THE "POSTCOLONIAL" IN TRANSLATION: READING SAID IN HEBREW

ELLA SHOHAT

The essay focuses on the "travel" of various debates—orientalism, postcolonialism, postzionism—between the U.S. and Israel, between one institutional zone and political semantics and another. Through a comparative history of these critical intellectual debates, the author considers some key moments and issues in the "translation" of Said's ideas into Hebrew. The reception of Said's work is engaged in its contradictory dimensions, especially in liberal-leftist circles, where the desire to go beyond Said offers some ironic twists. The issues examined include: the nature of the "post" in the concepts of the "post-colonial" and "post-Zionism"; the problem of "hybridity" and "resistance" in the land of partitions and walls; and the mediation in Israel, via the Anglo-American academy, of the "subaltern" intellectual.

Although Edward Said's ideas have traveled through many worlds, writing about his work as a "traveling theory" requires a sense of cross-border mediation and translation, as ideas are hybridized, resisted, contained, and recontextualized. Here I will focus on one form of such "travel," that between the United States and Israel, a situation where the receiving space for Said's ideas is a nation-state whose very foundation engendered this specific intellectual's exile. When Said invokes the right of return to that same place—where a state possesses the power not only to authorize or deny his return but also to oversee the circulation of his texts about displacement—then the question of that intellectual's "out-of-placeness" becomes even more fraught.

While my hope in this memorial issue would have been to tell a purely celebratory tale of Said's pervasive influence on Israeli intellectual life, the highly charged space of Zionism and Israel, and my own intricate positioning, make that task rather complicated. Beginning in the 1980s, my work initiated a...
conversation with Said’s critique of orientalism by examining the politics of representation in Zionist historiographical discourse and Israeli cultural practices.\(^1\) The hostile reception of that work in Israel, I think, was partly related to its association with Said’s work and even to my own closeness to Said. In those pre-Oslo days, dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians was literally and legally taboo, declared out of bounds by the “only democracy in the Middle East.” I want to clarify at the outset, then, that I write as one personally involved in the “translation” of Said’s thought into Hebrew. One leftist reviewer of my work compared both Said and myself, in our supposedly naïve admiration of the western “intellectual apparatus,” to the “miserable nigger, the victim of colonization, who licks his lips in excitement at the gold buttons and colorful glass beads offered by the cunning white merchant.”\(^2\) This rather amusing reproach of our “inauthenticity” as “spokepersons for the Third World” appeals to the old colonial trope of mimicry, while projecting the East/West dichotomy onto intellectuals whose biography and analysis clearly refuse that dichotomy. What interests me here, then, is the shuttling back and forth of Said’s work between one institutional zone and political semantics and another. Here I will consider some symptomatic moments and issues in this cross-border movement, asking when and which of Said’s texts have been stamped with an entry visa to Israel, which were permitted to settle, and which have had to be smuggled in or even forced to wander in a laissez-passer “no man’s land.”

**Postcolonial Studies Goes to Washington (Via Tel Aviv)**

For well over a decade, “postcolonial studies” has been highly visible even beyond academe. Said’s pre-eminence in the postcolonial field, however, seemed disconnected from the Israel/Palestine debates, where Said’s name was also prominent. The animosity generated in the wake of Said’s “trilogy” Orientalism, The Question of Palestine, and Covering Islam reached its paroxysm with the panicked hyperbole of “professor of terror.” In the post-September 11 landscape, the orientalist Right found the time opportune to reconquer what had earlier been “their” ivory towers. They could now enjoy a powerful observation post as self-anointed monarchs surveying these “un-American” activities. A highly visible coalition of (anti-Semitic) Christian fundamentalists, neocon Zionists, and culturalist orientalists all united to bring academia, allegedly taken hostage by “tenured radicals,” back into the warm embrace of Western values. In the June 2003 congressional hearings on Title VI, Stanley Kurtz of the National Review denounced the usual critical Middle Eastern studies scholars, Said most prominently.\(^3\) What was most striking, however, was the new focus on a different academic discipline—postcolonial studies. Postcolonial theory, which emerged as a prestigious field of inquiry in the late 1980s and which had generally escaped the institutional backlash directed at the revisionist historians and radical multiculturalists, for the first time began to “scan” on the neocon radar.
I do not mean to imply, of course, that the neocons have suddenly become devout exegetes of postcolonial texts. These critics are not in the least conversant with the anti-colonial writings and poststructuralist theories—intellectual currents at the very heart of Said’s contribution—that shaped what came to be called “postcolonial studies,” where Orientalism has constituted a key text. Said’s intervention, to my mind, forms part of a larger epochal shift in academia beginning in the late 1960s, the time of the first establishment of ethnic studies and women’s studies programs, and the academic emergence of diverse critical areas of inquiry—Marxism, Third Worldism, feminism. During the same period, area studies programs began to bypass or reject the post–World War II vision of scholarship promoted by the U.S. Defense Department in the service of cold war geopolitics. Latin American studies had already since the 1970s produced an impressive corpus of work critical of neocolonial policies and imperial discourses. Here the writings of figures such as Fanon, Galeano, Frank, Dorfman, Schiller, and Mattelart played a crucial role, becoming a kind of lingua franca in progressive circles. In Middle Eastern studies, meanwhile, critical scholars—many of whom contributed to Middle East Report and JPS—were politically and intellectually allied with Said’s critique of orientalism, which helped transform the field of Middle Eastern studies itself. Although the paradigm shift in Middle East studies came later, it was more publicly contested, especially as a battery of well-oiled foundations and institutes began to take aim at the entire field.

In his exposé, Kurtz accuses postcolonial studies in general of “undermining America’s security,” yet all the scholars that he denounces from within this vast field “happen” to work on the Middle East. Moreover, his claim that “postcolonial theory” forms the ruling intellectual paradigm in academic area studies (especially Middle Eastern studies) is simply mistaken, for while poststructuralist methodologies are widely practiced in literature departments, they form only a minor presence in Middle Eastern studies departments. The singling out of Middle Eastern studies, then, points to the targeting of both the territory and the author, revealing the missing link that turned postcolonial studies into the public enemy of the day. At last the new guardian angels could meaningfully tie together the two strands of “Said’s double career,” to cite a 1989 Commentary piece, “as literary scholar and ideologue of terrorism,” whose “spilling of ink” was deemed akin to “the spilling of blood.”

This long and winding road to postcolonial studies passes partly via Jerusalem, or better, Tel Aviv. Said’s reception in Israel has varied over the years, in some ways allegorizing the shifting state of the debates about the conflict. Said’s entry into media visibility during the first intifada came in the form of virulent attacks. Israel’s largest daily, Yedi’ot Aharonot, accused U.S.-based Palestinian professors like Said of “taking control” of the TV screen, luring naïve image-obsessed Americans through a new trompe l’oeil. In a new twist on the
old anti-Semitic motif of the Jewish chameleon hiding his innate outsiderness by impersonating “normal” Europeans, the critics charged Said with hiding terrorist intent behind a Western-style mask. The recent attempts by campus patrollers to intimidate those challenging the Israeli official line can be traced to this earlier anxiety that new Palestinian “publication relations techniques” might provoke a shift in American views. With a direct pipeline to the White House, however, well-endowed research institutes could now threaten to teach straying academics a lesson.

In a verbatim Hebrew recycling of the Kurtz tirade, the Ma’ariv journalist Ben-Dror Yemini, who opposes the occupation, praised Campus Watch and called for a withdrawal of government subsidies for anti-Israeli academics in Israel itself. Yemini proclaimed that the recognition by the Middle East Studies Association (MESA) of the “guru” Said was “one of the biggest bluffs of Middle Eastern studies” and linked it to Arab funding, further blaming Said for the “silencing of alternative voices” such as those of Fouad Ajami and Bernard Lewis. Acquiring the aura of a prophet in the wake of the second intifada and 9/11, Lewis was said to have predicted the unfolding culture clash and thus the collapse of Said’s thesis in Orientalism. Asked by Ha’Aretz whether he would recommend Orientalism to the Hebrew student, Lewis responded: “Only if the student is interested in the pathology of American campus life”; otherwise, the “book lacks value.” Meanwhile, Tel Aviv University professor Shimon Shamir suggested in his review of Martin Kramer’s Ivory Towers on Sand that orientalists from Lewis’s school had been “completely marginalized by Saidism... haunted by the orientalist label, treated with a mixture of condemnation and disdain.” Shamir praises Kramer for addressing the “damage” caused by the Saidian “take-over” of U.S. Middle Eastern studies. He also raises the issue of whether Israeli Middle Eastern studies are guilty of the same charge made by Kramer against their U.S. counterparts, but quickly reassures readers that in Israel these departments are “well anchored in scientific disciplines,” without “the same militant slide toward anti-orientalism.” Shamir does, however, criticize Kramer for ignoring the positive Saidian contribution to the rejection of essentialism.

Emmanuel Sivan, meanwhile, argues that Orientalism lent credence to the “all-embracing smear of the West” and to the “glorification of the East,” attributing to Said the very East-West dichotomy that he had so painstakingly disassembled. Sivan further accuses Said of essentialism, even as he himself demonstrates epidermic essentialism by enlisting the Arab identity of Said’s critics as proof against Said. Another scholar, Avi Bareli, dismisses the Saidian “analytical method” as offering only a “moralizing approach,” whose main objective is to “catch” and categorically condemn “the crook” rather than understand “the historical processes.” Such critics evoke Said’s name in tandem with their critique of post-Zionist historians and sociologists. The reception of Said’s work in Israel, then, has taken place within an institutional context largely shaped by orientalist-Zionist ideologies. As in the U.S., it was not so much Said’s study of French and British orientalism of the colonial past
(albeit relevant to the present) that has provoked the backlash; rather it was the book’s implications for a critique of Zionist discourse, especially when mobilized to defend Israel’s current policies.

**Writing Said in Hebrew**

Israeli orientalists had assailed *Orientalism* long before the Hebrew translation saw the light of day in August 2000, a full twenty-two years after the original English version. Despite this legacy of hostility, by the time it was published by the establishment press Am Oved, *Orientalism* could engender quite a few celebratory media interviews with Said. The book is now being taught in various Israeli university departments, largely by self-designated leftist professors, some identifying with the label of “post-Zionism,” some with “Zionism,” and a few with “non” or “anti-Zionism.” More recently, the translation of Said’s memoir *Out of Place* generated both accusatory and favorable reviews. Yet what remains unacknowledged is that Said’s *The Question of Palestine* had already been published in Hebrew in 1981, soon after its appearance in English, and that earlier that same year the literary quarterly *Siman Kri’a* published Said’s essay “Zionism from the Standpoint of its Victims.”

Defining Said’s essay as “controversial,” *Siman Kri’a*’s editors, many associated with Peace Now, included within the same issue a response entitled “Zionism, its Palestinian Victim and the Western World” by the historian of Zionism Yigal Elam. Whereas the response to the same Said essay in *Social Text*, where it had originally been published in English, highlighted the Holocaust, Elam privileged the putative responsibility of Palestinians themselves for their own dislocation. “The Palestinian nationalist movement,” he wrote, “made a severe mistake, when it initiated violent confrontation with Zionism,” because it was “not ready to pay the price of diplomatic compromise.” Like many liberal Zionists in the wake of 1977, Elam acknowledges that “occupation corrupts,” but denies any colonial dimension to Zionism. He concludes with a rush to defend “the West”:

“Nationalism,” “state,” “democracy,” “self-definition,” “citizenship,” “equal rights,” “secular culture,” “sovereignty” — all are rooted in a Western context...it is the West that supplies the only terminological context to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, since even the PLO formula of a “democratic secular state” comes out of the political philosophy of the West.

This unthinking equation of the West and democracy is made four decades after the advent, in the very heart of Europe, not only of the Holocaust but also of the fascism of Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, and Petain, and just two decades after French colonialism’s brutal war in Algeria. Furthermore, such historians do not take on board the critique of the Eurocentric premises of Zionist discourse itself as shaping its practices in Palestine. In fact, the investment in the
Enlightenment narrative of the "West" is fundamental for the Israeli peace camp’s vision of itself, constituting at once an ontological apologia and an identity-marker, and consequently has played a pivotal role in the reception of Said's work.20

The Question of Palestine, meanwhile, was published by the now-defunct nonprofit press Mifras, some of whose associates were linked to the anti-Zionist group Matzpen.21 Mifras published a few critical Hebrew writers32 and translated a number of works by Arab and other Third World writers, including Ghassan Kanafani’s Men in the Sun, Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Henri Curiel’s On the Altar of Peace, Ali Mazrui’s The African Condition, Abu Iyad’s My Home My Land, and Emile Habiby’s The Pessoptimist. “Despite the daily focus on the complications of the Israeli-Arab conflict,” the mission statement declares, “there hardly exists in Hebrew, literatures that open a window to a deep and critical understanding of Arab society and individuals."

Mifras enlisted the peace camp artist and intellectual Yigal Tumarkin to write the preface, entitled "My Dream Zionism." Yet, in defiance of the generic protocols of prefaces, which usually offer a hospitable prelude to the text in question, Tumarkin’s introduction deployed the hegemonic narratives against Said. Resurrecting the Promethean making-the-desert-bloom trope, for example, he complains that Said speaks as if “swamps and malaria never existed and are merely part of the Zionist publicity machine.” For Tumarkin, Said’s book “is a manifesto of frustration,” offering a “black and white picture” in contrast to his own “dream Zionism” where “there is light.” He thus concludes:

…it is hard to negotiate when one positions himself as a victim of the other side. What occurred was miserable and fated, a tragedy that victimized both sides, and now we need to seek a way to understanding based on logic and not on a division between the righteous and wicked. We have to think about the future and not remain captive to the burdens of the past and its lugubrious memories.

The preface, in dissonance with Mifras’s own mission statement, failed to create an intertextual environment that might have placed Said’s argument within the larger frame of anti-colonial discourse. Tumarkin’s preface could not be farther from comparable prefaces within the anti-colonialist tradition, for example, Sartre’s passionate endorsement of Fanon, at the very height of the French/Algerian war, in his preface to The Wretched of the Earth.

Said’s literary work, meanwhile, was not a real presence in the work of his most logical “interpretative community”—literary theorists within the emerging field of poststructuralism in Israel. A 1988 Hebrew translation of a book by the poststructuralist Christopher Norris, which praised both Orientalism and The World, the Text, and the Critic, transliterated Said’s name wrongly as “Sed,”23 when it could have been easily rendered correctly in Hebrew, which possesses the exact equivalent letters to the Arabic. The name “Sa’eed”
in its Arabic pronunciation perhaps was hard to "hear" or digest within a deconstructionist academic ambiance. In a context where the imagined inferiority of Arabic and Arabs usually goes hand in hand with the valorization of anything English, Edward Said's very name condenses an oxymoronic tension. The miswriting—or better, misreading—of his last name betrays the disconnect between the worlds of anti-colonial literature and Israeli literary studies. It betokens both the desire for the new theory of deconstruction and the lack of familiarity with one of the major poststructuralist scholars, whose book *Orientalism* had been foregrounded by Norris himself as an exemplar of interweaving text and context. Thus, at a time when Said's writing was broadening the scope of literary studies in the Anglo-American academy, Israeli literary theory hardly engaged his literary scholarship.

The translated *The Question of Palestine*, by now long out of print, did not leave a visible imprint in liberal-leftist publications. Yet by the late 1990s, Ha'Aretz's translations of several of Said's pieces on current events eased its readers into a celebratory reception of *Orientalism*. The shift from the marginal publication of *The Question of Palestine* to the mainstream publication of *Orientalism* reflects shifting trends in Israeli academia. By legalizing Israeli-Palestinian dialogue, the Rabin-Arafat handshake rendered such academic engagements less taboo-ridden. In the following years, a small but influential group of largely postzionist academics helped make Said a legitimate intellectual interlocutor. *Orientalism*'s more recent "travel" into Israel was also facilitated by Said's prestigious status in the Anglo-American academy, just as the elite aura of the term "postcolonial" enabled its current absorption into Israeli academic discourse. The time lapse between the translations, however, suggests a more complex genealogy for critical thinking in Israel and for the trajectory of Said's reception prior to the postzionist debate. Mifras's impressive earlier efforts to bring Said to the Hebrew reader should not be deemed irrelevant to the history of the debates. Similarly, over the past two decades, Said's "travel" into Israel was also supported by the Alternative Information Center and its publications, which explicitly articulated Zionism's relation to colonialism.

By now, the impact of Said's work has been felt in various fields in critical writings about Zionist discourses and Israeli practices. Even when Said's writing is not foregrounded, its influence is felt and acknowledged in such texts as Smadar Lavie's ironic look at Israeli anthropology of the Bedouins; Ammiel Alcalay's historical reflection on Mizrahi writers as intimately embedded in Arab culture; Yerach Gover's critique of the images of Arabs in Hebrew literature and of Zionist literary assumptions; Azmi Bishara's invocation of orientalism to address racist discourses about "educated Arabs" within Israel in a context where Bishara's very writing in Hebrew challenges the limits of Israeli citizenship; Sami Shalom Chetrit's historical account of Mizrahi struggle within anti-Zionist paradigms; Simona Sharoni's discussion of the gendered militarism of Israeli society; Sarah Chinski's look at orientalist underpinning of Israeli art history;
Gabriel Piterberg’s examination of the orientalist foundations of Israeli history books; Henriette Dahan-Kalev’s discussion of the Mizrahi as an orientalized “other”; Irit Rogoff’s exploration of the imaging of boundaries in Israeli visual culture; Yosefa Loshitzky’s invocation of Said’s reading of Camus to critique similar representations of the Arab in Israeli cinema; Dan Rabinowitz’s overview of Israeli anthropological texts on the Palestinians; Shoshana Madmoni’s account of racist media representation of the kidnapping of Yemeni/Mizrahi babies in Israel; and Oren Yiftachel’s discussion of ethnocracy in land development and Palestinian dislocation within Israel.26

Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin makes significant use of Said’s critique of orientalism to address the Zionist negation of Jewish exile, highlighting what he calls “religious colonial nationalism.” He discusses the dialectics of messianism and redemption as constituting the orientalist framework of Zionist nationalism, and the place of theological debate within it. He also answers Orientalism’s critics who faulted the book for ignoring German forms of orientalism. Instead, Raz-Krakotzkin looks at the Zionist shaping of Jewish History scholarship as itself emerging out of German orientalist views about Jews in modern Europe. The possibilities offered by Orientalism have been extended to other domains within Jewish studies, where the easy East/West dichotomy has also proven problematic in relation to Arab-Jews. Ruth Tsoffar offers an anti-orientalist reading of the interpretations and practices of the Egyptian-Karaites in their San Francisco diaspora. Gil Anidjar, meanwhile, suggests that Kabbalah scholarship, especially Gershom Scholem’s valorization of mysticism over rationalism, neglected to see the Kabbalah’s embeddedness in the Islamic world and Arabic writing.27

“POSTZIONISM”—WHOSE “POST” IS IT ANYWAY?

The changing discourses of the Anglo-American academia, energized by multiculturalism and the diverse “posts” (postmodernism, poststructuralism, postnationalism, and postcolonialism), facilitated Said’s “voyage” to Israel and made possible the marriage of still another “post” with another “ism”: “post-Zionism.” The scholars known as “postzionists” did not all identify with the label, constituting a heterogeneous group vis-à-vis the concept of “Zionism.”28 Revisionist historians such as Tom Segev, Avi Shlaim, Benny Morris, and Ilan Pappé performed invaluable scholarly work by challenging the hegemonic account of the partition and of the 1948 exodus, thus provoking the rage of mainstream Zionists. The postzionists’ rather ambiguous positions on “Zionism,” however, were challenged under the impact of the second intifada. While some explicitly announced themselves as devout Zionists (Morris), endorsing the “Barak-offered-them-everything-but-I’m-disappointed-in-the-Palestinians” narrative, a few others became more radicalized, breaking away from “postzionism” (Pappé).

The visibility of the postzionists was in many ways a product of the Oslo accords. That these historians could be consulted and help shape “Tekuma”—the
TV history series produced for the 50th anniversary of the State of Israel—speaks volumes as to their positioning as legitimate scholars in the public sphere. It is important to appreciate, however, the identity politics that permitted a favorable reception of postzionist scholars in and outside Israel. It is as though Palestinian history could be better heard if mouthed by (largely Ashkenazi) Israeli men. Many of the celebratory articles about postzionism treated the work as sui generis, marginalizing the contribution of Palestinian research on the same issues. The revisionist historians, as pointed out by such scholars as Nur Masalha, Rashid Khalidi, and Joseph Massad, basically put an Israeli imprimatur on earlier arguments made by Palestinian scholars. The reception of postzionism in this sense has also reflected an Israeli-centric approach to the representation of scholarship, where Palestinian scholars tend to be written out as subjects of intellectual history.

Said himself noted the “schizophrenia” informing postzionist texts. While some establish beyond any doubt that the forced exodus of Palestinians was a result of a specific transfer policy adopted and approved by Ben-Gurion, they refuse to acknowledge any Zionist plan to empty Palestine of its inhabitants. “Morris’s meticulous work,” writes Said,

showed that in district after district commanders had been ordered to drive out Palestinians, burn villages, systematically take over their homeland property. Yet strangely enough, by the end of the book Morris seems reluctant to draw the inevitable conclusions from his own evidence. Instead of saying outright that the Palestinians were, in fact, driven out he says that they were partially driven out by Zionist forces, and partially “left” as a result of war. It is as if he was still enough of a Zionist to believe the ideological version—that Palestinians left on their own without Israeli eviction—rather than completely to accept his own evidence, which is that Zionist policy dictated Palestinian Exodus."

The bifurcated discourse that characterizes even relatively critical circles can in my view be traced to the very origins of Zionism. Elsewhere I have argued that Zionism as an ideology, and Israel as a nation-state, form an anomalous project, narrating itself as liberatory vis-à-vis Europe even as it carries the same banner of the “civilizing mission” that the European powers proclaimed during their thrust into “found lands.” Zionist discourse itself thus embodies schizophrenic masternarratives: a redemptive nationalist narrative vis-à-vis Europe and anti-Semitism, and a colonialist narrative vis-à-vis the Arab people who “happened” to reside in the place designated as the Jewish homeland. Yet, unlike colonialism, Zionism also constituted a response to millennial oppression, and in contradistinction to the classical colonial paradigm, had no “mother country”; Metropole and colony, in this case, were located in the self-same place. Zionist discourse concerning a “return to the mother land” suggests a double relation
Emerging in the 1990s, the term “post-Zionism” suggested a premature eagerness to claim to have “gone beyond” Zionism even while Zionist ideology was exerting more power than ever.

The “post” in “post-Zionism” paralleled Fukuyama’s rather precipitous announcement of the “end of history” or Lyotard’s announcement of “the death of metanarratives.” The similarly euphoric “post-Zionism” pointed to a rather ambiguous conceptual project that promised to carry us beyond the tiresome Zionism-versus-anti-Zionism debate. Yet what this “beyondness” has meant is a question unto itself—since the implied haven of the “post” remains haunted by Zionism’s kinship with both the “national” and the “colonial.”

“Postzionism” also carries the traces of the term “postcolonial,” then at the height of its aura of prestige in the Anglo-American academy, exactly at the time when the prefix “post” was attached to “Zionism.” The questions I have proposed elsewhere with regard to the “post-colonial” in terms of its spatio-temporal ambiguity might equally be posed with regard to the term “post-Zionism”: that is, “post” in relation to what, to where, to when, and to whom? When exactly does the “post” in “post-Zionism” begin? And what kind of location and perspective does the term reflect? And what discourse does “post-Zionism” go beyond? The “beyond” of the “post” in “post-Zionism,” unlike in “post-colonialism,” takes us into a more complicated realm, precisely because the parallelism between Zionism and colonialism remains sublimated. In the term “post-colonial,” it is the prefix “post” that carries an ambiguous spatio-temporality, while the substantive suffix “colonial,” despite debates about historical and geographical variations, remains a more or less agreed upon signifier and frame of reference. In the term “post-Zionism,” in contrast, it is both the prefix “post” and the substantive suffix “Zionism” that are contested. It is especially the valence of what follows the hyphen in “post-colonialism” and “post-Zionism,” then, which in many ways distinguishes the two fields of inquiry.
TRAVELING POSTcolonIAL THEORY

Postcolonial theory has recently traveled via the Anglo-American academy into a certain postzionist world, where the “colonial” itself has hardly been thought through in any depth. It is in this context that one must understand a rather striking phenomenon central to the emergent postzionist-postcolonial discourse. Academic and journalistic texts have fashioned a kind of folk wisdom that posits Homi Bhabha as having surpassed Said. Immediately after Said’s death, leftist columnist Nir Baram wrote what he called a “sober obituary”:

For many years, Said’s hegemony has remained dominant, unopposed, despite the unexpected biting from Homi K. Bhabha, a brilliant scholar, who unlike Said redeemed the orient from the ultimate role of the victim and the slave, understanding that the imagination is not one-way but two-way: in other words, the orient also imagines the west and imitates it. Bhabha, speaking about two creatures that move in a constantly changing dynamic space, perfected Said’s frozen thesis, and led the way into a much more fascinating discourse.

This vision, which shows Said outclassed by the more sophisticated Bhabha, now constitutes a kind of topos in numerous Hebrew publications. Without engaging in any depth Said’s oeuvre or the varied debates around postcolonial studies, the facile recital of the Bhabha-beyond-Said mantra has come to be an entrance requirement for “doing the postcolonial” in Israel, a gatekeeping exercise in terms of which dimensions of the Anglo-American postcolonial corpus merit discussion.

This narrativizing of the English-language postcolonial field seems to date back to the 1994 translation of Bhabha’s “The Other Question” in the postzionist journal Teoria veBikoret (Theory and criticism: An Israeli forum). The editorial preface to the translation, written by philosopher Adi Ophir and literary critic Hannan Hever, presented the Bhabha-over-Said topos as a way out of Orientalism’s fixity with regard to the stereotype. While the editors’ efforts to bring Bhabha’s text to the Hebrew reader deserve strong praise, the politics of translation and the framing of the debate raise serious questions about the journal’s positioning of Said and implicitly of Israeli postcolonials themselves.

By selecting this specific Bhabha piece, and by writing a preface highlighting Bhabha’s transcendence of Said, the editors cast Bhabha as the subverter of Said’s hegemony. Yet, at the time of the translation of Bhabha’s essay, the bulk of Said’s work was (and still is) largely untranslated, including Orientalism, and for that matter any of Said’s literary and postcolonial theoretical work. Although it had translated Foucault, Deleuze, de Certeau, and later Spivak, Teoria veBikoret itself never translated any of Said’s articles, yet its readers were urged to go “beyond” Said. To really “go beyond” Said, however, the Hebrew reader would first have had to have “gone through” Said’s major texts.
obviously not suggesting that one should not critique Said’s work; the problem
is that the journal’s implicit call to “go beyond” Said— or, better, its suggestion
that we are all already beyond Said— was not accompanied by an exploration
of the broad theoretical intertext and historical context that inform his work,
and thus hardly does justice to the intellectual debate.

Postcolonial theory consequently was introduced to the Hebrew reader
within an intellectual and political vacuum, not only in relation to the huge body
of postcolonial work, but more importantly in relation to anti-colonial history
and writings. In Israel, the anti-colonial antecedents of postcolonial writings—
e.g., texts by DuBois, C.L.R. James, Cabral, Césaire, Fanon, Senghor, Retamar,
and Rodinson— have never been translated into Hebrew. Albert Memmi’s books
on Jewish-related questions, meanwhile, were translated in the 1960s and
1970s, but not his classic anticolonialist texts. In his preface to the recent

We cannot boast of having created morality and simultane-
ously dominate another people. For this reason I always re-
gretted that no Israeli publisher agreed to publish any of my
writing on these issues, and especially the Portrait of the
Colonized ... I am waiting hopefully for [it] also ... [to] be
published in Hebrew. It will mean that the Israeli public will
see itself finally as deserving to cope with the difficulties of
its national existence.37

The “going-beyond-Said” move, in other words, comes in a general context
where there has been little engagement with the foundational anti-colonial
texts. Bhabha’s essay, astonishingly, came into Hebrew existence not only be-
fore Said’s *Orientalism*, but also before the books of the major figure that both
Said and Bhabha assumed as a significant influence and interlocutor— Frantz
Fanon. For Israeli postcolonials who discover and ventriloquize Fanon only via
Bhabha, the intellectual “jump” into the “post” becomes a magic carpet flying
into the land of erasure.

It is the silence about Said’s profound and very diverse contribution, the cari-
caturing or “fixing” of his oeuvre into a few sentences about his putative fixity,
that raises doubts about this postcolonial reception of Said in Hebrew. Like
a few poststructuralist critics in the Anglo-American academy, these Hebrew
writers seem to displace Said’s deconstruction of the binarism of colonial dis-
course onto Said’s own text, as if Said, and not colonialism and racism, were
binarist. The editors and their followers, furthermore, have filtered Said’s oe-
vre only through Bhabha’s comments on Said in one section of an essay, con-
cerning the fixity of the stereotype, an issue now misleadingly placed at the
core of the whole Anglo-American postcolonial field.38 The very complex and
multifaceted field of postcolonial studies—which explores such varied issues
as the intersection of race and gender in anti-colonial thought, the narrated
and constructed nature of the nation, the imperial substratum of texts and
institutions, the tropes of orientalist discourse, the role of the diasporic intel-
lectual in the Metropole—gets reduced to a stagist narrative of Bhabhaesque
mobility superceding Saidian stasis. Bhabha’s own dialogue with and incorpo-
rations of Said’s writings in other essays such as “On Mimicry and Man,” “Signs
Taken for Wonder,” and “Dissemination,” meanwhile, went unmentioned by the
editors and the budding postcolonials seemingly eager to liberate the Hebrew
reader from the Palestinian intellectual Said.39 This rather tendentious framing
of Said’s vast corpus elides the common intertexts—specifically poststructural-
ist theory and anti-colonialist discourse—engaged by both Said and Bhabha.
Thus, in the name of going beyond binarism, Teoria veBikoret introduced its
own binarism for the postcolonial field, limiting it to a brawling arena where
two intellectual wrestlers, one supposedly fixed and static, and the other fluid
and mobile fight it out. Their shared (albeit differently accented) poststructural-
ist concerns with anti-essentialism and anti-Manicheanism are here pushed out
of the ring.

The scholars who apparently endorse Bhabha’s Derridian-Lacanian-inflected
discourse, furthermore, do not actually themselves go on to perform that discurs-
ive analysis through deconstructionist-psychoanalytical readings.40 The cur-
rent editor of Teoria veBikoret, the sociologist Yehouda Shenhav, for example,
also repeats the Bhabha-over-Said mantra, associating the latter with phrases
like “dichotomous,” “static,” and “rigid,” in contrast with Bhabha’s fluidity, “third
space,” and “hybridity.” Yet in the same text that endorses this destabilizing
mode of analysis, the author, oblivious to the methodological inconsistency,
also invokes the almost antithetical disciplinary grid of “social psychology.”41
As though the highly theoretical discourses of Lacanian psychoanalysis, and
the basically positivist domain of social psychology, could be regarded as one
and the same thing. The endorsement of the Bhabha-style of discourse seems
especially curious, then, since most of the texts that claim to go beyond Said
do not themselves move in the direction in which Bhabha’s Lacanian discourse
points. Thus one has the impression that it is not so much a question of mov-
into psychoanalytic-postcolonial discourse, but rather of staging a narrative
where Bhabha ends up delegitimizing Said. A more serious Hebrew account of
the English debates, moreover, would have at least acknowledged, if not nec-
essarily embraced, the diverse critiques not only of psychoanalytic theory but
also of Bhabha’s writings, for example by Benita Parry, who sees his work as
depoliticizing the critique of colonialism through a hyper-discursive turn. Nor
do such postcolonial Hebrew texts actually explore how psychoanalysis might
help illuminate a contested history where the fundamental debate, despite an
undeniable psychoanalytical dimension, is shaped by the very material issue of
land, and where the psychic economy of the conflict is caught up in unequal
power relations “on the ground.”

Other texts in this Hebrew postcolonial corpus form an amalgam of errors
and imprecisions concerning intellectual and political genealogies. In Teoria
veBikoret’s recent issue on “The Postcolonial Gaze,” the authors of the in-
troductory essay, Shehav and Hever—who once again reduce Said to rigid

binarism—seem to suggest that Fanon, the quintessential anti-colonial writer, historically belongs to post-colonial thought. They attribute to the “postcolonial” the “effort toward liberation from colonialist discursive modes,” while somehow dropping from the equation the anti-colonial discourse that had already attempted to do precisely that. In a case of the missing “anti,” the reader moves from the “colonial” to the “post-colonial” without passing through the “anti-colonial.” (I am not proposing here a stagist understanding of history, but rather a careful sequencing of debates.) In another text, Shenhav writes, in a curiously anachronistic account, that the post-colonial movement developed in the Third World in the 1960s. According to the author’s discursive sequencing:

The multi-cultural movement began in the post-colonial stream that developed in the Third World. . . . This movement was joined by other important struggles of the last thirty years: the feminist, the racial, the sexual, and the generational. . . . To the help of these struggles came the post-modern tradition, which tried to formulate the epistemological basis of new forms of cognition.

Disentangling these scrambled intellectual histories would require more effort than it deserves, but suffice it to say that neither “multiculturalism” nor “post-colonialism” began in the Third World; that the “feminist, racial, and sexual” struggles shaped postmodernism as much as postmodernism “helped” these struggles; and that there never was a postcolonial movement per se, even in the late 1980s. There was only a postcolonial theory, which emerged from diasporic “Third World” intellectuals operating in “First World” academe. Within the Israeli public arena, such authors, in other words, seem to speak confidently of oppositional intellectual history, situated in between the “First” and “Third” Worlds, even while demonstrating a shallow understanding of that history. Said’s work is thus received in a problematic intellectual environment, giving the impression of a faddish recycling of trends from the Anglo-American academe without a thoroughgoing engagement of the historical trajectories that shaped those trends.

**A “Post” without Its Past**

In the U.S. context, the terrain for Said’s Orientalism in 1978 had been prepared, on the Left, by a long series of struggles around civil rights, decolonization, Third Worldism, Black Power, and anti-imperialism. In Israel, intellectuals lived these moments quite differently. With a few exceptions, such as the small Matzpen group and the left wing of the Mizrahi Black Panthers, Israeli intellectuals did not engage in the debates about decolonization-Black Power-Third Worldism. Thus, the arrival of the “postcolonial” in the Anglo-American academy in the late 1980s, unlike its subsequent arrival in Israel, formed part
of a distinct trajectory. In U.S. academe, postcolonial discourse emerged in the late 1980s after ethnic studies had already challenged the Western canon, and in the wake of substantial (albeit insufficient) institutional reforms and corrective measures like affirmative action—themselves the result of various anti-racist and anti-imperialist revolts dating back to the 1960s and 1970s. While more radical U.S. students were supporting America’s “own” indigenous people (as represented in the American Indian Movement, for example), Israeli students were celebrating their state’s victory over “their” indigenous people—the Palestinian Arabs.

Postcolonial theory in the Anglo-American academy also emerged out of the anti-colonialist moment and Third Worldist perspective; that is at least partly what makes it “post.” But in Israel one finds a “post” without its past. Postzionist-postcolonial writing in Israel—and this is another reason why the analogy between the two terms is problematic—comes out of an academic context often untouched by the anti-colonialist debates. In the Third World, anti-colonial nationalism gave way to some “course corrections” and a measure of disillusionment, partially due to the return of neo-colonialism. This disillusionment with the aftermath of decolonization and with Third-Worldism, which provides the affective backdrop for postcolonial theory, had no equivalent in the Israeli context. The question of exactly when the “post” in the “post-colonial” begins already provoked a debate in English. But to suggest a moving beyond “the colonial” in a nation-state and in an academic space historically untouched by Third-Worldism requires that we ask this question with even more vigor. In the first instance anti-colonial discourse gives way to post-colonial discourse, but in the second, it is not anti-Zionist discourse that gives way to post-Zionist discourse, but rather Zionist discourse that gives way to post-Zionist discourse. It is a case, again, of the missing “anti.”

Reading Zionism through the prism of colonialism has been a taboo in Israeli academe. Given this context, one would think that the scholarly embrace of “the postcolonial” would foreground the discussion of Zionism’s relation to colonialism. But instead, one sometimes finds a kind of upside-down camera obscura discourse, even when in political terms these same writers oppose the occupation. Hannan Hever, for example, criticizes Said for viewing the Law of Return as racist and for not recognizing that the Law of Return, like American affirmative action, was legislated as positive discrimination in favor of refugees and the persecuted.45 But this analogy is ultimately fallacious. Affirmative action in the United States was intended to compensate those the nation-state had itself oppressed, those on whose backs the nation-state had been created, especially Native Americans, African Americans, and Chicanos. In Israel, in contrast, the Law of Return has been offered to those taking the place of the disposessed, those who come to constitute the nation. To ask Said to accept the Law of Return as a form of affirmative action for Jews misses the basic point, that for Palestinians the Law of Return simply continues a history of dispossession. The Law of Return-affirmative action analogy, furthermore, is made in an Israeli context where affirmative action for Palestinians and other minorities has never
been institutionalized and where it has often been caricatured, including in so-called liberal-left publications, in terms borrowed from the U.S. Right, as a kind of obnoxious “political correctness.” Although postzionist-postcolonials have certainly made a contribution by challenging certain Zionist orthodoxies, one wonders how post is this “post” when a term borrowed from the alternative American lexicon (“affirmative action”) surfaces in the Israeli context in the defense of the dominant ideology; when the Palestinian desire for a right of return is repressed from the discussion; and when the relevance of the critique of the “colonial” to the account of the “Law of Return,” “affirmative action,” and the “right of return” is circumvented. As with the term “post-colonialism,” the prefix “post” in “post-Zionism” erases both colonial lineages and anti-colonial intellectual history with a magical stroke of the “post.”

While Hebrew texts on “the postcolonial gaze” may denounce the abuses of the military occupation, they hardly articulate the links between that political stance and the Bhabhaesque theoretical model of “third space,” resulting in an unthinking celebration of the “in-between” in the land of partitions and walls. Although Said’s work engaged the question of flows between cultures—his notion of “traveling theory” is a case in point—most Israeli postcolonial texts reject his work in the name of “hybridity,” where presumably “not-only-the-colonized-but-also-the-colonizer-engages-in-mimicry.” Under the sign of “hybridity,” Nir Baram is thus able to contrast Said, unfavorably, with Ajami, praising the latter for his “deep research into the orient itself” and for his courage for daring to criticize the politics of the Arab world. This comparison overlooks Said’s own criticism of the Palestinian Authority and the Arab regimes, while ignoring Ajami’s binarist discourse that essentializes the Western-versus-Eastern clash.46 Here “fluidity” is mobilized against Said, but ends up by proposing Ajami, often viewed as an opportunist who flatters the orientalist illusions of the Right, as the new model of sly civility.

“Hybridity,” an invaluable instrument for cultural analysis—and indeed a very old trope in Latin America and the Caribbean—has been useful both in transcending the myth of racial purity central to colonial discourse and in challenging a Third Worldist discourse that projected the Nation as culturally homogenous. But “hybridity” must be seen as always already power-laden. Too often “hybridity” becomes a catch-all term, without any serious probing of its different modalities. In a copy/paste approach to a certain postcolonial discourse in English, the postcolonial in its Hebrew translation offers an undifferentiated valorization of “hybridity.” How can we think through the relation between a postcolonial discourse that reads resistance into the fact of hybridities on the one hand, and the current apartheid-like and literally fenced-in reality of Israel/Palestine, on the other? Think about the cruel hybridity imposed, for example, in construction sites of the Separation Wall, where the linguistic frontiers of Hebrew and Arabic are indeed traversed, but where Palestinians are obliged to build the very wall that tears their lives apart. What is gained, then, when the asymmetries of hybridity are bracketed or even elided and encoded as resistant?
In fact, such Hebrew texts lack an in-depth engagement with the English-language postcolonial debate that a decade earlier probed the potentially depoliticizing effects of “hybridity.” Notions of “oppression” and “resistance” are too easily dismissed as binarist simplifications, while “collaboration” and “cooperation” happily find their way to an all-embracing space where the colonizer and the colonized perform mutual mimicry. Passing off “hybridity” as always already “resistant” appears to sanctify the fait accompli of colonial violence. Such a “postcolonial gaze” turns a blind eye to Said’s gesture of opening a conceptual space for Zionism’s victimization in a context that had previously permitted to narrate exclusively Jewish victimization and Zionist redemption. Flattening Said’s argument, these texts overlook other productive Saidian categories, such as the critique of “origins” in *Beginnings*; the concentration on power-knowledge “affiliations”; the notion of the “worldly” adversarial intellectual; the idea of “mutually haunting” histories; and the privileging of spatial categories in *Culture and Imperialism*—all of which are highly relevant to the engagement of Israel/Palestine. Instead, Said is there only to be gone beyond, a point to be immediately departed from and transcended. This current Israeli postcolonial narrative thus relegates Said, and the people he stands for, to what I have elsewhere termed the realm of the “pre-postcolonial” within what Joseph Massad has called the “post-colonial colony.” By applying it to Said’s influential work, such authors abuse the term “hegemony,” while ignoring the centrality of that Gramscian concept to Said’s own work, all part of a rush to perform a rather hegemonic burial of Said’s oppositional texts.

In the context of U.S.-Israel traveling debates, then, Said occupies a paradoxical site in relation to the “postcolonial”; he represents at once a disempowered displaced Palestinian and an empowered American intellectual. As a Palestinian, Said evokes colonized and dominated people; as an American literary scholar he evokes the prestigious field of postcolonial theory. Said’s own Janus-faced position is part and parcel of the contradictory passing of his work through diverse checkpoints in Israel. Reading Said in Hebrew condenses an oxymoronic friction between the imagined geographies of Arabic (as East) and English (as West)—in the first, he is a haunting exile from Palestine, while in the latter, he holds the powerful wand of academic America. That Said’s final resting place is in Broummana, Lebanon, rather than either New York, where he lived for decades, or Jerusalem, where he was born, provides a suitably troubled and inconclusive allegory to the equally ruptured voyages of his ideas across national borders.

Notes

the book cover further pointed to our affiliation.

2. Bursztyn, a Tel Aviv University professor, suggested that Said and myself, unlike Fanon, are products of the Western academy and therefore inauthentic Third Worlders, forgetting that Fanon himself was educated in the French academy. "The Bad Ashkenazis Are Riding Again," Ma'ariv, 7 February 1992.


5. "Statement of Stanley Kurtz."


8. Ben-Dror Yemini, "Academia under Investigation," Ma'ariv, 4 July 2003. Although Yemini's article was written in Hebrew, the National Review Web site provides a link to the article—English and Hebrew seems to reinforce each other's legitimacy. On the links between right-wing Israeli and U.S. policy, see Joel Beinin, "The Israeliization of American Middle East Policy Discourse," Social Text issue on Transnational Palestine, no. 75 (Summer 2003).


14. Gabriel Pieterberg, teaching at the time at Be'er Sheva University, facilitated Orientalism's publication by Am Oved (translated by Atalia Zilberg) with the support of the Hayeem Herzog Center for the Study of the Middle East and Diplomacy.


16. In the early 1990s, at the invitation of Mizrahi leftist activists and writers Sami Shalom Chetrit and Tikva Levi, I began the translation of the introduction and the first chapter of Orientalism for a Hebrew anthology of translated anti-colonial writings, but the project came to an end for lack of funds from alternative presses and for lack of interest from mainstream publishers.

17. Out of Place was published by Yedi'ot Aharonot Books and Chemed Books, 2001. Ha'aretz (8 September 1999) translated Said's response to Justus Weiner's accusation that Said manipulated his biography ("'My Beautiful Old House' and Other Fabrications by Edward Said" in Commentary). Dan Rabinowitz was among those writing in defense of Said, "Politically Contested Childhood." Ha'aretz, 26 August 1999. (At the invitation of Rabinowitz, Said delivered the keynote address at the Israeli Anthropological Association in 1998). Similarly, Amnon Yuval reviewed positively Orientalism (Ma'ariv, 1 September 2000), and Tuvia Blumenthal, The End of the Peace Process (Ha'aretz, 2 December 2001) that has not been translated.

18. Siman Kri'a, a quarterly sponsored by Tel Aviv University in conjunction with the establishment press ha'Kibutz

19. Yigal Elam, "Zionism, its Palestinian Victim and the Western World," Siman Kri'a no. 14 (June 1981), p. 367. The author puts his faith in the West's ending the conflict, but he does so on the basis of the West's "political culture" of "equilibrium." In the Israeli side there is little sensitivity and understanding of these Western criteria; while on the Palestinian side I doubt it if there is any sensitivity and understanding at all. Even Edward Said still does not improve the picture on the Palestinian side, to judge by his article on Zionism." (p. 368) Elam's word "even" seems to suggest that one expects more from a modern educated Arab, living in the west.

20. In his review of Orientalism, the leftist Yoram Bronovsky invokes Athenian democracy versus Persian tyranny to criticize Said's own critical invocation of Aeschylus. ("The West is Right, Sometimes," Ha'Amutz, 10 March 1995.) Bronovsky's argument is premised on the idea that democracy is a Greek inheritance and that Athens was indeed a democracy; when in fact there are many sources to democratic social organizing, for example in diverse African and indigenous American contexts; and when in fact, Athenian democracy was based on slavery.


22. Among the original Hebrew books published were Shlomo Swirski's Campus Society and State (1982); Ronit Lentin's Conversations with Palestinian Women (1982); and Yemini's A Political Punch (1986), recounting his political transformation from Right to Left.


24. News from Within dedicated its October 2003 (19, no. 8) issue to Said's memory. Said joined the board at the invitation of its then editor, Tikva Parnass.


27. Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, "Orientalism, Jewish Studies and Israeli Society," Jama'a 3 (1999); Ruth Tsolfar, "The Stains of Culture: An Ethnoreading of Karite Bodily Rituals and Text" (forthcoming), Gil Anidjar, "Jewish

28. The revisionist sociologist Uri Ram was one of the first to use the term “post-Zionism” in his introduction to his Hebrew edited volume, Israeli Society: Critical Perspectives (Tel Aviv: Breirot Publishers, 1993), where post-Zionism was proposed as a hope for a new social agenda. In the same volume, Gershon Shafir, whose work unusually examines the relationship between Zionism and colonialism, also invoked the term to offer a “new universalist tendency” in contrast to the “rise of Neo-Zionism.”


30. Edward Said, “New History, Old Ideas,” Al-Ahram Weekly 378, 21–27 May 1998. Nur Masalha also had asked how can some of the revisionist historians such as Morris argue that there was no Israeli expulsion policy when their work rests on “carefully released partial documentation and when much of the Israeli files and documents relating to the subject are still classified and remain closed to researchers?” in “Debate on the 1948 Exodus.”

31. Said, “New History, Old Ideas.” Said singled out Ilan Pappe as the only Israeli revisionist historian who had showed consistency at the 1998 Paris meeting with Palestinian historians such as Elias Sanbar. Such tensions, I should add, also exist vis-à-vis the question of the Mizrahim. Tom Segev’s book 1949: The First Israelis (New York: Free Press, 1986) was received positively among leftist Mizrahim and intellectuals in the mid 1980s. We were thrilled that a book, based on the Israeli state archives, indeed indicated an intentional discriminatory policy, yet Segev reproached this reading of his book.


36. Spivak (”Can the Subaltern Speak?”) is the only other postcolonial author to have been translated by the journal, published in an issue that did not generate a reflexive discussion on the journal’s own politics of representation, for example the absence or the very limited presence of local critical “Third World” women (Palestinian or Mizrahi) on its board. Gramsci, another major Saidian intertext not translated by the journal, is forthcoming from Resling Press.

37. Albert Memmi’s books appeared in Hebrew in the following order: Pillar of Salt (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1960), Jews and Arabs (Tel Aviv: Sifriat HaPoalim, 1975), The Liberation of the Jew (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1976), and Racism (Jerusalem: Karmel, 1999).

38. In fact, the Teoria veBikoret editors selected the 1990 version of Bhabha’s “The Other Question” that contained his comment that Said’s “suggestion that colonial power and discourse is possessed entirely by the colonizer” is a “historical and theoretical simplification.” These words were removed in Bhabha’s later version of the same essay in The Location of Culture. Teoria veBikoret’s editors were aware of this later version—as they indicate that Bhabha’s last
paragraph in Hebrew is modified according to the later version. Yet, they frame Said through the prism of the word—"simplification"—omitted in Bhabha’s later version—but which has now become the focal point for Israeli postcolonial studies. For a comparison of the two versions, see Bhabha’s “The Other Question,” in Out There, eds. Russell Ferguson, Martha Gever, Trinh T. Minh-ha, and Cornel West (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1990), p. 77; and Bhabha, The Location of Culture (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 72.

39. Bhabha’s texts acknowledged Said’s work as pioneering, while Said endorsed Bhabha’s The Location of Culture.

40. Of the few exceptions to systematically deploy psychoanalytic-post-colonial framework are Raz Yosef, Beyond Flesh: Queer Masculinities and Nationalism in Israeli Cinema (Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 2004), along with Orly Lubin, who partially incorporates this method in Woman Reading Woman (Haifa: Haifa University Press, 2003).

41. For the Bhabha-over-Said argument, see Yehouda Shenhav, “Jews of Arab Countries in Israel,” in Mizrahim in Israel, eds. Hever, Shenhav, and Pnina Motzafi-Haller (Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute and Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2002), pp. 147–48; and throughout The Arab-Jews (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2003); for the “social psychology” reference, see The Arab-Jews (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2003), p. 115.

42. Shenhav and Hever’s theoretical preface, Teoria veBikoret 20 (Spring 2002), p. 11.


44. Shenhav, “Precious Culture,” in The Israeli Experience, ed. Sami Michael (Tel Aviv: Ma’ariv Book Guild, 2001), p. 87


46. Baram, “The Crown of the East.” He also applied this skewed version of postcolonial theory to the Mizrahi question, which was met by a critical response by Sami Shalom Chetrit, “Fed Up with the Askenazized,” Ma’ariv, 4 April 2003.