

If this is a genocide

A critical discourse analysis of opening addresses at the
Israeli Holocaust Remembrance Day 2014-2021

Gabriel Lindgren

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to the discussion on the relation between memory and security in how Holocaust remembrance discourse affect the construction of security in Israel. By utilizing Norman Fairclough's method of textual and discursive practice it analyzes speeches held by Israeli heads of state at the opening ceremony of Holocaust Remembrance Day between the years 2014-2021. Securitization theory is applied from a mnemonical perspective in order to explain how security, discursive production and identities are constructed. The speeches are analyzed with focus on how their lexico-grammatical composition and interdiscursivity promote a certain view of how to understand the present through imaginaries of the past. The results indicate that the linguistics and discursive practice of remembrance discourses reproduce a view of social reality in which the Holocaust creates meaning to security through depictions of existential survival and historical duty. A securitized meaning conditioned by the depoliticization of Holocaust-prevention and the creation of antagonistic social identities. Lastly, the thesis argues that Holocaust in contemporary Israeli remembrance discourse functions as a securitizing template for Jewish life.

Key words: Israel, Holocaust, remembrance, security, discourse

Words: 19 827

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Problem and purpose	4
1.2	Previous research.....	6
1.3	Disposition	8
2	Methodology	9
2.1	Ontological and epistemological considerations.....	9
2.2	Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis.....	10
2.2.1	Text.....	11
2.2.2	Discursive practice	12
2.2.3	Ideology and hegemony	13
2.3	Case selection, material and demarcation	14
2.4	Operationalization	15
2.5	Ethical considerations	16
3	Theoretical framework.....	18
3.1	Securitization.....	18
3.2	Mnemonic security	19
3.3	The antagonistic-agonistic security nexus.....	21
4	Analysis	23
4.1	Text.....	23
4.1.1	The Holocaust and security	23
4.1.2	The Holocaust and politics	28
4.1.3	The Holocaust and identity	31
4.2	Discursive practice	34
4.2.1	The lesson of the Holocaust	34
4.2.2	Genocide-prevention as depoliticization	37
4.2.3	The ideal survivor.....	39
5	Summary and conclusion	43
6	References.....	48

Abbreviations

CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CS	Copenhagen School
HRD	Holocaust Remembrance Discourse
PM	Prime Minister (of Israel)
PRE	President of the state (of Israel)
IDF	Israel Defense Forces

1 Introduction

What we have so far said and will say concerns the ambiguous life of the Lager. In our days many men have lived in this cruel manner, crushed against the bottom, but each for a relatively short period; so that we can perhaps ask ourselves if it is necessary or good to retain any memory of this exceptional human state. To this question we feel that we have to reply in the affirmative. We are in fact convinced that no human experience is without meaning or unworthy of analysis, and that fundamental values, even if they are not positive, can be deduced from this particular world which we are describing. (Levi 1959: 99)

Thus spoke the Italian author and Holocaust survivor, Primo Levi in his book *If this is a man*. The question Levi poses, namely if remembrance of the Holocaust is necessary and the meaning it entails, has withheld throughout history. Some 75 years after the liberation of such camps as Majdanek, Bergen-Belsen and Auschwitz-Birkenau, the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu stated in his address to the Yad Vashem that on the question of Israeli-Iranian tensions, “unlike what happened in the Holocaust, we are capable and we are determined to defend ourselves with our own power” (Netanyahu 2019). As to illustrate Levi’s point of carefully treading in the annals of the past when deducing it to analysis of the present, this internalization of history displayed the dynamic role of memory, security, and discourses. Illustrating how that which started in Auschwitz in a variety of affecting forms continues to this very day. Memory is by no means just an issue of the past.

The Holocaust, the calculated industrial deportation and subsequent murder of 6 million Jews rests as a solid block within the story of modern Israel. Since the creation of the state, the Holocaust as a collective memory has been immanently intertwined with Israeli society through ceremonies, museums, education, legislation and not least in the lives of survivors and their relatives. As the Holocaust historian Gideon Greif has put it: “Not a day passes without news that is directly or indirectly related to the Holocaust. This means that the Holocaust is part of the history of Israel on the one hand, but also, that it is part of Israel’s present” (Greif 2018: 70). Meanwhile, just as the social perceptions of those survivors settling in Israel were tarnished by the memory of violence and threats to personal security, the contemporary memorial culture of Israel to a large extent involves the same. The presence of the Holocaust as an analogy, metaphor and motivation for Israeli security - ever present during both times of tranquility and turmoil in the public discourse and collective memory - is experiencing a resurgence (Naor 2003: 149).

However, since the mid-1980s a perspective which connected the broad perspective of the horrors of the Holocaust induced by the Adolf Eichmann trial,

with the threats to physical security experienced during the Six-Day War in 1967 and the Yom Kippur War in 1973 set the stage for Holocaust remembrance as an instrumental tool for political mobilization. As the identification and commemorative institutions directed at Holocaust remembrance increased, so did the journalistic, public and political use of the Holocaust as a “template for Jewish life”. It’s during the time of this period where we see the introduction of the tradition of Prime Ministers and Presidents of the State of Israel conducting speeches during the opening ceremony of Yom HaShoah - Holocaust Remembrance Day. As Lustick (2017: 164) notes “the result of this active and unrelenting remembering of an event seen as both the greatest crime in human history and the epitome of what it means to be Jewish, is a culture that marinates Israeli Jews in the images, associations, emotions, and lessons of the Holocaust.”

A swift genealogy of “Holocaustia” indicates that the amount of resources, initiatives and commemorations directed towards Holocaust remembrance constitutes a growing importance of it to Israeli culture, to the degree that it is possible to talk about the Holocaust as a “template for Jewish life” (Lustick 2017: 154). But is such extensive remembrance by default a benevolent phenomenon in society? How is the Holocaust constructed as a memory of the past and an entity of the present, and furthermore what are the consequences?

This thesis intends to study the discursive conditions and consequences of Holocaust remembrance speeches in contemporary Israel. Specifically, its objective is to inquire into the relationship between historic remembrance and the discursive construction of security and identity. By using the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) as developed by Norman Fairclough (1995) to textually and discursively analyze memorial speeches of Israeli political leaders it seeks to illustrate the discursive workings and ideological effects of modern Israeli Holocaust remembrance upon the issue of security. The question of how securitization and identity are produced and conditioned by Holocaust remembrance serves a purpose of inquiry into how the Holocaust is constructed as an influence and defining feature of the state of Israel and its citizens.

1.1 Problem and purpose

By utilizing CDA as its analytical scope this thesis seeks to describe and explain how the discourse of Holocaust remembrance may be used to invoke a certain image of social reality in the context of security. Thereby it aims to expose whether or not remembrance of the Holocaust is a static or fluid entity, and how this position correlates to the creation of a securitized discourse materializing to a certain social construction of contemporary Israeli reality, and possibly excluding discourses that would not be in conjunction with this reality.

The purpose of this thesis is to contribute to the discussion of contemporary Israeli security by addressing the question of security as a contingent phenomenon intertwined and produced by historical discourses rather than an ontologically detached and objectively existing entity. Illustrating whether Holocaust remembrance today has become a contributing element to the securitization within the Israeli state and thereby showcasing the fallacies and flexibility of discourses as well as displaying its ideological underpinnings and necessary conditions in order to function. Specifically, this will be achieved by critical discourse analysis of speeches at the opening ceremony of Holocaust Remembrance Day to examine to which extent framings and functions of discursive conditions within Holocaust remembrance exist, that contribute to a certain discourse on security in the context of history. Having done this, I will then analyze the different discourses with regards to their interdiscursivity in order to reveal the discursive impact and potential hegemony of this. It will then be possible to discuss which concrete measures and conditions of Israeli political society are assumed and contested by the existing Holocaust remembrance discourse produced by political figures. The research questions for this thesis is as follows:

How is security constructed in Israeli Holocaust remembrance discourse?

While bridging the dialectical-relational approach of Fairclough's critical discourse analysis with mnemonic studies of securitization and identity formation, this study further seeks to contribute to the theoretical development of how security and identity is materialized through discourses on memory and remembrance to further broaden the understanding on why memory serves as an important entity in the creation of political subjectivity and assertions of authority (Klymenko 2022).

Beyond the confinements of academic contribution, the analysis of securitization within remembrance discourse is relevant to refine the understanding of the dynamics of antagonistic relations and how remembrance of collective trauma plays into the nature of the zero-sum game between disputants and their motivation for consolidating certain identities. On this backdrop it becomes possible to on the one hand elaborate the understanding of how hegemonic remembrance narratives may bolster processes of securitization at the cost of stifling political pluralism with the result of social tensions. On the other hand, it becomes possible to advance the understanding of how text and discursive practices conditions such antagonistic relations and the structures they rely upon, thereby providing a fruitful entry into how they may be changed in favor of an agonistic social contract. Deconstructing the claims produced by a state for its ontological security displays the social conditions underpinning the remembrance narratives (Ringmar, 1996; Epstein, 2011). Thus, it becomes possible to “imagine different, less fixed and more pluralistic mnemonic narratives for their ‘national’ biographies” (Mälksoo 2015: 223).

1.2 Previous research

The union of IR and studies on collective remembrance of certain historical events has been a growing area of academic research since its inception in the 1980s. The discipline of “memory studies” has permeated and stretched itself onto a number of academic fields and has among many others intersected studies of history, political science, linguistics, psychology and sociology (Klymenko 2022: 1). Initially consolidated in a strict positivist tradition of invoking a distinction between objective history and subjective memory, studies sought to understand how ideational entities such as ideological heritage and collective memory guides state’s behavior such as their foreign and security policy (Banchoff 1997; Langenbacher - Shain 2010). For example Beker (2010: 102-105) describes the political incentive leading to the trial and conviction of British historian David Irving for denying the Holocaust. The Austrian sentencing of Irving in 2006 relates to the target of Austrian officials to reconstruct the memory of the Holocaust from the premise of non-tolerance.

However, as contestation over the claim that history remains objectively accessible in terms of its epistemology and the universal generalizability of it increased, so did the alternative of interpretivist analysis (Lynch 2014). In directing its focus on the creation of meaning within memories and the context-specific use of past events for political ends, the distinction between memory and concrete action such as international policy becomes obsolete. As Müller asserts: “Interests, then, are not formulated prior to the uses and abuses of memory in a clear-cut way, but rather, memory and interests become interdependent, as political meanings and interests emerge in the struggle over past and future.” (2002: 30).

Whereas positivist and interpretivist epistemologies regard history and memory as either discrete ideational entities or instrumentally manipulated for political ends, the main point of discussion regards the epistemological view of history and memory as objective entities where historians assert the integrity of their method and scholars of memory studies refutes it (Fogu - Kansteiner 2006: 299). Without claiming to settle the dispute, this thesis assumes that any attempt, subjective or objective, to assess history and memory is a question of creating a false dichotomy. In accordance with Müller (2002: 24-25) what is of interest is to study how memory is situated, conditioned and expressed within the present through actions of the past.

With the interdisciplinary consolidation of the academic area, the conjunction between memory studies and security studies allowed for the development of several studies which argued for the importance of considering memory when analyzing security from an ontological standpoint (Levanon 2021; Langenbacher – Shain 2010; Edkins 2003). In an attempted taxonomy of the differing point of focus research programs dedicated to the scholarly study of memory and international politics, Klymenko (2022: 4) brings forth the perspective of “secured memory” as an area of interest. The argument is that states produce legitimacy and meaning of action by constructing a certain ontological security based on

historical narratives. Clearly present in the context of traumatic memories, Lerner (2020) argues that narratives of trauma are decisive in the construction of national identity, especially as instruments of projecting grievances onto international parties, and in the process “othering” international actors (Ibid: 7; 10). Furthermore Mälksoo (2015: 228; 232), building on the work of Mouffe (2013) discusses the normative consequences of such processes as not necessarily benign, since this type of remembrance often is securitized through a basic premise of mnemonic consensus. The issue being that such a consensus serves an antagonistic purpose of removing the issue of conflict from political participation, bolstering political dissatisfaction and polarization.

The plethora of research and insights of the field is predominant on the topic of history, memory and remembrance of the Holocaust. Since the interpretivist perspective on memory and politics that this thesis draws upon asserts that generalizability and the creation of a general “one size fits all” - framework of analysis is not feasible, it becomes essential to describe the specific academic inquiries that has addressed the discourses and narratives concerning Holocaust remembrance of victims and perpetrators. How it has been contextualized with security and securitization in the Israeli context and abroad.

In a study striving to analyze the connection between authority of Israeli journalists with commemorative articles, Zandberg (2010) deconstructs the production of journalistic texts on the topic of the Holocaust. The results show that journalists rarely wrote on the basis of their own professional authority, but newspapers instead sought authority in individuals either part of the official establishment or individuals who were survivors of the Holocaust themselves. This relationship between journalism and other social fields indicated that autonomy in the discursive practice of the journalistic field was relatively weak and that the biographical/political precedence of authorship contributed to a sanctification of the commemorative discourse. Zandberg concludes the assessment by presenting an alternative discourse produced by only one newspaper which covers Holocaust remembrance invoking professional journalistic authority. As a result, this discourse stands in contrast with the general framing of commemorations and allows for a more self-reflexive discourse aimed at working through the trauma, rather than just reproducing it as a nationalistic commemoration.

In similar ambition to critically describe and explain the mediation of differently constructed narratives about the Holocaust, Lustick presents four ideal types produced in Israeli culture since the 1940s: the Zionist Proof-text; the Wasting Asset; the Object Lesson for safeguarding human rights; and the Template for Jewish life. (2017: 125). The construction of Holocaust remembrance as an object lesson for safeguarding human rights is rooted in the claim that the genocide is a crime against universalist values and consequently should be understood in strict social scientific sense to prevent genocide as such from happening again. This construction is the most contested and controversial in Israeli collective memory and the study confirms the hegemony of a discourse which instead argues for the Holocaust as a template for Jewish life. A construction in which remembrance serves a fact-rendering purpose of portraying

a Jewish existence in an overwhelmingly non-Jewish world, where every foreign culture contains the potentiality of a final solution. Such a hegemonic discourse is according to Lustick problematic due to its institutionalization which constrains political leaders and producers of opinion to address the Holocaust when contradicting this hegemony, while risking the reproduction of xenophobic suspicion that sustain an antagonistic view of social reality (Ibid: 154, 164).

In summary, remembrance of historic trauma is a well-studied area in which discursive, genealogical and institutional analysis indicate that the perspective on how the Holocaust is framed and remembered in Israel may be consensual, but not neutral or non-contested. Furthermore, the case in question – the opening addresses of Israeli leaders at Holocaust Remembrance Day – has from what this study entails not been systematically scrutinized of its discursive conditions, despite it being the most institutionalized form of remembrance in contemporary Israel. Studies have primarily been concerned with the discursive exclusion itself and how such exclusion may harm democratic inclusion, but not how the discourses function in the creation of Israeli subjectivity in the context of security. The apparent conflict between alternative hegemonic and critical discourses has, from what this study can conclude, hitherto not been analyzed in the context of securitization using Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model for CDA.

1.3 Disposition

In chapter 2 the methodological framework is presented and discussed, including the epistemological and ontological considerations, the methodological approach of CDA, the material, demarcations and how the study intends to ensure validity and reliability while upholding its self-imposed ethical standards. In chapter 3 the theory which will serve the upcoming analysis is presented through a description of securitization, mnemonical security and the antagonistic-agonistic nexus. Chapter 4 constitutes the analytical section of the study structured around Fairclough's three focal points of analyzing text, discourse practices and social practices. Chapter 5 includes the summary and conclusion of the thesis wherein the results will be discussed with regards to the research question and the ambition to understand the materialization and social implications of securitization within Israeli Holocaust remembrance discourse.

2 Methodology

Conducting a critical discourse analysis is a complex and multifaceted scientific endeavor. The manifold of theoretical departures, ontological assumptions and definitions of terms constitutes a broad school of thought and approaches rather than a set of principles laid down and agreed upon. Hence, the interdisciplinary nature of CDA strives for a heterogeneity in which boundaries between theory and methodology are adaptable and dictated by the problem of research in question, rather than the opposite (Meyer - Wodak 2009: 5). Consequently, as CDA does not strive for any totalizing and universally applicable theories it is more appropriate to view the field as an inquiry into how “language use [is] conceived as social practice” (Fairclough 1995: 135).

Since CDA asserts the notion that language and social practice are intertwined in a dialectical relationship of mutual constitution, differing between methodology and theory becomes a question of creating imaginaries rather than two discrete and separable entities. However, for the sake of academic rigor and structure of this thesis I have chosen to make a distinction between the two. The former involves the practical considerations of crafting a convincing structure which makes it possible to analyze discourses, and the latter involves theories on security and identity which hold explanatory value for the analysis. As Meyer and Wodak state on the subject of methodological considerations when conducting CDA “The primary issue here is how the various approaches of CDA are able to ‘translate’ their theoretical claims into instruments and methods of analysis.” (Meyer - Wodak 2009: 23). This exposition of the methodological framework, will therefore focus more on the discourse analytical part of CDA, whereas the theory will focus more on the aspects for potential critical inquiry.

2.1 Ontological and epistemological considerations

In concurrence with the ontological and epistemological assumptions of CDA this thesis departs from interpretivism and constructivism. It does not intend to produce generalizable results applicable to any case similar to or outside the focus of the study, instead it opts for an inquiry into a field of analysis with fruitful opportunities for additional research. Furthermore, the narrow scope of this epistemological position does not mean that the results are of diminishable importance, since the study nevertheless analyzes the discursive effects of a

significant event in Israeli culture and some figures of great importance within its state institutions.

The study adopts the poststructuralist assessment of security that there are no objective ontological facts and that subjective positions of security and identity are produced discursively (Hansen 2010). Due to the purpose of the study to examine how the discursive conditions within Holocaust remembrance contribute to a certain discourse on security and identity, I will not analyze what Fairclough calls the social practice of discourse (Fairclough 1992: 237). Such a demarcation suits the theoretical scope of the study as it also limits itself to consider how securitizing moves and securitization is produced in HRD and not primarily the practical consequences of these.

2.2 Fairclough's critical discourse analysis

CDA as proposed by Fairclough stems from an assessment that the concept of discourse can be regarded as (1) language use conceived as social practice; (2) language associated within a specific social activity; (3) a way of signifying [i.e. giving meaning to an] experience from a particular perspective (Fairclough 1995: 135). Each definition serves a purpose of displaying the functions of discourses, namely how discourses contribute to the construction of social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and meaning (Jørgensen - Philips 2002: 67).

This leads to the conclusion that CDA targets two focal points of discourse: the communicative event and the order of discourse. The former is in Fairclough's work contextualized by the three-dimensional model of analysis which targets the textual, discursive and social circumstances of the event. The latter focuses on the structure of genres accessible and in use in a certain social domain and consequently the available and not available discourses that may be used.

In conjunction these two dimensions of analysis relate to each other dialectically meaning that a communicative event may reproduce, refute or change orders of discourse (Jørgensen - Philips 2002: 71). Consequently, discourses are to be understood as both constitutive and constituted in a varying and contingent manner over time. The dialectics of this relationship leads Fairclough to the postulation that every social practice includes semiotic – meaning making - elements (Meyer - Wodak 2009: 27).

It is this semiosis - internal but not reducible to itself - which is present in all social practices such as social relations, powers, institutions, beliefs and so on, that creates a bridge between structure and action. The view that semiosis and social practice are different but not discrete leads Fairclough to asking the question which then may be applied to all phenomenon of the social, including the question of meaning-making in Holocaust remembrance: "What is the relationship between semiotic and other elements?" (Fairclough 2009: 163).

Elaborated upon, the communicative event entails three dimensions of focus relevant to the researcher. Discourse, according to Fairclough, is simultaneously a

spoken or written text, discursive practice (meaning the production and interpretation of text) and a sociocultural practice (Fairclough 1995: 97). The discourse is not static in its sociocultural position, but exists at several levels departing from the immediate event and extending up to the very scope of society at its largest. Thus, the method of critical discourse analysis asserts that a communicative event functions through mediation by the discursive practice, between the text and the social practice. Hence, text and discursive practice needs to be analyzed in conjunction. As described in section 2.1 this thesis will not engage itself in analysis of the social practice since the purpose is not to analyze the consequences of HRD but how HRD through text and discourse ideologically conditions. Each of these dimensions will now be further explained.

2.2.1 Text

Textual analysis in the three-dimensional framework serves a descriptive purpose in which the analysis focuses on the textual entities which linguistically realizes discourses and genres (Jørgensen - Philips 2002: 69). Specifically, the textual analysis should focus on cohesion, grammar and vocabulary.

Cohesion regards the certain arguments, narrative and assumptions inducing a subjective position - i.e. ideological consequence - which clauses and sentences together create (Fairclough 1992: 174; 235). The purpose of this exercise is to display what Fairclough calls “the rhetorical mode” which refers to whether a clause can be classified as argumentative, descriptive, expository etc. (Ibid: 127). In the context of this thesis this will involve the analysis of such clauses of HRD that relates to the question of security and constitutes a securitizing move.

Grammar concerns the analysis of transitivity and modalities to reveal agency, causality, affiliation and responsibility in the text. Firstly, transitivity is presented as instrumental to analyze, meaning the verbs, nouns, pronouns, adverbs, prepositional and adverbial phrases which makes it possible to position the speaker's reflection and cognition of the world (Khan - Eid 2020: 110). According to Fairclough (1992: 236) this can reveal which processes and participants of discourses are favored depending on the agency and responsibility. Secondly, modality constitutes the degree of affinity which a text proposes to its statements and whether these are predominantly framed in subjective or objective terms (Ibid). As Halliday describes the phenomena it deals with the “speaker's judgement of the probabilities or the obligations involved in what he is saying” (1994:75). The analysis thus serves a purpose of revealing commitments constructing certain social relations, systems of meaning and knowledge to reveal whether HRD as it is presented in the material is discursively open for deliberation and interpretation or if it's disclosed for a particular construction of social reality.

Vocabulary as the third pillar of textual analysis serves the purpose of deconstructing specific uses of words “whose meanings are variable and changing; and upon the meaning potential of a word a particular structuring of its

meanings - as a mode of hegemony and a focus of struggle” (Fairclough 1992: 236). The idea being that the choices of word and wording hold meaning to issues and processes of social importance and contestation. A thorough analysis of this can consequently illustrate social hegemonies and power relations (Ibid: 185-186).

In summary, the goal of this holistic approach to textual analysis is to get insight into how texts produce the underlying semiosis of social events and relations, which in turn constructs a specific version of social reality and social identities (Jørgensen - Phillips 2002: 83).

2.2.2 Discursive practice

Analyzing what Fairclough calls the discursive practice, i.e. the mediating level between text and social practice, serves to illuminate the interpretative characteristics of the discourse. This part of the analysis will strive to analyze the production, distribution and consumption of HRD. However, as Jørgensen and Phillips (2002: 82) describe and Fairclough (1995: 134) concurs, the analysis tends to focus on the linguistic relationship between the communicative event and the order of discourse to identify which discourses are drawn upon and how they together with conventions are articulated. Hence, the production will be favored as a focus of analysis rather than the consumption of the text, since the thesis is interested in understanding the production of a certain construction of mnemonic security.

This is done by identifying the interdiscursivity and the intertextuality of the communicative event. Interdiscursivity lies within the intertextuality of the text, both addressing “the constitution of a text from diverse discourses and genres” (Fairclough 1995: 135). By analyzing the intertextuality, it becomes possible to address the implicit and explicit texts which the material is based upon and the production of discourse in terms of producers and the institutional positions of these. The notion that texts are non-autonomous entities, always drawing upon other texts holds importance for the idea that discourses influence how subjects are constituted. Thus, intertextuality generates an ideological influence of how human beings and processes are represented and collectively constituted (Fairclough 1992: 134). For example, intertextuality between HRD and educational discourse could indicate a certain power relation regarding how the Holocaust is to be epistemologically understood.

Analysis of interdiscursivity then reveals how different discourses are combined and configured in the text, for example how different discourses on how militarized, historical and political discourses on the Holocaust are configured in order to be interconnected with certain discourses of security and identity. More complex and latently displayed than intertextuality, the method relies on interpreting the text from how its rhetorical mode is constructed in terms of its position and purpose and how style, genre and setting of the discourse draws upon other discourses in order to create a certain type of knowledge (Fairclough

1992: 129-130). Through such a dissection of HRD it is possible to reconstruct how, for example what constitutes “the lesson of the Holocaust” and how that lesson should be learned.

Thus, emphasizing how CDA pendulates between a focus on structures through shifts in the orders of discourse and a focus on strategies of social agents, analysis of the discursive practice, the analysis of interdiscursivity immanent in the discursive practice constitutes a link and not an objective between text and social practice (Fairclough 2013: 180). Hence the analysis of the discursive practice will set out to identify the relation between Holocaust remembrance speeches and discourses motivating security strategies through a common set of genres and categorization of topics and sub-topics within discourses.

2.2.3 Ideology and hegemony

To methodologically infer analyzable results from the deconstruction of text and discursive practice, it is necessary to understand the medium which renders language with meaning, namely ideology and hegemony.

I understand ideology in this context as a dynamic and non-totalizing entity with the primary purpose of signifying and constructing meaning within discourses and text that can either produce, reproduce or transform an existing social relation, such as that between discourse and security (Fairclough 1992: 87). Ideology cannot be reduced to either a specific political idea, for example Zionism, and it does not exist in a simple form either textually or discursively. Instead it is “located both in the structure (i.e. orders of discourse) which constitute the outcome of past events and the conditions for current events, and in events themselves as they reproduce and transform their conditioning structure.” (Fairclough 1992: 89). The one-sided construction of practices which ideology imposes, serves the purpose of suppressing those contradictions and dilemmas which are in dissonance with the interests of the ideology (Chouliaraki – Fairclough 1999: 26). It is in this process of naturalization and denaturalization of discourses through ideological meaning-making we find the importance of understanding the order of discourse as a struggle for hegemony.

Hegemony as a concept stemming from critical theory considers how ideology produces and reinforces domination by rendering social relations and practices as natural. It is pointing towards the critical imperative of how seemingly consensual and value-neutral discourses in fact reproduce relations of domination. However, hegemony as “the relative permanency of articulations of social elements” (Chouliaraki – Fairclough 1999: 24-25) is perceived as a suppressing phenomenon destined to fail due to the impossibility of the openness of the social reality to correspond to the totalizing promises of the hegemony. Ideological contestation and struggle for hegemony are thus bound to bear discursive consequences. More specifically, the overdetermination of ideological hegemony results in problems of identity for the subjective group of the ideology (Laclau – Mouffe 1985: 104). Since discourses or social groups challenging the hegemony always exist, the

impossibility of ideology to achieve “social closure” bolsters social antagonism as domination is predicated upon the difference and non-equivalency between the in- and the outgroup (Chouliaraki – Fairclough 1999: 123). It is thus paramount in this analysis to include antagonism and its inverse as a point of analysis, since it allows for an assessment of whether HRD’s order of discourse is reproduced or open for transformation. For further elaboration on the nexus of antagonism-agonism, see section 3.3.

Ideological analysis through CDA explains the semiosis of a discourse while also contextualizing that discourse within a hegemonic struggle to understand its production, reproduction and potential transformation taking place within the hegemony. Hence, the results of this thesis will rely heavily on the method explaining the ideological meaning making behind securitization in HRD. The end goal is to clarify under which social conditions the current HRD is sustained under and respectively how the discourse functions in order to change or reproduce these conditions.

2.3 Case selection, material and demarcation

CDA encourages analytic inquiry into subjects and institutions rendered uncontroversial in the sense that they are constructed and consensually accepted as true (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 5). As Lustick has shown among the four types of constructions concerning the Holocaust in Israeli political culture, the construction of the Holocaust “as an object lesson about the need to protect the human rights of all peoples” has been the least successful (Lustick 2017: 149). Hence, if Holocaust remembrance is supposedly ruled by a hegemonic discourse that excludes discourses pertaining to for example democratic practice, while under the premise of homogenic consensus enabling reproducing antagonistic social tendencies, then the case may be more than fruitful for discursive inquiry. Or as Naor puts it: “In the use of the “lessons of the Holocaust”-without any serious historical attempt to define the meaning of this expression and its consequences against trading territories for peace, the art of political manipulation is being fully and powerfully revealed.” (2003: 149)

The material of this study consists of speeches by Israeli Prime Ministers and Presidents at Holocaust Martyrs’ and Heroes’ Remembrance Day memorial ceremony in the period of 2014-2021. The reason for this selection is both practical and theoretical. The period post-2014 is a practical demarcation to avoid compromising with analytic quality. It is also selected on the basis that 2014 marks the deliberation and subsequent implementation of the Iran nuclear deal, the election of Donald Trump as president of the United States in which American support for Israel increased, as well as the outbreak of the Covid-19 virus. A period where external events may have contributed to great political and social change in Israel.

Fairclough (1992: 237-238) argues that there are no direct answers to what constitutes a sufficient sample of data in a CDA, but one guideline that will be

used in the thesis is the standard of ensuring that the results can explain even detailed features of the discourse. The scale for which such detail will be determined reconnects to the theoretical framework – I.e. if the analysis is able to determine whether HRD constitutes an ideological edifice contributing to securitization.

For reasons of time and space, limits are also imposed on the width of analysis when it comes to text and discursive practice. On the textual level the analysis will predominantly focus on the features of transitivity and modalities in order to reveal how these produce certain meanings and materializations of reality. Analysis of discursive practice intends to showcase the production and consumption of text through its intertextuality and interdiscursivity and how it relates to the order of discourse. As the purpose of this study is to analyze how Holocaust remembrance functions as a discursive instrument to securitize, discursive consumption will not be addressed explicitly. From the results of the analysis of discursive practice this thesis then uses the theories of securitization and mnemonic security to explain how ideology and hegemony influences the social reality of Holocaust remembrance.

2.4 Operationalization

As Fairclough states (1995: 97), each level constituting the totality of discourse pertains to a different purpose of analysis. Whereas the discursive practice tends to an explanatory and interpretive purpose, respectively, the textual analysis tends to a descriptive purpose. Operationalization thus, holds greatest importance in the textual analysis since this function as the foundation for the interpretation of discursive practice and subsequent explanation of social practice. Extraction of data was done in two steps. Firstly, the speeches were thoroughly read in order to identify textual signifiers among the grammar, cohesion and vocabulary in HRD in the context of security, the state of Israel and the Jewish people. Secondly, excerpts of these were further analyzed on their properties of illustrating meaning, affiliation and attributions of processes/entities they produce.

Discursive practice is operationalized on the basis of interpretation of the results of the textual analysis. Three discursive topics contextualized to a specific theme: knowledge (The lesson of the Holocaust), existence (Genocide-prevention as depoliticization) and identity (The ideal survivor) are analyzed with regards to their intertextuality and interdiscursivity, in order to illustrate the types and genres of discourses used and how these relate to the order of discourse, that Holocaust remembrance discourse belongs to. Both the level of text and discursive practice were analyzed with regards to their properties of displaying and practicing discourses on the theoretical themes of securitization, depoliticization and antagonistic-agonistic structure of social relations. The hermeneutics of this thesis should thus be seen as a reflection of the theoretical framework analyzed through Fairclough's two dimensions.

2.5 Ethical considerations

Executing a rigorous CDA necessitates self-reflection on one's own ontological and epistemological position. Although I can argue that my intentions of conducting this study contains no private, professional or personal agenda, beyond the illumination of inequality and political injustices, disclosing that I am a white, male, occidental student may be at play from my subjective position as the conductor of this thesis. A concern regarding the ethical standard of this study will be directed towards avoiding language that reproduces dominating hegemonies of primordial/instrumental discourses, and avoiding the risk of being appropriated for social engineering (Fairclough 1992: 232; Jørgensen - Phillips 2002: 88). However, this is a superficial assessment that does not guarantee the ethical rigor of the study. Instead it is important to discuss the critical “why” of this study. Why is it motivated to critically analyze the practices of Holocaust remembrance and what is the motivation from the standpoint of critical discourse analysis that gives it claim to successfully doing that? Why critique?

CDA is “is unabashedly normative: any critique by definition presupposes an applied ethics.” (van Dijk 1993: 253). However, it is relevant to understand that the social imperative of CDA is not absolved of problems. Discourses are historically contingent, even when universally applied or based on a set of very particular conditions. Foucault (2007: 47) argues that norms and values, embedded in discourses hold the potential to become instruments of governance and hegemonic repression, even such norms as democracy, peace and emancipation. Approaching repressive discourses with the target of providing an external solution to them can run the risk of exchanging one type of hegemonic subordination with another. Even the idea of human rights constitutes a set of developed norms that are not autonomous from context, time and space (Van Dijk 2009: 62). This, I argue, remains the great ethical challenge to conducting a CDA - to avoid criticizing HRD from a standpoint that reproduces occidental perspectives on such issues as democracy, liberty and equality.

Even though CDA as a discipline understands itself as engaging in critique of the naturalization of discourses – especially when such naturalization is conditioned upon social domination and suffering aimed at transforming social injustices (Chouliaraki – Fairclough 1999) Foucault's assessment of critique as that which “is the movement by which the subject gives himself the right to question truth on its effects of power and question power on its discourses of truth” (2007: 47), displays how the scope for questioning would be prone for infinite circle-reasoning and relativism with regards to the proposed external solutions to the problems of the discourse. I will thus compromise with Fairclough's method to instead focus on deconstructing HRD to display its internal inconsistencies with its pronounced intentions. To avoid the logic of this reasoning that coherent discourses are non-problematic, for example that a coherent racist discourse is not normatively justified to criticize, I adhere to the hypothesis of Herzog that the only guiding norm for social critique is that “(human) [sic!] made suffering should be avoided” (2016: 281; 288). Hence the

ethical motivation of this thesis is as follows: HRD as it stands and the norms it produces must be rejected if not reconcilable with the notion of avoiding human-made suffering. Consequently, clarity about the conclusions inferred from the analysis will be of utmost importance and thoroughly measured on this ethical scale.

3 Theoretical framework

The ambition of this thesis is to criticize HRD on the basis that it reproduces a certain master narrative with discursive consequences for the creation of security and identity. To further broaden the understanding on why memory serves as an important entity in the creation of political subjectivity and assertions of authority I will use three theoretical concepts used in the analysis of text and discursive practice. Firstly, securitization theory is applied to analyze how security threats, objects and subjects are discursively produced through HRD. Secondly, theories of mnemonic security and depoliticization will explain how and why certain practices of remembrance tends to a purpose of alleviating memory from political potency. Thirdly, description of social relations structured along the nexus of antagonism-agonism will serve as an explanatory framework for the consequences and reproduction of securitization from a perspective of identity.

3.1 Securitization

Since its introduction by Ole Wæver (1995) and its development through the Copenhagen School in the late 1990s, securitization has become a well-established field in security studies as a constructivist theory with strong links to linguistic philosophy. In its definitional form securitization theory argues that security is a “move”, relocating political issues to a sphere of security and removing them from the established arena of political deliberation. An issue presented as an existential threat, needing extraordinary measures is viewed as an issue which has been securitized. As Buzan et al. states: “If by means of an argument about the priority and urgency of an existential threat the securitizing actor has managed to break free of procedures or rules he or she would otherwise be bound by, we are witnessing a case of securitization.” (1998: 25). Concretely this process includes a securitizing actor who mobilizes heuristic artifacts through an articulation of different practices in order to build a construction of implications. Implications about the vulnerability of a referent object through a depiction of a referent subject as constituting an unprecedented threat that motivates exceptional action (Balzaq 2010: 3). The securitizing actor could for example be head of state, mobilizing a memory to depict an “in-group” as unprecedentedly threatened by an “out-group” in order to align security with the securitizing actors’ choices and rationale.

The ontological alignment between securitization theory and CDA is apparent, since the former resonates the analytical focus on language and discourse.

However, the CS is very clear that a mere construction of a certain issue in terms of its threat and risk to security does not suffice as a securitization itself. In similarity to CDA this is just viewed as the discursive production, or securitizing move. For an issue to be fully securitized it needs to be accepted as such by the intended audience. This materialization of the discourse is according to Buzan et al. (1998) facilitated by a set of internal and external conditions. Internally, the lingo-discursive practices of grammar, vocabulary and textual construction is regarded as the conditioning factor that determines whether an issue is described in terms of the threat it poses and the measures prescribed to deal with that threat. Hence, an existential threat described as necessitating emergency measures can be said to constitute a powerful securitizing move. Externally, the materialization of the securitizing move depends on the position of the securitizing actor in terms of its authority as well as the specificity of the threat described. A speaker in a strong position of authority, such as a head of state specifying a threat and framing it in terms of its existential threat and call for deterrence is more likely to enjoy broad legitimacy (Ibid).

One relationship which the CS is self-reflective of when it comes to the consequences of securitization is that between securitization and depoliticization. Whether securitization is a form of depoliticization or hyperpoliticization induced by a total co-option of a securitized question by political leaders, remains disputed (Mälksoo 2015: 228). I understand securitization as both, on the basis that one can differ between “the political”, the social sphere of politics, and politics itself meaning the concrete deliberation and pluralism of ideas (McDonald, 2008: 579). Securitization leads to a rejection of the political sphere, while the exceptionality of actions induced by the constructed threat leads to a hyperpoliticization as exceptional measures become feasible.

This study accepts the notion that desecuritization is preferable to its alternative on the basis that the question of security and mnemonical remembrance are inherently political arenas of deliberation and engagement which is forestalled by the depoliticizing effect of securitization (Edkins 1999: 11). Thus, the methodological motives of CDA to a great extent run parallel to the theoretical point of analysis in securitization theory.

3.2 Mnemonic security

In the theoretical framework of securitization and ontological security, it is central to ask the question of what is being secured from a perceived threat and by whom it is being secured. Theorists argue that the creation of ontological security beyond material conditions such as territorial integrity, continuous existence of population and state institutions, also depends on non-material conditions. As such, both physical and normative survival hold great importance to the constitution of the self whether it be for a territory, population or collective narrative (Creppel 2011: 455). The latter notion of a narrative to consolidate a

coherent and consistent self-biography relates to the ambitions of states to ideationally survive and consequently “each state also wishes to secure its being as a certain sort of being; to guarantee its cohesiveness in order to reduce the fundamental unpredictability of the surrounding environment and its own vulnerability vis-a-vis other political actors.” (Mälksoo 2015: 224). According to Mitzen (2006: 351) this phenomenon could explain the irrational action of states on the international arena as deriving from a rigid standpoint of what constitutes the normative conditions of that state’s security.

One such form of ontological “survival as being” is the concept of mnemonic security. According to this strand of security studies, history, memory and remembrance are no exceptions to the creation of normative survival. The understanding is that remembrance exists in public consciousness to stabilize actors’ ideas of their own political agency (Mälksoo 2015: 222). Mnemonic narratives are possible to securitize. The motives of such a securitization of the past are diverse. However, it occurs within the securitizing intention of relating to the past and basing action in the present upon it, for the upholding of a certain coherent narrative of existence (Buzan et al. 1998: 21). By the logic that exceptional threats such as threats to existence require exceptional measures it becomes possible to render historical remembrance as a bearing factor and motivator for concrete actions of constraining what is perceived to be a threat (Mitzen 2006: 353). For example, the need to deter the risk of a contemporary repetition of the Holocaust.

The problems appear when taking into considerations how the rigidity of certain practice of remembrance may be at odds with a competing narrative. As Mälksoo (2015: 227) points out the securitizing move of discursively constructing an issue as a security issue may lead to securitization when limits are imposed on what historical events are permitted to be remembered, and how:

The securitization of historical ‘memory’ whereby ‘our’ narrative of the past is seen as being viciously misunderstood and misrepresented by other(s), whose vision of the past is thus regarded as existentially endangering for our existence as ‘us’, tends to reproduce mutual insecurities and reinstate historical animosities instead of alleviating them. (Mälksoo 2015: 222)

The normative protection of a particular past, may express itself through strategies of condemnation, delegitimization or criminalization in order “to secure a self by antagonizing others by the logic of survival” (Ibid: 228). Since such strategies renders, what could be an open and democratic debate on the past, impossible due to entrenchment of a moral fight between non-negotiable values.

This anti-political move is problematic because “the attempts to forge a mnemonic consensus [...] seek to overcome this antagonism [between competing historical narratives]; but, ultimately, end up confirming its state of seeming permanence, because ‘the political in its antagonistic dimension cannot be made to disappear by simply denying it or wishing it away’” (Mälksoo 2015: 227). Securitization, where visions of a certain past are shrouded as moral and the opposite as immoral, leads to competing narratives and groups being framed as

enemies destined to be fought and destroyed rather than actors “whose ideas might be fought, even fiercely, but whose right to defend those ideas is not to be questioned” (Mouffe, 2013: 6–7). In other words, depending on the degree of reflexive thinking that is possible from a discursive point of view, securitization of memory is bound to limit itself towards other forms of memory, and if motivations of survival deem it necessary - concretely confront or destroy the “other” (Ibid).

That securitization of memory and the creation of security pertaining to a collective narrative that it induces points toward the political importance of remembrance discourses and the potential of CDA to attain the consequences of a mnemonic “master narrative” (Berenskoetter 2014: 279). To further understand the theoretical assessment why this is the case it is necessary to further describe the antagonistic-agonistic nexus.

3.3 The antagonistic-agonistic security nexus

Critical security studies have repeatedly asserted that a fundamental aspect of modern security concerns the nexus between antagonism and agonism (Nagle 2014; Strömbom 2019). It proscribes a view of security which question the naturalization of security and universal understanding of security.

Antagonism refers to the idea that social relations and formation of identity are dependent upon the difference in the social space (Aggestam et al 2015: 1738). As constitutive of social relations antagonism is inherent in “the political”, understood as the ontological constitution of society, but as Mouffe (2013) has indicated it is not necessarily inherent to “politics”, meaning the spheres of political practice and institutions. However, as antagonism in modern societies is hegemonic in political life it structures politics as a totality where conflict and differences are problematized. This constrain of democratic conflict within the perimeters of the capitalist order leads to antagonism since, social, economic and political structural differences are impossible to neutralize (Tulumello 2021: 331). What can be called antagonistic security, thus constitutes the presumption that politics are a zero-sum game between enemies, where political space is disclosed to the ruling hegemony. The paradox of antagonistic security, consequently is that its totalizing view of security leads to further entrenchment of conflict and hostility it seeks to resolve, since it constrains the political space to not include discourses that do not correspond to the hegemonic idea of absolute security (Aggestam et al 2015: 1736).

If it is to be regarded as true that the political arena is not – as antagonistic security ascribes it to be - inherently an arena “between enemies, that is, persons who have no common symbolic space” (Mouffe, 2000: 13), the alternative emerges as the concept of agonistic security. As Aggestam et al (2015: 1738) argues agonistic security seek to create this very political space between legitimate adversaries in which contestation can take place and the non-totality of

society is agreed upon. Central to achieving such a political sphere is for institutions and arenas to be open for politics of negotiation and scrutiny, in order for interaction and articulation between “persons who are friends because they share a common symbolic space but also enemies because they want to organize this common symbolic space in a different way” (Tulumello 2021: 331). Consequently, the idea is to stop physical conflict, or war as the continuation of politics with other means, by providing the political means and therefore pave the way for the transformation of social relations and security. Whereas antagonism seek – but ultimately fails - to transcend the inherent antagonism of the political by totalizing – agonism seek to address it.

Understandably, the antagonistic-agonistic nexus is comparable to the concepts of securitization. It stresses the depoliticizing dynamics and consequences of securitization in how it explains why memory and security as constrained by a securitizing discourse may lead to self-reproductive antagonistic security.

4 Analysis

The analysis of the material consists of two sections. Sections 4.1 analyzes the text of speeches at the opening ceremony of Yom HaShoah in the years 2014-2021 with regards to cohesion, grammar and vocabulary. Part 4.2 analyzes the discursive practice or the production and consumption of discourse within the material, through the scope of intertextuality and interdiscursivity in order to establish topics and genres and describe the order of discourse. The sub-sections of the textual and discursive analysis follow from the three overarching theoretical themes of securitization, depoliticization and antagonism, which each are materialized through a set of chosen characteristics, for example how survivors are constructed.

4.1 Text

Since the Holocaust permeates the speeches held at the opening ceremony of Yom HaShoah I have selected three themes for textual analysis of the speeches conducted by PM:s and PRE:s in the period of 2014-2021. More specifically the Holocaust in relation to security, politics, and identity. Each of these themes in turn reflects the theoretical framework of securitization, depoliticization and antagonism. Methodologically the contexts are analyzed to reveal discursive patterns and irregularities in terms of cohesion, grammar, and vocabulary.

4.1.1 The Holocaust and security

Cohesion

Understanding how mnemonic security and securitization is realized textually within the speeches, lexical cohesion provides insight into how different words, metaphors and narratives are connected within a clause as a reflection of the ideology of the textual producer (Fairclough 1992: 235). A useful guide to assert this practically we find by describing the textual existence of a referent subject, a referent object, a heuristic artifact, a viable threat and a form of solution (Buzan et al 1998: 25).

As for the referent subject, the threat without doubt is constituted by Iran, “this murderous regime” (Netanyahu 2018) “[which] is sending threats of annihilation

day in and day out” (Netanyahu 2019). The threat being grounded as Netanyahu describes it, in that:

Just as the Nazis aspired to crush civilization and to establish a "master race" to replace it in controlling the world while annihilating the Jewish people, so too does Iran strive to gain control over the region, from which it would spread further, with the explicit intent of obliterating the Jewish state. (Netanyahu 2015)

Equally, the threat itself is presented as Iran’s willingness and capability to attain nuclear weapons to potentially use to annihilate Israel. So far, the referent subject and threat are clearly formulated. However, the referent object and solution to the situation attains its true meaning only in the context of the heuristic artifact, specifically how the situation with Iran is possible to compare with that of the Nazis and the Holocaust. The heuristic artifact of the memory of the Holocaust here takes two analogical forms, comparing the present with external and internal factors of the past.

Externally, the presented solitude of Israel’s account of security on the international arena, is not framed in terms of different analyzes or policies pertaining to security, but the inability of international community as infantile, naïve, blind and deaf towards that which is “taking place in broad daylight” (Netanyahu 2015), i.e. Iran’s alleged ambition to take over large parts of the Middle East. The analogy which Netanyahu makes from this assessment of the vulnerability of Israeli solitude and contemporary international passivity is one of history risking to repeat itself. Namely that Iran on accounts of its interest for nuclear power is approached through methods of appeasement rather than deterrence just as Hitler was approached with appeasement in the Munich agreement of 1938:

Some people delude themselves, just like what happened in Munich in 1938, that the agreement signed with the Iranian regime, this murderous regime, will stop its belligerence. But throughout history, we've seen time and time again how agreements with regimes of this nature were not worth the paper that they were written upon. This is exactly what happened to the Munich agreement and this is exactly what is happening today with the nuclear agreement. Signing this agreement with Iran not only did not diminish aggression and belligerence, it only strengthened and intensified it. The agreement ignored the efforts of Iran to develop the industry of ballistic missile construction and it allows it to continue its path and to enrich huge quantities of uranium and a whole arsenal of nuclear bombs. (Netanyahu 2018)

Internally, the referent subject of Iran posing a threat, the Holocaust’s function as an analogy for the present indicates a clear link to a certain narrative of what constitutes the referent object, that which is threatened. It is materialized through a description of the victims of the Holocaust. The narrative of Holocaust victims as in part allowing themselves to be slaughtered, clearly reproduces the idea of absence of military security as the predominant factor that contributed to the Holocaust (Lustick 2017). As Netanyahu states:

Our policy vis a vis Iran is clear. In the military field, a very strong stance against the attempts of Iran to establish themselves along our borders, and internally pressure, pressure and more pressure. Against the threats of annihilation Israel would not extend its throat to be slaughtered. Unlike what happened in the Holocaust, we are capable and we are determined to defend ourselves with our own power. (Netanyahu 2019)

Thus, international deliberation and non-military measure are not options at hand. Rivlin (2016) similarly asserts the purpose of the IDF by saying that “we should always be able to defend ourselves – we should not privatize our security.” However, he does not present the purpose of the IDF in relation to the Holocaust as primarily a question of material security against annihilation, but instead a relational process in which “the Holocaust put into perspective the necessity and crucial need of the Jewish people to return to its historical roots, as a nation that takes its fate in its hands.” Thus, he uses the Holocaust as a token needed for identifying the value of historical grounding and national determination in security.

The analysis of cohesion indicates a clear narrative concerning security. In terms of securitization the following can be deduced from the texts: Firstly, the referent object of Israeli existence is threatened. Secondly, the existential threat is posited by the referent subject Iran, especially in capacity of being a potential nuclear power. Thirdly, neutrality or disagreement to this assertion is metaphorically constructed as naïve complicity with the potential annihilation of Israel and its population as a consequence. As if to tie together the rhetorical mode of the argumentative cohesion of the relation between the Holocaust and security, Netanyahu frames security in strict existential terms. Namely, that “the awareness of danger is a prerequisite for life” (Netanyahu 2019). For whom this awareness of danger applies to and what the solution might be remains to be articulated, which connects to section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

Grammar

Remembrance of the Holocaust as moral, political and historical scale for policy appears frequently throughout the speeches. Hence a recurring method for the speakers to produce the cognitive basis for such a perception comes in the form of a relational process of applying transitivity (Khan - Eid 2020: 110). The Holocaust functions as a token for the process of identifying the need for the Israelis of today and tomorrow to remember and relate to it in, order to understand its contemporary similarities. Rivlin (2018) illustrates this, speaking about the internalization of the Holocaust:

Those who are willing to look courageously into their past and to bravely contend with anti-Semitism and racism that continue to raise their ugly head even today, will find in us their allies, determined partners in the paving of the way that leads from memory to the future. (Rivlin 2018)

The relational transitivity being constructed between the generalized group “Those who are willing to look” at the token of anti-Semitism and racism is connected to the other group through the identifying process “will find in us their allies, determined partners in the paving of the way that leads from memory to the future.” In other words, this is what is required to be considered an ally of Israel in its view of security. Such an outcome is clearly defined as desired due to it being described as acting “courageously” and “bravely”.

The crux of this proposition rests in the notion of it being conditioned by a shared assessment of history as the “us” in the clause which is negated by the fact of the passive verb “are willing”, indicating the assumption that this process is naturally existent as long as there exists a will to do so. As we have asserted in the previous section, this is conditioned by adopting the securitization of the threat Iran poses. However, it is clear that such a compliance to Israel’s assessment is not expected from the international community. Netanyahu literally presents his distrust. “The bad deal that is being made with Iran demonstrates that the historic lesson has not been internalised.” (Netanyahu 2015). Such a permissive modality is instrumental to understanding how Netanyahu holds precedence over the determination of security and what is the right interpretation of it.

The international community's apathy in combination with the view of an increased threat towards Israel in its immediate surroundings is a theme often brought forth by Netanyahu:

The West is yielding in the face of Iran's aggressive actions. Instead of demanding a significant dismantling of the nuclear program in Iran - a country that clearly states its plans to exterminate six million Jews here and elsewhere, to eradicate many countries and many regimes - the superpowers back down. (Netanyahu 2015)

A mental picture is thus constructed of the west’s attitude to threats as “yielding”, i.e. well aware of the consequences of its action, while not caring about them. By using the west as a “senser”, mentally reacting to the phenomena of Iran’s aggressive actions he is able to produce a two-folded image of the West as morally corrupt and unable to promote a “significant dismantling” of Iran’s nuclear program:

There are those who choose to overlook the intentions of Iran, who etches on its missiles “Israel must be wiped out,” and holds Holocaust-denial contests. These days they have a Holocaust-denial cartoon competition. Is there anything more depraved than that? We do not ignore this. Some are willing to accept Iran having nuclear weapons, but we do not and will not. (Netanyahu 2016)

Through such statements Netanyahu manages to showcase two things about the perception of Israeli security in reference to its friends and foes in the international community. He activates the existence of overlookers to the threats to Israel without specifying the nature of these actors, through the phrase “*There are* those who choose to overlook”. In this case he displays the idea that countries who don’t confront Iran on its missile’s etchings or it’s Holocaust-denial

competitions agree with the purpose of these phenomena. A keyword is “choose”, since it transmits the idea that the knowledge of Iran's hostile position and events of Holocaust-denial should be enough to neglect Iran the right to possess nuclear weapons. By then asking the question “Is there anything more depraved than that?” He is able to produce an ideological worldview of antagonistic and passive actors as equal in contrast to the security interests of Israel and equal in their intentions. In other words, anyone who refutes HRD, by implication, supports Iran’s nuclear ambition and constitutes a threat to Israel, implying that anti-HRD and the ambition to eradicate the state of Israel are mutually constitutive.

Similarly, to the analysis of cohesion, once the threat and referent subject has been established, the Holocaust as a heuristic artifact is brought forth as an analogy to describe the present and its solutions through the use of modalities:

When the war ended, the conclusion was clear: there is no room for weakness when facing tyrannous regimes who send their murderous tentacles in every direction. (Netanyahu 2015)

The solution to this complicity arises in the need for a strong, deterring military force whose purpose Rivlin (2016) asserts a high degree of affinity to by saying that: “We should always be able to defend ourselves – we should not privatize our security.”

Vocabulary

The use of certain words, indicates the activation of different roles, threats, and solutions to the described security dilemma. The threat posed towards Israel is regularly described in existential terms. Iran seeks to “annihilate” the Jewish people and “obliterate” the state of Israel in an ambition “to disseminate destruction and death” (Netanyahu 2015). This is followed by similar descriptions of the Iranian regime itself as a referent subject pathologically obsessed with the death and destruction of Jews and Israel.

The West is yielding in the face of Iran's aggressive actions. Instead of demanding a significant dismantling of the nuclear program in Iran - a country that clearly states its plans to exterminate six million Jews here and elsewhere, to eradicate many countries and many regimes - the superpowers back down. (Netanyahu 2015)

An observant reader would notice that the figure six million, in the material context “to exterminate”, does not represent the population of either Israel or the total figure of Jews in the world but the number of Jews killed in the Holocaust, thus making the implicit reference to the Holocaust possible. In turn, the use of “dismantling”, signifies a reductionist view of security in which the threat of Iran’s nuclear capabilities is seen as something mechanical and objective, while also malignant that needs to be removed. Furthermore, by this account it is possible to display how the construction of security within HRD serves a very clear purpose of portraying the world as inherently occupied by complicit foes. Israel is alone in realizing the threat, Iran is calculating on how to repeat the

Holocaust, while the world is “lulled into a slumber on a bed of illusions” (Netanyahu 2015).

As such it is proscribed that if international support cannot be relied upon, then the referent object of Israel has no choice but to ensure its own security through military means. It is interesting in this context to note how the solution – the IDF and Israel’s capabilities of deterrence are described with words whose connotation holds moral value and how the concrete methods of deterrence are obscured by tributes to bravery and courage. The IDF is repeatedly described as “a Jewish army that protects the nation of survival” (Rivlin 2016) consisting of “moral soldiers” (Netanyahu 2021). When its capabilities are described this is done with a central exception to mention the deterring power of Israel as a state possessing nuclear warheads:

The IDF is one of the strongest armies in the world, not only because of the tanks, planes, submarines and cyber, but largely because of the courage of our soldiers. (Netanyahu 2016)

This could be regarded as a deliberative omission since including nuclear weapons of the threat would drastically change the perception of threat in comparison to Iran who possesses no nuclear warheads and thus weakening the argument for securitizing Iran.

4.1.2 The Holocaust and politics

Cohesion

How the memory of the Holocaust is reproduced through rhetorical linkages to how it should be regarded and acted upon, reveals the textual aspect of the depoliticization that HRD produces. The narrative of Israel’s self-determination to survival is rooted in the creation of a cohesive self-biography in which the Jewish people through the Holocaust is given ideational primacy as above every political issue being concerned with survival through a perpetual fight against anti-Semitism:

The Jewish people will forever bear the banner of the struggle against anti-Semitism and racism. No political, diplomatic or economic interest will make us turn a blind eye on them, neither in Europe nor anywhere else. (Rivlin 2018)

Absolving this struggle of any political dimensions and identifying the primacy that this depoliticization induces for the question of security is further materialized textually through the formulation of defense policy. For Netanyahu this comes in the form of a “natural vested right as the sovereign state of the Jewish people to defend ourselves against our enemies and foes.” (2021). For Rivlin, revisiting a central statement, it means that “we should always be able to

defend ourselves – we should not privatize our security.” (Rivlin 2016). In both ways the state holds precedence over security.

The naturalization of such a stance and lack of self-reflexivity is apparent. However, whereas the tendencies to depoliticize memory with the purpose of upholding securitization are manifest, attempts to elaborate on the discussion of contesting memories are actually brought forth. The most direct attempt at describing the differing perspectives on the significance of the Holocaust and carving out a compromise is done by Rivlin. First by assessing the plural field as between two perspectives: “The first, is one that deals only with the universal aspects and lessons of the Shoah. The second is one where the Shoah becomes the lens through which we view the world.” (Rivlin 2017) He negates the two by instead promoting a third perspective in which the Holocaust should be regarded as a call to arms for self-defense, that it imposes a shared Jewish destiny and that man is beloved and created in God’s image (Ibid).

The consequences of this argument are two-folded. Firstly, the negation of the two contesting arguments removes memory from the political sphere where fierce pluralism may be acted upon. Secondly, the promotion of a compromise still retains the imaginary of a master narrative which co-opts the general ability to discuss such notions as a shared Jewish destiny and how-to best structure defense (Berenskoetter 2014: 279). Rivlin’s repeated attempts to reach a compromise between the Holocaust as something which mnemonically should be regarded as both a universal and particular event in history serving as a non-obscuring guideline, and that it is these principles “that should unite us all, regardless of our political outlooks, ideologies, or ethnic origin.” (Rivlin 2016) precisely indicates the anti-political move to create a mnemonic consensus (Mälksoo 2015: 228).

Grammar

A central theme for the discursive construction of modalities in the context of politics is the repeated narrative of the state of Israel as separated from the Holocaust. However, the general idea transmitted by the speakers is that the state of Israel still constitutes “the only possible memorial standing for our perished brothers and sisters.” (Peres 2014).

In transitive terms this naturalization of depoliticizing the memory of the Holocaust can be found to take a passive form when promoted. For example, when Rivlin (2015) declares that: “May the memory, of our brothers and sisters, be engraved on our hearts forever” – there is no discernable conceptualization of who should be responsible for this engraving or what it concretely should strive to achieve. The problem of such a lack of clear agency and motive becomes apparent when it is analogically applied to the issue of defense:

Our people has experienced it during the Holocaust and the lesson should always be seen before us at any time and the lesson is that we have to be able to defend ourselves on our own against any threat, against any enemy. (Netanyahu 2017)

As clear as the urge is for the lesson to “be seen”, as unclear is the responsibility for this seeing itself, which should be regarded when assessing the affiliation and

truth modalities of statements that speak about the arena for decisions of defense, namely the political state itself. That the state is important in this context is exemplified by such assertions that “The revenge for the Holocaust is the revival of our people.” (Netanyahu 2018). Still, it remains important, especially for Rivlin, who for four consecutive years states that “The State of Israel is not a compensation for the Holocaust.” (Rivlin 2015), to press on the fact that Israel as a nation should not be reduced to the Holocaust.

If one considers the merging of these phenomena – the enhanced focus on the process of recognizing the lessons of the Holocaust, the lack of method, responsibility and agency to do this, as well as the staunch opposition to discuss the role of the Holocaust in the creation of the state of Israel – what emerges is an unwillingness to discuss the meaning of the Holocaust, but to just accept it. A problem of this lack of self-reflexivity is that it further discloses the room for discussion and competing interpretations of the Holocaust. Hence the state of Israel as “the only possible memorial standing for our perished brothers and sisters.” (Peres 2014) is not only fulfilling a role as an institution of remembrance, but an ideological need to control and exclude forms of remembrance that could bring politicization to the discourse.

Vocabulary

In terms of the words used when depoliticizing language is exerted they function to undress the Holocaust of connotations that could be perceived as politically meaningful. The clearest indication of this is the surprising absence of references to the Holocaust as a genocide. Instead the Holocaust is described as an “inferno” (Netanyahu 2017), as a negation through the dichotomy of “The Holocaust and the resurrection, in the State of Israel” (Netanyahu 2021), but first and foremost as a “sacred memory” (Rivlin 2021).

The reason for the preference of using these terms instead of genocide could be that whereas the term genocide, which is based in a universal perception of crimes against humanity, can be subjugated to legislative and political contestation – it is harder to contest a memory, if it’s naturalized and understood as objectively true. In part this interpretation is confirmed by how the term genocide only is mentioned in Rivlin’s refusal to accept the view of the Holocaust as a trauma of universal importance: “We must not make do with a simplistic approach, objecting to genocide wherever it happens.” (Rivlin 2017).

This attraction to essentialize the Holocaust, rendering it of universal application through a very specific use of words, indicates the hegemonic use of language to resist politicization of HRD. The memory of the Holocaust is therefore never described as an unresolved trauma which can be dealt with through a multiplicity of interpretations, analogies and actions, but as a neutral burden which the Jewish people and Israel has to bear. Hence it is described as a “banner of the struggle against anti-Semitism and racism” (Rivlin 2018) “tattooed into our flesh” (Rivlin 2015) and from which arises a “historic duty” of remembrance (Rivlin 2016).

From a theoretical standpoint this indicates the existence of a normative protection of the Holocaust based in the ambition to overcome political

antagonism in order for the hegemonic perception of the Holocaust to survive. However, as Mälksoo has asserted “the political in its antagonistic dimension cannot be made to disappear by simply denying it or wishing it away” (Mälksoo 2015: 227). This could also explain why Rivlin is so keen to refute contestation between different interpretations of the Holocaust.

4.1.3 The Holocaust and identity

Cohesion

The analysis of cohesion in how arguments are used to mobilize identities reveals how rhetoric structures creates a link between the people of the present and the Holocaust as a memory. The encouragement of remembrance itself is put forth as something that should be temporally infinite, but not necessarily spatially infinite, in the sense that it is clear who has a greater duty to remember: “The Holocaust places before us - its victims, the Jewish people and the State of Israel - an infinite task of remembrance.” (Rivlin 2021). Through this, remembrance of the Holocaust is presented as both historically impervious and dependent on the capability of the Jewish people to always remember it. Furthermore, the Jewish and Israeli primacy to remembrance is not so much a of choice dependent on a clearer proximity to the trauma, but something that only they can do: “As a member of the Jewish people I may not and I cannot forget the horrors of the Holocaust.” (Peres 2014).

The epistemological primacy of the Jewish people to remember the horrors of the Holocaust, which repeatedly is described through the metaphor that “all of us, each and every one of us, have a number tattooed on their arm” (Rivlin 2015) comes with what could be described as a moral “upside”. Namely the ethic primacy to separate right from wrong on account of the historical trauma of the Holocaust, perhaps best exemplified in Rivlin’s account of the “holy duty” the Holocaust imposes:

The Holocaust will forever place us, the Jewish people, as eternal prosecutors on the stage of humanity, prosecutor against anti-Semitism, racism and ultra-nationalism. Prosecutors against pacts with the devil that trade human dignity and life for interests. Prosecutors against indifference, against the relativism of evil. Beloved is man, every person, created in the image of God. This is a holy duty from which the Jewish people cannot and should not want to escape at any time, under any circumstances. (Rivlin 2016)

Consequently, the role of eternal prosecutors clearly indicates the construction of the Jewish people as being in a state of absolute righteousness to determine what constitutes appropriate security and action, which explains Netanyahu’s contempt for the international community’s condemnation towards the actions of Israel’s “moral soldiers”:

It wants to investigate and interrogate the State of Israel arguing that our moral soldiers carried out war crimes daily. The soldiers of the State of Israel of the IDF are fighting the proxies of Iran and we are the ones to be denounced? (Netanyahu 2021)

Hence, three central arguments pertaining to identity can be inferred from the analysis of cohesion. Firstly, the assertion that the Jewish people have a duty to bear the memory of the Holocaust. Secondly, that the Jewish people are the only actors able to bear such a memory - including a monopoly of knowledge on what constitutes trauma and evil. Thirdly, that the Jewish people from this can determine appropriate action in accordance with an absolute ethic.

Grammar

On the basis of the duty, non-contingency and primacy of remembrance, the linguistic creation of different groups within HRD is exemplified by how agency and processes is distributed through the use of transitive verbs. Narratives of the apparent “in-group” – the Israeli Jew remembering the Holocaust – is constructed as a passive group acting from a defense of history. It is reflected in how the solitude of the Jewish people is reinforced by a focus on the process of standing alone, rather than the agency of who has abandoned Israel or why: “But even if we are compelled to stand alone, we will not be afraid.” (Netanyahu 2015). The neglected support of others is further entrenched in the passive construction of a two-folded guarantee – a guarantee of remembrance and a Jewish future: (1): “We are committed to remembering.” (Rivlin 2020) and (2): “We will forever be committed to a partnership of Jewish destiny.” (Rivlin 2016).

The focus on the process of being committed and the diversion of who holds responsibility for such a commitment – be it the state, the direction of security or politics itself – indicates a totalization of the interests of the intended audience. This is further displayed by how Netanyahu also passively promises that “we will guarantee life.” (Netanyahu 2015). Something which connects to the Jewish people to the Holocaust in the sense that: “Those who joined the uprising of the ghettos and the camps [...] we are given the opportunity to realize their dream, here in Zion, in Jerusalem” (Netanyahu 2018).

Obscuring that the circumstances are very different from the uprisings during the Holocaust, and presenting the realization of the dream as “given” is an example of how the discourse actively engages in diverting any political deliberation as to the responsibility for such a realization.

However, whenever identity is described in terms of what this identity imposes in future action to divert anti-Semitism and another Holocaust, the clauses turn active, which creates the picture of an identity connected to reacting to confrontation rather than contributing to it. Reinforced with such modal constructions as “we shall”, “we will”, and “we must” the claim to truth of such an agency is clear. For Rivlin the Holocaust constitutes the moral imperative of Jewish-Israeli existence: “As the years pass, we must take on the moral imperative, to fight for commemoration and memory, but also for the dream of the victims and survivors.” (Rivlin 2015). Netanyahu concurs with such a statement

of truth and further extends it to say that the perseverance of the Jewish population constitutes a proof of how “We have returned to the stage of history, we have returned to the forefront of history. We won our oppressors in the past and God willing, we will win you, too” (Netanyahu 2019).

In summary, analysis of grammars indicates the presence of several passive and active truths. The passive truth of Jewish Holocaust remembrance as a moral imperative, not accessible for political scrutiny, and the active truth of how contemporary remembrance and persons remembering constitutes a restitution of the persons and hopes lost in the Holocaust.

Vocabulary

The perhaps most significant keywords in relation to the connection between identity and the Holocaust is the use of “we” and “survivor”. “We” is generously used in the texts to assert the proposed collective “in-group” and their relation to the Holocaust. Firstly, it provides meaning to the idea of Jewish independence as the continuation of Holocaust-victims aspirations: “In the name of the six million, among them one and a half million children, we will carry the torch of Jewish independence.” (Peres 2014). Secondly, the “we” provides a sense of group-belonging to truth and objective understanding of reality: “We will continue to insist on the truth, and we will do everything we can to open the eyes that have closed.” (Netanyahu 2015). Thirdly, it is used to describe the group that shall hold power over the continued remembrance of the Holocaust: “We will continue to impart the memory of the Holocaust” (Rivlin 2015).

Whereas the “we” as a group constitutes that which connects the past with meaning in the present, the meaning of this “we” itself is never disclosed. The liberal use of “we” should not be overlooked as a simple strategy of attraction, but is in itself an important sign of who is included in the discourse. The absent identification of what constitutes the “we” rests on the assumption that everyone in that group shares the same perception, affinity and causal relation to the Holocaust.

Rivlin attempts to overcome this disparity between a Jewish-particular and Human-universal perspective of what the Holocaust should mean for the creation of identity stating that: “The Shoah is permanently branded in our flesh. Each of us has a number on our arm. Nevertheless, the Shoah is not the lens through which we should examine our past and our future.” (Rivlin 2017) However, by precisely not addressing the meaning of “we” and “our past and our future” he neglects to include differing perspectives and identities, indicating how discursive absence can result in polarization and exclusion of for example gentiles, Arabs and diasporic Jews from participation in the discourse.

This connects to the use of “survivor” and the ambition of all speakers to literally connect the “we” with survivors assuming the same victimhood: “The Holocaust places before us - its victims, the Jewish people and the State of Israel - an infinite task of remembrance.” (Rivlin 2021). Through such a construction in which “The number which was tattooed onto your flesh is etched into the hearts of this nation for generations, and has become the living will of the Jewish people.”

(Ibid 2016) the consequences for those who perhaps share the premise of inclusion to the “we”, but for different reasons do not subject to the normative ideology that identification with survivors presume are also excluded. Hence polarization of identities is further reinforced by this totalizing use of words.

4.2 Discursive practice

I will analyze three themes present in the texts to interpret how HRD is produced and configured in its potentially securitizing context. The themes concern how HRD produces and condition a certain knowledge, politicization and identity in the speeches, which in turn functions to create a connection between the Holocaust, security and identity. Since manifest or latent references to other texts, which could be significant for the intertextual consequences, are sparse, the primary focus will rest on asserting the degree of interdiscursivity. More specifically I have set out two objectives which will permeate the analysis. Firstly, I shall see how the securitizing move established as present from the textual analysis functions and relates to the order of discourse. In other words, I shall, with the theoretical framework as a baseline, determine in what way HRD assumes the notions of security, memory and agonistic-antagonistic relations. Secondly, I will on the basis of this determine the applicability of Lustick’s assessment of the Holocaust as a “template for Jewish life” (2017: 153) in which remembrance serves a fact-rendering purpose of portraying a Jewish existence in an overwhelmingly non-Jewish world, where every foreign entity contains the potentiality of a Final solution. The “template” infers the particularity of the six million perished and the exceptionalism of the Israeli state to deter it from happening again. It renders Holocaust remembrance as meaningful, albeit with a very particular purpose.

4.2.1 The lesson of the Holocaust

A phrase which is significant for the epistemological edifice of HRD is the repeated notion that for security, there exists “the lesson of the Holocaust” explicitly incorporated in a majority of the speeches between 2014-2021. As to the description of what the lesson of the Holocaust actually is, there seems to be an initial disagreement or dividing understanding between Benjamin Netanyahu’s and Reuven Rivlin’s interdiscursive formulation.

Netanyahu displays a continuous rigidity that the lesson is that: “democracies must not turn a blind eye to the aspirations of tyrannous regimes to expand. A conciliatory attitude toward these regimes only increases their tendency for aggression.” (Netanyahu 2015). This statement is explicitly repeated by

Netanyahu in 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2020. As to further adopt the discursive ramifications of “the template” Netanyahu asserts the material realization of the lesson in 2018, when he states that “There is one main lesson [...] it is that murderous evil that one does not stand against expands very rapidly and gradually threatens the entire humanity. This was the main message that I conveyed in the World Security Commission in Munich two months ago.” (Netanyahu 2018) Hence, the lesson as a template for Jewish life, includes the aspect of security in which the totality of the lesson is framed in terms of the necessity to securitize based on the need to avert evil.

Rivlin, similarly speaks about the lesson of the Holocaust in 2016, 2017 and 2019. In difference to Netanyahu, he engages himself in a discussion concerning the collective task of developing knowledge and understanding of the Holocaust by saying that: “These are the years in which we should take the opportunity to try to clarify along with you, how you want to shape the memory of the Holocaust and its lessons for future generations.” (Rivlin 2016). Furthermore, he directly addresses the normative conflict between “the object lesson” and “the template”, saying “there have developed two clear approaches to how Israeli society remembers the Shoah, and regards the lessons to be learned from it. The first, is one that deals only with the universal aspects and lessons of the Shoah. The second is one where the Shoah becomes the lens through which we view the world.” (Rivlin 2017). He then continues by discarding the two perspectives on the basis that the universal approach “Obviously, there are universal lessons to be learned from the Shoah, but denial of the unique nature of the Holocaust of the Jewish People is a historical, national, and educational error.” (Ibid) and the template as dangerous because “it obscures the richness of the Jewish existence of before the Shoah.” and because “this approach damages our ability to develop relations with the nations of the world and with our critics from a safe place, appropriate for dialogue.” (Ibid). However, in all instances where this less deterministic argumentation is brought forward, Rivlin still opts for a deterministic discourse. While this could be interpreted as a break with the idea of the Holocaust as a template of Jewish life, Rivlin continues to present his idea of a third perspective: “Firstly, we should always be able to defend ourselves [...] The second point is the shared Jewish fate [...] The third point, beloved is man created in God's image.” (Rivlin 2016) Although Rivlin’s “third-pillar”, on surface bear the potentiality of interdiscursive flexibility, it stills adopts the same logic as that of Netanyahu, namely a stable reproduction of the lesson of the Holocaust existing as a template.

Another aspect which should not be overlooked is the intertextual significance of describing the epistemological takeaway of the Holocaust as a “lesson”. It is not only a presumption that such a thing exists, but furthermore it can be perceived as a direct reference to the invoking of an educational standard. Its interdiscursivity implies both the educational discourse as it has developed in contemporary Israel since the 90s where Holocaust has rapidly been expanded in academia (Greif 2018), while also establishing a general educational discourse - namely that of the relation between the teacher and the pupil. The monopoly of knowledge as the institutional position of Israeli government to dictate what the

lesson is, is a solid indicator of both the productive and distributive ramification of HRD in the sense of a lesson. Consequently, the deterministic use of an educational discourse by a certain group, for a certain group, and with a content that does not open for political negotiation constitutes little room for political participation and pluralism. The rigid repetition thus confirms the hegemony and confinement of knowledge production of security within HRD.

Is there an interdiscursive relation between this formulation of learning from the past, and a securitizing discourse? Is the “real” lesson, the lesson of the need for securitization? To “learn what happened and guarantee that it will never happen again” (Rivlin 2018) several points are brought forth in the speeches. Buzan et al. recognizes three central concepts to securitization: the depiction of an existential threat to a referent object; a point of no return; and a solution to the situation, which may involve exceptional measures (1998: 33).

There exists an existential threat branded a security issue – Iran and its capacity to become a nuclear power. As Netanyahu (2021) states: “History taught us that [...] an agreement with Iran [...] will pave its way to nuclear power, a weapon that would risk us with extermination.” he explicitly formulates the existential threat to the referent object of the state of Israel. The point of no return is in the lesson attributed to the risk of letting such a threat grow because “murderous evil that one does not stand against expands very rapidly and gradually threatens the entire humanity.” (Netanyahu 2018). To this predicament there can be no compromise, either to assess the threat or to meet it. “Anyone planning our annihilation should know that the State of Israel is very strong. We have strong defense, offence and deterrence capabilities.” (Netanyahu 2016) Implicit in the formulation of action lies the nuclear capabilities of Israel, but the primary point is that the problem is rendered as only involving military measures – which constitutes an exceptional and apolitical response to a particular threat. There exists no other avenue of resolve for true internalization of the lesson.

In summary, the epistemology of the Holocaust as a lesson of history is a confirmation of the “template”-discourse as it pertains to the need for Israel to defend itself. With a low-degree of interdiscursivity it reproduces the hegemonic discourse of “the template”. If one is to describe this aspect of HRD with its low grade of interdiscursivity, it is possible to summarize it into three key points. Firstly, the lesson is specifically directed towards the Israeli Jewish population. Secondly, the lesson is not meant to be instrumental to action in any form of action other than in the Israeli social reality. Thirdly, the Israeli Jewish population is framed as having primacy over the construction and internalization of the lesson. If we assert that “the template” is overwhelmingly prevalent in the epistemological assessment of the Holocaust, the lesson is not so much of a lesson, but a doctrine. This remains as the lesson of the lesson.

4.2.2 Genocide-prevention as depoliticization

The rigid position of security within HRD reflects the need to further understand how the colonization of securitization may persevere within the order of discourse. As previously described, the order of discourse refers to the totality of available discourses within an institution and the relation between these (Fairclough 1995: 135). Within HRD the notion of “never again” – preventing another Holocaust, another genocide is central as that which motivates the entire cause of remembrance and consequently underpins the securitization. The priority of genocide-prevention is in accordance with the proposition of securitization theory, not politically contested or even regarded as something belonging to the political realm – where it could interact with alternative discourses. This depoliticization thus influences the fluidity of discourses and the static position of the order of discourse to maintain securitization. But how is this depoliticizing discourse invoked in HRD and how does the discursive practice uphold the discursive hegemony?

As the textual analysis indicated, the conception of the Holocaust and the state of Israel indicated a fixed and confined pertaining to a construction where Israel constitutes the primary locus for subjectivity of HRD. Peres literally states this when he asserts that “the State of Israel of today is [...] the only possible memorial standing for our perished brothers and sisters.” (Peres 2014).

The primacy of defense over politics is further emphasized by the temporal scope of the role of Israeli prime ministers:

We have to be able to defend ourselves on our own against any threat, against any enemy. The ones who wish to do us harm risk the very same harm that should happen to them [...] it is the only way to truly secure our very future. And we are definitely capable of doing that. [...] It is the superior goal, not the exclusive one, but the superior and first role of every prime minister in the State of Israel. (Netanyahu 2017)

If the superior goal of every prime minister is to ensure defending the state against any threat, against any enemy, the contingency of politics and history is not only alleviated from the proposition - but negated in its entirety. Defense is superior to any political deliberation or contestation. That hostility and criticism of Israel is primarily a problem of security and not a political problem and in the process, agency is absolved.

A telling point in how depoliticization of action is construed, regards the analogies between the fight against the enemies of Israel’s and the fight against the Covid-19—pandemic:

In the months since then, we received proof of this on a daily basis. The coronavirus outbreak requires a global fight against the virus—nothing less—and it demonstrates the importance of national sovereignty. Unlike the Holocaust, this time we identified the danger in time. We made important decision, such as closing the country’s borders, and we mobilized all the state’s systems in the war against the coronavirus.

We especially mobilized your willingness, your commitment and your sense of responsibility, citizens of Israel. Our accomplishments serve as a role model for many countries around the world. (Netanyahu 2020)

Within the logic of depoliticization the analogy is made by Netanyahu is not farfetched. One "fights" the "war" against the virus by exceptional means such as border closing and mobilization of state systems, and "nothing less" is feasible. Here, the depoliticization of action is obscured by a technologizing discourse. It is also a telling example of how securitization does not merely confine itself to military threats, but also public health crises so that "unlike the Holocaust", the danger can be identified in time. This, according to Netanyahu illustrates the "the importance of national sovereignty", meaning that he constructs the Israeli state as the only subject able to cope with the crisis. The other direction of the analogy - what the pandemic can tell about how Israel should handle threats to its security is further elaborated by Rivlin (2020) who also asserts that:

The current pandemic occupying the entire world, the war against an non-human, invisible and indiscriminate foe, only emphasizes our common obligation to human solidarity, to mutual responsibility and to the uncompromising battle against antisemitism and hatred, which also spread like an infectious disease from one to another. (Rivlin 2020)

If Israel ought to fight its perceived threats in an "uncompromising battle against antisemitism and hatred", it indicates that this fight is relieved of any need of being handled within a political context. The aversion of such a context, manifests itself in the responses to international criticism of Israeli militarism:

We do have a defensive force and we do have the natural vested right as the sovereign state of the Jewish people to defend ourselves against our enemies and foes. This is also our unequivocal answer to the scandalous decision of the International Court at The Hague. It wants to investigate and interrogate the State of Israel arguing that our moral soldiers carried out war crimes daily. The soldiers of the State of Israel of the IDF are fighting the proxies of Iran and we are the ones to be denounced? (Netanyahu 2021)

It thus illustrates the hegemony of depoliticization within HRD in which any discussion of Israel's "moral soldiers" and its "natural vested right" to defend itself against any enemy. It is not appreciated since it requires self-reflexivity of Israel's moral imperative of defense. Security and moral becomes non-negotiable as the depoliticization constitutes an integral part "to secure a self by antagonizing others by the logic of survival" (Mälksoo 2015: 228) This is also reflected by the repeated statements that the Iran nuclear deal - is not perceived as an opportunity to influence the political direction of Iran, but as an example of how "the West is yielding in the face of Iran's aggressive actions" (Netanyahu 2015). Regarding the agreement with Iran, Netanyahu (2021) states that "such agreements with such radical regimes are worthless" and that "this agreement will definitely not bind us

one bit. There is only one thing that we find binding, to prevent all those who strive to destroy us from carrying out their deeds.”

Thus, we see how depoliticizing interdiscursivity constructs the relationship between HRD, Israel and its security. In order to uphold the template of the Holocaust as directing the present in the task of genocide-prevention - politics is absolved from the order of discourse. As I have argued, securitization can be described as a form of depoliticization, meaning that it moves an issue to a constructed a-political realm. Defense in HRD takes an indisputable role as a non-contingent fact of life, reduced of agency and morally immune. Netanyahu's (2019) notion that "the awareness of danger is a prerequisite for life", consequently draws on a depoliticizing discourse rather than the alternative perspective of political life as a prerequisite for the awareness of danger.

4.2.3 The ideal survivor

Securitization and depoliticization is bound to have consequences for the creation of identity and subjectivity within HRD. Although the "out-group" – primary Iran, and secondary the West – is described as genocidal and complicit respectively, the discursive creation of an "in-group" illustrates the structure of social relations along antagonistic lines. Within the material, there exists one addressed group who possess a unique experience from which meaning can be discursively extracted, namely survivors of the Holocaust. Explicit intertextuality is only present in the texts whenever a survivor is quoted. As the primary witnesses of the Holocaust, an analysis of the discursive practice concerning how victims are being quoted and described can illustrate how social relations are interdiscursively constructed and whether or not these correlates with the ideals of the security template, or if they represent a path for transformation of the discursive practice.

Not taking into consideration that the survivors in question by default are Jewish (even though other groups also were targeted in the Holocaust) and for reasons of proximity Israeli citizens, the selection and emphasis of quoted survivors still constitute a rigid and non-diverse set of characteristics.

The first common denominator produced as a significant characteristic is the story of how survivors are emancipation through emigration to Israel. Although framed in terms of the Jewish diaspora as lacking a country of their own, both Rivlin and Netanyahu engage in a deterministic discourse of "home-coming". Intertextually this is explicitly referred to, Rivlin (2017) for example quotes one survivor as saying "I made Aliyah to Israel, and from here I never get lost.", with Aliyah being the historical term for Jewish immigration to Israel. That the post-Holocaustian relocalization is presented as having meant more than a place of refuge is further reinforced by Netanyahu (2018) who recites survivors in "You said, we are happy and overjoyed to live in Israel." (Netanyahu 2018). Furthermore, Israel is not only portrayed in terms of safe haven for the survivors, it is also described as an entity which serves as a moral victory of survivors

themselves: ““Here, in our home, in Israel, I know that I won the murderers big time. I won over them big time.”” (Netanyahu 2019).

Naturally, this relates to the second common denominator - the story of how survivors participated in the establishment of Israel, especially by public service in the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF). With Zionist underpinnings both Netanyahu and Rivlin repeatedly speak about survivors, or relatives of survivors in uniform as that which built and consolidated the Israeli state. For example, he extends his gratitude by saying:

My dear Holocaust survivors, you created this miracle. With your grand spirit you built and established this home, the IDF, the Mossad, and all the other security agencies, the legal world, the settlements. (Rivlin 2018)

A year earlier Netanyahu (2017) had already urged survivors by telling them: “You stand upright, proud, adorned with medals, you have children, you have grandchildren and you have great-grandchildren, all who served in the Israeli Defense Forces”. Perhaps the most telling example of the connection between surviving the Holocaust and service in the IDF was given by Netanyahu in in this year:

Or your story, Moshe Porat. The Jewish child from Hungary. When you were an inmate in the Mathausen camp, the Nazis tattooed the number on your arm - 10-80-80. And lo and behold: You told us that here in Israel as a 17-year-old boy you were so proud of the fact that you were conscripted to the army, to the Israel Defense Force, that you took the flashlight when you were in the tent and you looked at your identity number - 10-80-80 was the number. (Netanyahu 2017)

Never is a survivor mentioned who is not Jewish. However, absence does not confine itself to this requirement which could be perceived as an essential characteristic in the context of the discourse. Never is a survivor part of the Jewish diaspora. Only recollections of Jews perished in the Holocaust are accepted as testimonies. Never are the survivors anti-Zionist, be they secular or religious. Never is the Holocaust extended to include other survivors who don't meet the basic qualifications - sexual minorities, the disabled, the Roma, Soviet civilians or prisoners of war. In this reverse-logic it is possible to understand the selective intertextuality of reproducing a certain picture of survivors, which along with a low degree of interdiscursivity points to the further reproduction of a template even for the identity of survivors and those who supposedly are to perceive survivors as role models. Instead of a survivor, it becomes apparent that in “the template”, there exists an ideal form of survivor. The ideal survivor serves the task of affirming the particularity of the Holocaust as well as the particularity of the Jewish population as such, while also pointing towards a moral imperative to be a survivor of the survivors. Survivors came, built, served and their stories function as the template for Jewish life the apolitical sphere seeks to emit. And as Netanyahu asserts when he quotes a survivor, this is where the depoliticization attains its legitimacy to conduct itself in the face of perceived threats: “Prime

Minister," he said, "it is your duty to prevent another holocaust." And I responded: "That is exactly how I see my responsibility, that is exactly how I see my responsibility." (Netanyahu 2015)

However, to understand the antagonism underpinning the ideal survivor and how it relates to idea of the Holocaust as a template for Jewish life, is necessary to elaborate on the connection between survivors and the construction of present social roles.

Today, seventy years after the liberation of the death camps, we stand before you and we swear an oath, and promise, 'All of us, each and every one of us, have a number tattooed on their arm'. Yet, at the same time and in the same breath we remember: we came from Auschwitz, not because of Auschwitz. (Rivlin 2015)

The idea of how “the number which was tattooed onto your flesh is etched into the hearts of this nation for generations, and has become the living will of the Jewish people” (Rivlin 2016) established survivors as a clear and present in-group. Thusly, we can see how ideational survival is as important as physical. The ”in-group” of survivors motivates not only ostracizing “the other”, but can potentially motivate action towards them.

If it follows from the logic of securitization that if all enemies “are” Nazis, and Iran and the West are enemies, then Iran and the West are Nazis (Lustick 2017: 164), the inverse could be equally telling: If all who came from Auschwitz are Jewish, and every Israeli citizen came from Auschwitz. Then all Israeli citizens are Jewish. Such a hegemony is difficult to contest due to the fact that it sets up conditions on what it means to be an Israeli citizen and Jewish, which leaves no room for discussion within the discourse. The naturalization of a certain “in-group” is crucial to upholding the securitization and depoliticization of HRD, which do not correspond to the ideational feature of the Holocaust as a hegemonic lesson for how to attain “absolute security” (Aggestam et al 2015: 1736). Such construction of subjectivity is thus conditioned by the possibility of “turning from the abysmal hell in Auschwitz to the peaks of light in Jerusalem” (Netanyahu 2021).

Acknowledging non-Jewish experiences of the Holocaust and contestation over what it means to be Israeli could open the historical discourse to political deliberation and contestation of securitization on the basis of genocide-prevention. As Rivlin (2018) asserts it may not be that “the State of Israel is no compensation for the Holocaust”, however, the hegemonic antagonism of how the Holocaust is discursively described indicates that it is an important condition:

Our past must be the basis of our values, our actions and our alliances, the alliances that we strike. This is our history and this is our heritage and it is also the great message of the Jewish people to the entire world. (Rivlin 2019)

The ideal survivor here emanates as that which must be protected, based in antagonistic relations. A token, through which identification renders it possible for a duplication of survivors, by constituting survivors as the highest form of

materialization of the Holocaust as a template for Jewish life. The totalization of this survivor-myth indicates an interdiscursive relationship with an antagonizing discourse since it discloses the symbolic space of participation disclosed for a specific group (Tulumello 2021: 331) It functions as the totality towards which identification must be made. It will however in its totality disqualify any other claim to survivor heritage which pertains to political participation and non-alignment with the securitization through HRD. It's a discourse in which every protagonist as a potential survivor functions as giving meaning to a world in which every antagonist is potential Nazi.

5 Summary and conclusion

This thesis has aimed at providing insight into how the Holocaust is textually and discursively constructed in Israeli remembrance discourses to elaborate the understanding of the relation between memory, security, politics and identity. In this section I will discuss and summarize the analysis in order to conclude with an answer to the research question: *How is security constructed in Israeli Holocaust remembrance discourse?* Since this study adopts the poststructuralist claim that there are no objective ontological truths and that subjective positions of security and identity are produced discursively (Hansen 2010) I do not claim that it has the definite answer. Rather the summary discussion and conclusion should be regarded as building blocks from which studies can further elaborate questions on the relation between history and security. I have specifically sought to answer the question from a critical point of view by scrutinizing the textual and discursive practices of Israeli HRD from its securitizing aspects to display how threats, existence and identity are reflected through remembrance speech.

With regards to securitization the thesis could assert that the textual cohesion, grammar and vocabulary clearly positions Israel as existentially threatened by Iran on accounts of the latter's ability to attain nuclear weapons. Analogies of how Jews pre-WW2 experienced international solitude and consequently were targeted in the Holocaust makes possible analogies serving to illustrate the need to avert contemporary threats by military means. Compliance to reach to solve issues by diplomatic means is regarded as meaningless, but furthermore as an indirect complicity in Iran's alleged ambitions of annihilation, which entrenches the sense of urgency and vulnerability of Israel. By activating and excluding different roles in this bi-polar description of reality HRD makes it possible to motivate military deterrence. While "courageous" and "moral soldiers" are described as fighting for the existence of the Jewish people, certain aspects of the discourse are excluded, precisely because they risk undermining the master narrative of genocidal deterrence.

One such aspect which was identified concerned the absence of mentioning Israel's nuclear military might in comparison to Iran. Interdiscursively it was assessed that this securitization is materialized through an epistemological discourse of there being a "lesson of the Holocaust", which ought to be followed. As the analysis indicated such a lesson serves the purpose of framing the Israeli primacy to both the Holocaust and actions on behalf of their own security. A deterministic discourse which exists in accordance of Lustick's (2017) assessment of "the Holocaust as a template for Jewish life" and whose constant reproduction indicate a hegemonic position within the order of discourse. Securitization and its ramifications thus go unchallenged within HRD, indicating that Holocaust remembrance constitutes more than just a securitizing move.

Even though the implication was accepted that securitization contributes to depoliticization, there was no guarantee that it would be possible to infer from the HRD, which on surface takes place in a generically apolitical setting. However, as the analysis indicated depoliticizing constructions and strategies were found to exist. From the constructed primacy of the Jewish people to assess and interpret the Holocaust, it becomes clear that it was a priority to refuse Holocaust remembrance and the meaning it entails to be subjugated by political discussion. In fact, the Holocaust was deliberately framed in such terms as to absolve it of any political meaning in an attempt to reach a mnemonic consensus. This was confirmed by the lack of responsibility and agency ascribed to imposing the memory of the Holocaust. Instead, through memorial abstractions and a refusal to engage in any form of universal reason, which could open for political contestation of what the Holocaust means, the apparent depoliticization within HRD seems to be an integral part to the normative survival of it. As such it supports the hegemonic preservation of both mnemonic monopoly and securitization on the basis of memory. Within the discursive practice I interpreted this as the materialization of the template in the form that the perpetual fight against destruction and for survival has become an integral part of the Israeli perspective of security. It was especially clear how depoliticization for the sake of securitization led to the possible analogies between the Holocaust, conflict and the Covid-19 pandemic, as a result of not wanting to risk displaying security as anything else than “genocide-prevention”.

How HRD contributes to the discursive formations of social relations was contextualized by how the Jewish people are given an absolute ethic and monopoly of knowledge and insight of the Holocaust to act and how contemporary Jews were rendered as survivors by association. The referring to a “we” in the discourse was perceived as contributing to the constitution of closed group. A group which subsequently is mobilized as having a stronger duty and insight on shaping the future of Israel through an elaborated understanding of the past. Imparting the Holocaust in this sense created a homogenous and monolithic group, from which inclusion was both essentialized and conditioned by adhering to the normative ideology of what being a part of this groups means. From this I interpret exclusion as inevitable, both from the standpoint of identification and participation. HRD therefore reproduces an antagonistic dimension of reality where survivors emanate as the ideal in-group. Differing experiences and agonistic relations are therefore impossible to sustain due to the application of a totalizing discourse of what it means to be a Jew, an Israeli citizen and understanding the Holocaust.

Antagonism thusly also holds dominance in HRD and it is possible to confirm that the discourse of Holocaust remembrance is situated in the context of what Lustick (2017) calls “a template for Jewish life”. The framing of knowledge, time, policy and identity all draw upon a “forward-leading” discourse of the Holocaust.

Thus, we can conclude that HRD naturalizes a certain securitization of Israeli existence, while excluding discourses that are inconsistent or competing – such as a discourse inferred to understanding the political dimensions of the Holocaust. Furthermore, contemporary Holocaust remembrance discourse constitutes a

historical narrative that produces the Holocaust as defining feature of modern Israeli identity, confirming Lustick's notion that HRD primarily serves as a "template for Jewish life" (2017: 164). Thirdly, that the present order of discourse which HRD exists within favors antagonistic social relations instead of agonistic relations that potentially could alleviate social tensions and conflicts, thus constituting a hindrance to progress in social conflicts. However, as the analysis of the discursive practice has indicated, discourse remains rigid to promote the memorial of the Holocaust as a lesson for the Jewish population on the need proactively align their security with genocide-deterrence or run the risk of experiencing another Holocaust

What could be inferred from this were a set of potential problems that HRD brings forth. If the Holocaust is only portrayed in terms of the existential threat it poses to the state of Israel and its Jewish population, other central factors - not possible to securitize due to discursive disruption - are neglected, for example the similarities between Nazi Germany's annexation of Czechoslovakia and Israel's occupation of the west bank and the displacement of its citizens. The structure and relation of HRD subsequently rectifies the plethora of memorial discourse, excluding large groups of Israeli society from engaging in the conversation of history and contemporary politics. As this is bound to maintain discursive tensions within Israeli society, the closed arena and conversation runs the risk of reproducing the very antagonistic relations that the discourse regards itself to fight against.

It is presented as clear that Israel is not "under any circumstances, compensation for the Holocaust" (Rivlin 2016), but still "a deterrence against any attempt at another Holocaust" (Peres 2014). The point that so many of the speakers present – that the Holocaust cannot be forgotten – perhaps points towards the wrongful entry into Holocaust remembrance. The question is not if it's possible to forget, but rather if it's possible to remember and if remembrance entails risks itself.

Criticism could be directed toward this thesis of engaging too little in the concrete social effects of securitization of memory. Beyond describing how Iran is discursively construed as posing a threat comparable to the Holocaust, I have not discussed the apparent conflict between Israel and Palestine, sectarian groups, religious groups or the broader strokes of conflict within the MENA-region. For this reason, I want to reiterate that the purpose of this thesis has not been to measure or engage in any discussion about the effects of securitization on social practice, but strictly textual construction and discursive practice. However, it should be noted that in the answer to the research question, that yes, Holocaust remembrance does constitute a form of securitization grounded in historical experience, emerges another question. Namely the question what this means for Israel's social cohesion and conflicts.

Further, this thesis could be criticized for not taking into consideration the conflict between Israel and Palestinians. However, it has not been the point of this thesis to explain the social conflicts of Israel, but rather set the direction for where such inquiries may enter. The cumulative task of building on this thesis by applying it to internal social conflicts is thus, strongly encouraged as it would

undoubtedly bring light to the manifest consequences of Israel's discursive approaches to how it establishes security. For example, considering the effects on HRD of Israeli alignment and cooperation with Saudi Arabia. Another interesting inquiry would be to contextualize and compare Israeli HRD with how the Holocaust is discursively constructed among Palestinians, in order to assess the conditions of discrepancy and how they can be agonistically alleviated to alleviate tensions of conflict and violence. The question remains what is socially at stake in order for this discourse to reproduce its hegemony. If marginalization and repression is that which realizes the discourse, it is bound to bear long-casting consequences for Israel's social tensions, both domestically and abroad.

To just provide a concrete example of the possibilities to analyze social practice, one can mention the reaction towards Palestinian PM Mahmoud Abbas when he tried to engage in Holocaust Remembrance Day by stating that the Holocaust was the most appalling crime committed against humanity in modern times. The response from Netanyahu was not invitation to participate in common reasoning about the Holocaust from an agonistic standpoint, but to claim that Abbas was engaging in soothing of the international community and that he should choose between Palestine and peace with Israel (Levanon 2021).

Such a reaction, does not in itself prove the full hegemony of HRD as it stands today, but indicates the need to protect the discursive practice from elements perceived as possibly transformative of the conditions that motivates the current form of it. At the time of writing this in May 2022, Israel is experiencing civil unrest, killings and physical confrontation at The West Bank. As a response to forced evictions of Palestinian families in East Jerusalem, and Israeli violent repression of protests, Amnesty International has released a report investigating legislation and practices and accused Israel of invoking a structural system of apartheid (Amnesty International 2022). Before the report was published Israel's Ministry of Foreign Affairs responded to the publication, stating that "A few days after International Holocaust Remembrance Day, we once again learn that antisemitism is not just a part of history, but unfortunately, is also part of today's reality." (MFA 2022). Furthermore, a survey poll states that 47% of Israeli public are fearful of another Holocaust befalling them. A majority also expects the forms of Holocaust Remembrance Day to change (Israel Hayom 2022). From such indications of discursive colonization, it becomes clear that the role of the Holocaust still represents so much more than just a memory in Israeli social reality.

But more than this it is difficult to appreciate how these trends – invoking of the Holocaust and fear of another - are to co-exist if remembrance of the Holocaust is not subjugated to discursive changes. However, it could be a sign to both scholars and policy-makers to assess and discuss under which conditions the memory of the Holocaust should be perceived and enacted upon. If such change is to come, or already under way, what does it mean for the future of HRD?

It can be argued that Netanyahu himself formulated the oxymoron and the discursive conflict of HRD as it stands today: "Did the world really learn a lesson from the inconceivable universal and Jewish tragedy of the last century?" (2015). Providing a solution to the predicament of mnemonic dualities, should be of

concern for future policy-makers and researchers, but carefully doing so by avoiding the logic of either imposing the Holocaust as an antagonistic universal truth in a world which everyone is a Nazi, or as an antagonistic particularity of the Jews as perpetual threatened of their existence. Only with a reflexive framework can a fruitful discussion of trauma, history and policy be developed to understand how memory stretches itself over time and space.

6 References

Primary sources

- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 2015. *PM Netanyahu: Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day*. 15 Apr, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 2016. *PM Netanyahu addresses the ceremony marking Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day*. 4 May, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 2017. *PM Netanyahu addresses the ceremony marking Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day*. 23 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 2018. *PM Netanyahu addresses the ceremony marking Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day*. 11 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 2019. *PM Netanyahu addresses the ceremony marking Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day*. 1 May, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 2020. *PM Netanyahu addresses the ceremony marking Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day*. 20 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 2021. *PM Netanyahu addresses the ceremony marking Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day*. 7 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Peres, Shimon. 2014. *President Peres at Holocaust Remembrance Day ceremony at Yad Vashem*. 27 Apr, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Rivlin, Reuven. 2015. *Address by President of the State of Israel, H.E. Mr. Reuven Rivlin State Opening Ceremony of Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day 2015*. 15 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Rivlin, Reuven. 2016. *Address by President of the State of Israel, H.E. Mr. Reuven Rivlin State Opening Ceremony of Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day 2016*. 4 May, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Rivlin, Reuven. 2017. *Address by President of the State of Israel, H.E. Mr. Reuven Rivlin State Opening Ceremony of Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day 2017*. 23 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Rivlin, Reuven. 2018. *Address by President of the State of Israel, H.E. Mr. Reuven Rivlin State Opening Ceremony of Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day 2018*. 11 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.

- Rivlin, Reuven. 2019. *Address by President of the State of Israel, H.E. Mr. Reuven Rivlin State Opening Ceremony of Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day 2019*. 1 May, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Rivlin, Reuven. 2020. *Address by President of the State of Israel, H.E. Mr. Reuven Rivlin State Opening Ceremony of Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day 2020*. 20 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.
- Rivlin, Reuven. 2021. *Address by President of the State of Israel, H.E. Mr. Reuven Rivlin State Opening Ceremony of Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day 2021*. 7 April, Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.

Secondary sources

- Aggestam, Karin - Fabio Cristiano - Lisa Strömbom, 2015. "Towards agonistic peacebuilding? Exploring the antagonism–agonism nexus in the Middle East Peace process", *Third World Quarterly*, 36(9): 1736–1753.
- Amnesty International. 2022. *Israel's apartheid against Palestinians: cruel system of domination and crime against humanity*. London, England: Amnesty International Publications.
- Balzaq, Thierry, 2010. "A theory of securitization: origins, core assumptions, and variants" in Thierry Balzaq (ed.) *Securitization Theory: How security problems emerge and dissolve*. New York: Routledge: 1-30.
- Banchoff, Thomas, 1997. "German policy towards the European Union: The effects of historical memory", *German Politics*, 6(1): 60–76.
- Beker, Avi, 2010. "Building up a Memory: Austria, Switzerland, and Europe Face the Holocaust" in Langenbacher, Eric - Yossy Shain (ed.), *Power and the past. Collective memory and international relations*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press: 97-119.
- Berenskoetter, Felix, 2014. "Parameters of a national biography", *European Journal of International Relations*, 20(1): 262-288.
- Buzan, Barry - Ole Wæver - Jaap de Wilde, 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Chouliaraki, Lilie - Norman Fairclough, 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Creppey, Ingrid, 2011. "The concept of normative threat", *International Theory*, 3(3): 450–487.
- Edkins, Jenny, 2003. *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Epstein, Charlotte, 2011. "Who speaks? Discourse, the subject and the study of identity in international politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, 17(2): 327–350.
- Fairclough, Norman, 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, Norman, 1995. *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

- Fairclough, Norman, 2009. "A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research" in Ruth Wodak and Michael Mayer (ed.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications Ltd: 162-186.
- Fairclough, Norman, 2013. "Critical discourse analysis and critical policy studies", *Critical Policy Studies*, 7(2): 177-197.
- Fogu, Claudio - Wulf Kansteiner, 2006. "The Politics of Memory and the Poetics of History" in Claudio Fogu & Wulf Kansteiner (ed.) *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. Durham, U.S.: Duke University Press: 284-310.
- Foucault, Michel, 2007. *The Politics of Truth*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Greif, Giden, 2018. "The Evolution of Holocaust Remembrance in Israeli Society", *Témoigner. Entre histoire et mémoire*, nr. 4: 63-71.
- Halliday, Michael, 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hansen, Lene, 2010. "Poststructuralism and Security", *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*.
- Herzog, Benno, 2016. "Discourse analysis as immanent critique: Possibilities and limits of normative critique in empirical discourse studies", *Discourse & Society*, 27(3): 278–292.
- Israel Hayom, 2022. "Never again? Nearly half of Israelis fear another Holocaust" News article. 2022-04-24. [Electronic] <https://www.israelhayom.com/2022/04/24/never-again-nearly-half-of-israelis-fear-another-holocaust/> Accessed 2022-05-10
- Jørgensen, Marianne - Louise Phillips, 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Khan, Abdul Aziz - Fahd Mohammed Sagheer Eid, 2020. "Analysis of Transitivity in the News Texts Discourse", *AMU Journal of Language and Media Discourse*, 3(1-2): 109-120.
- Klymenko, Lina, 2022. "The International Politics of Memory", *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*.
- Laclau, Ernesto - Chantal Mouffe, 1985. *Hegemony & Socialist Strategy*. New York: Verso Books.
- Langenbacher, Eric - Yossy Shain (ed.) 2010. *Power and the past. Collective memory and international relations*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Lerner, Adam B., 2020. "The uses and abuses of victimhood nationalism in international politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, 26(1): 62–87.
- Levanon, Ofer Shinar, 2021. "Under a constant shadow: The Israeli–Palestinian conflict and the traumatic memory of the Holocaust", *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 27(1): 58–66.
- Levi, Primo, 1959. *If this is a man*. New York. The Orion Press Inc.
- Lustick, Ian S., 2017. "The Holocaust in Israeli Political Culture: Four Constructions and Their Consequences", *Contemporary Jewry* 37(1): 125-170.
- Lynch, Cecelia, 2014. *Interpreting International Politics*. London: Routledge.

- McDonald, Matt, 2008. "Securitization and the Construction of Security", *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(4): 563-587.
- Meyer, Michael - Ruth Wodak, 2009. "Critical discourse analysis: history, agenda, theory and methodology" in Michael Meyer & Ruth Wodak (ed.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications Ltd: 1-33.
- MFA. 2022. *MFA Press release: Amnesty UK expected to publish a false, biased, and antisemitic report tomorrow*. [Press release]. [Accessed 2022-05-10] Available from: <https://www.gov.il/en/departments/news/amnesty-uk-expected-to-publish-biased-antiemitic-report-31-jan-2022>
- Mitzen, Jennifer, 2006. "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma", *European Journal of International Relations*, 12(3): 341–370.
- Mouffe, Chantal, 2000. *The Democratic Paradox*. New York: Verso Books.
- Mouffe, Chantal, 2013. *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically*. New York: Verso Books.
- Müller, Jan-Werner, 2002. "Introduction: The power of memory, the memory of power and the power over memory" in Jan-Werner Müller (ed.) *Memory and power in post-war Europe: Studies in the presence of the past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1–35.
- Mälksoo, Maria, 2015. "'Memory must be defended': Beyond the politics of mnemonical security", *Security Dialogue*, 46(3): 221–237.
- Nagle, John, 2014. "From the Politics of Antagonistic Recognition to Agonistic Peace Building: An Exploration of Symbols and Rituals in Divided Societies", *Peace & Change*, 39(4): 468-494.
- Naor, Arye, 2003. "Lessons of the Holocaust versus Territories for Peace, 1967-2001", *Israel Studies*, 8(1): 130-152.
- Ringmar, Erik, 1996. "On the Ontological Status of the State", *European Journal of International Relations*, 2(4): 439-466.
- Strömbom, Lisa, 2019. "Exploring Prospects for Agonistic Encounters in Conflict Zones: Investigating Dual Narrative Tourism in Israel/Palestine", *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 44(2-4): 75-93.
- Tulumello, Simon, 2021. "Agonistic security: Transcending (de/re)constructive divides in critical security studies", *Security Dialogue*, 52(4): 325–342.
- van Dijk, Teun A., 1993. "Principles of critical discourse analysis", *Discourse & Society*, 4(2): 249-283.
- van Dijk, Teun A., 2009. "Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach" in Michael Meyer & Ruth Wodak (ed.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2nd edition. London: SAGE Publications Ltd: 62-86.
- Wæver, Ole, 1995. "Securitization and Desecuritization" in Ronnie D. Lipschutz (ed.) *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press: 46-86.
- Zandberg, Eyal, 2010. "The right to tell the (right) story: journalism, authority and memory", *Media, Culture & Society*, 32(1): 5-24.