This is a repository copy of *The possibilities and pitfalls of a Jewish cosmopolitanism. Reading Natan Sznaider through Russian-Jewish writer Olga Grjasnowa’s German-language novel Der Russe ist einer, der Birken liebt (All Russians love Birch trees)*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/96927/

**Article:**

https://doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2016.1203872

**Reuse**
Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher’s website.

**Takedown**
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.
The Possibilities and Pitfalls of A Jewish Cosmopolitanism. Reading Natan Sznaider through Russian-Jewish Writer Olga Grjasnowa’s German-language Novel Der Russe ist einer, der Birken liebt (All Russians Love Birch Trees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal:</th>
<th>European Review of History / revue européenne d'histoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript ID</td>
<td>CERH-2015-0059.R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Type</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keywords:</td>
<td>Jewish literature, Natan Sznaider, Cosmopolitanism, Olga Grjasnowa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Possibilities and Pitfalls of A Jewish Cosmopolitanism. Reading Natan Sznaider through Russian-Jewish Writer Olga Grjasnowa’s German-language Novel Der Russe ist einer, der Birken liebt (All Russians Love Birch Trees)

A Jewish Cosmopolitanism?

In Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order (2011), Israeli sociologist Natan Sznaider shows how Jewish thinkers before and after the Holocaust have advanced universalist ideas out of their particularist Jewish identities, connecting the Jewish experience to contemporary cosmopolitan concerns such as Human Rights, genocide prevention, and international justice. In the opening section of this article, we examine Sznaider’s elaboration of a historically-grounded and implicitly diasporic ‘Jewish cosmopolitanism’ as a response to what he sees as the increasing Jewish ethno-nationalism of the state of Israel. Next, we turn to Russian-Jewish writer Olga Grjasnowa’s Der Russe ist einer, der Birken liebt (All Russians Love Birch Trees, 2012). Like Sznaider’s Jewish Memory, Grjasnowa’s German-language novel posits a Jewish cosmopolitanism that insists upon the ‘Jewishness’ of the Holocaust and its universal significance, but this work of fiction also probes the limitations of a cosmopolitanism that aims to channel Jewish trauma into a principled solidarity with others. Finally, we ask whether Sznaider’s ‘Jewish cosmopolitanism’ can avoid the pitfalls of undifferentiated sentimentality and self-indulgence (or self-consolation), or avoid a potentially fraught stylization of Jews as ‘exemplary’.

In late 2014, Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu provoked international consternation, and not insignificant domestic concern, when he forwarded to the Knesset a bill to introduce a definition of Israel as the ‘national state of the Jewish people’ into the constitution. For Netanyahu’s critics, including two of his coalition partners, the proposed
legislation contradicted the ideal prominently featured in Israel’s Declaration of
Independence of 1948, namely the new state’s duty to ‘ensure complete equality of social and
political rights to all its inhabitants’. It appeared that Netanyahu was determined to set aside
Israel’s foundational rhetorical commitment to cosmopolitan principles—which had in any
case always clashed with the everyday reality of discrimination against its Arab citizens—in
favour of an uncompromising assertion of Jewish ethno-nationalism. For German-Jewish
commentator Micha Brumlik, Netanyahu’s reframing of Israel’s purpose could only end in
catastrophe, not only for Israeli Arabs and Palestinians seeking to realize their national
aspirations, but also for Jews. It would incite the biggest crisis since the Holocaust, as Jews in
the diaspora—committed to their Jewishness as an expression of universalist values—would
reject Israeli chauvinism as no better than any other expression of aggressive particularism.¹

Brumlik, of course, is not the only thinker to have observed the tension between
universalism and particularism in Jewish existence, especially in the diaspora, and to argue
that Jewishness loses its prophetic, universalist significance when it sacrifices the former for
the sake of the latter. Promoting a Jewish Enlightenment (Haskalah) in the late eighteenth
century, Moses Mendelssohn emphasised Judaism’s universalist ethical underpinning, shared
with the other Abrahamic faiths—reason, tolerance, love—as an indispensable counterpart to
the Jewish people’s special covenant with God, forged through revelation. Indeed, Jewish
enlighteners (maskilim) emphasised the humanistic aspects of Judaism while depicting Jews
in the diaspora as mediators between the particular and the universal.² In more recent times,
American scholar and public intellectual Alan Wolfe, in his provocatively titled (and hotly
debated) book At Home in Exile. Why Diaspora is Good for the Jews (2014), has argued that
‘in a world in which nation-states are primarily concerned with protecting their own,
however, the diaspora remains the place where a universalistic Judaism will survive best’.³
(Here, Wolfe’s At Home in Exile to some extent recalls Juri Slezkine’s 2004 The Jewish
Century, which prefers a cosmopolitan nomadism for Jews to the normalising tendencies of
the nation-state Israel). Jews in the diaspora, Wolfe suggests, are not only charged with
preserving the universalist impulse intrinsic to Judaism, at risk of being of extinguished in
Israel as it ‘turns to the right’ (HE, 7). It seems that they are also—in the wake of 9/11 and
the clamorous claims of ‘national security’—charged with preserving universalism itself.

Wolfe’s allusion to the signal assertiveness of nation-states in the present day—
focussed on their citizens’ physical protection, often to the detriment of their liberties, and on
the targeted (and not so targeted) elimination of perceived threats—reminds us of why the
debate on universalism and particularism has become so vital, and not only for Jews in Israel
and in the diaspora. People across the world are today faced today with the bewildering
simultaneity of 1) globalization, that is, the massively intensified flow of people, products,
and ideas across frontiers resulting from the post-Cold War liberalisation of trade and the
communications revolution; 2) the emergence of what German sociologist Ulrich Beck terms
the ‘world risk society’, or the reality that ethnic conflict, civil war, refugee crises, mass
migration, terrorism, climate change, and other symptoms of global instability, pay no heed
to borders; and 3) the renewed emphasis on the agency of the nation-state and on (national,
ethnic, religious) identity within this new global fluidity. Being both more dependent on one
another and yet also hyperaware of the differences that exist (or are created) between us—
privileged or marginalised; citizen or non-citizen; Christian, Muslim or Jew—we are
conscious, however dimly, that the question of how we can live together defines our age.

For scholars working across philosophy, political science, sociology, and cultural
studies, this question has prompted a revived engagement with cosmopolitanism, whether
in its Classical formulation (Diogenes the Cynic, the Stoics), its Enlightenment elaboration by
(mainly German) eighteenth-century thinkers such as Kant, Lessing, and Herder, or in
relation to (say) contemporary Human Rights discourse and international law (Benhabib),
supranational federations (Habermas, Beck, Held), or a ‘vernacular’ or ‘discrepant’
postcolonial cosmopolitanism (Bhabha, Clifford). At its core, this academic concern with
cosmopolitanism responds to an historically contingent but no less urgent, real-life need to
find ways to deal equitably—that is, ethically—with others in a world characterized by
increased proximity and increased conflict while sustaining what we feel defines us. Most
explicitly attempting to resolve the apparent conflict between the (moral, political and
ethical) imperatives of universalism and the (emotional, identificatory and motivational)
appeals of particularism—especially in the aftermath of 9/11 and the war on terror—Martha
Nussbaum and Kwame Anthony Appiah have proposed a ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ in which
allegiance to people closest to us (or to a nation) underpins our responsibility towards global
‘others’.

A concern with the tension between universalism and particularism is—today—thus
not only a matter for diaspora Jews seeking to reconcile their identity as a ‘nation’ with their
lived reality as a globally dispersed minority. Yet the fact that ‘the Jew’ has for centuries
been constructed as a trope for precisely this tension—and for cosmopolitanism, defined
positively (mobile, multilingual, worldly) or negatively (placeless, unpatriotic, modern)—
means, as Cathy Gelbin and Sander Gilman argue, that even as Jews have ‘largely vanished
from the debate about cosmopolitanism [they] remain the palimpsest of academic discourse’.4
Benhabib often refers to her Sephardic Jewish heritage in Turkey,5 and allusions to the
scapegoating of ‘rootless cosmopolitan’ Jews abound in Beck’s work (e.g. Cosmopolitan
Vision, 2006, and Cosmopolitan Europe, 2007), whereas for Bhabha Jewishness even appears
to embody a kind of essential(ist) cosmopolitanism: ‘a form of historical and racial in-
betweenness’.6

Israeli sociologist Natan Sznaider goes a step further. Sznaider, who was born in
Germany to Polish Holocaust survivors and moved to Israel aged 20, presents ‘the Jewish
condition’ not simply as a trope for the tension between universalism and particularism—now the defining feature of the global present—but (potentially, at least) as an *exemplary* cosmopolitan resolution of this tension. In *Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order* (2011), a compelling case is made for the legitimacy (and value) of particularity—a distinctively Jewish voice—*within* the universalist aspirations of cosmopolitanism. Above all, however, Sznaider’s suggestion that Jews can continue to assert, and indeed insist on, their specificity even as they circulate as citizens of the world is even more ambitious than the rooted cosmopolitanism championed by Nussbaum and Appiah. In *Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order*, Jews move from being a mere referent (or even commonplace) within debates on cosmopolitanism—an archetypal case study—to a source of inspiration. ‘Jewish cosmopolitanism’, Sznaider argues, may (come to) be seen as a ‘global civilising force’—‘It does not wait passively for redemption but provides a politics of redemption’.7

Sznaider echoes Wolfe in arguing that ‘today Jewish cosmopolitanism is in danger of disappearing’ as it is ‘swallowed up by an increasingly aggressive Jewish ethnic nationalism’ (*JM*, 147), and he too sees this as a potentially catastrophic cause of estrangement between Israel and Jews in the diaspora. But for Sznaider, the revival of Jewish cosmopolitanism is not only something to be wished for, a universalism to counter the retreat within the borders of the nation. It also implies something akin to a messianic imperative to save the world.

**Jewish Cosmopolitanism and Cosmopolitan Memory**

But what is Jewish cosmopolitanism—and what makes it so special? For Sznaider, the answer to this question derives from his re-reading of Hannah Arendt.8 Indeed, *Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order* both pays homage to this influential German-Jewish philosopher who fled the Nazis for the United States and asserts her continued, indeed
deepened significance, for contemporary global politics. ‘The choice of Arendt’, Szaider insists, ‘is not arbitrary. Perhaps more than that of any other thinker of the twentieth century, the urgency of her writing on totalitarianism, critical judgment, and evil remains relevant today’ (JM, 2). Certainly, it is no coincidence that sociologists, political theorists, and philosophers have (re)turned to Arendt to help them think through anew the banality of violence and indiscriminate killing, the relationship between political thought and political action—how sentiment becomes deed, and what inspires democratic in preference to destructive acts—and how we might cultivate a proper ‘amor mundi’ (love of the world, which was Arendt’s initial choice of title for her 1958 book The Human Condition).

Benhabib, for example, refers often to Arendt in her 2004 Berkeley Tanner lectures, released as Another Cosmopolitanism, and in 2010 she published a volume Politics in Dark Times: Encounters with Hannah Arendt, with contributions by distinguished thinkers on Arendt’s work on freedom, equality and responsibility, the nation state, the failure of politics, and evil.

Szaider’s specific interest, however, is in Arendt’s thinking about Jewishness, and in her elaboration of the relationship between Jewishness and worldliness. To this extent, we can surmise that Szaider’s ambition is to fill with particular content Arendt’s universalising musings on ‘world-building’, for instance in The Human Condition, in which she famously declares that the world is ‘a human artefact, the fabrication of human hands, as well as affairs which go on among those who inhabit the man-made world together’, continuing:

To live together in the world means essentially that a world of things is between those who have it in common, as a table is located between those who sit around it; the world, like every in-between, relates and separates men at the same time.”
Arendt describes here how a world is created in common in the spaces between men (and
women) as they bring to its construction particular experiences that intersect with but also
diverge from others”—particularism and universalism, or a rooted cosmopolitanism,
therefore. Sznайдier’s concern is with Arendt’s elaboration of which specifically Jewish
experiences might add something to this world-building. ‘It is my intention’, he notes, ‘to
show how she constantly navigated between universalism and particularism through her
understanding of political judgment, the revolutionary tradition, federal republicanism, and
other issues she examined through the prism of the Jewish fate’ (JM, 3-4).

In Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order, Sznайдier shows that Arendt—
typically considered a ‘secular thinker whose relationship to Jewish thought was one of
critical distance’ (JM, 3)—was profoundly committed to translating ‘some rather unpolitical
Jewish] thinking into political action’ (JM, 22). In chapters on Arendt’s relationship with,
transmission of, and essays on Kafka, Walter Benjamin, Gershom Scholem, Moritz
Goldstein, Simon Dubnow, and Salo Baron, Sznайдier reveals how Arendt sought to
universalise from (without denying the specificity of) these Jewish writers and intellectuals to
intervene in broader contemporary debates on totalitarianism, liberty, and Human Rights. At
the same time, Sznайдier’s own intellectual loyalty, which he honours through his detailed
reevaluation of Arendt’s indebtedness to the same individual, is most likely ultimately owed
to Benjamin. Certainly, the title Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order hints at this
allegiance. Benjamin—far more readily than Arendt—is associated with particular Jewish
(messianic) traditions of memory-work related to disruption and dispersal, tikkun olam
(‘repairing the world’, deriving from medieval Jewish mysticism), and hoped-for redemption,
and the book’s unexpected twist will be to align the Arendt, the resolutely political thinker,
with this metaphysical thinking. More obviously, the introduction begins with a quotation
from a letter Benjamin once wrote to his Zionist friend Ludwig Strauss that effectively sums
up Sznaider’s postulation of the indispensability of a Jewish cosmopolitanism: ‘It would be bad for Europe if the cultural energies of the Jews were to leave it’ (JM, 1).

Arendt is recast as a Benjaminian figure. The urgency to repair history drives her dedication to a universalist ideal of Human Rights yet—in Sznaider’s reading—this cosmopolitan commitment does not conflict with Jewish particularism but is infused by it. History does not preclude cosmopolitanism—the particular historical experience of this or that group need not disrupt universalism or be dissolved within it—for it is possible to grasp that which is generalisable while also insisting on what is specific. Arendt, Sznaider claims, exemplifies ‘the cosmopolitan potential’ of the Jewish experience, ‘which straddles the interstices of universal identifications and particular attachments’ (JM, 5).

Here it is important to emphasise that for Sznaider (and, he argues, for Arendt) ‘history’ and ‘experience’ are not general terms denoting some generalised state in which Jews have lived ‘in the past’—exile, dispersion, and diaspora. Rather, he is talking about events, and, of course, for the most part about one event (or assemblage of events) in particular, namely the Holocaust. This distinction is vital, since it connotes just how radical Sznaider believes Arendt to have been. In At Home in Exile, Alan Wolfe rightly prognoses that ‘particularism’s appeal in the wake of both the Holocaust and the birth of Israel […] was all but inevitable’ (HE, 72), and he ends with an impassioned plea to focus less on this event and more on the existential condition of Jewish existence through two millennia, namely exile: ‘But the events of the 1930s and the 1940s are not the only events constituting Jewish memory […] By bringing back to life the universalist ideals developed during their long residency in exile, a new generation of Jews can offer the best hope for a revival of a Jewish future’ (HE, 215). For Sznaider, on the other hand, Arendt’s insistence on the Holocaust as a specifically Jewish experience and an injunction to think in universalist terms not only precludes its appropriation as the foundation stone of Israeli ethno-nationalism. It also
suggests that the Holocaust is in fact the only sustainable basis for a truly situated Jewish cosmopolitanism—a Jewish cosmopolitanism that is locatable in time and space rather than one that can seem ahistorically diffuse. (As, indeed, it does in Wolfe’s formulation). In brief, Szaïder asks us to take seriously—and to place the appropriate emphases within—Arendt’s oft-cited criticism of the Jerusalem court in *Eichmann in Jerusalem* (1963) that it failed to recognise that the Nazi genocide was a ‘crime against Humanity, perpetrated upon the body of the Jewish people, and that only the choice of victims, not the nature of the crime, could be derived from the long history of Jew-hatred and anti-Semitism’ (cited in *JM*, 119).

Szaïder’s reading of Hannah Arendt in *Jewish Memory and the Cosmopolitan Order* is primarily intended to reclaim the Holocaust from the particularist claims of Israeli nationalism. Yet it most likely also responds to criticism levelled (perhaps unfairly) against Szaïder’s earlier book, written with Daniel Levy, *The Holocaust and Memory in The Global Age* (2007; originally in German, 2001), namely that his (and Levy’s) prognosis of a ‘cosmopolitan memory’ of the Holocaust de-emphasises its Jewishness in favour of its universal significance. In fact, this may be the purpose of Szaïder’s replaying, in *Jewish Memory*, of Arendt’s exchanges with Hans Magnus Enzensberger in the mid-1960s, when she contradicted his attempt to read her *Eichmann in Jerusalem* as demonstrating that the Holocaust was only about the destructiveness of capitalist modernity. For Szaïder, Arendt’s retort to Enzensberger exemplifies that Jewish memory is not at odds with cosmopolitan memory. It is an instantiation of cosmopolitan memory that transmits Jews’ particular implication in events of world-historical dimension and universal significance.

Cosmopolitan memory, as described by Szaïder and Levy in *The Holocaust and Memory in The Global Age*, emerges from the ‘historical link between memories of the Holocaust and the emergence of a moral consensus about human rights’.10 It encompasses the by-now global acknowledgment of the enormity of the Holocaust and its role in mobilising
confrontations with other atrocities. Cosmopolitan memory is akin to what Michael Rothberg calls multi-directional memory—the circulation of Holocaust motifs through other traumatic pasts (and presents)—but the claim made for it is larger, namely that it connects injustice everywhere not just to the Holocaust as a crime perpetrated, as Arendt says, upon the body of the Jews, but also to its universal significance as the basis of contemporary ethics. In the post 9/11 era, Sznaider and Levy argue in their next book—bearing the programmatic title Human Rights and Memory—‘memories of past abuses […] drive human rights remedies and have further raised the cost of committing such abuses’.11 The Holocaust, it is implied, is in this context always the ‘originary memory’. Jewish memory—and Jewish cosmopolitanism—is not only a particular form of cosmopolitan memory, therefore. It is also a privileged form, insofar as it transmits the Holocaust as the foundational moment of contemporary Human Rights discourse and—to reiterate Sznaider’s claim in Jewish Memory—insofar as it ‘does not wait passively for redemption but provides a politics of redemption’ (JM, 142).

However, it should be apparent from the present analysis that Jewish cosmopolitanism—rooted in the existential experience of exile, dispersion, and diaspora, but also concretely in the historical singularity of the Holocaust—is not simply a Jewish bequest to humankind in universum. As repeatedly suggested above, it also defines a pluralistic Jewish identity to counter the ‘Jewish ethnic nationalism’ that Sznaider (with others) sees as increasingly dominant in today’s Israel (JM, 147). But more than this—and going beyond longstanding debates on an Israeli centre versus a diasporic periphery12—we might now also wonder whether the exceptional quality of the Jewish experience within the contemporary re-framing of cosmopolitanism as a call-to-action emerging from memory implies the exceptionalism of Jewish identity itself. What does it mean for a modern Jewish identity to have this representative, even exemplary status? And we might wonder what whether this Jewish exceptionalism—suggesting Jewish mediation between the particular and the
universal but also recalling a long history of negative as well as positive conceptualisations of
‘Jewish chosenness’—might be a less unproblematic solution to the cosmopolitan challenge
of our age than, in Sznaider’s compelling prose, it might at first appear.

In the closing chapter of *Jewish Memory*, Sznaider gives a brief account of the
twentieth-century graphic artist Bruno Schulz (born 1892 in the Drohobych, at the time part
of the Austro-Hungarian empire, later Poland, occupied first by the Soviets then the Nazis,
and after 1990 belonging to the Ukraine). His purpose is to show something of the Jewish
pluralism that he has described. Schulz wrote in Polish, was fluent in German, and knew
some Yiddish and Hebrew (*JM*, 142-3). But it is also to relate how Schulz’s work has been
(mis)appropriated, by different individuals and entities, always as *either* particular or
universal but never both. Schulz, Sznaider recounts, was forced to paint the walls of the home
of the SS officer Felix Landau with scenes from German fairy tales—in 2001, the mural was
discovered by a German documentary filmmaker, Benjamin Geisler, but then shortly
afterwards removed to Israel, to Yad Vashem. For Sznaider, Yad Vashem’s emphasis on the
Jewish particularity of Schulz’s life and fate (he was murdered because he was Jewish), is as
misguided as Geisler’s desire to universalise (of de-ethnicise) the Holocaust victim as ‘simply
Bruno Schulz’ (Geisler in interview with Celestine Bohler; cited in *JM*, 145) within what—in
his book *Shattered Spaces* and in a essay in this special edition—Michael Meng terms
‘redemptive cosmopolitanism’. (Speaking specifically about modern-day Germany, Jack
Zipes notes the ‘contemporary German fascination for things Jewish’ and Karen Remmler an
‘imagined cosmopolitanism that would return Germany to a sense of ‘normalcy’”13). The
interplay of particularism *and* universalism, Sznaider concludes, is the only perspective from
which a ‘realistic cosmopolitanism’ can be developed. This is the lesson to be learnt not only
from Arendt, but also even from more manifestly ‘Jewish’ twentieth-century figures such as
Scholem, Feuchtwanger, Baron, Schulz and Kafka (*JM*, 146).
In what follows, we examine a more recent imaginative work, Olga Grjasnowa’s 2012 novel *Der Russe ist einer, der Birken liebt* (All Russians Love Birch Trees), in order to further test Sznaider’s hypothesis, as it were. On the one hand, Grjasnowa embodies the re-emergence—in Germany of all places—of significant centres of Jewish life in Europe, with the cultural and linguistic plurality that that implied before the Holocaust. This increasingly high-profile young writer, born 1984, is one of about 200 000 ‘Kontingent-Juden’ (so-named in German bureaucrats: quota Jews) who were permitted from the early 1990s to immigrate from the former Soviet Union until restrictions were imposed in 2005,14 and she speaks Russian and some Azeri (she grew up as part of the Russian minority in Azerbaijan) and chooses to write in German. On the other hand, even as it both exemplifies this transnational perspective and largely reproduces Sznaider’s ideal of a Jewish cosmopolitanism rooted in the particular memory of the Holocaust, *Der Russe* (most likely intentionally) may also reveal the continued difficulty of translating this ideal into a way of living.

---

**Der Russe ist einer, der Birken liebt**

Writing in 2002, Leslie Morris and Karen Remmler name Katja Behrens, Maxim Biller, Esther Dischereit and Barbara Honigmann as ‘only four of a growing number of second-generation and, more recently, third-generation writers for whom the memory of the Shoah plays a major role in the self-understanding as Jewish writers living in Germany’.15 A little more than a decade later, this timely avowal of a renaissance of German-language fiction by self-identified Jewish authors following the end of the Cold War and German unification is in need of some updating. First, the number of authors with a Jewish background has continued to increase, as a result of the influx of Jews from the former Soviet Union but also of Jewish immigration—often a second or third relocation—from elsewhere in Eastern Europe, the United States, and even Israel. (Second-generation writer Doron Rabinovici moved as a child

---
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from Israel to Austria already in 1964, as did Rafael Seligman to Germany in 1957). Vladimir
Vertlib, for example, is a multiple migrant of Russian-Jewish background. Born in Leningrad
in 1966, Vertlib’s family moved first to Israel, next to Austria, Italy and Austria again, then
Italy (again), the Netherlands, and Israel once more, the United States and—acquiring
citizenship—back to Austria. His novels Abschiebung [Deportation, 1995] and
Zwischenstationen [Interim stations, 1999] are largely based on his family’s travels.¹⁶
Similarly, Irene Dische, the daughter of Jewish refugees ‘returned’ to Germany from her
parents’ adopted country, the United States, and now publishes in both English and German.

Second, the marked (and to-be-expected) concern of first- and second-generation
writers with the Holocaust, and with the incongruity of Jewish life in Germany after the
Shoah, has attenuated somewhat in the work of the third generation. On the one hand, this has
to do with the passing of time. But it may also have to do with the fact that, especially for
younger Jewish writers from the former Soviet Union, the Holocaust seems less salient than
more recent persecution. As Y. Michal Bodemann and Olena Bagno explain: ‘While other
Jews in Germany experience the Second World War as the great trauma, this is not
necessarily so for the Russian Jews; for them, present-day Russian anti-Semitism and earlier
the Gulag, have often been the greater traumatic experience’¹⁷ To the extent that Jews in the
Soviet Union were largely spared from the Holocaust, authors of Russian-Jewish extraction
may tend to focus more on Soviet persecution and prejudice, or—in ways which remain
taboo for other Jewish writers in German—even to draw parallels between the Nazi and
Soviet dictatorships. (Vertlib’s Das besondere Gedächtnis der Rosa Masur / The
Extraordinary Memory of Rosa Masur, from 2001, recounts Stalin’s anti-Jewish purges and
Germans’ current exoticisation of the Jewish immigrants whose ancestors they once
victimised).¹⁸ Third, and related to this more indirect relationship to the Holocaust, writers of
this new generation now set their own histories in the context of other minorities’ experiences
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of dislocation and marginalisation, especially in the present day. The Russian-Jewish immigrant Wladimir Kaminer, for example, is famous for his mocking of Germans’ stereotyping of their ausländische Mitbürger (foreign co-citizens)—also implied in Grjasnowa’s parodic title ‘All Russians Love Birch Trees’—whereas Julya Rabinowich’s Die Erdresserin (The Woman Who Eats Dirt, 2012) thematises the trafficking of women across borders and the persecution of undocumented migrants.\textsuperscript{19}

Third-generation writers, particularly from the former Soviet Union, are thus above all concerned with the often harsh reality of immigration to Germany. Lena Gorelik’s Meine weißen Nächte (My White Nights, 2004) and Alina Bronsky’s Scherbenpark (2008; Broken Glass Park, 2010), for instance, relate the difficulties that both Jewish \textit{and} non-Jewish migrants encounter in gaining employment, decent housing, and social acceptance.\textsuperscript{20} To this extent, these novels reflect both the specific ‘stagnating integration process’ of Russian-Jewish immigrants to Germany, as Schoeps and Glöckner describe it,\textsuperscript{21} and the wider emergence of what Azade Seyhan defines as ‘paranational communities’, that is groups ‘that exist within national borders or alongside the citizens of the host country but remain culturally or linguistically distanced from them and, in some instances, are estranged from both the home and the host culture’.\textsuperscript{22} In the work of Kaminer, Rabinowich, Gorelik, and Bronsky, as in Grjasnowa and fellow Russian-Jewish writers Vladimir Vertlib and Katja Petrowskaja, protagonists with Russian(-Jewish) backgrounds interact almost always only with other recent migrants, or with second- or third-generation Turkish-Germans, intensifying the ‘vague linkage between “things Jewish” and things “Turkish”’ that Leslie Adelson identified in 2000.\textsuperscript{23} (Maxim Biller’s 2003 Esra makes this linkage explicit,\textsuperscript{24} as does the 1998 novel Gefährliche Verwandtschaft / Dangerous Relation by Turkish-German writer Zafer Senocak).\textsuperscript{25} To this extent at least, Russian-Jewish writers in German—\textit{and} Turkish-
German writers—engage with multiculturalism as a given social reality in the today’s Federal Republic of Germany.

Yet ‘Jewishness’ is nevertheless still more than just another ethnic marker. In works by Jewish and non-Jewish writers, Jewishness suggests both the deterritorialising effect of contemporary transnationalism—‘the ideal of fixed territories of culture’, Regina Römild argues, is ‘a fiction, and mobility becomes the common ground for the proliferation of diasporic life-worlds, cultures and identities’—and the redemptive potential of cosmopolitan memory. The Holocaust, or textual palimpsests of the Holocaust, intervenes into such narratives to urge empathetic identification with (other) historical trauma as well as the disruptions of the present. In Turkish-German Feridun Zaimoglu’s *Hinterland* (2009), the unexpected (even uncanny) appearance of orthodox Jews at the railway station in Bratislava encapsulates both the forced migrations of the Soviet, Ottoman and Nazi empires thematised throughout the novel and the dis- and relocations of globalisation today: ‘Dutzende von orthodoxen Juden drängelten sich auf dem Bahnsteig, woher kamen sie, wohin gingen sie, wollten sie alle etwa in den Zug steigen?’. (Dozens of orthodox Jews were pushing on the platform, where did they all come from, where were they going, did they really all want to get into the train?). At the same time, the fact that these Jews are willingly boarding a train—rather than being forced into one—may offer hope that historical trauma can be overcome, and that mobility might cause a cosmopolitan subversion of borders.

In Grjasnowa’s *Der Russe*, it appears that this subversion of the nation has already taken place. Mascha, the novel’s Russian-Jewish protagonist, associates almost exclusively with other migrants. The sole significant exception is her German boyfriend Elias, whose ‘hohe Wangenknochen, blaugraue Augen und dunkle Wimpern’ (high cheek bones, blue-grey eyes and dark eyelashes) mark him out as the ‘exotic other’—for Mascha’s mother, in a striking inversion of age-old stereotypes of Jews, his strange beauty and innate ability to
pleases others, embody his ‘Hochstaplerzüge’ (imposter’s characteristics), for which, however, she cannot help but love him.\textsuperscript{30} And even Elias is from the former German Democratic Republic, a place ‘to the east’ that is perceived by Mascha and her migrant friends as backward and provincial (and racist). To this extent, Elias too might be considered a migrant within the post-unification Federal Republic. His efforts to research and understand Mascha’s pre-migration history in Azerbaijan in the months before his untimely death (\textit{DR}, 150)—he dies in hospital some time after he breaks his femur—may be motivated by a desire to become part of this transnational solidarity, just as her melancholic fixation on him after he has gone may suggest her desire to include him, posthumously at least, and to recognise him not just as a ‘German’ but as a fellow exile with his own story. Before Elias’s death, in fact, their relationship was tense, in part on account of their different positioning in relation to current debates on people with a ‘Migrationshintergrund’ (migration background) and Germany’s evolution into a society that is not so much multicultural as ‘postmigrantisch’ (postmigrant; \textit{DR}, 12).

Germany exists only as a deterritorialised space in which the displaced and the dispossessed reassemble and share memories of trauma. Mascha’s ex-boyfriend Sami (for whom she longs throughout the novel, even as she mourns Elias too) was born in Beirut during the civil war; Cem is Turkish-German and a homosexual; and the Kurdish refugee Sibel is scarred across her body from the beatings inflicted by her father and older brother. Sibel was Mascha’s first lesbian affair, and, here again, Mascha is prone to melancholic fixation. In each case, a traumatic past predicts Mascha’s empathetic identification, even over-identification, with her fellow migrants, and also with Elias. Her visits following Elias’s death to his family home in east Germany are most likely a belated acknowledgment of the dislocation he suffered in fleeing both the beatings he had received from his alcoholic father and, more generally, the constraints of his east German background (\textit{DR}, 90).
Mascha’s own traumatic memory is delayed, even displaced, however. And it is not
the foundational Jewish memory that, following Sznaider, we might expect to motivate the
empathetic investment that she demonstrates through her readiness to prompt her fellow
migrants to recount the abuses they have suffered. The past that Mascha struggles to speak
of—she cannot tell Elias, even when he asks directly—is not the Holocaust. It is the violent
collisions between ethnic Armenians and Azeris in Azerbaijan in 1992, and specifically—the
reader is to surmise—the brutal expulsion of Armenians in retaliation for the Khojaly
massacre of 25–26 February, when 161 Azerbaijani civilians were killed in the Armenian-
majority Azerbaijani enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh. Throughout the novel, Mascha is
haunted by the image of the body of a young woman in a light-blue underskirt lying before
her ‘mit verdrehten Beinen und blutenden Unterleib’ (legs twisted, with bleeding abdomen;
DR, 107).

Yet Mascha’s horrific experiences in Baku in 1992 do ultimately relate to the
Holocaust. Just as Sami, Cem, Sibel, and Elias prompt Mascha’s delayed confrontation with
her own horrific experiences in Baku in 1992—enabling their cosmopolitan solidarity—so
does Mascha’s account as a Jewish witness to a pogrom inflicted on her Armenian
neighbours, prompt her (re-)telling of her grandmother’s narrow escape from the Germans. In
the novel’s closing pages, Mascha finally arrives at the ‘original trauma’ of the Holocaust:

Weißt du, in meiner Kindheit gab es einen geprackten Koffer zu Hause, für den
Fall der Fälle. In unserem Fall war es die ehemalige Aktentasche meines
Großvaters, und darin waren frische Unterhosen, Familienfotos, Silberlößel und
Goldkronen, das Kapital, das sie unter dem kommunistischen Regime
akkumulieren konnten. Die Armenier waren schon lange aus der Stadt fortgejagt
worden, und nicht wenige von ihnen wurden exekutiert. Meine Oma, die die 
Shoah... (DR, 276).

(You know, in my childhood there was a packed suitcase at home, just in case. In 
our house, it was my grandfather’s old briefcase, with fresh underwear, family 
photos, silver spoons and gold crowns, that capital that they were able to 
accumulate under the communist regime. The Armenians had long been chased 
out of the city, and not a few were executed. My grandma, the Shoah...)

Mascha’s grandmother had given refuge to fleeing Armenians (DR, 282), for which she was 
denounced by neighbours, most likely forcing the family’s migration. What she takes from 
the Holocaust, therefore, is not a particularist narrative of Jewish victimisation but rather a 
universalist obligation to offer sanctuary. Here, Grjasnowa’s novel points beyond the mere 
depiction of multiculturalism as a contemporary social reality, or even as an inherently 
limited ideal of mutual respect between communities living alongside or even separately from 
one another, and gestures toward cosmopolitanism. In contrast to Kant’s famous but 
somewhat limited definition of hospitality as the essence of ‘cosmopolitan right’ in Perpetual 
Peace (1795)—‘the right of a foreigner not to be treated with hostility because he has arrived 
on the land of another’—, moreover, we glimpse a modern understanding of 
cosmopolitanism as universal Human Rights. This cosmopolitan ideal extends beyond the 
absence of molestation to proactive protection and, as important, to empathetic identification 
with traumatised others based on a universalised mobilisation of Jewish memory.

Reading back through the novel from the perspective of its conclusion, we surmise 
that Mascha’s Jewish memory—distilled from her grandmother’s knowledge of the
Holocaust, as it were—motivates her investment in the traumatic experiences of others.

Above all, her fluid (bi-)sexuality connotes not only the undermining of the heteronormative nation. In this, she joins many other ‘unsettling’ transnational protagonists in contemporary German-language literature, who, in their turn, frequently often ‘typed’ as Jewish, to the extent that Jews have long been characterised as sexually and ‘nationally’ deviant. Her alternating attraction for both men and women also additionally intimates her strikingly embodied desire to know the other, even as she herself finds it difficult to tell of her experiences in Azerbaijan. (The traumatic memories of others ‘screen’ her memories of Azerbaijan, just as these memories screen her grandmother’s memories of the Holocaust).

Indeed, more or less the only character with whom she ‘just’ has sex, without any subsequent desire for emotional intimacy, is the Israeli Ori, who is trauma-free and a staunch defender of his country’s defence of its national(ist) aspirations. Mascha’s sustained sexual intimacy with his sister Tal—easily accepted by Ori, who seems to recognise that he does not have a ‘story’ to engage Mascha—may have to do with the fact that Tal felt compelled to abandon her daughter following the breakdown of her relationship, and with Tal’s ‘scandalous’ activism on behalf of Palestinian victims of the Israeli response to the second Intifada.

Parts three and four of the novel are set in Israel and the West Bank. On completion of her advanced qualification in interpreting, Mascha sleeps with her comically-named German professor Windmühle (windmill)—as in ‘tilting at windmills’, most likely a satirical allusion here to Germans’ vainglorious bluster about ‘making-amends’—and secures his endorsement for a post with a German aid organisation in Tel Aviv charged with monitoring ‘the situation in Israel’. ‘Diese Organisation hatte sich wie Dutzende andere perfekt in den Konflikt integriert’ (this organisation, like dozens of others, had integrated itself seamlessly into the conflict), she comments sardonically, adding that if the fighting were to cease they would no longer be able to boast to potential sexual partners that they lived in a war zone (DR, 183).
She flies to Israel, has her laptop blown up by bored security personnel at the airport, moves into an apartment with sea views, makes contact with relatives, including her cousin Hannah who is disappointed that she doesn’t look sufficiently Jewish (DR, 167), and takes advantage of the lack of real work at the office to mourn Elias, crave Sami, and pursue Tal.

In Israel, Mascha is forced to confront head-on the question that she had hitherto managed to evade in the transnational, cosmopolitan togetherness she enjoyed in Berlin, namely what her Jewishness means to her. The fact that she speaks Arabic—initially learnt from Sami, then consolidated during her studies—but not Hebrew, is a repeated source of bafflement, and even affront, for her Israeli companions. And she instinctively rejects the Israeli nationalism embodied not only by Ori, but also by her relatives, the various officials she encounters, and Russian-Jewish settlers in the occupied territories. This does not mean that she entirely repudiates Israel. Watching CNN reporting on Israeli’s incursions into the West Bank with Cem in Germany, she had felt the need to counter what she saw as the media’s lachrymose presentation of the Palestinian fate (DV, 59)—before she travels to Israel, it seems that were some limits to her universalising empathy. But, lacking any sincere understanding of, or even interest in Jewish ritual, she needs to forge a secular Jewish identity that does not depend on a departicularised diasporic solidarity with other migrants—in Germany, she is more Russian than Jewish—or an inflammed Israeli nationalism.

Jewish memory of the Holocaust, and more broadly identification with the suffering of others, may enable just such an identity. In Germany, Mascha objects to a fellow student’s gauche philo-Semitism: ‘Ich habe einen deutschen Pass. Ich bin nicht Israel’ (I have a German passport. I am not Israel; DR, 6); in Israel, she insists on her German citizenship, to the great irritation of her cousin Hannah (DR, 166), and she speaks German with Sami, a potential lover, and allows him to take her for a Russian immigrant (DR, 178), just as she had always emphasised her Russian rather than Jewish origins in Germany too. In the fourth and
final part of the novel, however, Mascha crosses into the West Bank, where for the first time, and notwithstanding the obvious risk, she embraces an unambiguous identity. ‘Ich bin jüdisch’ (I am Jewish; DR, 274), she declares to Ismael, the Palestinian man who offers her refugee after she escapes Tal, Tal’s new love interest, and the ineffective Israeli peace delegation for which she was to interpret (none of the Israelis speaks Arabic...). With Ismael—the former Hamas supporter, who now sees the error of his earlier intolerance and religious fundamentalism (DR, 273-4)—she finally seems able to speak of herself, and of her own trauma. She lives in Germany, and she is Russian by nationality, but she was born in Azerbaijan, where she endured both anti-Semitism and civil war (DR, 265-74). And above all she is a Jew—secular, profoundly conscious of her history, and cosmopolitan.

The cosmopolitan understanding Mascha achieves with Ismael—the name given to Abraham’s first son in Jewish, Christian and Muslim scripture, though each tradition has different interpretations of his role and significance—may even be more genuine than the solidarity she experienced with fellow migrants in Germany. Mascha and Ismael do not have sex, even though this is an obvious possibility in his room overnight, and nor does their sharing of trauma imply a blurring of the self-evident differences between their histories and current situations. In other words, their cosmopolitan exchange is based not on physical intimacy or on the dissolution of their particularist identities within an undifferentiated universalism, but on the recognition of difference—the scars inflicted on his arm by an Israeli bullet; for her: ‘Meine Oma, die die Shoah...’ (DR, 276)—and even of the ultimate unknowability of the other. The brief relationship forged by Mascha and Ismael, therefore, is characterised by the unsentimental recognition of our detachment identified by Arendt as the condition for authentic engagement with the other—‘the world, like every in-between, relates and separates men at the same time’—and, as important, for political action: ‘Because compassion abolishes the distance, the worldly space between men where political matters,
the whole realm of human affairs, are located, it remains, politically speaking, irrelevant and
without consequences’. Accompanying Ismael, Mascha is welcomed at a Palestinian
wedding, in spite of the discomfort some guests feel at her presence. In a dream-like state,
she narrates, at length, the horrors of the civil war in Azerbaijan—her recollection of tanks
shelling buildings invokes the suffering that the Palestinians at the wedding with her have
endured, and will endure. At the very end of the novel, the reader grasps that Jewish
memory—the Holocaust—is not just the keystone of a secular Jewish identity. It also entails
an injunction to think globally, and to act in defence of universal Human Rights.

Thus far, Grjasnowa’s Der Russ is to endorse, and even embody, the possibility
of a Jewish cosmopolitanism in which the Jewish particularity of the Holocaust is seen to
possess a universal, even redemptive significance. However, one of the benefits that readers
gain from literature—in addition to aesthetic pleasure—emerges out of the way fiction may
nuance the ‘ideal types’ that populate generalising works of philosophical enquiry such as
Sznaider’s Jewish Memory. Grjasnowa’s Mascha inhabits Der Russ not only as an exemplar
of Sznaider’s cosmopolitan Jewish memory, therefore, but also as the embodiment of the
inconsistencies and self-absorption of real human beings. And it is in its focus on the
difficulties that individuals encounter in translating principle into practice that Grjasnowa’s
novel helps us to conceptualise some of the limitations—and indeed problems—of Sznaider’s
conceptualisation of a Jewish cosmopolitanism.

At Israel’s principal Holocaust memorial centre Yad Vashem, Mascha seems almost to
be paraphrasing Sznaider when she insists on the universalist meaning of the Holocaust and
rejects the ethno-nationalism of Jewish settlers in the West Bank:

‘Wir dürfen nichts vergessen’, sagte Tante # 13.
‘Naturlich nicht’, sagte ich. ‘Allerdings reicht das alleine nicht’.

‘Wie meinst du das?’ fragte Hannah.


(‘We must forget nothing’, said aunt number 13.

‘Of course not; I said, ‘Though that’s not enough’

‘What do you mean?’ asked Hannah.

‘Even the most fanatical settlers commemorate the Holocaust’, I said).

Elsewhere, however, we wonder whether Mascha’s cosmopolitan solidarity truly reflects her principled openness to others or simply a more egotistical longing for consolation. In the West Bank, swastikas drawn by Hamas fighters trigger not so much a rational engagement with the need to create alliances across traumatised communities as jumbled memories of the Caspian sea, her mother, and Elias: ‘Zurück zu meiner Mutter, ich wollte, dass sie mich beschützt. Ich wollte zurück zu Elischa, mich an sein Hemd klammern und seinen Geruch einatmen, sein Gesicht wieder klar vor mir sehen’ (DR, 280). (Back to my mother, I wanted her to protect me. I wanted to get back to Elias, to cling to his shirt and breathe in his smell, see his face before me again).

The refusal of sentimentality that characterises Arendt’s (and Szaider’s) cosmopolitanism—the essential unknowability of the other must be acknowledged if the temptation to colonise is to be resisted—is, in practice, difficult if not impossible to sustain. The attitude of respectful detachment towards one another that Mascha and Ismael manage to achieve together will scarcely be tested over time. It is clear from the
outset that her sojourn with him will be brief, and as soon as she can she phones Sami, her Beirut-born ex-lover, and enjoins him to leave behind his girlfriend in Germany and to extract her from Palestine. At the end of the novel, Mascha opts to return to the emotionally satisfying, but undifferentiated, empathetic solidarity that she had appeared determined to exceed during her time in Israel. It seems unlikely that she will continue, once back in Germany, to channel traumatic memory into political engagement.

Even if sentimentality can be avoided, there is still a danger that ‘the Jew’ once more becomes little more than a cipher. Sznajder’s emphasis on the specifically Jewish experience of the Holocaust styles Jewish memory, as previously noted, as both central to cosmopolitan memory and, more broadly, as representative. But in what sense representative? If Jewish memory embodies the suffering of all humankind, then the Holocaust’s title as the most egregious example of the cruelty people throughout the ages have inflicted upon one another creates a manner of detachment that is different in kind from the distance that Arendt sees as the essential basis of equality between the multitude of others who ‘have the world in common’. Jews stand apart, fetishized as descendents of the Holocaust or resented for their aloofness—their difference from us is not the same as our difference from other ‘others’. Or, if Jewish memory speaks for others who have been traumatised, must detachment mutate into disassociation, as the Jewish experience is deployed in the service of others? On her return to Germany, Mascha will no doubt endure the painful philosemitism of her fellow student Daniel, and continue to have to repress her Jewish (rather than Russian) past even amongst her fellow migrants.

If Jewish memory no longer motivates any practical, political cosmopolitan commitment, therefore, the risk may be that it becomes merely an instrument for the ritualistic expression of what Gillian Rose calls ‘Holocaust piety’, or a vessel for the
containment of a whole world of traumas, or both at the same time. In any event, Jewish memory appears ‘flattened’, to the extent that the particularity of the Holocaust acquires a citational quality, in Derrida’s sense of a communicative act that, through its constant iteration, is intended to testify to truth but in fact signals the ever present possibility of inauthenticity. Jewish identity is not only once again reduced to the Holocaust. It is also defined, and delimited, either as a conduit for empathy and affect or as a container for universal suffering rather than as substantial in and of itself.

In the final analysis, it is difficult to surmise what kind of political engagement Szaider envisages in Jewish Memory and The Cosmopolitan Order beyond his admiration for Arendt’s lofty insistence on the particularity of the Jewish experience within the universality of Human Rights, and on the indispensability of cosmopolitan exchange based on the acknowledgment of difference. How is a cosmopolitan Jewish memory, and identity, to be actively articulated, beyond the sort of well-meaning rhetoric formulated by the Israeli activists that Mascha accompanies into the West Bank? Does Szaider expect ‘regular’ Jewish individuals—outside the circle of intellectuals that feature in Jewish Memory—to confront injustice more concretely, locally and globally, and perhaps especially in relation to Israel? But why not expect this of all people? Why expect more of Jews, and therefore perhaps less of others? It might seem to be an odd consequence of the Holocaust that Jews should be expected to internalise its lessons more fully than others. Indeed, the most striking, and positive, aspect of Grjasnowa’s depiction of Mascha is that she is as flawed—as human—as all the novel’s other characters. The author’s suggestion seems to be that there can be no requirement for the Jew to be ‘better’ than those she or he lives amongst.

Conclusion
Sznider’s *Jewish Memory and The Cosmopolitan Order* presents a timely and
demanding challenge to think again about Jewish identity, and to expound a positive ‘Jewish
cosmopolitanism’ to set against the prejudice that, historically, has accompanied that
designation. However, insofar as *Der Russe* exemplifies through its form and content
precisely the movement back and forth between particularity and universalism that
Sznider praises in Arendt—and the Polish-speaking Jewish graphic artist Bruno
Schulz—Grjasnowa’s novel may offer something more concrete, and potentially more
radical. The most ‘cosmopolitan’ aspect of *Der Russe ist einer, der Birken liebt*, in
truth, is not its elaboration of Holocaust memory as the basis of Human Rights practice
and solidarity across borders. Rather, it is its own inherent transnationality that is key, and
not only the fact that it was written in the German language by an author of Russian-Jewish background but also, just as if not more important, the way it connects German,
Middle Eastern, and Eastern European pasts and presents. This in itself already
undermines the parochialism of the nation, and indeed national narratives. We might
debate, with Leslie Morris, whether this represents a ‘translation of Jewishness into
[... ] an imagined transnational community’,35 or we might set Grjasnowa’s novel
within the broader ‘transnationalisation’ of German-language (and other) writing in
recent years, including fiction by Jewish, other ‘minority’, but also ‘majority’ authors.36
In any event, the increasing traversability of national borders and national cultures that
we are witnessing in the contemporary era—along with a pervasive ethnocentric
backlash—has reignited the debate on cosmopolitanism and seems to require *all* of us,
Jews and non-Jews, to look beyond our ethnic and national limit(ation)s. It might be
inspiring to think, however, that we would wish to become citizens of the world *without*
reference to the Holocaust—because global citizenship is seen as a desirable goal in
itself—and without requiring Jews to be, once again, somehow *exemplary*. 
Grjasnowa’s next novel after *Der Russe*, titled *Die juristische Unschärfe einer Ehe* (*The Judicial Uncertainty of A Marriage*, 2014), certainly has no requirement for an exemplary Jew. Jonoun, the novel’s American-Jewish migrant to Germany, is blithly unaware of the trauma her girlfriend Leyla has suffered at the hands of the repressive authorities in her home country Azerbaijan, and of the distress she causes Leyla’s (homosexual) husband Altay. And she appears to have no connection whatsoever to the Holocaust. Without the possibility of a redemptive cosmopolitanism rooted in memory—whether Jewish or any other—however, the issue now is that the only cosmopolitanism that seems able to assert itself against the nation state as an instrument of global consumer capitalism (Germany, along with other western countries) or of repression (Azerbaijan and other countries in the region, even after the Arab Spring) is the elite cosmopolitanism of the super-wealthy as they jet around the globe in search of either tax-friendly or legally-dubious regimes. Sznaiders’ Jewish cosmopolitanism may be utopian—or even problematic—but it is surely to be preferred to the depressing reality of the only form of cosmopolitanism that, thus far, actually seems to have succeeded in establishing itself as truly global.
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