

The Journal of Religion

to move the rabbinical school to Paris, but it is also true that a much broader spectrum of observers approached Napoleon III's urban rejuvenation with similar reservations over speculation and corruption. When leaders of the Bordeaux Consistory or the Metz Consistory decried the debauchery of urban life, they were not reflecting the unique sensibilities of their more religious Jewish constituency but those of French citizens everywhere who likewise worried about moral decline and the very practical concerns of waste disposal and water provisions. One wonders if it could be that the French government circumspectly courted the Paris Consistory into providing the right kind of institution (and building) for the rapid revamping of Paris in the 1860s. To a meaningful extent, Paris was not only more chic than Metz, but developers understood that, for a limited time, they were getting more bang for their buck on the booming boulevards. Did the Paris Consistory really only look to move the *École Rabbinique* to Paris because of its cultural draw, or was it also due in part to Napoleon's financial schemes in selling lots as incentives for construction in 1852, followed by generous loans of half a billion francs between 1865 and 1869 sanctioned for the rebuilding of the city of Paris? We might consider, for instance, the burgeoning of synagogue architecture in the 1860s in Paris. Haus suggests that French Jewry adopted some of the aesthetics of Catholicism into their curricula, which seems like a relatively minor point in light of Jewish architect Alfred Philbert Aldrophe's synagogue raised a few blocks away from the *École Rabbinique*. Financed by the Rothschilds with state subsidies in the form of a land grant provided by Haussmann's *Préfecture de la Seine* between 1865 and 76, the synagogue proudly adopted the idioms of the Catholic Church to publicly project its congregants' Frenchness.

Haus's technical book, produced from indefatigable archival research, will be more relevant to historians of modern Jewish studies than to French or education historians. From this vantage point, the book should be cherished for its sophisticated analysis of the role that money played in the modernization of French Jews.

MAYA KATZ, *Touro College*.

KOLTUN-FROMM, KEN. *Material Culture and Jewish Thought in America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 2010. 342 pp. \$26.95 (paper).

Ken Koltun-Fromm's *Material Culture and Jewish Thought in America* is an ambitious interdisciplinary experiment that radically challenges prevailing notions of what constitutes modern Jewish thought and how it should be studied. First and foremost, Koltun-Fromm makes clear that there is Jewish thought in America. This is not a small accomplishment. Despite gestures to include Mordecai Kaplan, few in the field have made explicit the role of American culture in the work of not only Kaplan but Heschel and Soloveitchik as well. Koltun-Fromm makes this case. By paying attention to place, space, and material culture in the works of these key thinkers, he offers new and innovative readings. But the book does more than this: it also demonstrates what can happen when we take seriously the role of material culture—journals, books, ritual objects, food, film, art, and places—in shaping how Jewishness is performed and understood in America. That is what this book seeks to do.

The book is an intervention in "thought"—an attempt to broaden and reimagine the contours of this discourse in relation to material culture. And,

given the specificity of material culture and its practices, Koltun-Fromm shifts his own focus from Europe to twentieth-century America to see how this place and its cultural productions inform Jewish thinking. Not only does he address three recognized and important Jewish thinkers, he places them in conversation with popular best-selling writers of the period: Joshua Lieberman; Erich Fromm; and “the father of modern advertising,” Edward Bernays. Arguing for how the Jewishness of these popular writers informs their works, Koltun-Fromm juxtaposes their works with those of Kaplan, Heschel, and Soloveitchik. The chapter on Lieberman, Fromm, and Bernays (chap. 2) moves along a chronological path that begins with Kaplan writing at the beginning of the twentieth century (chap. 1) followed by two additional chapters on those other midcentury thinkers—Soloveitchik and Heschel. In this way Koltun-Fromm already broadens the category of Jewish thought. He then shifts gears more fully to embrace material cultural productions that have yet to be considered as relevant to the field of Jewish thought, works by key American Jewish literary figures who cover the span of the twentieth century—Anzia Yezierska, Philip Roth, Cynthia Ozick, and Bernard Malamud in chapter 5—and then works of film and visual culture in chapter 6. Koltun-Fromm’s primary focus is on the legacy of the twentieth century gesturing toward the present, mainly in his final chapters and conclusion.

For Koltun-Fromm, “material culture” means many things; it is, I am tempted to say, anything not normally addressed in Jewish thought, broadly construed. This is both a strength and a weakness in the book when, at times, readers may be confused about what links all of these chapters together. And, this is, in part, why I insist on reading the text as an intervention in thought. This is where it has the most utility and where the logic deployed works best. Given this, those more familiar with other scholarship on any of the novelists or most of the visual texts addressed in the later chapters may be disappointed. This is not new ground. My sense is that these works are brought into this study as a way of showing philosophers and theologians that there is much to be gleaned when they begin to pay attention to these other forms of American Jewish creativity. That said, I do want to note some especially noteworthy sections of the book, including even some parts of these later chapters. There are wonderful new readings of Heschel and Soloveitchik. These chapters open up key works by these thinkers in powerful and compelling ways. Especially noteworthy is the way Koltun-Fromm reads Heschel’s *The Sabbath* over and against not only the beautiful artwork in the book but guidebooks directed to Jewish women on how to observe the Jewish holidays, like the Jewish Home Beautiful. Here Koltun-Fromm is at his best, enabling us to see in new ways what for many may be a familiar text. He does the same thing with Soloveitchik’s *Halakhic Man*. By placing Soloveitchik in Boston, he shows how that city came to shape Soloveitchik’s thinking. These are original and powerful readings. Also noteworthy is Koltun-Fromm’s account of the visual legacy of the covers of *Lilith* magazine in chapter 6 and his brief reading of Jewish Barbie in his conclusion. In these examples and even in his earlier chapters, Koltun-Fromm shows great sensitivity and engagement with issues of gender. Throughout the book he consistently engages with gender as a crucial aspect of materiality and does so to great effect.

As much as I admire this book, I have some quibbles and disappointments. As much as I can appreciate the utility of a very broad conception of material culture, I found the thread holding the volume together too thin. I wanted

The Journal of Religion

more of an overarching argument and a stronger claim that this work is an intervention into the field of Jewish thought. I wanted to hear Koltun-Fromm, who knows the field so well, to have made explicit why material culture matters. The introduction, and less so the conclusion, place this work more squarely in the field of North American religion using terms and discourse gleaned from that field. Works by Robert Orsi and David Morgan, among others, clearly helped Koltun-Fromm shift gears. This makes sense, but I regretted that Koltun-Fromm did not more fully show how these works are not only useful for studying American Jewishness but also how Jewish thought and practice challenge these decidedly more Christian models of material practice. I longed for some of what is more evident in the conclusion to have helped shape the introduction and the initial framing of the project. I wanted to hear Koltun-Fromm use Jewish Barbie to talk back to Morgan and Orsi about how Jewishness complicates notion of religion in America, how it is not all about faith, and even how attention to the rituals and the practices of even ordinary working-class Catholics, like those Orsi writes about, differ from what Koltun-Fromm sees when he looks at works of American Jewish cultural and religious production. That said, I see this book as a beginning and look forward to seeing where this experiment takes Koltun-Fromm in his next project.

LAURA S. LEVITT, *Temple University*.

YAKIRA, ELHANAN. *Post-Zionism, Post-Holocaust*. Translated by ELHANAN YAKIRA and MICHAEL SWIRSKY. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 342 pp. \$29.99 (paper).

Reviewing Elhanan Yakira's *Post-Zionism, Post-Holocaust* puts any critical reviewer in a bind. He employs a brilliant conceit: a Manichean logic whereby one who disagrees with the a priori assumptions of the author is immediately placed in the enemy camp—either explicitly or by implication—which invalidates her reading.

The book has three related essays on political thought and a postscript focused on contemporary thinkers. The first essay describes the move of Robert Faurrisson and others on the French left from anti-Zionism to various degrees of "Holocaust denial." Yakira's thesis, mostly clearly articulated in the second essay, posits a chain of identifications. There is really no such thing as post-Zionism; post-Zionism is really anti-Zionism, and anti-Zionism is really anti-Semitism. By extension, post-Zionism is different only in degree but not in kind from Holocaust denial. While post-Zionists are not Holocaust deniers in the formal sense, the foundation of their thought includes denying the legitimacy of Israel as a "Jewish" state, thus denying Jewish collective self-determination, thus denying Jewish peoplehood. For Yakira, therefore, post-Zionist positions are not simply immoral; they are "criminal" (318).

The third essay reflects on Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, where Yakira argues that the "moral failure" at the core of her book contains the germ-cell of post-Zionism. His postscript serves as an occasion to bash Judith Butler, Tony Judt, and other contemporary political thinkers and to make explicit the intimate connection between them, Israeli post-Zionists, and French Holocaust deniers (310).

A substantive problem with the book is the intentional lack of precision characteristic of polemical tracts. There are three categories discussed that