was his private affair and that we should not make a thing out of this. But Ahmet emphasizes that this mosque was under surveillance by the German Intelligence Service for Islamic extremism and that they should consider how to prevent Muhammand from radicalizing. Majd disagrees, stating that some Christian evangelical groups sound just as hostile to democracy and to the constitution as this mosque does, and that this can be scary but it is the parents' business to take care of that. "Let's see, maybe this is just another fashion of his that he will outgrow soon," mumbles Ahmet, unconvincingly, at least in my view.

The conversation quiets down but Angela, the silent bystander, still seems quite distressed over Muhammad's part in all of this. So, I ask everyone in the room: "What is the story with the flag? It keeps coming up." "Well, you know," starts Ahmet, and clarifies that "flags are a general problem at that site. Flags are generally not allowed, but some bring Israeli flags. No one can bring a German flag, it is a highly charged site and Poles as well as Jews have very sensitive reactions to seeing a German flag at Auschwitz." Angela, angry, exclaims that:

> This is exactly the problem with German guilt! A German person is simply guilty and cannot articulate herself anymore; she is just supposed to feel guilty. But what are Israeli flags doing there? That does not seem to be a problem, even with all the politics and violence going on in the Middle East! But as a German you are not in a position to say anything against that.

Angela's comment erupted like a volcano and, given how infuriated she sounded, no one dared to respond. It was unclear whether Angela meant that no one is telling Israelis not to bring flags or no one is daring to stand up to violent Israeli politics. Or whether Angela simply wanted to state that the "no flag rule" should be more consistent and applied to all flags. She expressed that Germans are still haunted by guilt and judged by their national past, while other states are involved in committing crimes and get away with being nationalist. I did not ask for clarification, but I could see the power that Muhammad's suggestion had. He somehow knew exactly where to touch the wound. By simply stating that he would bring a Palestinian flag, he had made us understand that there was a problem in the kind of Holocaust commemoration that allowed for any expression of state-nationalism.

Majd took on a reconciliatory tone and explained that Auschwitz, as a symbolic site, was also about competing prerogatives of interpretation (orig. *Deutungshoheiten*), of who had ownership over the place and what kind of political or national narrative should represent what this place was about. Muhammad, he said, just wanted to provoke by insisting that the Israeli state should not have that prerogative over Auschwitz either, given its current politics. "Let's see if he joins the trip," Majd concluded. Angela, still huffing and puffing, declared that Muhammad had already bid farewell to this trip. Majd's explanation of Muhammad's plea to bring in a Palestinian flag was once again denationalizing Auschwitz as a way of maintaining it as a space for universal humanity.

Muhammad's presence, his refusal to shake hands had already been off-putting for Angela. His open declaration, however, to enter the space as a Palestinian, although

ambiguous and unclear in aim, triggered so much for Angela, the only ethnic German person following the conversation. The Israeli flag in Auschwitz, although a national symbol of a state, also demonstrated that Jews had survived after all. It could be seen as an expression of victory, but also as a positive telos out of this genocidal history. As such, it could offer some relief from German guilt and nationalism. With Muhammad's addition of the Palestinian flag, however, he prompted a reminder that Palestinians were connected to this history in tragic ways and that Germans remained guilty, because of Palestinian expulsion from historical Palestine. Muhammad made her feel guilty as a German, something that could not be sanitized by Majd's universal tolerance discourse.[205] Relatedly, Muhammad's suggested visible presence as a Palestinian in the space that Majd continuously construed as a memorial for universal humanity, pointed to the difficulty of just being human same as everyone else. It was as if Muhammad was saying that because of his racial differentiation as a Palestinian he cannot simply enter as a human. Therefore, Muhammad was threatening both Angela and Majd for different reasons. But he also emerged from this conversation as a larger political threat for the current epistemology of Auschwitz as a space of exception. As a Muslim he occupied a racial slot and made race palpable after the Holocaust, at least for me. His refusal to shake hands, his unruly behavior and yet commitment to divide his free time between two mosques placed him in the eyes' of the social workers and teachers as a radicalizing Muslim man, who was threatening in several ways.

The racial frame usually attached to Auschwitz and the Holocaust, as exceptions to the rule in state-formation, had been re-attached by Muhammad to the formation of states as such. His Palestinian presence, albeit heavily performed, demonstrated that racial structurations of entire groups are inherent to nation-state formations. His plea to bring the Palestinian flag to Auschwitz memorial can be read as drawing a connection between the Palestinian condition and the workings of the Israeli and the German states, as continuous, effective, and regular mechanisms of racial states. The Holocaust is related to as the irrational racist past that turned Jews and others into sub-humans based on religious, ethnic, and political difference, when all difference can be in fact reconciled with the liberal nation-state. Yet Muhammad's emphasis on ethno-national particularity, his claim to Muslim piety and his active engagement within two mosques challenged an all-inclusive raceless liberalism. Although, no one stated that in the moment, but Muhammad's presence was also rebellious. He refused to be pacified with this history, symbolically claiming that something of that racial and racist history lived on and could not be neatly placed into one particular time-space as a past.

Muhammad's entrance into the conversation also brought to the fore the different stakes in commemorating the Holocaust in Auschwitz. While Ahmet and Majd did not feel guilt or shame personally, they each had different forms for engaging it with their students. Majd disengaged from guilt, insisting instead on the universality of Holocaust history as relevant for everyone and other contexts, too. For Majd, the Holocaust was a phenomenon that needed to be understood beyond nation-state projects and ethno-religious particularity. Ahmet acknowledged that Holocaust history bore German particularity, in the way ethnic Christian-Germans were triggered to feel guilty by it, but he turned guilt into empathy with his students. Both social workers were in fact engaged in finding ways into this history. In contrast, the history teacher and Angela were treating this history as a burdensome exception to an otherwise overcome past.

[205] Sanitizing Holocaust memory has been a general trend since the inauguration of the Holocaust Memorial next to the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin. The Holocaust Memorial, dedicated to the murdered European Jews, was initially supposed to have all the names of the Jewish victims inscribed onto the surface of the site. This plan was rejected by the former chancellor Helmut Kohl as too emotional. Ironically, the Kohl government had earlier given permission to erect the statue of a Käthe-Kollwitz pieta for all the victims of the Second World War. The statue, being both markedly Christian and affective, caused criticism but was built nevertheless.

All these positions were inside and could be mapped onto racelessness. This raceless approach to Auschwitz carried two related rationales: First, verbally and practically, as the social workers claimed, it effected a naturalization into German nationhood, when one was already a citizen, but still marked as Middle Eastern and Muslim. Second, it translated Christian-German guilt into national responsibility, which could be shared collectively with the majority rather than the majority alone receiving and carrying blame. Both rationales rest upon the work Middle Eastern immigrants are willing to do in order to confirm and consolidate the moral, political, and legal insistence on racelessness.[206]

The refusal to do this kind of work, as Muhammad did, disturbed the logic of racelessness. On the one hand, pointing out racial differences and relations produced and articulated through state-formations, including the current liberal-democratic German state. On the other, he turned himself into a racial reference that can be targeted within the logic of racial historicism, without seeming racializing or racist within the logic of racelessness.

5.3 Auschwitz as the Exception of the State

The imaginary of Auschwitz, as the one concentration camp that stands in for the genocide of European Jewry and other minorities, was both present and absent in the German public sphere. Yet its presence-absence needs to be accounted for. Auschwitz did not simply index to a place outside of Germany or to a concrete locale in Poland, although it is both of those things. Primarily, Auschwitz points to a different political order, kept alive both as a past phenomenon and an exception to the general rule. Auschwitz stands for the current liberal imaginary of the Nazi State as the exemplary racial state. The spatial distance of Auschwitz relocates state violence into an exceptional space outside of everyday governance, but also makes it available for the most gruesome imaginaries of Nazi violence. Camps and memorial sites located closer to German cities do not have this exceptional quality. In addition, they are not as huge, not as infamous, and have not managed to industrially kill roughly 1.1 million inmates. Further, Auschwitz is the most iconic of these sites, its train station serving as the image for deportation to death.

In their edited volume *Anthropology in the Margins of the State* (Das and Poole 2009), anthropologists Veena Das and Deborah Poole take up the question of exception in order to inquire into the state of exception and crisis, as these define laws, rules of membership, and political boundaries for certain subjects. The state of exception, a concept that Das and Poole engage genealogically through theorists Giorgio Agamben and Carl Schmitt, is refashioned from an anthropological perspective in order to name and define the "practices embedded in everyday life in the present" (Das and Poole 2009, 13). As both authors claim, the exception might not be a simple marginal phenomenon but reveal something substantial about the rule. In a similar vein, Auschwitz is central in defining civic practices and in revealing the general regulatory nature of the citizen-state relation in the present. German citizenship requires that a detour through Auschwitz be taken in the course of instituting a citizen-state relation, and

[206] Please note that there was a discussion among anti-racism activists and legal scholars in Germany in 2011 on the term race in the German constitution. The anti-racism activists sought to obliterate this term, because they saw it as misleading and reifying naturalist biological hierarchies. They opted for the exchange of race with ethnicity. Those who insisted that this term should remain, countered that race was an analytic tool accounting for the longer histories of racism and ongoing racism. Within this line of argumentation, racism perpetuated race and not the other way around. According to this group of critical legal scholars, obliterating the term would cause a silencing effect, as such making racism unnameable. It is noteworthy however, that race in this context was discussed as a social construct, and not as a political-state project. Similarly, the question of religious minorities and non-Christian difference as the basis for state discrimination is not thematized. See here for the constitutional debate in German: https://www.parlament-berlin.de/ados/17/Recht/vorgang/r17-0185-v_Beitrag%20Cengiz%20Barskanmaz.pdf.

only in this way does the nature of the German state become legible as a tolerant raceless state.

Das and Poole refer to the state of exception in contexts of war; they show how it redraws legal boundaries, in order to attend to the more informal and extra-legal techniques that exist between formal law and actual practices. In the context of my research, a state of exception did not formally exist, since the very term state of exception *(Ausnahmezustand)* is attached to the reign of National Socialist terror and therefore a decision to declare a state of exception is not taken lightly in Germany. Yet, after September 11, 2001, certain security measures were put in place and privacy laws were eased in order to define a security crisis concerning Islamic extremism. These security measures primarily targeted non-European immigrants, Muslims specifically, and prompted new educational and surveillance formats for those communities.

The civil society organizations working for tolerance prided themselves on teaching social skills aimed at countering extremism, viewing this approach as a more effective and less stigmatizing form of securitization. More importantly, the civil society organizations emerge from and work inside a negative relation to the National Socialist order and everything that was attached to it.[207] In addition, Islamic extremism, same as other forms of extremism, is defined by the German Intelligence Service *(Bundesverfassungsschutz)* as promoting political ideologies that are hostile to liberal democracy and therefore akin to Nazism. In other words, the Nazi past as a racial naturalist order is maintained in a relationship with the current racial historicist order in the framework of racelessness as a state logic.

According to this state logic, a citizen must relate to Auschwitz as an exceptional past phenomenon, one that has been overcome but that at the same time is kept alive in perennial commemorative acts, because dangers to liberal democracy will always find new shape, in neo-Nazis, communists, and Islamists. Thus Auschwitz is brought back to memory, in order to be banned again. Auschwitz, then, is the exceptional component necessary for the moral rule of the liberal democratic state. As the historical and political exception, it is central to structuring civic practices, national affects and to producing citizen-subjects within the current liberal democratic order. By remembering the liberation of the death camps such as Auschwitz, the German state perennially invokes liberal democracy as an incomplete project. Because the project remains incomplete, society must work towards the ideal of liberal democracy in the everyday and further extend this task to immigrants as a means of fending off all political forms of extremism. Although the school trip discussed here was not funded by the Ministries, even the social workers used this language of tolerance in the everyday in order to strengthen liberal democratic sentiments. This shows how pervasive this particular discourse is.

Auschwitz is also a stain from the past, perhaps the most persistent and public stain on post-war Germany. As a stain, it could come up in the most unexpected places and sully the occasion, as with the 'stumble stones'[208] that have been placed in front of ice cream parlors,

---

[207] In fact, even the German Intelligence Service *(Bundesverfassungsschutz)* makes the same rhetorical move. Last year it advertised online a history book about its organization. The book inquires whether and how the GIS is different from the *Geheimstaatspolizei* (GESTAPO) of the Nazi regime, given that it was founded in the 1950s with many former secret police of the Nazi regime taking on new, yet similar positions in the post-war German state. The answer is that the GIS has completely overcome its Nazi connection and has been working since its inception to protect the liberal democratic constitution and not the terror reign of a single-party rule. Here a proud announcement of the launch party at the headquarters in Berlin: https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/de/aktuelles/termine/te-20170630-ankuendigung-keine-neue-gestapo.

[208] The *Stolpersteine* project was started in 2003 by a German artist, first as a German project that was eventually expanded into other European cities. In order for an actual bronze stone representing a deported victim of the Nazi regime to be placed at the site of a deportation, homeowners are required to contact the artist and give their address; research is then conducted to discover whether there were deported residents who should be

hip cafés, or kids' playgrounds, reminding one of the many interrupted lives whose final destination was Auschwitz. Auschwitz thus becomes a part of daily life in Berlin—the stumble stones are stepped on or walked over on a daily basis, though they are mostly ignored, except for Holocaust Memorial Day.

The figure below shows typical practices of stumble stone care around January 27, Holocaust Memorial Day. A typical memorial practice includes cleaning/polishing the stones, lighting cemetery candles, and decorating the stone with flowers. This image was proudly posted by the Salaam-Shalom Initiative, demonstrating that they, as a Muslim-Jewish interfaith group, take care of stumble stones in the district of Neukölln. In recent years, politicians of immigrant descent have coordinated migrant organizations for public cleanings of stumble stones, in order to prove that these Muslims qua Germans cherish Holocaust memory and fight political extremism.[209]

Fig. 1: Courtesy of Salaam-Shalom Initiative.

These forms of relating to Auschwitz only started in the late 1990s after the reunification of Germany, amidst fears within Europe of resurgent German nationalism. The early 1990s brought new meaning to the crimes committed in the former German-occupied territories and formerly communist neighboring countries. Prior to 1990, as a geographic locale, Oświęcim, the actual Polish name of Auschwitz, remained a distant place; once located in the Nazi occupied territories and later in communist Poland, it belonged to a different political time and order. With the fall of communism and the eastward expansion of

remembered. Munich is the only city within Germany that has banned stumble stones from its cityscape. Placing the stone is usually in itself a public commemorative event accompanied by a little celebration. The stumble stones mention all deportation destinations or disappearances. The placement of the stone costs €120. See here for more detail: http://www.stolpersteine.eu/en/home/

[209] The most famous examples are German-Turkish SPD politician Dilek Kolat and German-Palestinian Secretary of State Sawsan Chebli. See here: https://www.welt.de/regionales/berlin/article174745891/Staatssekretaerin-Chebli-putzt-Stolpersteine.html.

the European Union, Auschwitz was included in a newly shared European telos.[210] Visiting the Auschwitz Memorial Museum as part of a school excursion to Poland became a European thing to do for graduating high school classes. These trips were usually organized in Western Europe under the banner of building bridges with their formerly Eastern Bloc neighbors, to repair historical injuries and relations that had stagnated during the Cold War era.[211]

The Federal Republic of Germany had been on the right side of history in this case, and visiting the former labor and death camps of Auschwitz now involved an encounter with two layers of political time, each of which had proven wrong and unsustainable. In a way, Western Germany, as the liberal democracy, had triumphed over two evils. This triumphalism was embodied confidently by the Berlin Republic and created a certain political condition that enabled the German state to intervene in world politics. It was now *because* of Auschwitz that the German government could claim responsibility for ending violence.[212] Germany could become a global player again, because it had successfully purged the specters of its past and shaped itself up to become a normal state among a community of states.

Similarly, the Holocaust Memorial inaugurated in 2004, located next to the American Embassy at the Brandenburg Gate, points to the Holocaust at the same time that it pushes these ugly connections aside. Given the carefully designed space of the black coffin-shaped concrete slabs and "The Place of Information" center underneath the huge 4.7 acre field, the memorial is crafted to speak of a bygone era in an aesthetically pleasant way. The assumption is that the lessons of Auschwitz have been learned, so that in effect what is on display is not simply a memorial for the Holocaust but a monument to how confidently the new German Republic deals with its past. The apology inherent in these monumental structures that reference Jewish life and its destruction is thus spoken from a position of moral-political triumphalism (Dekel 2013).[213]

The political past is commemorated as the racist exception that structures the civic practices of the present, both as redress for crimes committed and for the cultivation of a liberal citizenship. Therefore, Auschwitz stands for the *exceptional* character of the crimes committed against humanity in the German national imaginary. As such, Holocaust Memorial Day, which is celebrated every year on January 27, is more important than the date marking the official end of World War II, because it gave birth to a more acceptable racial state. The importance of January 27 is marked by the German parliament in commemorative speeches and by the president and chancellor in actual visits to the Auschwitz Memorial. The Red Army's liberation of the camps in Auschwitz-Birkenau is taken up as the symbolic liberation of all camps for all humans. In contrast, the date marking the end of World War II is not an official memorial day in the Federal Republic; commemorating it would also mean to remember humiliation. Humiliation as a national feeling is deeply overshadowed by a sense

[210] This goes hand in hand with the Stockholm declaration of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance in 2000, which asserted that the memory of the Holocaust is a common European task and the defining element of European identity.

[211] An official apology for the German invasion and the crimes committed during the Second World War in Poland was issued during the 1970s by then chancellor Willy Brandt. This apology included an agreement on borders.

[212] Here I am referring to a statement by the former German foreign minister Joschka Fischer, who pushed the German Bundestag to vote for a military intervention in Serbia in 1998. Fischer argued that he had learned "Never again Auschwitz!" a statement that he claimed compelled one to act against inhumanity, injustice, and unjustified violence. "Never again!" or "Never again Auschwitz!"—a contested warning statement within Germany—was used now to address the world from a German perspective, one that claims international validity on the basis of its own particular experience.

[213] A spatially separate memorial for the murdered Roma and Sinti was built and inaugurated several years later; another visual installation between the two memorials in Tiergarten reminds viewers of the murdered homosexuals. Interestingly, the categorical divisions between concentration camp inmates (Jew/Roma&Sinti/Homosexual/Communist) introduced by the Nazis are thus reproduced by the memorials.

of guilt.[214] A crucial part of this political practice is that individuals self-hierarchize feelings such as guilt, shame, and humiliation in relation and subordinate to responsibility. Hierarchizing these feelings is part of a structuring division between public and private.

While the crimes and atrocities against Jews and other minorities are a public fact, a denialist picture emerges in the more intimate settings of the family. A certain layer of shame conflicts with guilt and produces personal denials of responsibility, as the study by sociologist Harald Welzer shows (Welzer, Moller, and Tschuggnall 2002).[215] Feelings of humiliation, defeat, and loss did not inform or translate into a political practice. These feelings are usually covered over by a sense of shame and take the shape of silence. Silence in relation to the Holocaust, Auschwitz, and the German past never means the absence of speech but the forceful containment of conflicting feelings, perceptions, and thoughts that the (Christian) German people were wronged or, at the very least, still are paying a price for their mistakes. The above-described emotional outcry of Angela's or the history teacher's gesture to approach German history without any judgment are related attempts to overcome a burden that still weighs heavily and to find normalcy. This kind of feeling is also expressed privately in conversations in which Germans defend public Holocaust memorial culture in order to say that they have paid the price for Nazi crimes and should be permitted to move on.

In his non-fiction work *On the Natural History of Destruction*, the novelist W.G. Sebald takes up the question of humiliation during the last days of WWII, explaining how the Allied powers bombed German cities from the air in order to break the morale of the population. Sebald traces how destroyed German cities and more than 600,000 dead civilians in the last months of the war produced silence rather than outrage (Sebald 2012). In a personal interview, he recounts his own childhood walks through meter-high piles of rubble in the city of Munich and wonders why no one was commenting on these piles of rubble or even referring to them. As a child, he internalized this rubble as a natural component of the cityscape. Years later, he was still haunted by how all this destruction had been naturalized by the civilian population and also gone unremarked by public figures (Hoffmann 2012, 177). The silence of humiliation thickened into a kind of cultural amnesia, which is how Sebald describes and condemns "the self-imposed silence of German writers" on the issue of Allied bombing (Ibid.).

For Sebald, the issue with remembering the war and the Holocaust is not about whether one either commemorates the air bombings or the deportations of minorities. Rather, he takes issue with the fact that the German state has cultivated a prescriptive form of commemoration that is centered on the abstract figure of the Jew without ever exploring the depths of the suppressed feelings of national disillusion.[216] Sebald describes in an interview

[214] May 8 was indeed an official memorial day in the GDR between 1967-1985 and inculcated a specifically communist perspective on the defeat. The day itself was called the Day of Liberation (Tag der Befreiung) in both German states.

[215] I had a first-hand personal encounter with a history teacher in Neukölln, who had written a book titled *Was My Grandpa a Nazi?,* in reference to Harald Welzer's book *Grandpa was no Nazi!* The author discusses his grandfather in two cases. In the first case, his grandfather is acquitting a Jewish girl after racial laws had already been ratified. In the second case, he has a Jewish man imprisoned for being in a romantic relationship with a Christian woman. The couple is accused by her brother as committing racial disgrace *(Rassenschande).* The Jewish man is sent directly to a concentration camp after his imprisonment. The book is a personal attempt to work through the complexities of law and justice under the Nazi regime, but its author openly asks whether his grandfather can be called a Nazi, given that he also did make an ethically correct decision in the case of the Jewish girl that he acquitted. In a long conversation with me, the author told me about what happened in the aftermath of having published this book, how he had found the brother of the Jewish man and how he had a stumble stone dedication ceremony for his deported family and brother. It was hard to listen to, but the hardest part was when he in all honesty asked me whether I thought his grandfather was a Nazi. I did not answer his question.

[216] Similarly, Sebald finds survivor encounters demeaning and downgrading, reducing complex lives and deep injuries to a story with a take-away. At the same time, he admits that he was always fascinated to hear about

how the publication of his book in German triggered very nationalist responses. He received letters from German readers who would congratulate him for taking on that neglected chapter in German history and who would then go on to provide a patriotic and nationalist counter-thesis for the absence of these narratives. Most letters idealized pre-war Germany, but one academic went so far as to say that it was "the Jews" who bombed Germany. According to Sebald, this was the moment he realized that German memorial culture had failed because it had not purged these other feelings of betrayed national supremacy.

In the course of the last decade, nationalist-populist sentiments have again come to the fore. Members of nationalist right-wing parties, such as the National Democratic Party of Germany (NPD), have claimed in 2004, around the same time that the Holocaust Memorial in Berlin was inaugurated, that the Allied bombing of German cities was a form of holocaust, a bomb-holocaust that should be remembered. Part of the difficulty in talking about German suffering during the war is that this is taken to be a form of "victim competition"—as if talking about one suffering erases the other. Yet nationalist right-wing parties have taken up German suffering in order to claim that they were the actual victims of the war. Björn Höcke from the *Alternative für Deutschland* (AfD) party has called the Holocaust Memorial in the city of Berlin a memorial of shame, claiming that no nation or state would display their shameful history as the Germans have been compelled to do.

These counter-oppositional forms to the memory of the Holocaust are similarly articulated from within the post-Holocaust condition of racelessness. In contrast to the liberal voices, however, they are thickened with the sentiments of a broken Christian-German superiority, usually left unspoken. These voices would not claim to speak for a German race but do articulate a national victim position, usually unacknowledged in public. This form of broken superiority has less to do with remembering crimes against humanity than with having to forget national humiliation. Further, these voices have become louder in recent years, claiming that "Auschwitz is bird shit in the scope of German history" and that Germans have reason to be proud of themselves otherwise.[217] Implicit in these statements is that Auschwitz is the exception to the general rule. Additionally, if race does not exist as is the current rule than at least ethnic Christian Germans should be able to rightfully claim their nation without being considered racist.

Relatedly, the same nationalist groups, similar to more conservative and Islamophobic segments within the other political parties, uphold the idea that Jews never behaved like Muslims. They were racialized and wrongfully killed by the Nazi regime, because in fact they had been enriching German culture and not exploiting it like Muslims do. However, this discourse advanced by liberals, conservatives and nationalists alike erases the longer German-Jewish history and the broader Western European history of Jews having been subjected to racial historicism for centuries prior to the Holocaust.

This kind of speech is enabled precisely by the condition of racelessness, whereby Muslims are marked *only* as a religious group and thus can be discussed as a problem and threat to the political rule, while Jews can be nostalgically referred to as having been wrongfully annihilated in light of their having been fully assimilated. Statements such as these usually erase, how German Jews were not accepted as equal Germans even after heavy assimilation and patriotic sacrifices during WWI. In other words, German Jews although predominantly fully assimilated were never accepted as equal Germans. In addition, Nazi rule had to heavily intervene in re-defining Jews as an inherently inferior group, because most German-Jews had assimilated as secular citizens. Yet these two different procedures, as two sides of the same racial logic, cannot be articulated together because the Holocaust, as the

---

survivor stories, but he would not want to encounter someone as just that: a survivor who can simply deliver a story within the neat time-frame of a meeting.

[217] https://www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/afd-chef-gauland-vogelschiss-aeusserung-war-politisch-unklug/22667294.html.

most atrocious examples of racism, should not be relativized and must maintain its exceptional status neatly placed in a bounded space-time.

Racelessness in the context of Germany as a historically shaped political condition, layers different and at times opposing sentiments about what it means to be a German nation. In its public political form, the one I see closely entangled with the liberal-democratic state, racelessness is closely bound up with remembering the Holocaust, as a way of insisting on Germany's current self-definition as a tolerant nation-state, which in turn authorizes it to discipline political, religious and demographic groups. The nationalist uptake on racelessness is that it is not racist to call out Muslims as a threat to (Christian) national unity and social integration, because of their religion and culture. In other words, racelessness is not the withering away of a racial order, but the naturalized historicist ordering of racial hierarchies after the Holocaust that makes it hard to talk about racism, when it goes beyond individual prejudice and skin color. As such, racelessness converges with secularity to delimit the legibility of the citizen-subject, who must display no ethnic or religious particularity and who must relegate these to the private sphere in order to pass as "the same as everyone else.

5.4 The Jewish Survivor as a Normal Person

A week after the encounter with Muhammad in the social worker's office, Majd announced that Ruth Winkelmann, a German-Jewish survivor, would be brought in to speak to the students. She would be accompanied by the local representative of the stumble stones project, who would tell the students the history of the eugenics center in Reinickendorf where disabled children had been murdered and Afro-Germans sterilized. Both the representative and Ruth Winkelmann had been invited in order to provide some reality feel to the very abstract and distant history. It would be an entry point into thinking about their neighborhood and their *Kiez* as implicated in and shaped by this history.

Upon Majd's recommendation I read the survivor's memoir about her life during the war years in Berlin. The book—originally written in German and titled "Ruth Winkelmann: Suddenly I Was Called Sara. The Memoir of a Jewish Berliner" (*Ruth Winkelmann: Plötzlich hieß ich Sara. Erinnerungen einer jüdischen Berlinerin*) (2011)—is the coming-of-age memoir of a German-Jewish girl growing up in a bi-religious household. Ruth's paternal lineage describes a well-off secular Jewish family with strong communal ties, known to be benefactors of and generous donors to Jewish educational institutions. Ruth first narrates, through reported speech, how her parents met and how her father broke with his family because he wanted to marry a Christian woman. After Ruth's birth, the father is welcomed back into his family and Ruth's mother promises to ensure the child will receive a Jewish education in the synagogue and the Jewish school. During the Nazi reign, the parents resort to a lawyer in order to halt deportation. The lawyer advises the parents to get divorced so the family can escape deportation. Shortly after the divorce, the father's deportation notification arrives by mail and the mother realizes that she had inadvertently cut off the father's last protection from deportation, namely his ties to a Christian woman and their mutual children. The story culminates in her father's deportation to the labor camp at Monowitz, a sub-camp of Auschwitz, where he is killed while performing forced labor.[218] Ruth, her sister, and her

[218] Buna-Monowitz is part of Auschwitz, same as Birkenau. The different camps were organized around the tasks performed there. Buna-Monowitz consisted mostly of Jewish forced labor for the chemical company I.G. Farben. Built of a merger of six German chemical companies, four of which still exist, I.G. Farben legally operates even today, though it has never paid systematic compensation for the crimes it committed. Famous witnesses imprisoned at Buna-Monowitz are Primo Levi and Jean Améry. The death of her father remains a mystery, one that haunts Ruth for many years. In the last chapter, she tells how she met a waiter on a cruise ship from Cyprus to Haifa. The man approaches her, because of her smile, explaining that it reminds him of someone he met many years ago under tragic circumstances and asks if she perhaps knows him and discloses her father's name. He tells her then, that they worked together at Buna, and that her father actually did not work himself to death and was

Christian mother are the only survivors from the entire Jewish family through the paternal line; they were saved by their *Aryanization request*[219] and by virtue of the divorce.

The memoir opens with the Russian invasion of Berlin and ends with a trip to Israel. In between, Ruth is unaware that she is Jewish or any different from the majority of Germans. She thinks of her Jewish family as equally German, but notices how things begin changing around her after the main pogroms against Jewish businesses on November 9, 1938 (*Reichskristallnacht)*. She develops a heightened sense of difference when her Jewish school is surrounded by SS police and the students and faculty are all trapped inside. But the majority of the account is dedicated to a description of surviving the war with scarce resources and with the help of an NSDAP member. While the book mentions all these details, Ruth's self-presentation in the school centers around herself after the war.

Ruth, although already 87, looks at least 20 years younger with a radiant facial expression. One can tell that Ruth pays a lot of attention to her attire; she is well dressed and wears a golden Star of David pendant. When she talks about her years as a young girl in war-torn Wittenau, a northern part of Berlin adjacent to Reinickendorf, she mentions how difficult it was just to find work.

There is no mention of Auschwitz in her account, so one student asks her what she thought about Auschwitz back then. She responds that no one really knew about Auschwitz back then, nor did anyone know about the dimensions of the death camps. Another student again asks: "But what do you feel, when you hear the term Auschwitz?" Ruth takes a deep breath and states that she is relieved now but that when watching movies about Auschwitz she usually cried. "It was only after I saw hell with my own eyes that I was freed from fear and I could get a sense of where my father had died. But there is no redress for me *(Wiedergutmachung)*. I am German and I will remain German."[220]

Ruth's answer concerning how she feels about Auschwitz included an assertion of her Germanness. But the question put to Ruth was implicitly about what she feels about Auschwitz as a Jew, as someone who had lost her family in the concentration camps and her father in Monowitz. The students wanted to know how Ruth relates to Auschwitz as a Jewish survivor, since those are the terms in which she had been introduced. Yet Ruth's position as a survivor, from which she had been invited to speak, was possible precisely because she had not been deported like the rest of her Jewish family and because she herself had cultivated a separation from her Jewishness through her mother's Aryanization request.

Ruth's narrative emphasized cultural sameness and equality, as if being Jewish bore no traditional, religious, or cultural particularity. It was as if she had suddenly been made identifiable as a Jewish girl by virtue of her name change even though she was simply German, as her book title suggests. Ruth then speaks from the position of the German who is bereft of her family, her paternal-Jewish community, and perhaps also bereft of the possibility of recovering her Jewishness. But Ruth also reveals something about the notion of redress, namely that there is no redress for her. In a way, Ruth is saying that commemorating the Holocaust or giving a platform to Jewish survivors does not help the actual victims. Moreover, when addressing the students, Ruth was in effect saying, "I am German and I will

---

not gassed in a chamber. According to this man, one evening at the end of a shift Ruth's father was pushed down from the upper levels of a scaffold by a factory official and died immediately.

[219] The German term is *Arisierungsantrag*. I need to do more research on this to make a clear statement, but so far I have only found that the *Arisierungsantrag* was mainly used to turn (business) property owned by German Jews over to the hands of German Christians at a specifically designated court in Munich, Bavaria. One article discusses how the same court allowed Germans to make the case that they were actually not Jewish. Borderline cases were put on trial and the claimants had to prove their Germanness by disavowing "Jewish practices" such as certain sexual practices deemed perverted and immoral. These testimonies inadvertently defined Jews as monstrous perverts and sub-humans vis-à-vis decent Aryans.

[220] Based on fieldnotes from November 2015.

remain German [same as you]!" Certainly, this was also the victorious statement of the survivor, who had experienced difference as leading to social and political discrimination.

In the following days, when I asked the students what they thought about meeting Ruth, they usually stated that it was interesting because she was a normal person just like everyone else. The students did not understand what was Jewish about her other than the Nazi ideology that had declared her and her family enemies of the state. I also approached Ahmet about inviting Ruth Winkelmann to speak from the position of the Jewish survivor. Was it so effective after all, given the students' responses? Ahmet explained that what mattered most was that the students meet a Jewish person in the first place. Since most of them don't have any other opportunities to encounter someone Jewish, meaning that Jews remain abstract figures for them, meeting someone Jewish and noticing that she is a normal person is an achievement in itself, stated Ahmet.

In a conversation with five students who had already gone on the trip the previous year, a clearer picture emerged. Only two could remember who Ruth Winkelmann was; the rest had no memory of her. The two who remembered her explained that in comparison with the trip to Auschwitz she was not so exciting. "Also, the book was not written by her but by a ghostwriter, and she had never been to Auschwitz as an inmate," added the students. And what is it about Auschwitz, I ask, how is it more exciting? The students tell me how you can get a glimpse of different moments, the black execution wall, the remains of a gas chamber, the hair, the shoes, the smells, the gigantic size. It just makes you cry, they say. The students had internalized Auschwitz as this exceptional place of evil in which violent things happen, but they could not relate to Ruth as a survivor who had lived through the everyday of gradual genocide. What then was the survivor's task, especially here as a Jewish survivor?

The figure of the Jew, as a survivor and a wronged friend, had been attributed this double task: to speak from the position of the Jewish experience but also to provide grounds for identification as a human. Ruth's emphasis, however, on being German and on having been raised the same as Germans in a secular Jewish family with a Christian mother, flattened her Jewish particularity. It seemed that Ruth's narrative construction of sameness had made Auschwitz and the genocide of European Jewry even more exceptional for the students, who saw Auschwitz as the place where everything was turned upside down. This perceived exceptionality was slightly puzzling for me, given that the stumble stone representative and local historian who spoke alongside Ruth had demonstrated how state-regulated eugenics had aided gradual genocide, which had been practiced in local clinics and hospitals in this very neighborhood.

The narrative of the Jewish survivor had created a void, pointing to the loss of a life that is not fully representable once the genocide and the Holocaust have become the dominant narrative frame for understanding an *evil history* that culminated in Auschwitz. As Ruth's Jewish particularity became relatively unimportant and was not accounted for, the possibility opened up for the ethnic German students to imagine that this could happen to anyone, even to them as Germans in their home country.

This feeling of being threatened and potentially under attack was fostered by the visit to Auschwitz in certain ways. At the memorial site, we decided to gather and hold a commemoration for the murdered subjects from Reinickendorf. The students read out twelve names, addresses, dates of birth and dates of deportation. Majd had earlier printed out the names on paper for everyone to see and hold on to, as a way of grasping how Reinickendorf was connected to the Holocaust. The students would later say that they think differently about these streets now; knowing that people had been deported from their own neighborhood, they felt implicated. One girl in particular said that she looked up her own name in the displayed book of victims in Auschwitz and found it, adding that she had never thought that someone with her identity could end up in a Nazi concentration camp.

As many students after the memorial visit told me, being deported to a concentration camp could happen to anyone, even them. When I asked who would deport them to concentration camps, a handful of the ethnic German students expressed fear of Muslims and recent refugees, claiming that many of them were members of sleeping cells, waiting for the right time to take over Germany and get rid of them. One male student, who had written a very sensitive letter about the camp, told me that ISIS was doing social experiments in German society to check "our" security apparatus and to attack at the right time. Several of the other female students added that they felt disturbed by so many refugees in their own vicinity. Also, that their parents were afraid of so many new Muslim men entering the country, given what recently happened in Cologne.[221] When I explained that most refugees were fleeing conflict and wars and had a right to asylum, all of these five students expressed frustration. One female student stated that her father would be voting for the *AfD* if the refugees are allowed to stay because he does not recognize his country anymore. In these follow-up conversations, the terms Muslims, ISIS terrorists, and refugees merged into an interchangeable whole.

Her comment and the comment of other students were surprising also in how they used the term Muslim for me. When they referenced Muslims, they mostly meant refugees and terrorists. At the same time, the present persons in the groups, such as the organizers, some of the students and me, were not addressed as Muslim and were similarly not seen as threat. The term Muslim had almost a life of its own and attached itself to what the students described as terrorists. In the way, the term Muslim was circulating and normalizing the terrorist as a just another person with a particular religion, it also heightened the figure of the Muslim predominantly as a terrorist. Being Muslim in this context became interchangeable with being a terrorist.

The figure of the Muslim became hyper-differentiated and emphasized through notions of violent terrorism. In contrast to the Jewish survivor, who was hardly understood in being Jewish or what Jewish was. Jewish difference could not be rendered beyond the narrative of genocidal racism and was also not understood beyond the racial framework of the Nazi state as a pseudo-scientific physical substance.

5.5 Travelling Anxieties

The anxiety over Islamist attacks had been present already on the way to Poland. The summer of 2015 had been dubbed the summer of the refugee crisis and events had sparked a debate over closing European borders. Further, widespread retaliation attacks in Paris, for which ISIS claimed responsibility, added a new layer to the problem with the refugees: Were there Islamist extremists among the refugees entering European territories and were they preparing terrorist attacks?

This general anxiety affected the preparation of the trip in certain ways. Would there be an atmosphere of hostility against the Muslim students? When talking with Majd, he reassured me that last year they had been in Poland with one veiled student and did not experience any issues. There was no veiled student in the group this time, but Muhammad kept announcing that he would have to perform ritual prayer outside, especially if the

[221] The Cologne incident refers to the New Year' Eve of 2016, where mostly organized gangs of North African descent had in group action harassed and pickpocketed women. The incident with many unclear details was both reported and not clearly explained in media. It was then picked up by right-wing nationalists with claims that Syrian-Arab refugees had gang raped several hundred women during that night in Cologne. Over the course of 2016, the issue was discussed and in more detail in news reporting and through legal hearings. Fact was that these were members of a criminal network consisting mostly of Moroccans, who had fled to Germany but were rejected in their asylum cases. Having risked their lives to come to Europe, they were living in illegality and managing their lives as criminals with no prospects anywhere. My insights are based on conversations with Mohammad Amjahid, news reporter for the German weekly DIE ZEIT and German-Moroccan himself, who closely followed the cases from the courtrooms.

excursions went on all day. Majd usually disengaged from Muhammad's public prayer announcements. He declared them to be petty and futile provocations because, as he told me, he had already explained to Muhammad that his inclusion in the trip, although they all wished him to be there, did not give him the right to provoke the organizers. He wants to instill fears and to provoke Majd went on, implying that Muhammad simply wanted to use prayer to scare the general public amidst an atmosphere of suspicion of Muslims. Majd's explanation made sense to the extent he had already shown himself to have adopted an external perspective on being Muslim and on Islam, a perspective that was framed by the racial discourse on terrorism.

The bus departed at six o'clock in the morning and we spent several hours on the road before eventually arriving at a hostel in Krakow. As the main organization team was a social volunteer organization, half the bus was filled with elderly visitors who were friends of the main organizer and there were around five additional volunteers *(Bundesfreiwilligen)* between the ages of 18 and 21 in that group. We took a break just after the bus crossed the Polish border. As I was standing there with Majd and some students an elderly man from the main group approached us and asked who the Palestinian organizer was. We looked towards Majd, waiting for him to respond, but he wouldn't speak. The man repeated that he had heard a Palestinian social worker was organizing this trip with the students and he found this truly amazing. So he wanted to ask him about his motives for doing so, especially as a Palestinian. "Is that you?" he directly addressed Majd. Majd mumbled a short yes, yes, and then excused himself to go look after a student. Majd disappeared in the crowd of students and the man seemed disappointed for having missed out on an extremely fascinating encounter.

For some reason, I could not help but think of these early 20th century encounters between European anthropologists and *real savages*. But Majd had somehow defied being made this *real savage* by not responding as interpellated, as a Palestinian organizer of this trip. I had already noticed that Majd tried to downplay his Palestinian background in his work environment, whenever I made remarks about his famous SPD politician brother or his connection to Palestine. In the context of the office, I saw his refusal to talk about these aspects as his own way of inhabiting his everyday work life in a professional manner, without revealing too much of his personal background. But Majd's Palestinian background stood squarely within the framework of this trip, given that the figure of the Jew was also transferred to Israel and being Palestinian worked as a disturbance, as we had already seen with Muhammad's attempts to bring in Palestinian flags or kufiyyahs. All the while, at least in conversation with me and in the context of the school, Majd had mobilized the 'we' of the universal human, finding ways to incorporate his presence into Holocaust history. Yet the organization of this commemoration trip actually stressed Majd's Palestinian particularity and revealed the cracks in his universalist take on Auschwitz. This trip had acquired the form of his "exclusionary incorporation" (Partridge 2012) whereby Majd became further differentiated at the time of his inclusion. From the perspective of the elderly German participant, Majd was not merely a social worker who had organized this trip, nor was he an assimilated good citizen of immigrant parents, but he stood out as a Palestinian who was caring for the memory of the Holocaust. This was in fact fascinating for this man, as he repeated to me later once more.

Majd's refusal to thematize his background created awkward situations, especially at moments when he was directly addressed, such as the one described above. At another moment during the trip, Majd was asked by one of the participating teachers why we had not joined the main organizers at the pub in Krakow. Majd responded that he disliked pubs because he did not drink alcohol. The teacher asked if Majd was Muslim and, again, Majd avoided a fully verbalized engagement and only nodded silently. In contrast to Muhammad, who was emphasizing both being Palestinian-Muslim, Majd disengaged from such moments immediately. By doing so, he both refused to enter the conversation as a Palestinian-Muslim

man, but also confirmed that there was something discomforting in being a Palestinian-Muslim. As if admitting that in a full sentence required a longer response or perhaps even a confession as to what he was doing here, how he came to do this, why he really organized a trip to the Auschwitz Memorial. Of course, these were all questions I had asked him before, but I never addressed him by foregrounding his Palestinian identity, posing it as a fascinating oxymoron to his tolerance work grounded in Holocaust history.

It seemed as if beyond the surface of universal responsibility Majd was extremely anxious that he could become a racial reference, similar to Muhammad. Or put differently, by engaging in racelessness as a neutral endeavor of being same as everyone else, Majd was constantly erasing or relegating his own marked ethno-religious difference. By doing so, he privatized certain features of his self that were difficult to hide and would come up again, particularly so, on this trip to commemorate the Holocaust in Poland.

Back in the bus, I sought to sit next to Muhammad in order to get to know him better. The seat next to him was currently unoccupied and I asked for permission to sit down. He welcomed me but also told me to make sure I did not touch him, not even with my elbow or my foot, as he was preparing to pray. I offered to come back later, but he insisted I should just sit. I had a sense that he wanted me to see him pray. He said that he just disliked missing prayers and that he would pray in his seat right now. I watched him pray and thought that he looked extremely concentrated and calm for a change.[222]

There was something genuine about Muhammad, in the way he was childishly excited and unbroken. He asked me if I knew the story of *Ayyub*. "What about it?" I asked. "Well," he started and his voice shifted again to that rehearsed register of the teacher: "Ayyub, he lost everything, his wife, his children, his house, everything, you know, but he never lost his faith! He said *alhamdulillah, alhamdulillah*." He was quite loud, yelling at me, but I saw it as a sign of his excitement. "I see," I said. "Do you know Job (Hiob)?" I asked. "No, never heard of it, who is that?" "Well, it is the same prophet, but in the Old Testament." "Oh no, I don't read that, that is all forged," he answered with a face of disgust. "It is the same story," I said, "I am not sure what you see as forged." "No, I don't care for that, not interested, really." He would shake it off and turn away.

Muhammad's emphasis on Islam as the singular truth to anything really annoyed me in that moment and I was wondering, what had convinced him to join the trip at all. "Why do you want to visit the Auschwitz Memorial?" I asked him. "What is special about it for you?" "I don't think there's anything special about it," he answered. "I mean, don't we see this happening all the time in Syria, Iraq, or Palestine? People are being tortured and killed, murdered in wars, not just adults, also children. I don't see a difference or why this should be special." "So why did you join, then?" I ask him. "I joined because I am curious and because everyone tells me that this is special and I want to know what it is that makes it special." I leave it at that, as Muhammad seems to be done with speaking to me.

We are close to arriving and I go back to my seat, only to find it occupied. So I stand next to two female volunteers from the other group and we start a conversation about our jobs. They mistake me for another social worker at the school. One of the girls, Wendy, opens up about her work in a kindergarten in Neukölln. She says that it is terrible and an unbearable

[222] Once Muhammad was done with his ritual prayer, he hosted me like a guest in his house. He offered me a homemade hummus sandwich. While spreading the hummus over the Arabic pita bread, he told me proudly that he makes the hummus himself and that he taught himself to cook it, not his mother. I inquired about his parents, what they did for a living and if they were also religious. His mom was unemployed and his father was working in a mobile telephone shop. But he said that his parents did not care to teach him anything about Islam and that his mom was an infidel *(Ungläubige)*. When I told him that this is quite a harsh term, he insisted that his mom describes herself this way and openly states that she does not care for any religion. He told me that he taught himself to pray and would go to different mosques depending on how he felt or what sorts of events each was organizing.

place. Wondering if she suffers from bullying or unfriendly colleagues, I inquire what it is that makes it so unbearable. “There are no Germans,” she says. “None, zero. Only Arabs and Turks, it is really terrible.” I feel personally offended, so I ask why Arabs and Turks are terrible, especially since we are speaking about toddlers ages 3 to 6. Wendy seems a bit more careful in her wording now as she explains that they don’t speak proper German and that it is really hard to work with them. Their parents also don’t speak proper German. “Because they migrated to Germany, is that what you are saying?” I ask, visibly annoyed that an 18-year-old volunteer is openly using degrading language to describe immigrant children. “Yes, yes,” she says, “they are mostly migrant families.” “Well, that sounds really different from what you were describing in the beginning as a problem,” I respond. “I actually thought it was even racist what you said,” I add. Both Wendy and her friend seem shocked and I also note that the term racist gains a different quality on the way to Auschwitz. Racist sounds like murderer, as if she were verbally killing these toddlers.

The bus stops and we all leave to get our bags. Several minutes later, Wendy approaches me apologetically and explains that it must have sounded really strange what she described, but that it is a *problem* and the *problem* needs to be named, without hiding the *problem*. Ferit, the volunteer at the school, joined our conversation. “What’s going on?” he asks. So Wendy describes the *problem* again, but this time in different terms and slightly toned down. “Are you are saying they are all *Kanacken,* or what exactly is the problem?” asks Ferit in a blunt fashion.[223] Wendy is embarrassed by the taboo term *Kanacken*, something she is aware is socially unacceptable for her to use, especially in front of me and Ferit. She blushes and just leaves without any comment. Ferit looks at me, asking: “So what is the problem? I don’t understand.” The problem is that there is a language and class barrier I say, the children grow up bilingually and their German is not up to public standards, their parents are working-class immigrants or refugees, I am actually not sure.

The lack of German language, as Wendy described it, was not the actual problem, but how this group caused anxiety for being in Germany and not be German enough. Berlin has become a very international city into and out of which many people are migrating and it is home to several hundred bilingual or monolingual French, Spanish, and English pre-schools and kindergartens, usually funded by the European Union in order to facilitate cultural exchange early on. In general French, Spanish or any other European difference in language did not trigger the same anxiety over unassimilated foreigners as Middle Easterners did. The problem was that Wendy had to lower herself and deal with Turks and Arabs from a low-income milieu that was generally regarded as a cultural problem. What I called out as racist speech, shocked Wendy and her friend, because racism was attached to different practices and a different ideology; those we were about to be exposed to on the Memorial site. As there was no race in racelessness and as Turks and Arabs were publicly discussed as a problem, Wendy did not perceive herself to be making racist statements. Rather, she had just wished for these toddlers and their families to be better educated and socially developed, in order to be like Germans given that they lived in Germany.

5.6 Commemoration, not Prayer

When we arrived at the main entrance to the museum at the Auschwitz Memorial, several European groups had arrived at the same time as we did. While we were waiting for

[223] *Kanacken* is an interesting term, because no one fully knows why Turks and Arabs in Germany are called Kanacken, but the term originally refers to the native population of the Canaque islands. The islands were invoked in the 1970s by the Minister of the Interior at the time, who argued that if Germany had no fully functioning migration law, then even the Canaques would soon be at the door. In colloquial German it has several functions and meanings. It is used as an insult and as a designation for a primitive person, a subhuman, especially when it is expressed by a white ethnic German. Yet the term is used by many German-Turks and German-Arabs as a way of asserting pride and intimacy through reclaiming the insult, usually when no ethnic German person is around. In that sense, it is comparable to the English “n”-word.

our tour guide to arrive, a screen at the ticket desk announced the upcoming tours in various European languages. The museum space was meticulously organized to welcome and lead several European groups simultaneously into the actual space. A permanent photo installation opposite the book kiosk exhibited historical milestones and noteworthy moments at the memorial site.[224]

The German speaking Polish tour guides split the group in two. As the guide introduced us to the former camp site, we were standing opposite the open gate and the wrought iron words on top of it: *ARBEIT MACHT FREI* (work sets you free). Other groups were taking cheerful photos underneath the gate, some making a victory sign, others simply grouping neatly underneath it. There was something strange about taking cheerful souvenir pictures at this sight, but no one seemed to mind. We were connected with the tour guide through a walky-talky and we could hear her voice from meters away. She walks us through the different barracks, explaining the part of the camp known as Auschwitz I. A barrage of information on the logistics of Auschwitz comes through the device. Students listen, but we are not all looking at the same objects and documents. Most rooms and buildings are barren, furnished only with glass vitrines and original documents. One hallway is decorated with black-and-white profile pictures of mostly Polish inmates, neatly hung in rows of black frames covering the entire wall. The pictures display the names and numbers of each inmate. All of them are shaved and dressed in the black and white striped attire that one associates with concentration camps. It occurs to me that this clothing looks like pajamas.

The tour guide explains that the first inmates were Polish resisters to the Nazis. The Nazis ascribed a number to each inmate and took their photo. As most political inmates resisted their arrest, they were brutally beaten up first, which shows in the photos. The faces exposed clear bruises or teary eyes. When the number of inmates grew and the camp professionalized, individual pictures became a bureaucratic challenge and were abandoned.

Most of the visit transpired calmly, with students listening attentively to the tour guide. The walking tour led us through different sites, from exhibition barracks housing to former torture chambers, from dark cells in the basement to outdoor execution sites and from there to the gas chamber and the cremation ovens, our last station at the main camp. The detailed information on prisoner life in the camp was overwhelming and when we broke for lunch, we all rushed to the adjacent restaurant to order food, no one spoke during lunch.

After lunch we walk to the actual death camp of Auschwitz, the site where the deportees would arrive and then be segregated into groups who would be sent either immediately to death or to death through labor. Majd and Ahmet had collected the names of deportees from Reinickendorf and the students were briefed about holding a commemoration ceremony for the local victims of the Holocaust. The tour guides led us through the ruins of former barracks, abandoned train cars, laundry disinfection chambers, a hall with a collection of personal photos of some inmates, and the destroyed gas chambers.

With all gas chambers levelled to the ground, the sun was shining over a wide green field and a dozen red brick houses. Majd and Ahmet decided that we should commemorate the local victims of Reinickendorf in front of the destroyed gas chambers. Majd asked Ferit, the volunteer, to open the address and four students to read out the names and exact addresses of the last places the victims had lived. By reading out names and exact addresses, we brought these names into the space of Auschwitz and built a direct connection between these two locales. All the information we had been hearing, about how many people died in the camps and where they all came from, the big history of mass genocide, was now narrowed down to

[224] One photo showed a young man from behind wrapped in the Israeli flag. I thought again of Muhammad's request to show up in the Palestinian flag and how provocative this was for everyone. I also wondered, if this is all that is left to express being Jewish in Europe, being a nation in an exclusive state outside of Europe in the Middle East.

these twelve names from Reinickendorf. Auschwitz hit close to home. We observed a moment of silence and then dispersed for free individual strolls, in order to have a moment of reflection. The stroll around the area took us to a small but entirely blackened pond. Four black plaques in English, Polish, Hebrew, and German explained that this pond was used as ash disposal for all the burnt bodies. One of the volunteers kneeled down in front of the four black plaques, crossed himself and folded his hands for prayer. At the sight of this volunteer praying, I was touched by such an intimate gesture and so was the art teacher standing next to me. But the prayer triggered an argument over the right to pray at the memorial site.

The Christian prayer at the memorial site reminded us all that Muhammad had earlier requested to pray and had been rejected by Majd. Muhammad exclaimed, "Why is he allowed to pray and I am not!?" directly addressing Majd. Majd, seemingly nervous, responded that he had already explained why and stated that there would be no further discussion about this now. "This is unfair, why am I not allowed to pray and he is?" Muhammad repeated in a manner that demanded a response. Majd explained that the volunteer was not accountable to him but to the main organizer, who did not seem to mind. Majd went on explaining, pointing at the volunteer, that he prayed for the victims of this site and was respectful of their death. "But perhaps Muhammad wants to pray for the victims as well," I interjected, while trying to understand why Majd seemed so nervous. "No," said Muhammad, "I just wanted to do my own ritual prayer." "You see," said Majd, "he just wants to provoke," then Majd walked off. Muhammad shrugged his shoulders and I also felt at odds with Muhammad's request and Majd's reaction. There was no time to ask, but it seemed that Majd was extremely anxious about the sight of an Islamic prayer at Auschwitz; and Muhammad knew how to inflame this anxiety to an unbearable point.

5.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have attended two different racial configurations embedded in an ordering mechanism of *racelessness.* This ordering mechanism either heightened religious and ethnic difference, as was the case with Muslim difference, or it erased Jewish difference. While the Jewish survivor was almost not recognized or not understood in what was Jewish about her, she provided a point of access for the ethnic German students to identify with her and to take on that position of the Jewish victim. In contrast, a half of the ethnic German students would express fear of Muslims in the guise of terrorists and refugees. Similarly, the two volunteers talking about Turks and Arabs as a terrible problem was never understood to be racist or to the least racializing speech but just pointing out a problem. In those rather minor moments, I could sense how this kind of language was comfortably used, because race, racism and racial relations were thought of morally evil and specific to a particular space-time of Auschwitz and the larger Holocaust.

The dynamic between Muhammad and the social workers revealed that although the school and the trip had no particular extremism prevention purpose, the fear of Islam and Muslims loomed in the background. For Majd the trip was a way of relating to Auschwitz from an unmarked position of humanity. Similarly, Majd never foregrounded a particular Palestinian, Muslim or hyphenated identity. Yet organizing the trip marked him and his position instead of naturalizing him as a human. Other participants on the trip were keen on finding out who the Palestinian social worker was. Acknowledging and marking the entrance of a Palestinian into Auschwitz memorial as something remarkable given the history that had brought Palestinians to Germany. Muhammad's performance as Muslim-Palestinian worked like the opposite to Majd's position and mostly provoked Majd than anyone else. Although Muhammad did not bring a kufiyah or a Palestinian flag to Auschwitz, his presence threatened Majd and the order of the space as one of universal humanity. Being Jewish or Christian in that space were not differentiated subject positions, they were humanized and

inherently part of that space. In contrast being Muslim and explicitly showing it could not be embedded in a common humanity.

In my follow-up conversations with Majd, he clarified that he does not have anything against Muhammad's wish to prayer but that he felt it was a provocation only. When I asked how it would provoke, he explained that there had been recent terror attacks in France and that it was not sensible to conduct Muslim prayer in an atmosphere of fear. Majd answer was offering an even wider window of what was at stake, although I think that the Muslim prayer of one of his students felt personally disturbing and negatively reflecting back on him. Yet Majd openly accounted for the context in which Islamist, terrorist or Muslim had become interchangeable.

Even in a place like Auschwitz memorial, or perhaps because it was Auschwitz Memorial, being simply Muslim and human could not be reconciled. Muhammad's earlier threats to come with a Palestinian flag had already raised questions of what he was intending to do, his Muslim prayer was a similar provocation according to Majd. The provocation of these acts, as Majd clarified, was not inherent to them, but shaped by the wider social gaze onto Palestinians and Muslims. In making this statement, Majd contradicted his earlier position of going to Auschwitz for universal humanity and questioned the space of exception. The entrance and visibility of Muslims and/or Palestinians in the memorial site made ongoing racial exclusion and aversion against religious minorities in Europe palpable.

Lessons Learned? A Conclusion

During fieldwork I stumbled upon one sentence over and over again: "Because of history!" This sentence was usually offered to me, whenever I asked questions about how we understood tolerance, how we related to race or racism, or why certain things in civic education are set up and organized the way they are. In personal conversations, the answer seemed like an impasse to me, as if the question could not be engaged with anymore other than pointing to an object both removed and yet constitutive of everything around us. It was usually the definitive response and signaled that I had over-exhausted my interlocutor with questions followed by silence, shoulder shrugs, a look away. But "Because of history!" was more than a response to a question; it was a claim, a statement, a promise, and a delivery to that promise that performed the "now here we are still after the Holocaust." Uttering "Because of history" was not confined or limited to a liberal segment or specific to one purpose.

The German parliament, spearheaded by the SPD, literally made this statement when it introduced a legal petition in 2018 for the surveillance and possible deportation of refugees, when they engage in anti-Semitic demagoguery. Members of the AfD, I talked with during my field research in Berlin, they would make this statement in order to say that they were no Nazis and yet they were always read as such. Enunciated from the political elites and centers this statement was a reassurance, a knowing, a keeping promise that one was really on the right track, while executing policies or aiming for political change. Stated from the other side, by the Jewish communities and spokespersons, it would come as a reminder, and a warning that perhaps the memory of the Holocaust was not so stable and present anymore, as for example during the circumcision ban in 2012. In a context still grappling with religious and ethnic difference in ways that I have described throughout this dissertation, this line was reserved for those who could claim that they had learned from history, their history.

Holocaust history has provided the frame and object through which minority citizens have been addressed publicly, but also in tolerance training programs and extremism prevention projects, the main focus of this dissertation. Hence, German state institutions have generated a relationship in which formal citizens of Middle Eastern migrant backgrounds have come to be perceived and inscribed as not sufficiently citizenly, tolerant and secular. In teaching tolerance to new citizens, the German state, public institutions, and the majority could take on a positon of already tolerant. Moreover, in this position they could reassert a character of the German nation as already morally superior by having learned the lessons from the past, secularized and cultivated tolerance into which newcomers had to adapt and integrate. Exceptions to the rule were located in the extremist margins and similarly combatted, yet never stigmatized in the same way as Muslims subjects are, who were doubted to be citizens at all.

Tolerance hailed as the prime civic virtue in liberal democracies has appeared in two major forms in my discussion. In the first form it has appeared as the political practice shaping secular governance of minorities and thus, was not located in jurisdiction or law. Rather, it inscribed the conduct of social and political practice and permeated the practice of legal affairs, conferral of rights or their deferral as I demonstrated in chapter 1. In its second form, the political discourse of tolerance disseminated into the field of civic education and shaped concrete practices, to be trained and performed. In this second form, tolerance was not a unified practice or a homogeneous thing it could take on different shapes and guide various interactions. Yet it was organized around the Holocaust as the most evil but exceptional event in history centering the figure of the Jew as a violated subject. Further, it had a homogeneous opposite in this field namely traditional Islam that was dealt as the source of intolerance obstructing the ability to be an agentive citizen in a liberal democracy.

The question of citizenship as one of political equality, rightful belonging, but also as a disciplinary tool underwritten by majoritarian norms and values, I have approached by

centering the episteme of the post-Holocaust. This episteme has conditioned what could be said, known and done, not only about the Holocaust and German-Jewish history, but about the present political context as such. Here, citizenship coincided with a notion of secularity that was not only placing religion in a particular place and judging it from an epistemological ground of history, but the Holocaust was the "constitutive exception" of history. As that "constitutive exception" it could never fully be just past, just history, but remained the exceptional space-time to the current political order. As the exception it could be called upon and related to as a civic act, but never in ways that would question its exceptionality. A consequence of this exceptional status is that state technologies in their racializing effect cannot be accounted for in German society beyond the historical time of the Holocaust. Similarly, managing and regulating migrants, refugees and religious minorities in the contemporary remains articulated in a benign form of secularizing as an entirely different project from previous times and certainly unaccountable in its racializing effects.

The disciplining of minority citizens, as a religious problem, in the civic educational programs remained embedded in racelessness. Racelessness, I have conceptualized as stemming from the exceptionality of the Holocaust itself and from cutting off certain racial effects from state workings, "the separation of state and race," as formulated by David Goldberg. In this dissertation, this kind of separation has been effected by the official aim to enable Muslims to separate between religion and politics, private and public, traditional Islam and contemporary world. Here my suggestion throughout the dissertation was that religious difference is not simply race, but that the reference to religion as a problem mobilized governmental technologies and procedures that had a racializing effect onto subjects categorized as Muslims. In other words, the identification and regulation of what counted as religious difference with further disciplinary mechanisms mobilized and realized an epistemology of race and attached itself to those subjects marked as Muslim.

By inviting participants as Muslims and potential Islamic extremists into these programs shaped how these programs judged and assessed certain statements, especially those that counted as intolerant or failing secularity. These moments of failure were connected to religious intolerance, anti-Semitism and potential Islamic extremism lurking in the social milieu of the participant. In the same vein, failing to relate to the Holocaust in the publicly accepted way was usually addressed as emanating from religious intolerance and led to moral panics and social exclusion of the exposed Muslim as I demonstrated in chapter 2. Unfolding in the context of racelessness, these social dynamics were mapped onto the individual failure of the Muslim subject.

Educating Muslims to be citizens was predicated upon a secularization paradigm interchangeable with "racial historicism." Racial historicism as the benign form of changing inferior subjects into a better, usually civilized, state intersected with trying to change religious ways of inhabiting the world with secular ways, commonly understood as a separation of spheres. While the general way of dealing with minority subjects has been predicated upon the historicist notion of racial relations, the moments of moral panic revealed that Muslims were also regarded by the same institutions as inherently incapable of becoming secular citizens; that is tolerant in the German inflected way. Relatedly, by expanding Holocaust memory onto these new citizens and by incorporating them a direct racial relationship was enacted turning ethnic Christian-secularized Germans into masters of this history and re-inscribing a Germanness vis-à-vis this new minority.

Civic educators of migrant and Muslim backgrounds, my main interlocutors in the civil society organizations, by contrast had to maintain an ongoing distance and boundary-drawing between themselves and their target group. They could become secular role models, but they were aware of their liminal space within the wider field of civic education. Similarly, their speaker and subject position was fraught with frictions vis-à-vis their target group. It was as if their own position was one of toleration, always threatened to be taken away from them,

the moment they misstep. These anxieties as they crystallized mostly in contentious moments were illustrative of how Muslims as such were positioned in German society. Regardless of actual mastery or failure, by virtue of having entered this relationship defined on majoritarian terms, the minority subject re-affirmed majoritarian values and norms as shaped by the public institutions and the state and confirmed one's own status as Muslim.

In the provided chapters, I have discussed the complexity of this idealized German Muslim position usually embodied by the civic educators, social workers, and community organizers. By doing so, I have also attended to how the practice of citizenship has been taken up as a practice of secularity. In chapter 3, I have paid particular attention to how Middle Eastern forms of speaking about Israel and Jews became the site of combatting anti-Semitism. Although this speech could not simply be categorized as hate speech, it enabled the transposition of older German-grown concepts of anti-Semitism onto a new group. While the civic educators were usually keen on de-emphasizing religion as a resource or visible practice, most starkly so in the last chapter on the Auschwitz memorial, religious sentiments and convictions were never fully absent. Traditional Islam figured as a problem, even when it was unnamed. In chapter 4, I have attended to how the Christian notion of atonement for the state of Israel and the murdered Jews during the Holocaust has conflated the two into the theological figure of Israel. By doing so, a notion of atonement has been mobilized and expanded beyond the churches and inscribed secular citizenship as such.

The practice of citizenship in Germany remains underwritten by Christian-secularized notions of inhabiting the world as a human. Being constituted through the post-Holocaust episteme, however, it centers an eradicated European Jewish community in the moment it seeks to secularize and incorporate a heterogeneous former immigrant community as Muslims. This triangulated relationship between Germans, Jews and Muslims has enabled a moral nationalism for the majority and racialized Jews and Muslims in certain ways. While Jews remain exceptionally violated victims, Muslims are regarded as potential violators.

Bibliography

Aguilar, Luis Hernández. 2018. *Governing Muslims and Islam in Contemporary Germany: Race, Time, and the German Islam Conference*.
Aguilar, Luis Manuel Hernández. 2017. "Suffering Rights and Incorporation. The German Islam Conference and the Integration of Muslims as a Discursive Means of Their Racialization." *European Societies* 19 (5): 623–44.
Aitken, Robbie. 2014. *Exclusion and Inclusion: Gradations of Whiteness and Socio-Economic Engineering in German Southwest Africa, 1884-1914*.
Aktürk, Şener. 2012. *Regimes of Ethnicity and Nationhood in Germany, Russia, and Turkey*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Amir-Moazami, Schirin. 2011a. "Pitfalls of Consensus-Orientated Dialogue: The German Islam Conference (Deutsche Islam Konferenz)." *Approaching Religion* 1 (1): 2–15.
———. 2011. "Dialogue as a Governmental Technique: Managing Gendered Islam in Germany." *Feminist Review* 98 (1): 9–27.
———. 2016a. "Investigating the Secular Body: The Politics of the Male Circumcision Debate in Germany." *ReOrient* 1 (2): 147–70.
———. 2016b. "Zur Produktion Loyaler Staatsbürger: Einbürgerungstests Als Instrument Der Regulierung von Religiös-Kultureller Pluralität in Deutschland." *Forschungsjournal Soziale Bewegungen* 29 (2): 21–34.
Arendt, Hannah. 1973. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. 1 edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
———. 2000. *Israel, Palästina Und Der Antisemitismus*. Berlin: Wagenbach.
Asad, Talal. 2003. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. 1st ed. Stanford University Press.
Attia, Iman. 2009. "Die »westliche Kultur« und ihr Anderes." transcript Verlag. 2009.
Baker, Cynthia M. 2017. *Jew*. Reprint edition. New Brunswick, New Jersey ; London: Rutgers University Press.
Balibar, Etienne, and Immanuel Wallerstein. 1991. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. London: Verso.
Barskanmaz, Cengiz. 2011. "Rasse – Unwort Des Antidiskriminierungsrechts?" *Kritische Justiz* 44 (4): 382–89.
———. 2018. "Framing Race and Law in Europe." *Völkerrechtsblog* (blog). February 26, 2018. https://voelkerrechtsblog.org/framing-race-and-law-in-europe/.
Bauman, Zygmunt. 2001. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cornell Univ Pr.
Bergmann, Werner. 2002. *Geschichte des Antisemitismus*. 1. Aufl. München: C.H.Beck.
Betz, Tobias, Sonja Pohlmann, and Carsten Volkery. 2006. "Islam-Konferenz: Schäuble Wünscht Sich 'Deutsche Muslime.'" *Spiegel Online*.
Brown, Wendy. 2008. "Regulating Aversion." Princeton University Press. 2008. http://press.princeton.edu/titles/8306.html.
Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Harvard University Press.
Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2007. *[(Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference)]*. Princeton University Press.
Chin, Rita. 2007. *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany*. Cambridge University Press.
Cil, Nevim. 2007. "Topographie Des Außenseiters."
Claude, Inis L. Jr. 1955. *National Minorities. An International Problem*. 1St Edition edition. Harvard University Press.

Dalceggio, Alessia. 2016. “Ricky Van Oers, (2013). Deserving Citizenship. Citizenship Tests in Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Wolf Legal Publishers. 299 Pp. £ 138 (Hbk).” *Nations and Nationalism* 22 (4): 846–48. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12240.
Das, Veena, and Deborah Poole. 2009. *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*.
Dekel, Irit. 2013. *Mediation at the Holocaust Memorial in Berlin*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Deutscher Bundestag, 1999. 1999. “Plenarprotokoll 14/28.” March 19, 1999.
Dohm, Christian Conrad Wilhelm von, and Wolf Christoph Seifert. 2015. *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden*.
Dreier, Horst. 2013. *Säkularisierung und Sakralität: Zum Selbstverständnis des modernen Verfassungsstaates*. 1st ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
Eley, Geoff. 1991. “Liberalism, Europe, and the Bourgeoisie 1860–1914.” *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*, 293–317.
Eley, Geoff, and Jan Palmowski. 2008. *Citizenship and National Identity in Twentieth-Century Germany*. Stanford University Press.
Eliav, Mordechai. 1960. *Jüdische Erziehung in Deutschland im Zeitalter der Aufklärung und der Emanzipation*. Waxmann Verlag.
Erb, Rainer, and Werner Bergmann. 1989. *Die Nachtseite der Judenemanzipation: Der Widerstand gegn die Integration der Juden in Deutschland 1780-1860*. Berlin: Metropol Verlag.
Esmeir, Samera. 2012. “Juridical Humanity: A Colonial History | Samera Esmeir.” June 30, 2012. http://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=16425.
Fanon, Frantz. 2008. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Grove Press.
Fava, Rosa. 2015. *Die Neuausrichtung der „Erziehung nach Auschwitz“ in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft: Eine rassismuskritische Diskursanalyse*. 1 edition. Berlin: Metropol-Verlag.
Fernando, Mayanthi L. 2014. *The Republic Unsettled: Muslim French and the Contradictions of Secularism*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
Foblets, Marie-Claire, Jean-François Gaudreault-Desbiens, and Alison Dundes Renteln. 2010. *Cultural Diversity and Law*. Bruxelles: Emile Bruylant.
Forst, Rainer. 2004. “The Limits of Toleration.” *Constellations* 11 (3): 312–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1351-0487.2004.00379.x.
Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Edition. Vintage.
Gailus, Manfred. 2008. *Kirchliche Amtshilfe: Die Kirche Und Die Judenverfolgung Im “Dritten Reich.”* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Georgi, Viola B. 2003. *Entliehene Erinnerung : Geschichtsbilder Junger Migranten in Deutschland*. Hamburg : Hamburger Edition, 2003.
Göktürk, Deniz, David Gramling, and Anton Kaes. 2007. *Germany in Transit: Nation and Migration, 1955-2005*. 1st ed. University of California Press.
Goldberg, David Theo. 2002. *The Racial State*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
———. 2009. *The Threat of Race Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:101:1-201412175101.
———. 2015. *Are We All Postracial Yet?* Place of publication not identified: Polity Press.
Gryglewski, Elke. 2013. *Anerkennung und Erinnerung: Zugänge arabisch-palästinensischer und türkischer Berliner Jugendlicher zum Holocaust*. 1 edition. Berlin: Metropol-Verlag.
Hammer, Juliane. 2005. *Palestinians Born in Exile: Diaspora and the Search for a Homeland by Juliane Hammer*.
Hanks, William F. 2000. *Intertexts: Writings on Language, Utterance, and Context*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Hanks, William F. 2005. “Explorations in the Deictic Field.” *Current Anthropology*. 46 (2): 191–220.
Hanks, William F. 2013. “Counterparts: Co-Presence and Ritual Intersubjectivity.” *Language and Communication* 3 (33): 263–77.
Heng, Geraldine. 2011a. “The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages I: Race Studies, Modernity, and the Middle Ages1.” *Literature Compass* 8 (5): 315–31.
———. 2011b. “The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages II: Locations of Medieval Race1.” *Literature Compass* 8 (5): 332–50.
Horlacher, Rebekka. 2015. *The Educated Subject and the German Concept of Bildung: A Comparative Cultural History*. New York: Routledge.
Jarausch, Konrad H. 2008. *After Hitler: Recivilizing Germans, 1945-1995*. Translated by Brandon Hunziker. Reprint. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
Jaspers, Karl. 1946. *Die Schuldfrage: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Frage : (2. Aufl.)*. Zürich.
Jikeli, Günther. 2015. *European Muslim Antisemitism: Why Young Urban Males Say They Don’t Like Jews*. Indiana University Press.
Judd, Robin. 2007. *Contested Rituals: Circumcision, Kosher Butchering, and Jewish Political Life in Germany, 1843-1933*. Ithaca [etc.: Cornell University Press.
Kammerer, Gabriele. 2008. *Aktion Sühnezeichen Friedensdienste*. Göttingen: Lamuv Verlag GmbH.
Katz, Jacob. 1973. *Out of the ghetto ; the social background of Jewish emancipation, 1770-1870.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
———. 1998. *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770-1870*. Edited by Henry L. Feingold. Syracuse, N.Y: Syracuse University Press.
Laurence, Jonathan. 2001. “(Re)Constructing Community in Berlin: Turks, Jews, and German Responsibility.” *Germpolisoci German Politics & Society* 19 (2 (59)): 22–61.
Legerer. 2011a. “German Law Journal.” June 21, 2011. https://web.archive.org/web/20110621215741/http://www.germanlawjournal.com/pdfs/Vol06No02/PDF_Vol_06_No_02_465-471_Art_SI_Legerer.pdf.
Legerer, Anton. 2011b. *Tatort: Versöhnung. Über die Aktion Sühnezeichen, Friedensdienste in der BRD sowie in der DDR und Gedenkdienste in Österreich.* 1. Aufl. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
Leggewie, Claus. 2011. “Monoculturalism Is Dead: Multiculturalism Has yet to Come.” *Eurozine* (blog). February 21, 2011. https://www.eurozine.com/monoculturalism-is-dead-multiculturalism-has-yet-to-come/.
Lewicki, Aleksandra. 2014. *[(Social Justice Through Citizenship? : The Politics of Muslim Integration in Germany and Great Britain)]*. Palgrave MacMillan.
Mahmood, Saba. 2015. *Religious Difference in a Secular Age: A Minority Report*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Mandel, Ruth. 2008. *Cosmopolitan Anxieties: Turkish Challenges to Citizenship and Belonging in Germany*. Duke University Press.
Masuzawa, Tomoko. 2005. *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism*. University Of Chicago Press.
Meister, Robert. 2012. *After Evil: A Politics of Human Rights*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Motte, Jan, and Rainer Ohliger. 2004. *Geschichte Und Gedächtnis in Der Einwanderungsgesellschaft: Migration Zwischen Historischer Rekonstruktion Und Erinnerungspolitik*. Klartext Verlag.
Nathans, Eli. 2004. “The Politics of Citizenship in Germany.” Bloomsbury Publishing. 2004. https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/the-politics-of-citizenship-in-germany-9781859737811/.
Ohliger, Rainer, Jan Motte, Viola Georgi, Bartholomäus Figatorski, Richard Traunmüller, and Joscha Legowie. 2006. *Integration und Partizipation durch historisch-politische Bildung*

Stand - Herausforderungen - Entwicklungsperspektiven. Berlin: Stiftung “Erinnerung, Verantwortung und Zukunft.”
Özyürek, Esra. 2015. “Export-Import Theory and the Racialization of Anti-Semitism: Turkish- and Arab-Only Prevention Programs in Germany.” ResearchGate. 2015. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0010417515000560.
Partridge, Damani J. 2010. “Holocaust Mahnmal (Memorial): Monumental Memory amidst Contemporary Race.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52 (4): 820–50.
———. 2012. *Hypersexuality and Headscarves: Race, Sex, and Citizenship in the New Germany*. First Edition edition. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Peter, Frank. 2010. “Welcoming Muslims into the Nation: Tolerance, Politics and Integration in Germany.” *Muslims in the West after 9/11 : Religion, Politics, and Law Muslims in the West after 9/11 : Religion, Politics, and Law / Ed. by Jocelyne Cesari, ISBN 9780415776547*, 119–44.
Povinelli, Elizabeth A. 2007. *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Ranan, David. 2018. *Muslimischer Antisemitismus: Eine Gefahr für den gesellschaftlichen Frieden in Deutschland?* 1st ed. Bonn: Dietz, J H.
Rothberg, Michael. 2009. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford University Press.
Said, Edward W. 1979. *Orientalism*. 1st Vintage Books ed. Vintage.
Sebald, W. G. 2012. *On the Natural History of Destruction.*
Senellart, Michel, and Michel Foucault. 2009. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978*. Translated by Graham Burchell. 1 edition. New York, NY: Lectures at the College De Fra.
Shooman, Yasemin, and Riem Spielhaus. 2010. “The Concept of the Muslim Enemy in the Public Discourse.” In , 198–228. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203863961.
Shoshan, Nitzan. 2016. *The Management of Hate: Nation, Affect, and the Governance of Right-Wing Extremism in Germany*. Reprint edition. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
Silverstein, Paul. 2018. *Postcolonial France and Its Futures: Identity, Popular Culture and Imperial Frictions.* London: Pluto Press.
Sorkin, David Jan. 1999. *The Transformation of German Jewry, 1780-1840*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
Stoler, Ann Laura. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault’s History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Duke University Press.
———. 2016. *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in Our Times*.
Tezcan, Levent. 2012. *Das muslimische Subjekt: Verfangen im Dialog der Deutschen Islam Konferenz*. 1st ed. Konstanz: Konstanz University Press.
Theo Goldberg, David. 2016. “Militarizing Race.” *Social Text* 34 (December): 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-3680846.
Weir, Todd H. 2015. “Germany and the New Global History of Secularism: Questioning the Postcolonial Genealogy.” *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory* 90 (1): 6–20.
Welzer, Harald, Sabine Moller, and Karoline Tschuggnall. 2002. *Die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus: »Opa war kein Nazi«: Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust im Familiengedächtnis*. 9 edition. Frankfurt am Main: FISCHER Taschenbuch.
Wienand, C. A. 2012. “From Atonement to Peace? Aktion Sühnezeichen, German-Israeli Relations and the Role of Youth in Reconciliation Discourse and Practice.” In *Reconciliation, Civil Society, and the Politics of Memory. Transnational Initiatives in the 20th and 21st Century*, 201–35. Bielefeld: transcript. http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1417688/.
Winkelmann, Ruth, Claudia Bauer, and Heimatmuseum. 2011. *Ruth Winkelmann: Plötzlich hieß ich Sara: Erinnerungen einer jüdischen Berlinerin; 1933-1945*. Berlin: Jaron.

Yurdakul, Gokce. 2008. *From Guestworkers into Muslims: The Transformation of Turkish Immigrant Associations in Germany*. New. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Zimmerer, Jürgen. 2011. *Von Windhuk nach Auschwitz?: Beiträge zum Verhältnis von Kolonialismus und Holocaust*. 1., Aufl. edition. Berlin: Lit Verlag.

Online Resources (in order of appearance)

www.transit.berkeley.edu/archives/volume-8-1/
www.holocaustremembrance.com/index.php/stockholm-declaration
www.parlament-berlin.de/ados/18/IIIPlen/vorgang/d18-1061.pdf
www.parlament-berlin.de/ados/18/IIIPlen/vorgang/d18-1061.pdf
www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-11559451
www.ghdi.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=859
www.returningfromgermany.de/en/voluntary-return
www.pdok.bundestag.de/index.php
www.dipbt.bundestag.de/dip21/btp/14/14028.pdf
www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/DIK/DE/DIK/1UeberDIK/DIK2014Teilnehmer/dik2014teilnehmer-node.html.
www.youtube.com/watch?v=15vpBe2sf5c
www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DIK/DE/Downloads/LenkungsausschussPlenum/Plenum-arbeitsprogramm.pdf;jsessionid=D723FE204487BE63678C1F25C8F6A45C.1_cid286?__blob=publicationFile.
www.deutsche-islam-konferenz.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DIK/DE/Downloads/Sonstiges/Zwischenbericht%20AG%20Praevention2011.pdf;jsessionid=D723FE204487BE63678C1F25C8F6A45C.1_cid286?__blob=publicationFile.
www.irp.uni-osnabrueck.de/institut/ueber_uns.html
www.bpb.de/politik/extremismus/antisemitismus/37945/antisemitismus?p=all
www.english.alarabiya.net/en/perspective/features/2017/07/19/The-Palestinian-woman-who-works-in-a-Jewish-Museum-by-choice-.html
www.theguardian.com/world/2017/sep/01/trojan-horse-the-real-story-behind-the-fake-islamic-plot-to-take-over-schools
www.timesofisrael.com/berlin-anne-frank-center-guide-says-holocaust-suffering-like-palestinian-strife/
www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/hoecke-rede-im-wortlaut-gemuetszustand-eines-total-besiegten-volkes/19273518.html
www.bpb.de
www.stiftung-evz.de/eng/the-foundation/history.html
www.stiftung-denkmal.de/startseite.html
www.topographie.de/en/
www.stiftung-evz.de/fileadmin/user_upload/EVZ_Uploads/Publikationen/Studien/2006_migration.pdf.
www.kiga-berlin.org/uploads/KIgA_Widerspruchstoleranz_2013.pdf.
www.berghof-foundation.org/fileadmin/redaktion/Publications/Other_Resources/PrimeTextbuch.pdf.
www.dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/18/041/1804173.pdf
www.asfev.de/fileadmin/Redaktion/Dateien/Publikationen/Jahresberichte/Jahresbericht_2017_web.pdf
www.nachhaltigkeit.axelspringer.de/de/grundsaetze/unternehmensgrundsaetze.html
www.bundeskanzlerin.de/bkin-de/aktuelles/rede-von-bundeskanzlerin-merkel-bei-der-begegnung-mit-dem-praesidenten-des-staates-israel-reuven-rivlin-1533970
www.dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/19/004/1900444.pdf
www.parlament-berlin.de/ados/17/Recht/vorgang/r17-0185v_Beitrag%20Cengiz%20Barskanmaz.pdf
www.verfassungsschutz.de/de/aktuelles/termine/te-20170630-ankuendigung-keine-neue-gestapo
www.welt.de/regionales/berlin/article174745891/Staatssekretaerin-Chebli-putzt-Stolpersteine.html

www.tagesspiegel.de/politik/afd-chef-gauland-vogelschiss-aeusserung-war-politisch-unklug/22667294.html