



C O N F E R E N C E O N

THE LAUNCHING OF THE EUROPEAN ROUTE OF JEWISH HERITAGE

18-20 June 2004

**Centre Culturel
de Rencontre
Abbaye de Neumünster
Luxembourg-City**

**B'nai B'rith Europe
European Council of Jewish Communities
Red de Juderías de España-Caminos de Sefarad**

in collaboration and with the support of the Ministry of Culture of Luxembourg,
the Centre Culturel de Rencontre Abbaye de Neumünster
and the European Institute of Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe



B'NAI B'RITH EUROPE



Contents

3 WELCOME SPEECH

Mr. François Moysé, Vice-president of the Commission on Jewish Heritage, B'nai B'rith Europe

REPORTS

4 1). «Les origines du projet - Discours de bienvenue»

par Mme Claude Bloch, Présidente de la Commission du Patrimoine Juif, B'nai B'rith Europe

6 2). «Introduction»

by H.E Gérard Philipps, Luxembourg's Former Ambassador to the Council of Europe

8 3). «Les itinéraires culturels européens»

par M. Michel Thomas-Penette, Directeur de l'Institut Européen des Itinéraires Culturels du Conseil de l'Europe

12 4). «The renewal of Jewish Monuments in the Czech Republic»

by Dr. Arno Parik, Exhibition Curator, Jewish Museum, Prague

17 5). «Le patrimoine juif en France - Evolution d'une sensibilité»

par le Pr. Dominique Jarrassé, Professeur d'histoire de l'art contemporain, Bordeaux

20 6). «Presentation of the European Day of Jewish Culture in different countries»

Roundtable moderated by Ms. Eva Castellanos, representative of Red de Juderias de España

21 7). «Presentation of the European Route of Jewish Heritage (Historical perspective)»

by Ms. Camille Dansette, European coordinator of the European Day of Jewish Culture

23 8). «The importance of the preservation of Jewish heritage»

by Mr. Max Polonovski, In charge of the protection of Jewish heritage, Ministry of Culture, France

27 9). «European heritage submission»

by Mr. Clive Lawton, Specialist in Jewish ethics

28 10). «The contribution of museums in the Route»

by Ms. Annie Sacerdoti, Coordinator of the European Day of Jewish Culture in Italy

CONCLUSIONS

29 11). «Future challenges: partnerships, activities, routes»

Summary of the working groups

30 12). Summary

by Ms. Laure Amoyel, Member of the Steering Committee

APPENDIX

31 Programme of the conference

32 List of participants

33 List of speakers

34 Survey on the European Route of Jewish Heritage

37 Distribution of the working groups

Reports

Welcome speech

François Moyse

It is a great pleasure to welcome all the participants to the launching meeting of the European Route of Jewish Heritage in Luxembourg. There could not be a nicer place to hold such a meeting than the Centre Abbaye Neumünster, the brand-new Conference Centre in Luxembourg-City, located in the lower part of the city of Luxembourg, just at the foot of its impressive rocks and walls. We want to thank the Director of the Centre, Mr. Frisoni, for his kind assistance together with his staff, in the organisation of the meeting.

The reasons for this meeting to take place in Luxembourg are to be found in the fruitful co-operation which started a few years ago with the European Institute of Cultural Routes. This Institute of the Council of Europe is located in Luxembourg. Thanks to the precious assistance of the Director Mr. Michel Thomas-Penette, we were able to intensify the contacts between the European coordination of the European Day of Jewish Culture and the Council of Europe, as well as with the Ministry of Culture of Luxembourg. At this point we would like to pay tribute to Minister Mrs. Erna Hennicot-Schoepges and to Mr. Guy Doc-kendorf, who is heading the department at the Ministry of culture, for their invaluable support.

Indeed, it must be recalled that the European Day of Jewish Culture started a few years ago – as Mrs. Claude Bloch will point out later – in 1996 in Alsace (France). The European dimension started in 2000 when four organisations, at the time, at their forces together, namely B'nai B'rith Europe, the tourist agency of Lower Alsace, the European Council of Jewish Communities and the Spanish Route of Jewry (Caminos de Sefarad).

Opening Jewish sites like synagogues, cemeteries, ritual baths and other places to the broad public around Europe under one logo was a spectacular achievement. Such an animation process is very enriching. However, in order to safeguard most of the

Jewish sites in the long run and to renovate those in need, a permanent process must be achieved, to keep the Jewish sites in a good shape, for the benefit of the future generations of Europeans.

Therefore the idea came up not only to have one common day of animation in Europe, but to create a real European Route of Jewish Heritage, a project recognized by the Council of Europe as being worth of be coming part of the European Cultural Routes, selected for their value to all Europe.

B'nai B'rith Europe, in the name of the European coordination, has pursued the contacts with the European Institute of Cultural Routes. Because of the geographical proximity, Laure Amoyel and myself living here in Luxembourg, the idea came up to organise this launching meeting of the European Route of Jewish Heritage here in Luxembourg.

We would like to thank the ambassadors De Muysen and Philipps for their presence, as well as Mrs. Albertanza and Mr. Jomantas, members of the Steering committee of the Council of Europe and Mr. Thomas-Penette, the Director of the European Institute of Cultural Routes. Our thanks also go to all our guest speakers, who are specialists on Jewish Heritage and who will ensure that their expertise will enrich the debates in a scientific manner. Finally let me thank all of the participants, who have dedicated a lot of time to this project and with whom we look forward to working with for a long time.

Reports

1). Les origines du projet - Discours de bienvenue

Claude Bloch

Nous sommes réunis ce matin, certains pour la première fois, pour poursuivre ensemble un rêve fou qui naquit pour nous en 1995 et dont je vais vous conter brièvement l'histoire.

Cette année là, deux préoccupations se sont rencontrées dans notre belle Alsace :

D'une part, tout d'abord, celle de l'Agence de Développement Touristique du Bas-Rhin (ADT) qui recevait des demandes de touristes américains à la recherche des traces de leurs ancêtres mais qui était bien en peine de leur répondre, au grand désespoir de Catherine Lehmann, qui y occupait les fonctions de chargé de mission.

D'autre part, le B'nai B'rith Hirschler (BB) (organisation juive pluraliste) constitué d'un groupe de bénévoles épris de culture alors en recherche de projet. Un contact fut établi, un peu par hasard, et immédiatement l'équipe du B'nai B'rith fut prise de passion pour cette action. Nous voulions contribuer à la sauvegarde d'un patrimoine juif rural alsacien très riche, puisqu'on y dénombrait plusieurs centaines de sites. Un premier inventaire de ces lieux fut entamé, aboutissant à l'identification de monuments en bon état mais aussi à la découverte émouvante de cimetières en friche ou de synagogues abandonnées et en triste état.

Très vite, dès la première année, est venue l'idée d'organiser une Journée « Portes Ouvertes » permettant d'ouvrir au public des sites juifs toujours clos.

En effet, pour sauvegarder un patrimoine, il faut avant tout le faire connaître. Mais pour attirer le public, il faut également jumeler cette ouverture avec des animations ponctuelles et de qualité permettant de créer des événements forts. Ce n'est qu'ainsi que l'on peut capter l'attention des élus et des médias. Ces ouvertures et animations sont aussi des réalisations concrètes qui permettent de motiver les bénévoles autour de projets rapides à mettre en œuvre.

Le 7 juillet 1996 eut donc lieu la première journée « Portes ouvertes » spécifiquement consacrée au judaïsme. 18 sites étaient visibles dans tout le département. Les bénévoles du B'nai B'rith y accueillaient les visiteurs, les renseignant et leur distribuant des fiches techniques. La communication était restée relativement modeste et pourtant 5.000 visiteurs, essentiellement non juifs, se déplacèrent.

Voyant l'intérêt du public alsacien pour cette action, l'Agence de développement touristique, avec le B'nai B'rith comme partenaire, prit le thème de la découverte du Judaïsme comme projet structurant pour trois ans.

Dès 1997, la journée porte ouverte devint transfrontalière, les ouvertures se multipliant des deux côtés du Rhin, en Alsace comme en pays de Bade-Wurtemberg.

En complément de ces ouvertures, le B'nai B'rith Hirschler, toujours en partenariat avec l'ADT organisa aussi différentes actions telle que la formation de guides, l'édition d'une brochure ainsi que diverses expositions, certaines de très grande envergure et d'autres plus modestes.

Cette conjonction du professionnalisme de l'ADT et de l'enthousiasme du B'nai B'rith ont alors permis de doubler chaque année le nombre de visiteurs.

Puis en 1999, au cours d'un colloque organisé par M. Max Polonovski, nous découvriions que nous ne sommes pas les seuls et que, partout en Europe, des hommes et des femmes se préoccupaient de la mise en valeur du patrimoine juif, agissant avec le même enthousiasme, et comme nous, furent frappés par la curiosité du public, mais aussi par la masse des préjugés que seule l'information permet de combattre.

Des liens et des amitiés très forts se sont alors tissés en particulier avec nos homologues italiens, espa-

Reports

gnols et allemands. En collaboration avec les deux organisations juives européennes que sont le European Council of Jewish Communities (ECJC) et le B'nai B'rith Europe (BBE) ainsi que deux organisations gouvernementales la Red de Juderias et l'ADT, nous créions, structurions et puis développiions la Journée Européenne de la Culture Juive (JECJ), telle que vous la connaissez aujourd'hui.

Ce groupe proposa une date d'ouverture des sites, un thème pour les animations, un graphisme pour les affiches, un mode d'emploi ainsi qu'un communiqué de presse commun. Dans chaque pays un coordinateur national se chargea de la réalisation d'un programme.

Là encore, le succès fut au rendez-vous puisque aujourd'hui 25 pays européens (Allemagne, Belgique, Bosnie-Herzégovine, Bulgarie, Croatie, Danemark, Espagne, France, Grande-Bretagne, Grèce, Hollande, Hongrie, Italie, Lituanie, Luxembourg, Pologne, Portugal, République Tchèque, Roumanie, Serbie, Slovaquie, Suède, Suisse, Turquie, Ukraine) participent à cet événement.

Et aujourd'hui, comme en 1999, fiers de nos spécificités et riches de nos différences, nous nous retrouvons tous ensemble pour franchir une nouvelle étape dans la valorisation du patrimoine juif. Après la confrontation de nos expériences très diverses, nous mettrons en place l'itinéraire Européen du Patrimoine Juif (IEPJ).

Cette nouvelle étape nous permettra de mieux faire connaître la richesse des témoignages laissés par une longue histoire, souvent tragique mais aussi parfois heureuse. Cette offre ne sera plus, pour l'essentiel, concentrée au cours d'une seule journée, mais répartie sur toute l'année. L'IEPJ constituera le cadre dans lequel nous pourrons donner corps à ce qui a été et reste notre ambition: valoriser, sauver et faire connaître le riche patrimoine juif européen ou, autrement dit, le valoriser et le faire connaître pour le sauver.

Reports

2). Introduction

H.E Gérard Philipps

I remember with pleasure the discussion we had a couple of years ago at the Council of Europe with representatives of B'nai B'rith with regards to the ideas and the project of a Route, of an Itinerary¹. I was at the time ambassador of Luxembourg. I was accredited to the Council of Europe and we were preparing the Luxembourg presidency of the Council of Europe. Within the programme of the 6 months' presidency that Luxembourg did at the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, at the time composed of 44 members, we had put as one of our priorities cultural itineraries. In the twelve months prior to Luxembourg's presidency, we also worked on this topic, working on the idea of itineraries was professionally interesting and personally very rewarding. I got to know the existence and the practice of the Cultural Routes in 1997-98 when I started working in Strasbourg. Before that, I had a vague idea about them but I was not too sure what their aim was.

I would just like to give you a few ideas which might come into use for your discussion today when you discuss the specific cultural route which you are launching which certainly merits discussion. What I say might shed light on some of your issues, questions and I hope to add to the general discussion.

When we wanted to promote the idea in the late nineties and early 2001-2002, we found that different Member States of the Council of Europe reacted in various ways. States such as Luxembourg have been interested in the cultural routes since the very beginning. I would just like to remind you that the idea of itineraries was born in the mid 80's in the Council of Europe's General Direction of education, culture and sports. Unlike the European Union which has much money, the Council of Europe is not a very rich organisation. The programme was carried out some ten years and then there was no more money. The government of Luxembourg decided that it wanted to pursue this idea and decided to set up in Luxembourg the European Institute of Cultural

Routes and thus in fact took over from the Council of Europe and co-financed an activity which the Council of Europe could no longer fund.

We are grateful for the Institute's work which has proved itself to be increasingly more professional and which is able to sell its knowledge, experience and methodology.

I believe that the Institute is a place where the methodology for the culture of itineraries is developed. It enables the progressive redefining of projects highlighting European values.

Its methodology is also a living thing. It's a kind of culture which is being created in that Institute, which is in the process of doing and from which you can both learn and elaborate further concepts. When defining your route, you will certainly draw on the experience, on the knowledge of Mr. Thomas-Penette and his collaborators.

Just to come back to the attitude of States, of their ambassadors when they represent states in a large international organisation, you have those who believe that this type of project is interesting, that it is good business, that culture is a large part of society and education, that it is one of the elements which is constantly present in daily life. Those representatives of states are led to combine professional and personal interests. Then there are those who are perhaps not interested because their state does not have or has little opinion on it. Then you have people in the middle who ask some questions about it: What does it carry? What does this added value mean? Why should they support this including financially? How should it be explained to our governments? This leads me to conclude that governments at the top are very often not very interested because they are not very close to the cultural itinerary. They are very close to cultural policy, they say "Heritage is important" but when it comes down to getting to grips with the issue they have a certain distance with regards to the project. In fact, we have discovered that local and regional governments or collectivities are much closer and they are much more interested in the realisation of

¹In English I prefer the word Itinerary to the word Route which refers too much to the Route 66. It is too light. Whereas in French, I prefer the expression on the definition of these activities.

Reports

Cultural Routes because culture, heritage is closer to them. It is in the village. It is in the town, in the city. One fundamental conclusion which I drew from all of this is that you need to get to the people who are close to this object or to the subject of your itinerary. Further you get away from them, the more theoretical they become.

We then come from the idea of closeness, proximity to the object or to the subject of the itinerary. We come to the idea of network which is another fundamental idea of the whole Institute, of the whole itinerary that already exists. The principle of networking, of collaborating through common heritage of different nature is to establish very complete links which are not just like a meeting once in a while at a conference but rather amounts to working together and linking principles, linking subjects, linking ideas putting them in relationship with one another. In fact, networking can be done, locally, in the city. It can also be done at a national level. It certainly should be done at a transnational, transborder level for various greater subjects. There is thus a regional, continental, European dimension. I believe that the itinerary which is the main subject of your discussion today has certainly a European dimension. It also includes young people. It certainly has a European dimension but it may start in various places at a very very local level in order to link and to develop itself.

The Council of Europe is not a powerful organisation but I think that it is an organisation which has a cultural, moral and political force. An organisation from which it is positive to get a label from. The Council of Europe stands for human rights. It stands for tolerance. It stands for non discrimination. It stands for many good ideas and therefore having the Council of Europe on the cultural routes certainly is a great value.

I would also like to give you an example of the discussions which are taking place at a states representatives level on Cultural Routes. Many questions come to mind: What do they give to me? How do they look? How can I see them? Can I feel them? Can I touch them? Or are they just something which I have to intellectualise? It is a difficult discussion. For some, Cultural routes are something which they

need to feel, touch, see, smell and for others, generally more educated people, Routes are an abstract philosophical concept.

An ambassador for instance asked me: "Can I have maps please? I want to have maps, to draw up where I can go. I would like to take my car, walk twelve kilometres and after these twelve kilometres, I would like to see, touch and feel the Route. I need maps. Produce me a book with maps, a book with beautiful things that you tell and that the Institute can promote. In this way, my government will help develop this project". Of course, he was exaggerating but he pointed out the necessity to elaborate a concrete route. There is a wonderful text about the idea on how to use the cultural routes and how to develop them, on what they are there for and what they stimulate in us.

Another idea behind the Cultural Routes, which was certainly in the mind of the Luxembourg government when it was preparing the presidency, was that in post-war regions like in South-East Europe, cultural heritage can facilitate the rehabilitation getting of normality after there has been a terrible war. Indeed, cultural heritage can facilitate a kind of cooperation between cities, countries or a whole region which have a common cultural heritage. The Routes enable to highlight the common values between people. Thus, you can have relationship among people on common values. Sometimes people discover that they have things in common which they had never suspected. Cultural, architectural and other common heritage enables people to get closer together and creates a common understanding. Transborder cooperation between countries which are in conflict is much easier when it comes to cultural issues and the respect for diversity.

To conclude, I would like to point out an underlying element which is necessary in order to constitute a Cultural Route. It is important to bear in mind that you are working on something which has very many aspects and very different facets. All these facets are exploitable, interrelated and can be put into a context of complex projects like yours. In cultural, historical, religious and other terms, this is a project of great complexity but I believe that because it is so complex and so rich that it will be an absolute success. I believe in your project like I believe in the general concept of Cultural Routes.

3). Les itinéraires culturels européens

Michel Thomas-Penette

Les interventions qui ont précédé ont bien posé les questions qui vous préoccupent en ce qui concerne le programme des itinéraires culturels. Il s'agit à la fois des motifs qui expliquent pourquoi vous avez dû attendre jusqu'en mai dernier avant que l'itinéraire du patrimoine juif soit officiellement intégré au cadre du Conseil de l'Europe et du travail qui reste à accomplir maintenant.

Son Excellence l'Ambassadeur Gérard Philipps a insisté sur un certain nombre de contradictions, voire de difficultés de ce programme qui tiennent au fait qu'il s'agit probablement d'un des programmes les plus anciens menés par une institution européenne en ce qui concerne la culture et qu'il est donc naturel que sa définition soit régulièrement revue.

Un certain nombre de dates caractérisent cette évolution:

En 1984, l'Assemblée Parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe émet une recommandation sur l'idée d'un programme d'itinéraires culturels et met en avant un premier thème, celui des chemins de pèlerinage en Europe et tout particulièrement celui vers Saint Jacques de Compostelle.

En 1987, le programme est lancé et se développera pendant dix années d'activités au sein du Conseil de l'Europe.

En 1997, à la demande du Conseil de l'Europe qui souhaite doter le programme d'une agence technique, l'Institut Européen des Itinéraires Culturels, le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg décide de l'accueillir et de le doter de locaux et d'une subvention de fonctionnement.

En 2004, en plus du siège de la Tour Jacob situé sur l'itinéraire culturel Wenzel et ouvert en 1997, nous bénéficierons de locaux au Centre Culturel de Rencontres de l'Abbaye de Neumünster, ce qui nous don-

nera évidemment beaucoup plus de facilités de travail pour, à la fois, rencontrer le grand public en mettant à disposition une bibliothèque et la documentation réunie depuis dix-sept ans sur les itinéraires culturels et utiliser des salles de réunion sur place pour des conférences et des rencontres. Mais 2004 aura connu aussi une nouvelle inflexion dans le programme des Itinéraires culturels du Conseil de l'Europe. La présidence luxembourgeoise du Conseil de l'Europe a tout mis en oeuvre pour que de nouveaux itinéraires voient le jour et elle a surtout insisté auprès des autres pays européens impliqués, pour que les moyens de ce programme soient renforcés en créant un Accord Partiel qui mette autour de la table les pays plus volontaires que d'autres sur ce sujet et qui réunissent des moyens supplémentaires.

En effet, compte tenu du nombre de partenaires qui travaillent sur le terrain, il existe un effet multiplicateur important. Lorsque le Conseil de l'Europe consacre un euro au programme, l'Institut peut en trouver neuf pour mettre en place des actions pour lesquelles les partenaires investissent cent euros. Toute augmentation de la dotation initiale peut avoir un effet multiplicateur encore plus grand.

Cette idée n'a pas abouti en raison d'un certain nombre de contradictions qu'a souligné l'ambassadeur Gérard Philipps. Il y a des pays qui sont très volontaristes en matière d'itinéraire culturel et je pense tout particulièrement aux pays d'Europe centrale et orientale... et d'autres qui le sont moins parce que les itinéraires culturels leur semblent dépendre plus des autorités locales.

De ce fait nous nous trouvons maintenant devant une double question : comment mieux définir les itinéraires culturels pour qu'ils correspondent à une définition plus décentralisée et comment trouver les moyens supplémentaires que les pays membres n'ont pas souhaité y mettre.

Reports

Dans les questions de méthodologie que nous devons examiner ensemble, d'autant plus au début de la mise en place d'un itinéraire, il est indispensable de comprendre cet arrière-plan concernant les questions de définition et de financement du programme.

L'ambassadeur Gérard Philipps a rappelé les questions posées par un de ses collègues à Strasbourg, l'ambassadeur de Suisse, et son désir d'obtenir des cartes des itinéraires culturels, en un mot des tracés européens. Il est vrai que même si nous insistons d'abord sur les valeurs, sur la définition européenne du thème des itinéraires culturels, sur le contour politique d'une action de cet ordre, il s'agit d'aboutir à un désir de visite, ou de parcours, à une proposition concrète pour les touristes.

On a insisté en introduction sur la question de la sécurité démocratique, sur celle de la protection des minorités et on a rappelé des moments importants de la mémoire de l'Europe, ainsi que la volonté paneuropéenne de dialogue culturel. **C'est sur ces valeurs que reposent les Itinéraires culturels et sans ces valeurs, on peut avoir un superbe tracé, il ne s'agit pas d'un Itinéraire Culturel du Conseil de l'Europe.**

Mais en même temps, il est vrai qu'à un certain moment, le public doit pouvoir suivre, découvrir concrètement ce que nous voulons dire en défendant ces valeurs.

L'itinéraire du Patrimoine Juif est particulièrement exemplaire de ce point de vue. Le travail positif d'explication, l'accueil vers des patrimoines juifs pour un public non juif, comme vous l'avez mentionné tout à l'heure en ce qui concerne la première Journée Européenne de la culture juive, constitue un travail extrêmement important qui doit permettre de dépasser ce qui se traduit aujourd'hui par ce regard étrange de l'autre sur un patrimoine inconnu, voire par des agressions et par des actes violents.

Pour résumer, le programme des itinéraires culturels du Conseil de l'Europe, c'est d'abord un thème et le thème fort que vous avez choisi, que vous avez proposé, que nous avons parcouru ensemble depuis

trois ans en nous rencontrant régulièrement **vient d'être retenu par le Conseil de l'Europe, le 10 mai dernier. C'est donc maintenant un thème officiel sur la liste des itinéraires culturels du Conseil de l'Europe.**

Lorsque l'on est face à un thème aussi important, vient ensuite la mise en place d'un certain nombre d'actions, actions que je voudrais maintenant détailler.

Le règlement des itinéraires culturels définit en effet les lignes d'action. Je pense qu'il est important de voir comment on peut répondre ensemble précisément à chacune des lignes d'action.

Il définit également la mise en place **d'un réseau.** Lorsque vous aviez fait cette proposition, vous étiez déjà vous-même en réseau constitué lors de l'organisation de la Journée Européenne de la Culture Juive. Il s'agit donc de travailler maintenant à la mise en place d'une association qui définisse le rôle de ce réseau en ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre de l'itinéraire.

Type d'actions.

Les itinéraires culturels doivent s'appuyer sur une réflexion scientifique et poser un certain nombre de bases scientifiques sur un sujet. Donc **il est très important,** et là je rentre dans ce que le Conseil de l'Europe et l'Institut attendent d'une rencontre comme celle que nous avons aujourd'hui, **que se dégage parmi vous un Conseil scientifique qui constitue le socle du travail qui est réalisé et donne son point de vue aux différentes étapes.**

Vient ensuite le travail d'interprétation du patrimoine. Vous avez choisi volontairement en partant de la Journée Européenne de la Culture Juive de centrer l'itinéraire sur l'idée du patrimoine - pas de la culture au sens large mais du patrimoine. De ce fait, il y a là devant nous un **travail tout à fait important d'écriture, de présentation, de mise en évidence et d'explication pour le public et ce toujours dans un esprit d'interprétation européenne** c'est-à-dire non seulement en termes d'interprétation locale - même si le patrimoine est toujours local et présente une expression forte des identités locales - mais sur-

tout dans ses relations avec d'autres patrimoines en Europe. Il faut dire en quoi il a été influencé par les apports extérieurs, quels sont les traits communs à travers l'Europe, quelles sont les bases de ces racines communes, de ce patrimoine commun que nous avons déjà évoqué.

Troisième élément important pour un itinéraire culturel du Conseil de l'Europe, c'est l'implication des jeunes européens.

Le fait que participent à ces actions des Européens en âge scolaire, en temps scolaire ou non scolaire, est essentiel. Nous avons réellement à préparer l'avenir de l'Europe et c'est au travers de ces groupes que nous réunissons déjà dans le cadre d'autres itinéraires, dans des Centres de Culture Européenne, au sein de patrimoines significatifs, ensembles à plusieurs nationalités pendant quinze jours, que se fait cette discussion interculturelle les yeux dans les yeux. Quand on est dans le patrimoine et quand on vient de cultures différentes, qu'on se regarde et qu'on vit ensemble, que l'on a une réelle appréhension de l'histoire - on parlait de sentir le patrimoine tout à l'heure, de le toucher - il se passe quelque chose de fort. Lorsque l'on constate à l'heure actuelle, pour ne prendre que la situation française, la multiplication des injures racistes quotidiennes dans les établissements, il est clair que les problèmes du regard porté sur la religion de l'autre et sur son identité culturelle sont devenus sources graves de conflits. Je pense qu'il y a un travail essentiel à réaliser au travers de cet itinéraire que vous vous proposez de construire.

Et puis bien entendu, on revient à l'idée de circuit, de tracé, de parcours. Nous aurons à faire ensemble un travail important de présentation pour le public de cet itinéraire du patrimoine juif.

Mais je suis d'autant plus confiant que l'initiative de départ s'est articulée sur le fait qu'il y avait déjà des actions touristiques concrètes. Je pense à ce qui existe aujourd'hui en Alsace autour du patrimoine juif et j'ai pu déjà, au cours des réunions que nous avons eues ensemble, constater combien le Red de Juderias faisait un travail approfondi sur le plan culturel, un travail de formation d'équipes, de remise en oeuvre de traditions et de cultures en direction d'un public qui arrive avec un oeil neuf, sans idées préconçues sur ce patrimoine.

La préparation de ce parcours s'est fait en plusieurs étapes. Le Conseil de l'Europe avait été alerté d'un certain nombre d'initiatives. Les représentants français étaient venus au Conseil de l'Europe lors de la préparation du colloque de Paris auquel certains de nos collaborateurs ont assisté.

Lors de l'année consacrée à « l'Europe, un patrimoine commun », l'Institut a confié un travail à l'une de ses stagiaires d'origine roumaine sur toutes les initiatives concernant le patrimoine juif en Europe. Elle était originaire de Iasi et avait effectivement une sensibilité, un regard particulier sur le patrimoine juif de la Roumanie. A partir de ce premier travail, nous avons eu la chance d'être contacté par François Moise, venu en voisin et par le Red de Juderias. Et enfin nous nous sommes réunis avec vous pour un début d'explication de ce que voudrait dire un itinéraire culturel c'est-à-dire, comme vous l'a expliqué Madame Bloch, le fait de passer d'un évènement important, marquant, une fois par an à une action continue. Ce qui veut dire qu'un circuit peut être visité toute l'année, que des patrimoines doivent être ouverts toute l'année, qu'il doit y avoir un travail scientifique de fond, un travail d'interprétation. Et surtout - j'ai pu constater que plusieurs de vos communications allaient dans ce sens — que le rôle important des musées, qui sont des vrais centres d'interprétation permanents permettant de donner un certain nombre de clés pour des visiteurs et pour des touristes, soit intégré dans l'ensemble des parcours.

Je dois insister: la mobilisation des musées dans le dispositif général de l'itinéraire est aussi une des tâches que nous examinerons ensemble et qui est extrêmement importante.

Parmi tous les itinéraires, ou les propositions d'itinéraires sur lesquels nous avons travaillé depuis que nous sommes au Luxembourg, trois ont été adoptés cette année par le Conseil de l'Europe sur des questions parfois différentes et parfois complémentaires : l'itinéraire du patrimoine juif, l'itinéraire du patrimoine migratoire en Europe et l'itinéraire du patrimoine industriel. En soulignant ce fait, je veux indiquer par là que le travail que nous aurons à faire au cours de ces prochains mois consiste également à voir comment on peut établir des synergies, des relations et des

complémentarités avec les autres thèmes des itinéraires culturels.

Enfin, je voudrais terminer par **deux rendez-vous importants** pour la suite du travail. Le plus proche a lieu **dans deux jours**. Le Conseil de l'Europe dans son processus de réexamen du programme a souhaité organiser des plates-formes informelles qui soient en tout cas moins formelles que des réunions d'ambassadeurs, de ministres, en essayant de mettre autour de la table tous les acteurs des itinéraires culturels depuis ceux qui ont une idée, qui la défendent jusqu'à ceux qui la mettent en pratique, voire qui la vendent en tant que produit touristique.

Parmi les itinéraires culturels que le Conseil de l'Europe a souhaité entendre, regarder de plus près, il y en a un qui a été élu depuis 1997. Il s'agit de l'itinéraire de l'héritage andalou qui lui aussi parle de rencontre entre les religions et de tolérance. Certains d'entre vous vont participer à cette réunion lundi en expliquant à un ensemble de représentants de pays, à un ensemble de délégués des assemblées du Conseil de l'Europe, à des professionnels du tourisme pourquoi vous avez senti le besoin d'une relation avec le Conseil de l'Europe et comment se sont effectués l'approche et le travail d'ensemble jusqu'à aujourd'hui et quelles sont vos difficultés à construire, à trouver des financements, à aller de l'avant...

Le deuxième rendez-vous aura lieu les 10-12 septembre 2004 **en Lituanie**, puisque en effet lors des discussions un peu informelles que nous avons eues depuis plusieurs années, Alfredas Jomantas qui est membre du Conseil d'orientation des itinéraires culturels, a lui-même jugé important de son côté que les Journées Européennes du Patrimoine en Lituanie soient consacrées cette année au patrimoine juif.

C'est un travail de préparation d'une année de la part des responsables lituaniens. Nous avons fait la proposition d'y inviter trois ou quatre parmi vous pour venir témoigner de votre expérience et faire en sorte que les musées et les villes lituaniennes concernés participent à cet itinéraire et vous rejoignent.

Reports

4). The renewal of Jewish Monuments in the Czech Republic

PhD. Arno Parik

The specific nature of the conditions governing the existence of Jewish communities - the discrimination ensuing from religious, economic and political factors and the frequent change in or demise of settlements - is the main reason why many Jewish monuments disappeared throughout history without a trace. It happened in the Middle Ages, after the banishment of Jews from towns in the 15th and 16th centuries, and even after the departure of Jews from the small rural communities after 1848. Most Jewish monuments, however, were destroyed during the Nazi occupation and during the 40-year Communist regime. During this time Jewish monuments received only a minimum of care - in fact they were often deliberately destroyed for no reason at all. It wasn't until after November 1989 that it became possible for the first time in history to set about the systematic documentation and preservation of Jewish monuments in Czech Republic.

Jewish monuments in the Czech Republic are in the possession of 10 Jewish communities, although some belong to municipalities, societies, organisations and Protestant churches. A significant number of Prague monuments have been entrusted by the Prague Jewish Community into the care of THE JEWISH MUSEUM, which was returned to Jewish administration in 1994. It immediately set to work on the renovation of the most prominent historical buildings. The first to be reconstructed was the Maisel Synagogue (1592) in 1995, followed by the Baroque Klausen Synagogue (1694) in 1996. The same year saw the completed renovation of the Memorial to the almost 80,000 Czech victims of the Holocaust in the Pinkas Synagogue (1535). The names of all the victims were again inscribed on the walls of this house of prayer, which is the second oldest in Prague. The beginning of 1998 saw the completed renovation of the Ceremonial Hall (1908) of the Prague Burial Society by the Old Jewish Cemetery and November saw the reopening after 16 years of the newly restored Spanish Synagogue (1868). All these buildings now house

new permanent exhibitions which place the preserved artefacts into a Jewish historical and spiritual context. Also completed in 1997 was the reconstruction of the provincial synagogue in Golcuv Jenikov (1871), which is used as a depository of synagogue textile. In 2000 the museum finishes the reconstruction of the modern annex to the Spanish Synagogue, which becomes now the new Museum administrative centre with offices, restoration workshops and depositories. The extensive reconstruction of the Smíchov Synagogue (1863/1931) was carried out in the years 2002-04. This synagogue will serve from 2005 as the new seat of the archive of the Jewish communities and depository of the art collection. Work is now being done on the reconstruction of the synagogue in Brandys nad Labem (1787/1828), which is intended for use as a storage for the museum's library.

The Jewish Museum is also responsible for the restoration of tombstones in the OLD JEWISH CEMETERY of PRAGUE. In 1994 a specialist committee was set up (consisting of representatives from the Prague Institute for Monument Conservation, restorers, technologists and historians) to establish the way restoration work should proceed. All stone surfaces were cleaned, conserved and divided into two categories: those requiring immediate conservation and those intended for restoration. About 40 tombstones are conserved and about 50 are restored each year. This programme of restoration and conservation of tombstones in the Old Jewish Cemetery is to continue into the future. In 1997 a seminar was held by the Jewish Museum on the preservation of Jewish cemeteries. This dealt with issues relating to technology, conservation and cultural history. While reconstruction work was being carried out in late 1997 in the cellar of an old house in Prague's New Town, a discovery was made of a large number of fragments of mostly 14th century tombstones from the oldest Jewish cemetery of Prague.

Since 1990 the Jewish Museum has also been carrying

Reports

rying out a systematic DOCUMENTATION of Jewish monuments in the Czech Republic, including the gathering of archive data and information on Jewish settlements. This documentation is being carried out in co-operation with the Jewish Heritage Council and was partly published in 1995. A brief compilation of data that had been gathered earlier by Jiri Fiedler was published in the book "Jewish Monuments of Bohemia and Moravia" (1991). The archive is currently being digitalised and supplemented by findings made in other archive reports and all kind of sources. However, it already constitutes a comprehensive basis for a future encyclopaedia covering approximately 600 Jewish communities and including data on settlements, synagogues, houses of prayer and cemeteries that belong to Jewish communities. At present extended entries on Jewish settlements by Jiri Fiedler are being added to the five-part encyclopaedia "Towns and hamlets in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia". In 2004 the new survey of the Jewish monuments in Bohemia is being to be published by Blanka Rozkosna from Prague Jewish community building department. On the basis of the above documentation it is now possible to form a relatively clear idea as to the amount and the condition of Jewish cemeteries, synagogues and community buildings. Throughout the last thousand years there have emerged over 600 Jewish communities in what is now the Czech Republic. Most of these historical Jewish communities lived in connected residential districts, GHETTOS and JEWISH QUARTERS or STREETS. Places with older and larger Jewish communities in particular included over 300 such housing areas, about 100 of which have survived at least in part to this day. These natural groups of Jewish monuments also suffered the heaviest losses. Most of the former ghettos were pulled down after emancipation and converted in the post-war period. Reconstruction projects can only be influenced indirectly by means of co-operation with local authorities and monument preservation centres. The towns in Moravia that are attempting to preserve the original character of these urban units include Trebic, Boskovice, Mikulov and Velke Mezirici and in Bohemia they include Kolin, Polná, Breznice and Hermanuv Mestec.

100 years ago there were around 400 SYNAGOGUES in what is now the Czech Republic. Even in the pre-

war period about 50 synagogues in small rural communities were either demolished or converted for residential purposes. During the Nazi occupation at least 35 synagogues were set fire to and demolished in the border areas, which had been occupied since October 1938. During the remainder of the war at least a further 25 synagogues were destroyed - mostly prominent contemporary buildings notable for their size, location and decoration. During the Communist regime almost 100 synagogues were demolished. Some were condemned due to unsound structural conditions, some had to give way to modern developments but many were demolished for no reason at all. There are now approximately 200 synagogues in the Czech Republic, almost half of which, however, have been seriously damaged by subsequent conversion projects. Only 3 synagogues in Prague and 1 in Brno are still used for their original purpose. 30 synagogues now house various cultural centres, around 40 were transferred in the post-war years to Protestant churches, 48 buildings were converted for residential usage, 38 contain storehouses, while the rest are used as offices, health centres, manufacturing bases and commercial institutions.

The second largest investor involved in the reconstruction of Jewish monuments is the PRAGUE JEWISH COMMUNITY, which is responsible for the management of 28 synagogues and 159 cemeteries in three regions of Bohemia. 1996 saw the completion of the European Union supported project for the reconstruction of the Renaissance High Synagogue (1568), which is used for divine services. The ambitious reconstruction of the exterior of the Old-New Synagogue (ca 1270) took place in 1998, while next year saw the complete reconstruction of the interior of this monument, which is one of the most prominent in Prague. While the building survey was being carried out the following measures were taken: uncovering of part of the original paving, lowering of the floor level to the original height (by 15-25cm), uncovering of stone arches in the main hall, restoration of the decorative stonework of the aron ha-kodesh, portal, coping stones and 32 brackets. The installation of a new heating and air-conditioning system maintain a constant temperature and help preserve the damaged decorative stonework of the building. The

Reports

reconstruction was completed in the middle of March 1999. The year 1998 saw the completed reconstruction of the prayer hall in the synagogue in Jeruzalemska Street (1906), the window stained glass of which were completely repaired. From 2001 to 2003 the whole main street front of this popular Prague Art-Nuveau synagogue were restored and renewed completely. The overall reconstruction of this building, including renovation of the valuable organ, however, exceeds the current financial possibilities of the Jewish Community.

1995 saw the completed reconstruction of another provincial synagogue owned by the Prague Jewish Community - the late Baroque synagogue in Rychnov nad Kneznou (1782) in eastern Bohemia, which is used as a regional Jewish museum and memorial to the Jewish writer Karel Polacek. Since 1995 reconstruction work has also been carried out on valuable Baroque synagogues in Ustek, Polna, Ledec nad Sazavou, Breznice and Luze. Of these, the reconstruction of the synagogue in Breznice (1725/1822) is of particular interest as it led to the uncovering of a number of well-preserved layers of paved floors and foundations of the original bimah and aron ha-kodesh. The large Baroque synagogue in Polna (1683) on the Bohemian-Moravian border is also a highly interesting building - plans dating from 1852 were found depicting its disposition prior to modernisation. At that time the large four-cornered bimah and steps leading to the aron were pulled down and plaster with traces of rich Baroque paintwork was removed. The reconstruction of the synagogues in Polna was finished in 1999. Inside the synagogue the permanent exhibition was placed devoted to the local Jewish history, including special section documenting the famous Hilsner affair of 1899. Thanks to its remote location the synagogue in Lu_e (ca 1760) avoided modernisation and the bimah remained intact in the main central area. In the synagogue in Ledec nad Sazavou (1736) fragments of the original ornamental vault decoration and of the painted background to the aron ha-kodesh as well as some of the inscriptions on the west wall were revealed under numerous coats of later paintwork. Preparations are now being made for the reconstruction of the synagogues in Caslav, Jicin, Cesky Krumlov and Nova Cerekev. These projects, however, require even greater finan-

cial resources.

Of the projects carried out by the PROVINCIAL JEWISH COMMUNITIES should be mentioned the reconstruction of the Great synagogue in Pilsen (1892) which is believed to be the second largest in Europe. Repairs to the exterior of these buildings were implemented in 1996-97 with support from the state, the city of Pilsen and an ad hoc foundation established by the local Jewish community. A gala concert by the cantor Malovany in the February of 1998 marked its opening. The reconstruction of the interior, paintwork, appurtenances and large organ, however, still require considerable funds that as yet are not available. The Pilsen Synagogue is to house a concert hall and a permanent exhibition on the history of Jewish communities in the region of west Bohemia. Work has begun on repairs to the roof of the Old Pilsen Synagogue (1859), which is the venue for prominent exhibitions and summer folk concerts. The resources of other Jewish communities in Bohemia - Ustí, Teplice, Decin and Liberec - are limited and barely suffice for the maintenance of cemeteries, community centres and prayer halls. In addition, the vast majority of synagogues in the west and north-west part of the country were destroyed by the Nazis during the Second World War. The costs of reconstruction for such large synagogues as the one in Decin (1907) and in particular the one in Zatec (1872) far exceed the resources of these communities. A modern building for the state science library was in the year 2000 developed on the site of a destroyed synagogue in Liberec (1889) - a new prayer hall was built above the surviving foundations of the old building.

A number of PROVINCIAL SYNAGOGUES in Bohemia have remained in the possession of local authorities as they have already invested in maintenance and repairs. The first reconstruction to be completed was that of the Baroque Synagogue in Rakovnik (1764), which houses the Václav Rabas Gallery and is the venue for chamber concerts. The Baroque Synagogue in Kasejovice (1762) (in which was established a local museum in the 1950s) was renovated in 1994 and now houses a new ethnographic exhibition dedicated to Jewish and local folk art. The most prominent Jewish building owned by a town is the synagogue in Kolin (1642/96), which has been partly

Reports

reconstructed but remains closed - its restitution is the subject of a legal dispute between the local authority and the Jewish Community in Prague. Work begun in 1997 on the reconstruction of the synagogue and ghetto remains in Hermanuv Mestec (1728/1870) on the basis of an earlier project; the reconstruction was finished in 2000. The local authority in Nova Kdyne purchased the local synagogue (1863) from a private owner, after which it began renovation. A unique case of co-operation between a town, a private foundation and the state took place during the reconstruction of a former Jewish house in village Dobra Voda in the Sumava foothills near Hartmanice, where the Museum by Simon Adler was opened in 1997. Some synagogues became the property of various societies - for example, the synagogue in Radnice (ca 1780) is now owned by a nature preservation society and the synagogue in Ckyne (1828) by the Society of Friends of Israel. Sooner or later after the revolution other synagogues came into private ownership. In the case of buildings of historical value the Prague Jewish Community seeks to gain them back - for example the synagogues in Nova Cerekev (1855) and Kosova Hora (ca 1740). Also privately owned is the newly discovered synagogue in the Terezín Ghetto (1943-45), the reconstruction of which was financed by the Terezín Memorial. In the case of the synagogues in Turnov (1718) and Bezdruzice (ca 1800) and the privately owned prayer hall in Krakovany (1892), the religious community is seeking to have them listed and to ensure their renovation under the supervision of monument preservation bodies.

The most prominent investor in reconstruction projects in Moravia is the JEWISH COMMUNITY IN BRNO, which is responsible for the management of 10 synagogues and 46 cemeteries. In the last years the Jewish Community in Brno has been carrying out the town- and state-supported renovation of the Functionalist synagogue in Na Krenove (1936) - the roof, part of the facade and interior were repaired in 1998 and the rest was completed in 1999. Since 1991 work has been carried out on the reconstruction of the synagogue in Boskovice (1698). The roof and facade have been completed and funds are being put aside each year for the restoration of local murals from 1704/5 which are among the earliest and most

interesting Jewish relics in the Czech Republic; the restoration was finally finished in 2000. 1995 saw the completed renovation of the Old Synagogue in Holesov (1559/1737) and the opening of a new exhibition on the history and life of the Jews in Moravia. In the same year reconstruction was carried out on the Old synagogue in Velke Mezirici (ca 1760) - an exhibition on the history of the local Jewish community was installed in the gallery, while the main hall is to be used for prominent exhibitions held in collaboration with the local museum. In 1994-97 repairs to the roof and facade were carried out in the rural synagogue in Straznice (1869), which is also planning a historical exhibition after completion of the reconstruction. May 1998 saw the completed reconstruction of the late Classical synagogue in Slavkov (1858), which is being used as a regional archive and study. The remarkable decorative paintwork has been carefully documented and is planned for renovation. The Jewish community of Olomouc is responsible both for the preservation of its cemeteries and the reconstruction of the synagogue in Usov (1784), where a discovery was made of the foundations of the central octagonal bimah and wall inscriptions. Essential repairs have also been made to the flood-damaged synagogue in Krnov (1871).

A greater number of provincial synagogues in MORAVIA remained in the possession of local authorities which are also contributing towards repairs. Reconstruction of the Upper synagogue in Mikulov (1723) was started as early as the 1980s and completed in 1992 and in 1995 a new exhibition dedicated to the history of the local Jewish community was installed. 1996 saw the completed reconstruction of the synagogue in Hranice (1864), which now serves as the local museum art gallery. The greatest event of 1997 was the completion of the long reconstruction of the Back synagogue in Trebíč (ca 1700). During two years conservation work has been carried out on surviving murals and inscriptions (dating from 1706/7) in the synagogue. These reveal two basic layers of decoration reflecting both the traditional style of Polish synagogues and the original designs of local artists. The installation of a permanent exhibition on the history of the local Jewish community is being prepared in the women's gallery, while the main hall is a venue for lectures and concerts. Also

Reports

completed in 1997 was the reconstruction of the synagogue in Lomnice (1785), which is used as an exhibition and concert hall. The reconstruction of the large Neo-Romanesque synagogue in Breclav (1868) was finally begun in 1998 - extensive renovation of the decorative murals is in preparation. The synagogue is to be used by the local museum which is based in the adjacent building of the Jewish school. In 1997 the reconstruction of the Empire synagogue in Trest (1825) was completed by the Hussite Church with support from the local authorities.

Apart from a few exceptions, JEWISH CEMETERIES are in the exclusive ownership of Jewish communities. Out of more than 400 Czech and Moravian Jewish cemeteries, around 70 were destroyed during the Nazi occupation and the post-war period. More than 330 Jewish cemeteries and approximately 25 Jewish sections in municipal cemeteries have been preserved at least to a certain degree. Management of 159 Jewish cemeteries is the responsibility of the Prague Jewish Community. Building work is being carried out at 84 cemeteries - i.e., construction and repairs of walls, raising of damaged tombstones, and repairs to cemetery buildings, ceremonial halls and mortuaries. Memorial exhibitions have been installed in a number of ceremonial halls - for example, in Benesov, Pardubice, Dobruska, Zamberk, Ckyne, Rakovnik, Drevikov and Petikozly. In other places cemetery houses are used as caretaker flats (Mladá Boleslav, Havlickuv Brod, Hermanuv Mestec, Turnov and Branys nad Labem). Since 1990 renovation and reconstruction work at 64 cemeteries managed by the Prague Jewish Community has been fully completed, renovation work has been mostly completed at 30 cemeteries, while conservation work has at least been initiated at the remaining cemeteries. Other communities are also expending considerable amounts on the renovation of Jewish cemeteries, but at least 50% of costs are borne by the state or the relevant local authorities. A recurrent problem is that of anti-Semitic vandalism, which manifests itself in the defacing of Jewish cemeteries. This has recently involved the defacing of the old cemetery in Libochovice (1992), the overturning of tombstones in Golcuv Jenikov (1995) and Svetla nad Sazavou (1997), the spraying and defacing of tombstones in Hradec Kralove (1996), and of the Jewish memorial in Trutnov (1998) on the anni-

versary of the Crystal Night Pogrom.

In Moravia a total of 46 Jewish cemeteries are managed by the Jewish Community in Brno. 21 cemeteries were fully renovated and building work is continuing on the renovation of cemeteries in Brno, Dolni Kounice, Mikulov, Miroslav, Straznice, Lomnice, Jihlava, Velke Mezirici, Holesov, Jemnice, Slavkov and Boskovic. Ceremonial halls were renovated in Trebic, Uhersky Brod, Bzenec and Podivin, where an exhibition on the history of the local Jewish community was installed. The Jewish community in Olomouc looks after 10 cemeteries, to date has carried out repairs to Jewish cemeteries in Olomouc, Prerov and is continuing with the renovation of the cemetery in Usov, Sumperk and Tovacov, where an exhibition devoted to the history of the local Jewish community and burial customs was installed in 1997. 1998 saw the completed reconstruction of the Olomouc Ceremonial Hall.

More rapid progress in renovation projects is hindered by a lack of funds, both on the part of Jewish communities and their partners. In view of the state of the Czech economy, greater support from the state and local authorities cannot be counted on in the immediate future. Neither is it possible for Jewish communities to expend significantly greater amounts on renovating their cemeteries and monuments than to date. In addition, the Jewish Museum in Prague receives no state support, which means that it has to cover most repair and reconstruction work from its own taxable income.

5). Le patrimoine juif en France Evolution d'une sensibilité

Pr. Dominique Jarrassé

Il ne saurait être question de présenter le patrimoine juif français dans son ensemble dans cette rapide contribution, aussi ai-je opté pour une réflexion sur l'évolution de sa définition durant la dernière décennie. Pour la question de la protection, j'avais fait un petit bilan pour la revue *European Judaism*² et Max Polonovski qui participe à nos travaux est la personne la plus à même d'en parler. Je préfère donc réfléchir à la nature des supports utilisables pour une mise en valeur de ce patrimoine, pour marquer son ancrage dans l'espace et donc servir de base à tout itinéraire.

La définition générique que je proposerais comme point de départ est la suivante: « le patrimoine est le déploiement d'une mémoire dans l'espace », formule que j'ai inscrite dans un Guide³, qui m'a obligé à reprendre la réflexion sur la nature du patrimoine juif esquissée en 1994 dans un numéro de la revue *Monuments Historiques*.

Je voudrais donner également une tournure concrète à cette réflexion en l'illustrant non seulement de quelques chef-d'œuvres, mais aussi de cas concrets auxquels j'ai pu me trouver confronté.

L'invention du patrimoine, ou une fontaine Wallace peut-elle faire partie du patrimoine juif ?

Le patrimoine n'existe pas en soi, il est le produit de nos recherches et du consensus qui s'opère pour lui accorder cette reconnaissance. C'est donc un statut précaire, dépendant de la bonne volonté des historiens et acteurs du patrimoine, comme du public (propriétaires ou société en général) qui plébiscite ou non cette promotion des objets. Il ne peut naître qu'en adéquation avec une demande sociale. Néanmoins, l'initiative individuelle est primordiale car elle enclenche le processus qui aboutit ou pas.

Voici une anecdote significative. L'année dernière, lors des nouveaux aménagements du centre de Bordeaux, le concepteur, Wilmotte, jugeant l'ancien

mobilier urbain inadapté à son dessein, a fait enlever sur une petite place que traverse la rue Sainte-Catherine, l'artère commerçante de Bordeaux, une vieille fontaine Wallace que les services de la Ville ont réinstallée dans un quartier excentré, à La Bastide. Or les élus bordelais ignoraient l'histoire de cette banale fontaine Wallace offerte en 1873 avec quatre autres par un mécène né à Bordeaux, Daniel Iffla Osiris. Lorsqu'il avait effectué ce don à sa ville natale, le bienfaiteur, qui imitait en cela le grand mécène anglais Richard Wallace qui avait pris en pitié les Parisiens, assoiffés durant le siège de 1870, avait précisé que ses fontaines pouvaient être disposées au gré de la municipalité, sauf une qu'il souhaitait voir implantée sur une petite place, la place des Augustins. Il ne précisait pas pourquoi : en fait, cette place (aujourd'hui place du Général Sarailh) était au cœur de l'ancien quartier juif où il avait passé son enfance et où, semble-t-il, avait existé une petite fontaine disparue. Après les travaux de Wilmotte, je me suis ouvert de mes regrets de voir encore une fois la mémoire d'Osiris (qui m'est cher) bafouée dans sa ville natale (et accessoirement de la disparition du charme désuet de cette place avec ses arbres qui ont aussi été coupés...), à quelques Bordelais sensibles et en particulier à un photographe appartenant à la Communauté juive. Celui-ci a mené campagne. D'abord mal reçue, la protestation a ensuite obtenu un écho favorable: la semaine dernière, *Sud-Ouest*⁴ annonçait que la fontaine Osiris allait être réinstallée place Sarailh, malgré le coût et la nécessité de défoncer les nouveaux aménagements... La municipalité d'Alain Juppé a-t-elle repris conscience du sens de l'histoire, a-t-elle eu peur de froisser la communauté juive, a-t-elle voulu concilier les fondements sans lesquels il n'existe pas de continuité, la mémoire et la modernité ? Je ne sais trop, attendons le discours de réinauguration, s'il y en a un... Attentons que la fontaine soit réellement réinstallée...

Cette anecdote soulève une question cruciale sur la

²« Jewish Heritage in France : evaluation of twenty years work and protection », *European Judaism*, vol. 34, n°2, autumn 2001, p. 39-54.

³Guide du patrimoine juif parisien, Paris, Parigramme, 2003, p. 5.

⁴Francis Schwartz, « La fontaine revient sur les traces d'Osiris », *Sud-Ouest*, mercredi 9 juin 2004, p. 2-8.

Reports

nature du patrimoine: il semble parfois évident⁵, lorsqu'il s'agit de bâtiments anciens, des synagogues en particulier qui ont bénéficié de protections importantes depuis les années 1980, des cimetières (dans une moindre mesure, car là d'autres enjeux sont soulevés⁶). La définition ne saurait, pour moi, se limiter au patrimoine monumental.

Dans le judaïsme, le monument existe, même s'il n'est pas monumental: certes il y a le Livre, mais le zekher s'inscrit aussi dans la pierre, la borne-témoin (matseva) posée lors de l'alliance entre Jacob et Laban par exemple⁷. Il apparaît donc nécessaire de repenser l'extension de la notion de patrimoine juif. Je m'attacherai ici au cas français en prenant le plaisir de vous montrer quelques chef-d'œuvres parallèlement à ces quelques propos.

Les étapes de la reconnaissance et l'extension de la notion

Dans l'idéologie française, jusqu'aux années 80, il n'était pas possible de prendre en compte spécifiquement un patrimoine juif. Le pays de Vitet, Mérimée et Viollet-le-Duc, doté depuis 1830 d'institutions patrimoniales, ne pouvait jusqu'alors considérer un patrimoine qu'en fonction de sa qualité esthétique, de sa valeur historique et éventuellement de sa capacité de remémoration (pour parler comme Riegl) nationale, régionale, municipale... La dimension juive pouvait se superposer, mais non suffire. Le classement en 1924 des synagogues de Carpentras et Cavailon, alors en péril, attestent bien ce processus: de magnifiques édifices du XVIIIe siècle témoins d'une histoire originale, celle du Comtat Venaissin. Or ce furent justement les deux seuls protections, avec des édifices médiévaux (Rouffach, Haut-Rhin, en 1921, et Trets, Bouches-du-Rhône, en 1926), jusqu'aux années 80.

La notion de « nouveaux patrimoines » a d'abord joué pour les synagogues, dont une trentaine furent protégées entre 1980 (Lunéville) et 1985 environ. Pour les cimetières, il est significatif que ce n'est qu'au cours de la décennie 90 qu'ils ont été protégés (en petit nombre d'ailleurs), parallèlement à une seconde campagne de protection des synagogues. On vit

paraître aussi la notion de « lieux de mémoire » lancée par Pierre Nora et reprise par les services de l'Etat.

J'ai moi-même mesuré le changement de mentalité. Un ancien rédacteur en chef de la revue *Monuments Historiques* avait refusé en 1990 un numéro spécial consacré au patrimoine juif en France, selon l'argument que la revue ne faisait pas « de numéros confessionnels ». Son successeur accepta dès 1993 l'idée avec enthousiasme ; il fit plus : il accepta une vision élargie de ce patrimoine, puisque la vénérable revue consacrée en priorité aux monuments s'ouvrit cette fois aux musées et collections, aux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale : ce fut le n° 191 de 1994 (un collector, car il est épuisé et la revue est morte). On y mêlait inventaire des édifices médiévaux et classiques, synagogues des XIXe et XXe siècles, monuments commémoratifs et collections...

En 2003, à l'occasion d'un Guide du patrimoine juif parisien (cette fois avec un éditeur privé, donc moins prisonnier des définitions administratives), dans une ouverture d'esprit qui lui fit accepter ma démarche, je me suis attaché à élargir encore — immodérément ? — la notion de patrimoine, y incluant l'art et les artistes juifs, la mémoire littéraire et surtout le mécénat, dimension que je juge essentielle et qui donne sens à des objets non juifs, à des éléments des cultures nationales mis en valeur par des Juifs. Ces actes attestent ce qui pour moi est une clé, la symbiose identitaire et symbolique des échanges culturels : en un mot, une simple fontaine Wallace peut se charger de sens. Dans ce Guide, je tenais aussi à faire figurer une personnalité comme Walter Benjamin dont on connaît l'amour pour Paris et les pénétrantes analyses qu'il a données des passages parisiens ; le lieu de mémoire propice à l'évocation de W. Benjamin m'est alors apparu comme devant être la Bibliothèque Nationale : à cause de cette extraordinaire photo qui nous montre le philosophe penché sur les anciens catalogues, mais aussi parce c'est là qu'a dormi, durant quarante ans dans les papiers de Georges Bataille, le manuscrit du Livre des Passages... Plus banalement Josef Roth, l'écrivain viennois exilé qui est venu achever sa vie à Paris, peut être évoqué par un café parisien. Ici, les ancrages dans la ville prennent tout leur sens pour restituer un moment extraor-

⁵Ce qui est faux, j'ai pu le mesurer dans mes recherches sur les synagogues; pour un groupe ou une municipalité qui réagit, comme à Bruyères (Vosges) ou à Senones (Vosges), combien d'autres demeurent hermétiques à la sauvegarde des synagogues.

⁶Voir les déclarations de Max Polonovski au colloque de 2000, Le Patrimoine juif européen, colloque international, au Musée d'Art et d'Histoire du Judaïsme, janvier 1999, Collection R.E.J., Paris-Louvain, Peeters, 2002, p. 183-194.

⁷Shmuel Trigano, «Les monuments d'une alliance», *Monuments Historiques*, n° 191; février 1994, Le patrimoine juif français, p. 10.

dinaire de la vie intellectuelle, ces années 30 où Paris fut, pour quelques temps, une capitale de la pensée juive en exil... De la même manière, des mécènes peuvent être évoqués à travers les châteaux (Malmaison, Champs) et les musées (Musée Nissim de Camondo) qu'ils ont offerts à la France

Les difficultés du patrimoine non monumental

Si l'on accepte cette définition un peu englobante que « le patrimoine est le déploiement d'une mémoire dans l'espace », notion qui se révèle tout de même plus restreinte que celle de « lieu de mémoire » qui recouvre aussi bien le Panthéon que la Marseillaise ou le Dictionnaire de Larousse, on découvre des lieux, au sens physique du terme, porteurs d'une dimension juive. Mais des pans entiers et majeurs de l'histoire et de la culture juive en France sont absents de l'espace : ainsi, dans un itinéraire, sur quel support évoquer Rachi et les tossafistes. Il est significatif que des touristes prennent la petite synagogue de Troyes, baptisée « Rachi » pour celle du grand commentateur... Où évoquer les gloses ? Au musée seulement. Autre problème, l'évocation de la vie juive ouvrière, de la culture yiddish populaire, les lieux sont rares ou sans aura. Ainsi, dans mon Guide, ai-je tenu à faire figurer tout de même un lieu symbolique, l'Asile de nuit rue Lamarck.

Aujourd'hui, la cause du patrimoine n'est pas gagnée. Si, en de nombreux endroits, la Journée Européenne de la Culture Juive peut permettre d'avancer, il y a loin encore jusqu'à la mise en place de structures permanentes. Dans le Sud-Ouest dont les potentialités sont énormes en matière de patrimoine juif, il n'existe même pas un itinéraire ou un guide... Enfin, il convient de se souvenir que le contexte n'est pas favorable, depuis deux décennies, à la mise en lumière du patrimoine juif en raison de la recrudescence des violences et profanations.

On pourra juger que par un processus d'extension, que j'ai moi-même condamné ailleurs, je tends dangereusement à englober des réalités difficiles à concrétiser. Il me semble fondamental d'inclure une variété d'aspects culturels afin de ne pas figer par la vision du patrimoine juif dans le religieux (synagogues, cimetières, judaïca) ou le victimaire (camps, monuments de la Choa).

Reports

6). Presentation of the European Day of Jewish Culture in different countries

Roundtable moderated by Eva Castellanos

The participants presented the organisation of the European Day of Jewish Culture in their respective countries. It was a very interesting experience to gather for the first time the national coordinators of the European Day of Jewish Culture and to enable an exchange of good practices.

Among others, Mrs. Marta Gyoriova, Slovakia's coordinator, did a PowerPoint presentation with a description of the organisation of the event in her country. Mrs. Annie Sacerdoti presented the success of the EDJC in Italy. She stressed the fact that in 5 years, 50000 visitors took part in the event. Mr. Alfredas Jomantas, member of the Steering Committee of the European Institute of Cultural Routes and the new coordinator of Lithuania described the situation in his country and the first organisation of the event. Mr. Peter Gyori from the Czech Republic emphasized the difficulty for the national coordinator to organise the event on a voluntary basis. He stressed the fact that the Czech Republic would not be able to continue to organise the event if the organisers did not receive a financial support from the European network. It is difficult for his team to find funds in order to pay the printing of the poster, for example or the expenses of the secretariat...

Moreover, other participants used the opportunity of this roundtable to present the situation of Jewish heritage in their country. It was the case of Mr. Jerzy Kichler from Poland. He reminded the participants that many synagogues were destroyed during the 1939-1945 war and in 1945, only 2000 synagogues out of 8000 were still standing.

Finally, Mr. Werner Transier from Speyer (Germany) presented an exhibition "The Jews of Europe in the Middle Ages" which will take place from 19 November 2004 to 20 March 2005 in the "Historisches Museum der Pfalz" of Speyer.

The result is the same from North to South and from East to West: the success of the Day is constantly increasing thanks to the strong mobilisation of Jewish

communities and organisations and local public institutions, museums, municipalities, tourist boards.

Nevertheless it was noted that this fantastic solidarity is no longer enough. It is necessary to professionalize the event, to find some partners and funds which will allow the network which exists at the European level to benefit from a larger margin of negotiation in the organisation and the European coordination of the Day (promotion of the event, diffusion of the information) and the development of organised structures at the national level.

This roundtable was also the opportunity for the European network through Mrs. Eva Castellanos, moderator of this session and representative of Red de Juderias, to remind the national coordinators of the necessity for the success of the event to send regular information (programme, evaluation, press review...) to the European coordination so that a genuine image of what is happening across Europe can be given.

Reports

7). Presentation of the European Route of Jewish Heritage

Camille Dansette

"From the success of EDJC to the European Route of Jewish Heritage"

It is the promotion and preservation of this Heritage as well as the efforts made by the different coordinators who have made the European Day of Jewish Culture a successful day around Europe during these last five years.

The EDJC is a success but it is only the first step of our project. Today, we would like to continue and coordinate this action all the year long.

Here is a brief reminder of the project of European Route of Jewish Heritage which has been promoted by the partner organizations of the EDJC, namely B'nai B'rith Europe, the European Council of Jewish Communities and "Red de Juderias de España". The Route has been recognized by the "European Institute of Cultural Routes" and will be officially done so in December 2004.

"The concept of the European Route of Jewish Heritage"

The main idea of this project is to create a Route which consists in highlighting the traces left by Judaism throughout generations across Europe. The European Route of Jewish Heritage will cross Europe from south to north and from Western Europe to central Europe including all the countries which you represent here. Jewish sites are too linked by common elements by a Jewish heritage which is a full part of the European Heritage.

These traces should be **selected, recognized** and **signalized** as are the sites of the world heritage.

Selected:

Some sites have to be selected.

Recognized:

Through different criteria that we will see later, the

sites have to be recognized as a homogeneous part of the Route.

Signalized:

The final part of the project consists in selecting the sites and placing them on a map of Europe under the same symbol. It is due to your experience and knowledge that the sites will be selected and included into the Route and as a first step in the map of Europe.

"How each one of the national coordinators can participate in elaborating the Route"

That's where the project relies partly on your shoulders.

In fact we all have our own particular knowledge of our country, our community and the potential sites which can be of interest to building this Route.

The conference today and yesterday is enabling you not only to meet and share experiences and good practices but is also an opportunity for us to use one another's expertise. It is by putting our knowledge together that we will be able to build this Route of Jewish heritage.

In order to start with the selection of the sites, we have established a first questionnaire, or if you prefer a survey. This survey is trying to identify a maximum of 5 sites per country. We know that it is extremely difficult to select only 5 sites, but you will understand of course that it is a first step. What I would like to do with you today is briefly to present the survey as we have done it so far and then discuss together the validity or completeness of the criteria we have so far.

The survey is divided into 2 parts. It has identified 2 kinds of criteria which are necessary in order to select a site.

1) Historical and cultural legitimacy:

- Synagogues
- Cemeteries

Reports

- Ritual Baths (Mikve)
- Museums
- Jewish Neighbourhoods
- Archives
- Schools
- Others

Secondly,

2) Practical details.

Every site should:

- have precise contact details
- be opened all year around
- be mentioned in the local or national tourist guide
- have special tourist guides available
(in the local language, English and others)
- have a leaflet with a brief explanation of the site
- have possible guided tours for specific target groups
(for instance, pedagogical activities/kits)
- have Kosher facilities available
- be accessible to disabled people.

We have tried to include as many cases as possible but know that this list is not extensive. We would really like to have a complete survey. This is one of the final aims of this conference.

8). The importance of the preservation of Jewish heritage

Max Polonovski

History like memory is a selection. Even in its most real and concrete aspects like monuments, heritage doesn't escape the rewriting done by the passing of time and by men. Victorious Christian Europe had tried to erase the multicultural roots of its civilization. Parallel histories had to coexist at the same time without any connexion between them.

From the medieval period, there are few traces of Jewish life in France. The works of the Nova Gallia Judaica completed with those of Norman Golb for Normandy show how the presence of Jews in the heart of the town in the Middle Ages is an historical fact the importance of which should be re-evaluated. You can feel it in the archaeological discovery of the 11th century Jewish monument in Rouen and in the medieval synagogue of Montpellier.

In the historiography, the parallel history of Jews joins the National history in 1791 when French Jews were emancipated. The integration of the Jews in the French society implies the creation of official community bodies which will build without constraint places of worship, schools, welfare houses, hospitals, etc. Cities closed previously to the Jews are open, the Judaism become more homogenous through the territory. It explains why the essential monumental remains left by French Judaism don't go back further than the 19th century.

The "discovery" of Jewish heritage by the public administration can be dated when "the Heritage year" was decided in 1980 by the ministry of Culture. At that time, the notion of patrimony took a more affective aspect. Then industrial architecture, cinemas, shop facades, musical instruments, etc, were considered as landmarks. In this process, Jewish heritage met some difficulties. The criteria used for the traditional heritage (gothic churches, medieval castles) couldn't be used for a heritage nobody was aware of.

This is one of the most usual difficulties that Jewish heritage has to face: misunderstanding and lack of knowledge.

In 1980, the minister of Culture gave special instruc-

tion to his regional agencies in charge of documenting the synagogues to be especially indulgent with this kind of monuments. More over he decided to register as historic monument the synagogue of Lunéville without submitting the case to its Commission of Protection which would have been the normal procedure. 20 years later, another minister had to practice this "positive discrimination" and had to impose the complete classification of the synagogue of Bordeaux for which the Commission had only proposed a partial protection.

What to protect? The question of the number of monuments should help in the matter of protecting Jewish heritage. What is the proportion of Jewish monuments among the national heritage? 200 synagogues? Less than 200 cemeteries (only 53 for the period before the revolution). On these 400 monuments or sites, 50 are protected as historical monuments. It means that it would be easy to manage with such a small amount of monuments. What is it in comparison with the 40,000 protected monuments in France? Thinking of these 400 monuments, we should be relieved and believe that it will be easy to protect and preserve them. This is not the case. It raises the question of choice. What has to be protected, all the traces of Jewish presence or a selection? If everything is protected, does it mean that everything has the same importance? The specificity of the Jewish heritage is that the small amount of monuments in our country is significant in regard of the history of the Jews. It is important to preserve this specific heritage without making any choice because each element of it is often the only chance to let people know about the Jewish culture. Each element which disappears contributes to the revision of History.

The recent destruction of a synagogue in Strasbourg is an illustration of this statement. The synagogue of the rue Kageneck was the only case of a community centre of the German orthodox movement of Samson Raphael Hirsch at the end of the 19th century. The other buildings of this congregation in Germany

Reports

had already disappeared after 1938. The community had decided to sell their synagogue because their members didn't live in this area anymore. A permit of demolishing the building was given by the administration. Then, when we were informed of what was to happen, it was too late, it would have been too costly to protect the synagogue.

Another example is the synagogue of Balbronn. The same administration gave the permit of demolishing of the synagogue which was about to collapse. A project of transfer of the façade to Jerusalem was elaborated by an association. The eventual loss of the synagogue, as part of the local history and of the landscape, provoked a strong emotion in the ministry of Culture. The minister took a quick decision of classifying the monument as national landmark, making impossible the transfer to Israel. If this decision to protect the synagogue was taken in a hurry, it was not the same to avoid the collapsing of the walls. Since 1999, nothing had been done to consolidate the structure of the building which can fall down at any moment.

Cemeteries are particularly vulnerable. It is a unique and huge corpus of Jewish funeral literature from the Middle Ages to our time which you cannot find in any other religion. We don't have any comprehensive inventory of them. Each tombstone is a parcel of heritage, a small monument, which is disappearing slowly and insidiously.

Cemeteries are the most difficult places to preserve for several obvious reasons. Firstly, since it is related to death and sorrow, the cemetery has a heavy meaning in modern mentalities which obliterates the cultural aspect of it. Secondly, there is no other possibility to find another use to an old cemetery. If you can re-use a synagogue as anything else (cultural centre, storehouse, museum, whatsoever), it is impossible for a cemetery and its hundreds or thousands tombstones.

Bayonne is one of the most interesting Judeo-Portuguese cemeteries in South-West France. Several thousands of inscriptions tell the story of an important sephardi community from 1658 to nowadays. First step of a network connecting Spain and Portugal to the metropolis of North Europe, Amsterdam, London, Hambourg, but also to the new territories in Jamaica, Curacao, Barbados, etc. In 1981, the city of Bayonne asked the Jewish community to give a piece

of land in the cemetery, where the oldest tombs were laying, to enlarge the road. After the agreement of the Rabbi, an exchange was made with the city of the piece of land for a new wall and a commemorative plaque. In 1995, the municipality wanted to build a turn-around to get the traffic better in this area. They asked for a new mutilation. And here you can measure the evolution of mentalities. Creation of an association, opposition of the community, intervention of the minister of Culture obliged the town to modify the project. Only an empty space was sold to the city with the compensation of the maintenance of the cemetery.

But here too, the lack of decision (not to employ another word) of the administration can also be measured. The cemetery was proposed for being registered as a historic monument by a colleague of mine in 1980. It was necessary to get a first amputation, the attempt of a second one, and nearly 25 years to expect the case would be presented to the appropriate commission.

To end with the examples of difficulties met by the Jewish heritage at the level of its perception by the different owners or partner at an administrative or cultural side, I would quote the case of Niederhagenenthal in Upper-Rhine where a misinterpretation of an inscription generated a conflict. A long elegy was discovered by a scholar who published it in a scientific journal. He made a mistake in reading it and gave to the tomb a century more than it deserved. The historical interest became then so important that the minister of Culture decided to register not only the tombstone but all the cemetery. The opposition of the local population to a regulation which was implied by the legal protection took the form of explicit threats against the stone. When you know that most of the stones of this cemetery were broken down during the war, not by the Germans, you have no doubt about their skill in this matter. So, the administration preferred not to send the decree signed by the minister to the mayor of the village.

The conservation of stones is not only the problem of the private cemeteries but it concerns also the huge urban necropolis. Sometimes, helped at first by vandalism, time and nature of the material finish the work. That is why the traces of the history of Jewish bourgeoisie in big cities disappear under the pressure of the cost of the land and the overpopulation.

Reports

As you know, the Jewish communities cannot take in charge this heritage as a whole anymore. There is no geographic or demographic correspondence between the Jewish population and the Jewish sites because of the migrations, the war and the economic activities. It is thus necessary to have this heritage adopted by the whole population as a part of its local, regional or national heritage. This is the main challenge for the Jewish heritage. Its future depends on the success of this process of transfer of cultural responsibility, only way to slow down or to stop its disappearing. The other side of the question is the role of heritage in the national identity, and what place must take the Jewish heritage in it.

In the regions where there are no more Jews left, the question of re-using of desecrated synagogues is constantly raised. Since 60 years, the Alsatian consistories succeeded in being rid off a great amount of useless synagogues, soon transformed in Firemen station (Scherwiller), carpentry workshop (Neuwiller), factory of Sauerkraut (Krautergersheim).

Today, the consciousness of the cultural value of this heritage makes necessary to think more thoroughly on the passage from a sacred to a secular use. The intention is not only to keep an architectural shell or just its location in the urban network. The attempt to find a cultural use for a synagogue is of course the most preferred solution by all the actors in this field. But you cannot reiterate too often the transformation of a synagogue, like that one of Bouxwiller, in a Judeo-Alsatian museum. The case of Delme, centre of contemporary art, or of Hochfelden, local museum, remain the ultimate goal at which the community leaders in charge of dozens of useless synagogues look at in vain. It is clear that the ambition to find a suitable affectation to those synagogues makes their future rather awkward, if the solution is not found quickly enough.

The last question is why and for whom the Jewish heritage has to be protected.

I was struck by the way Claude Bloch told the story about the birth of the European Day of Jewish Culture. She said that the question which is at the origin of the creation of this event was the demands of North American Jews looking for their roots in Alsace and that the answer which was given was the project of providing information on Judaism to non-Jews. I think

all the problematic of our reflection is in this paradox. It is necessary to identify the public. Do we promote the Jewish heritage for the Jews? Do we try to share our cultural treasures with non-Jews? Or are we just looking for a better knowledge of our multicultural backgrounds? There is not a unique answer to these questions.

In France, we are not in the case developed by Ruth Gruber in her book "Virtually Jewish" where it seems that it is easier and apparently successful to be a non-Jew promoting the Jewish Heritage for non-Jews. In our country which has the largest Jewish population in Western Europe, the dialogue between Jewish organizations and public administration is not simple. A legal separation exists between the religion and the State. But in the case of Judaism, the ditch is deeper, increased by a history made of hope and of deception, the Dreyfus affair, the discriminating laws of Vichy, several waves of antisemitism. The Jewish communities are still quite cautious in regard of any inquisitive interference in their affairs. They prefer a total independence which guarantees a better tranquillity. On the other side, the public administration is not eager to intervene in religious matter of a so sensitive community.

Today, the Ministry of Culture is disengaging itself for economical reasons and the Jewish communities are more and more unable to face the numerous problems of the conservation of their heritage. Both of them should search and facilitate the mediation of associations. Associations are the best link connecting the different local and regional levels. They are also the medium between the population and the heritage. Their action may help to avoid the temptation of communitarian turning-back and to promote Jewish heritage as a component of national heritage. This is the sense of the action of the EDJC as it was established by Claude Bloch and Catherine Lehmann. It is also the example given by the association IMMAJ of Marseille. It is a necessary step. Since we don't speak anymore of the French "cultural exception" which is now replaced by the "cultural difference", it is crucial to give to the Jewish heritage the right place in the sight of all. It is the condition of its survival. Two aspects cannot be dissociated. First, integration of the Jewish contribution in the national heritage, as we already said, is a fair restoration of the historical truth. As Catherine Trautmann, our former

Reports

minister of Culture, said the Jewish heritage in France belongs to all the French people, the same way the cathedrals of France belong also to the Jews of France.

Secondly, the Jewish identity must be developed through its heritage. To reach this goal, the first condition is that the owners, those who are in charge of this heritage, which are the Jewish communities, should take a little care about it. As Sharman Kadish said, if "owners and occupiers, especially the Jewish community itself, do not cherish their historic buildings, we are fighting a losing battle".

The lack of value of the Jewish heritage comes from a long contempt. The Jews see their heritage in the eyes of the Other. It is these eyes we have to change.

Reports

9). European heritage submission

Clive Lawton

Jewish tradition is deeply ambivalent about its attitude to places and things. Indeed, if you were to ask the Jew in the street which items most immediately conjure up Jewish life he or she may well name matzah, candlesticks and so on long before naming this or that particular architectural beauty or artistic artefact.

And we should remember, that in actual fact, the candles are more important than the candlestick and matzah is designed to be eaten.

This is not to say that Jews have been or are indifferent to art and beauty. There is certainly a mitzvah which encourages us to beautify whatever we are doing, so that choosing a more beautiful lulav or creating a more attractive haggadah is understood to be virtuous.

What then to make of the heritage developments amongst European Jewry?

The bad news is that the rabbis of old found ways to remember the Temple without rebuilding it. They domesticated aspects of Temple behaviour in such a way that the Jews could continue for millennia without its replacement. By making the Temple concept decentralised and portable, they not only insured the survival of the Jews but seemed to indicate that we didn't need such buildings and monuments to get to the essence of who we are.

Still more bad news might be found in the actions of King Hezekiah who destroyed the brass serpent that Moses had made at God's command for fear that the Israelites of his time were using it as a focus for idolatrous worship.

But there is good news too. Nearly all Jewish practice is concrete and located. Jews do not understand spirituality as existing in some numinous space outside of the material. We are required to meet together in

minyanim if at all possible, to follow prayers in books and not say them by heart, and just about every festival and special event has artifacts and objects that insure that the event comes alive. The Jewish commitment to kitchen-sink mysticism means to say that things are important to us.

But they're not important for their own sake. There are only important because of what they can achieve. It seems to me, therefore, that if we are thinking about the Jewish heritage in Europe we should not only be concentrating on sites and objects but we should also be thinking about the educational consequences of paying attention to these things. What is it that we want Jews and non-Jews to learn as a result of preserving these monuments or displaying these artifacts? If we are merely showing them something from the past, in what might feel like a rather futile event to demonstrate past grandeur, it strikes me that this is not really what Jews are about. But if we're trying to expose to them values, principles and ideals which not only enriches the Jewish present and enhances the possibility of a Jewish future but also inspires the non-Jewish world, then engaging with our heritage, preserving it and displaying it, seems not just a desirable thing to do but almost an imperative.

There is only one kind of truly sacred object for Jews and that is something which has the name of God written in it. A mezuzah, tefillin and a sefer Torah are the prime examples of sacred objects. But the halakha is clear that if Jews need to sell a scroll of Torah to dowry a bride, that is the priority they should adopt.

Preserving even our most sacred things does not take precedence over ensuring the future, but I see no reason why one cannot support the other.

Reports

10.) Jewish museums in Italy

Annie Sacerdoti

From 1930 to today, around ten museums have been opened in Italy. These are now joined by projects for two monuments to the Shoah (one in Ferrara and the other in Rome) and by a Shoah Memorial in Milan. So it is a very dynamic and particularly varied scene. Indeed, we have some museums that could be defined as traditional; these were set up immediately after the war with the intention of collecting documentation, religious testimonies, traces of traditions and rites. There was no concern or consideration for any artistic and cultural value they might have, as the first and only aim was to save them from becoming lost and ruined. This view gradually began to change as the communities became aware of the value of their own artistic and cultural heritage and understood the importance of making it known to the non-Jewish world as well.

These initial collections of objects still form the basis of the main Italian Jewish museums: there are museums in Livorno (which opened in 1930), Venice (1955), Rome (1960), Casale Monferrato (1968), in Florence (1981), in Soragna (1982). However some of these museums have changed a great deal over the years: Venice considers not only the two exhibition halls but the entire ghetto as a museum with its skyscraper buildings, its synagogues, its midrashim, the Banco Rosso pawnbroker's, the centuries-old inscriptions. In Rome, on the occasion of the centenary of the synagogue which was celebrated in April 2004, a magnificent exhibition space has just been opened which already brings together an ancient lapidary and is preparing to host temporary exhibitions. Casale Monferrato has supplemented the traditional section of its museum with an original "Museum of Lights" which contains only Hanukkah menorah made by contemporary craftsmen.

In 1999, the first "dynamic" museum opened in Bologna. It doesn't have objects on display but instead it uses multimedia techniques, explanatory panels and screened images on Jewish history and life. It has reading rooms and conference halls, videos and a special

list bookshop. It organises conference programmes and visits around the local area. Furthermore it is the only one of its kind in Italy as it is managed by the Emilia-Romagna Regional authorities and not by Jewish communities or institutions like the other museums.

The museum in Genova is different again. It opened in April 2004 and is currently showing a large exhibition of works by Chagall, many of which are being shown for the first time (they come from his granddaughter's private collections). The organisers intend for the museum to become the cultural centre for big Jewish exhibitions in the city: the next ones could be on Modigliani and Pissarro.

Some final considerations. For many reasons, it can be said that the era in which museums were considered purely as places for the conservation and static display of objects is a thing of the past and this goes for Jewish museums too. Indeed working around a stable nucleus, it is necessary to plan temporary exhibitions, supplemented with conferences, discussions, film screenings and extra activities that go to make the museum a living place; a place in which young people in particular can read the past, history, religion, traditions, with the words, images, rhythms and times that suit them, that fit in with their language, with their way of seeing culture. Otherwise we will have preserved a lot of objects but we will have lost the young people. And finally, a wish: that the European Day for Jewish Culture can contribute to creating and consolidating relations between separate museums in the various countries, promoting exchanges of exhibitions, objects, artists and, in short, of knowledge.

Conclusions

Future challenges: partnerships, activities, routes

Summary of the working groups

The participants agreed on a number of basic principles. Despite the fact that much work has been done to explain, interpret Jewish heritage to the public, thanks to the European Day of Jewish Culture, the participants became aware of the necessity that a real in-depth work is still to be done in order to go from a significant event, one time per year, to a continuous action, a guided tour which can be visited all year round.

Having been reminded of the definition of the Cultural Route by the Council of Europe, every participant became aware of the necessity to concretely realise and to work on presenting it to the public. It was agreed that the public should be encouraged to discover in concrete terms what is genuinely meant by European Route of Jewish Heritage.

Hence the accent was stressed the necessity to draw a layout, a map. In order to do so, a Scientific Committee should be created, scientific criteria of selection of sites should be established according to historical realities including the particularities of each country. In this point of view, it was important to consider the definition of Jewish heritage and recall that this notion must be understood in its larger context. Besides the monumental heritage, the notion covers arts, Jewish artists, literary memory and particularly the sponsorship (highlighting objects of national culture by Jews). In addition, some of participants stressed the importance to do a cultural and not religious reading of Jewish heritage, in order to show to the wider public that Jewish heritage is a part of the European heritage. Other participants suggested that some of the criteria used to include a site should be reformulated, instead of kosher facilities being compulsory, this should be understood as an added value to the site...

The participants set themselves some targets within the next year. The first step consists in doing an inventory of sites of European Jewish heritage. A survey with a list of suggested criteria was distributed to

the national coordinators, who were granted the task of distributing it at a local level in order, on the one hand, to make an inventory of the current guided tour and on the other hand, to select a list of 5 sites per country.

Conclusions

Summary

Laure Amoyel

The conference closed with the official launching of the European Route of Jewish Heritage. The inauguration of the first plaque was scheduled for September 2004 in Lithuania. It was agreed that it would be put upon a wooden synagogue in Žiežmariai which will soon be restored.

Although the Route must still be built and a real in-depth work must be done, this meeting showed that the work which has already been done is impressive. The project was welcomed with unanimity and much enthusiasm.

The richness of exchanges and the intensity of the debates which took place during these two days show how important the meeting of the partners is in order to share experiences and underlined the fact that discussions are fundamental in order to realise this kind of project.

This conference was the opportunity to launch the basis of a continuous and lasting cooperation between the different coordinators and partners of the European Day of Jewish Culture. From now on, regular meetings will be organised in order to realize this important European project.

Appendix

Programme

Friday, 18th June 2004

Arrival of the participants

3:00pm:

Visit of the Clausen-Malakoff Old Jewish Cemetery

6.30pm:

Service at the Synagogue of Luxembourg (optional)

8:00pm:

- Dinner offered by B'nai B'rith Luxembourg
- Welcome speech by Mr. François Moyses, President of B'nai B'rith Luxembourg
 - Speech by the Minister of Culture, Mrs. Erna Hennicot Schoepges

Saturday, 19th June 2004

9:30am-10:00am: Opening Ceremony

Welcome speeches

- H.E Gerard Philipps, Luxembourg's Former Ambassador to the Council of Europe
- Mrs. Claude Bloch, Chairperson, Jewish Heritage Commission, B'nai B'rith Europe

10:00am-10:45am:

Introduction by Mr. François Moyses

"The European Cultural Routes" by Mr. Michel Thomas-Penette, Director, European Institute of Cultural Routes of the Council of Europe

10:45am-11:00am: Coffee break

11:00am-11:45am:

"Routes of Jewish Heritage in the Czech Republic" by Dr. Arno Parik, Exhibition curator, Jewish Museum, Prague

11:45am-12:30am:

"The Jewish Heritage in France" by Pr. Dominique Jarrassé, Professor of contemporary history of art, Bordeaux

12:30am-1:45pm: Lunch

1:45pm-3:30pm

Roundtable moderated by Mrs. Eva Castellanos, Red de Juderías de España

Presentation of the European Day of Jewish Culture in different countries

4:00pm-6:00pm

Guided Tour of the Wenzel Itinerary (Luxembourg)

7:00pm:

Dinner

8:00pm: Yiddish concert. The PLATSCH trio.

Sunday, 20th June 2004

9:00am-9:20am: Presentation of the European Routes of Jewish Heritage (Historical perspective)

by Mrs. Camille Dansette, European coordinator of the European Day of Jewish Culture

9:20am-10:10am: Panel of experts conducted by Mr. Neville Kluk, Executive chief, ECJC

- **"The importance of the preservation of Jewish Heritage"** by Mr. Max Polonovski, In charge of the protection of Jewish Heritage, Ministry of Culture, France
- **"The contributions of museums in the Route"** by Mrs. Annie Sacerdoti, Coordinator of the European Day of Jewish Culture, Italy

10:10am-11:45am:

Future challenges: partnerships, activities, routes

Working groups (Coffee break during working groups)

11:45am-12:30pm: Reports, Debate

12:30am-1:00pm: Summary by Mrs. Laure Amoyel, member of the Steering Committee

1:00pm: Lunch

Shabbat will be observed.

Appendix

List of participants

ALBERONTANZA, Alberta,

Member of the Steering Committee of the European Institute of Cultural Routes, Italy

AMOYEL, Laure,

Member of the Steering Committee, Luxembourg

BLOCH, Claude,

Chairperson, Jewish Heritage Commission, B'nai B'rith Europe, Strasbourg (France)

CASTELLANOS, Eva,

Member of Red de Juderias, Spain

CHEVALLIER, Fabienne (Dr.),

Researcher, Paris

COLLAND, Vivian (Dr.),

Coordinator EDJC, Holland

DANSETTE, Camille,

European coordinator of the European Day of Jewish Culture (EDJC)

DEAK, Andrea,

Coordinator EDJC, Hungary

FATUCCI, Cesira,

Coordinator EDJC, Italy

GYORI, Peter,

Coordinator EDJC, Czech Republic

GYORIOVA, Marta (Dr.),

Coordinator EDJC, Slovakia

JARRASSE, Dominique (Pr.),

Historian of art contemporary, Bordeaux (France)

JOMANTAS, Alfredas,

Member of the Steering Committee of the European Institute of Cultural Routes and Coordinator EDJC, Lithuania

HEIKINHEIMO, Mikko,

Former Ambassador of Finland, Paris

KICHLER, Beata,

Poland

KICHLER, Jerzy,

Coordinator EDJC, Poland

KLUK, Neville,

Chief executive, European Council of Jewish Communities, London

LAMBERT, Jean-Pierre,

B'nai B'rith Hirschler, Strasbourg

LAWTON, Clive,

Specialist of Jewish ethical questions, London

LEIBOWITCH, Elise,

Association culturelle hébraïque de la Sainte-Baume (ORELIA), France

LORER, Hanna,

Coordinator EDJC, Bulgaria

MONASTIRSKY, Arkady,

Coordinator EDJC, Ukraine

MOYSE, François,

Vice-Chairperson, Jewish Heritage Commission, B'nai B'rith Europe, Luxembourg

PARIK, Arno (Dr.),

Historian of art, Jewish Museum, Prague

PERELBERG, Joëlle,

Coordinator EDJC, France

PHILIPPS, Gérard,

Former Ambassador, Luxembourg

POLONOVSKI, Max,

Official representative in charge of the protection of Jewish Heritage, Ministry of Culture, France

SACERDOTI, Annie,

Coordinator EDJC, Italy

SCHLIMOVICH, Mariano,

European Council of Jewish Communities, London

THOMAS-PENETTE, Michel,

Director, European Institute of Cultural Routes, Luxembourg

TRANSIER, Ursula,

Germany

TRANSIER, Werner,

Curator, Historic Museum of Pfalz, Germany

VIVES, Véronique,

Association culturelle hébraïque de la Sainte-Baume (ORELIA), France

ZULTAK, Isidore,

Metz, France

ZULTAK, Lucy,

Metz, France

Appendix

List of speakers

AMOYEL, Laure,

Member of the Steering Committee, Luxembourg

BLOCH, Claude,

Chairperson, Jewish Heritage Commission,
B'nai B'rith Europe, Strasbourg (France)

CASTELLANOS, Eva,

Member of Red de Juderias, Spain

DANSETTE, Camille,

European coordinator of the European Day of Jewish
Culture (EDJC)

JARRASSE, Dominique (Pr.),

Historian of art contemporary, Bordeaux (France)

KLUK, Neville,

Chief executive, European Council of Jewish
Communities, London

LAWTON, Clive,

Specialist in Jewish ethics, London

MOYSE, François,

Vice-Chairperson, Jewish Heritage Commission,
B'nai B'rith Europe, Luxembourg

PARIK, Arno (Dr.),

Historian of art, Jewish Museum, Prague

PHILIPPS, Gérard,

Former Ambassador, Luxembourg

POLONOVSKI, Max,

Official representative in charge of the protection of
Jewish Heritage, Ministry of Culture, France

SACERDOTI, Annie,

Coordinator EDJC, Italy

THOMAS-PENETTE, Michel,

Director, European Institute of Cultural Routes,
Luxembourg

Appendix

Survey European Route of Jewish Heritage

Presentation:

The project of the European Route of Jewish Heritage has been promoted by the partner organisations of the European Day of Jewish Culture namely B'nai B'rith Europe (BBE), the European Council of Jewish Communities (ECJC) and Red de Juderías de España.

Main idea:

The creation of a Route consists in the highlighting of the traces left by Judaism throughout generations across Europe.

The European Route of Jewish Heritage will cross Europe from the South to the North and from Western Europe to Central and Eastern Europe. Jewish sites will be linked by common elements by a Jewish heritage which is a full-part of the historical and cultural European Heritage.

Goals:

1). To preserve and promote Jewish heritage as European heritage⁸.

2). To make the Europeans aware of the cultural richness brought by the Jews across Europe during their stay in so many different regions. It further wishes to preserve and enhance part of the European cultural heritage that the Jewish sites scattered around Europe represent.

This Route would not only enable visitors to discover the history of the Jewish people but would also enable them to know better their local and national history.

Indeed, everywhere they have lived and everywhere where they were able to, Jews built their synagogues, have left a cemetery and other traces, not only to express their faith, but also to let the living testimony of their presence as well as of their contribution to life and the development of their village, city or region. Pledge of their particularism, this heritage is also a sign of their will to integrate in the surrounding society, without giving up their religion, but enriching their contribution the evolution of a common life.

3). To promote tourism around these sites.

Implemented means:

A seminar was organised between the 18th and the 20th of June 2004 in Luxembourg in order to launch the European Route of Jewish Heritage.

In order to create the European Route of Jewish Heritage, some sites have to be pre selected.

The partner organisations have established a preliminary list of criteria.

- Criteria:

Two kinds of criteria should be respected:

1). Historical and cultural legitimacy.

- The site has participated at least once in the EDJC.

- The site must be Jewish heritage

Synagogues

Cemeteries

Ritual Baths (Mikve)

Museums

Jewish Neighbourhoods

Archives

Schools

Others

The site must have architectural, artistic, cultural, historical and/or religious interests.

2). Practical details.

Every site should:

- have precise contact details

- be opened all year around

- be mentioned in the local or national tourist guide

- have special tourist guides available (in the local language, English and others)

- have a leaflet with a brief explanation of the site

- have possible guided tours for specific target groups (for instance, pedagogical activities/kits)

- have Kosher facilities available

- be accessible to disabled people.

- Next step.

The next step will be to define the list of the sites pre

⁸The creation of the European Route of Jewish Heritage which has just been recognised as an official Route of the Council of Europe, follows largely the objectives that the European Institute of Cultural Routes has had since its creation i.e. highlight the common Cultural Heritage of all Europeans.

Appendix

selected across Europe. We would be grateful if you could assist us in this task.

In this way, you will contribute to the realisation of this project which is a real challenge and especially an opportunity for European Jews to promote and preserve Jewish Heritage.

Please find herewith a survey.

We would be grateful if you could complete it and sent it **before 15th of October 2004** to:

Camille Dansette

European coordinator of the EDJC

39, Val Saint André

L-1128. Luxembourg

Tel/Fax: +352 26 25 88 57

Email: cam.dansette@internet.lu

SURVEY GENERAL INFORMATION

Country:

Name of your organisation:

Person responsible for Culture (Name and contact details):

Do you know if a Route of Jewish Heritage exists in your country?

If so, do you have any information about it?

Name:

Contact person:

Tel:

Fax:

Email address:

Please briefly describe it?

Do you have any related publications?

Title:

Author:

Editor

Year:

ISBN:

We would be grateful if you would select **MAXIMUM 5 sites** which, according to you, fulfil the list of criteria which has been established (please refer to the introduction).

Please fill in one form per site.

I. Historical and cultural legitimacy

1). Has the site been opened during the European Day of Jewish Culture?

Yes

No

If so, when? (date)

How many visitors were there?

2). Cultural and historical Jewish heritage

Which type?

Synagogues

Cemeteries

Ritual Baths (Mikve)

Museums

Jewish Neighbourhoods

Archives

Schools

Others (please specify)

When was the site built?

Has the site been classified as a historical monument?

Yes

No

If so, when?

Has the site been restored?

Yes

No

If so, when?

If not, is it necessary?

What are the site's particularities (architectural, artistic, historical and/or religious)?

Please briefly describe them.

Appendix

II. Practical details

1). Contact details of the site

Name:

Address:

Owner (if appropriate):

Contact person:

Tel:

Fax:

Email address:

Website:

2). Is the site opened to the public during the year?

Yes

No

If so, what are the opening days and times?

3). Are there any guides in your local language?

Yes

No

English?

Yes

No

Or other languages?

Yes

No

If so, please specify.

Are these guides trained ?

Yes

No

4). Is there any mention of this site in the local or national tourist guides?

Yes

No

If so, please specify.

5). Is there any published material about this site?

Yes

No

If so, please enclose and give reference.

6). Is there public transport provided to this site ?

Yes

No

If so, which one ?

7). Is this site is accessible to disabled people?

Yes

No

8). Are there any guided tours for targeted towards specific groups (young people, school for instance)?

Yes

No

If so, please specify.

9). Are there any nearby kosher facilities? Please specify.

10). Other comments or details.

Appendix

Working groups

| | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Experts | Arno Parik Annie Sacerdoti | Dominique Jarrassé | Max Polonovski |
| Participants | Andrea Deak Cesira fatucci Peter Gyori Marta Gyoriova Jerzy Kichler Arkady Monastirsky Vivian Colland | Elise Leibowitch Hanna Lorer Jean-Pierre Lambert Lucy Zultak Claude Bloch Alberta Alberotanza | Véronique Vives Joëlle Perelberg Werner Transier Mikko Heikinheimo Clive Lawton Mariano Schlimovich |
| Rapporteurs | Neville Kluk | François Moyses | Eva Castellanos |

Impressum

Brochure edited by:

B'nai B'rith Europe
36, rue Dautzenberg/Bte 3
B-1050 Brussels
Belgium

European Council of Jewish Communities
74-80 Camden Street-The Forum
NW1 OEG-London
United Kingdom

Red de Juderías de España-Caminos de Sefarad
Apartado de Correos 379
17080 Girona
España

With the support of:

The Ministry of Culture of Luxembourg
20, Montée de la Pétrusse
L-2912 Luxembourg

Printing and Design:

Ka Communications S.a.r.l.
213, avenue Gaston Diderich
L-1420 Luxembourg
Tel: 26 45 88 66
www.kacom.lu

Luxembourg, December 2004

Cover:

Poster of the European Day of Jewish Culture

Back page:

Exhibition Board on the European Day
of Jewish Culture.

For more information, please contact the
European coordinator of the
European Day of Jewish Culture:
camille@jewishheritage.org
www.jewishheritage.org



