



PROJECT MUSE®

Introduction

Tuvia Friling

Israel Studies, Volume 14, Number 1, Spring 2009, pp. v-xvii (Article)

Published by Indiana University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/258033>

Introduction

IN LATE NOVEMBER 1942, THE JEWISH AGENCY EXECUTIVE, THE leadership of the Yishuv (Jewish community in pre-state Israel), called a press conference and made the first-ever official announcement of the shocking truth: Nazi Germany was perpetrating the systematic, all-inclusive, industrial annihilation of European Jewry and the destruction of the Jewish people. This was not a pogrom of the type all too common in Jewish history, but a Holocaust.

The Yishuv comprised 475,000 Jews, mostly young people of European background, new immigrants who had arrived in Eretz-Israel over the last two decades. The European landscape, the names of the communities being devoured in flame, the families going up in smoke—all were a living, breathing, organic part of their flesh. Most were dedicated Zionists, whose dream was to close the Diaspora chapter in Jewish history and create the “New Jew”, the Jew of the Land of Israel; nonetheless, the Diaspora was still an inseparable part of their lives. The Holocaust was present in the life of the Yishuv and later in the State of Israel—at least from the moment the official announcement was made. Thus began a long, convoluted, agonizing process of internalizing the Holocaust’s meanings; of living in its shadow, along with the scars engraved in the flesh and embedded in the consciousness.

The answer to the question “Where do Israelis begin living the Holocaust?” can be found in the first official announcement of mass murder in Europe. The shocking official revelation was made not by the millions-strong Jewish communities in the free world; nor by powerful organizations such as the World Jewish Congress or the Bund, or the Ultra-Orthodox community, or by any of the hundreds of other Jewish organizations and subgroups of America’s wealthy, proud Jewish community.

News of the catastrophic fate of Europe’s Jews was already known to most of the leaders of these groups. Scores of Jewish organizations and movements, large and small, secular and religious, national, non-national, and anti-national invested all their efforts to attaining the highest position in the organizational hierarchy where they could submit their “solution”

and leadership to the Jewish people. Between the two world wars some of these organizations engaged in large-scale aid programs for their European brethren. When Hitler rose to power they also began applying public, political, and economic pressure. Nevertheless, it was the small Zionist community in the Land of Israel that brandished the sword and distinguished past disasters and the latest developments, and recognized the need to prepare for the new challenges while the larger, more powerful organizations buckled under political pressure not to go public.

While the official publication from Eretz-Israel is well-known, its inherent, muted, symbolic meaning is generally left unmentioned, and seems to lie at the heart of this anthology: the Holocaust's presence in the lives of Israelis. The Yishuv, like other Jewish communities, also strove for centrality, for a preeminent position in the Jewish world. It was the freest Jewish community, even though it was living under the British Mandate authorities, who, by the time the war broke out, had nullified their commitment to the Balfour Declaration.

The small Jewish community lived tenuously alongside and in the midst of a large Arab population that had launched the "Arab Revolt" (1936–1939)—a violent uprising, which signaled Arab intentions regarding the Zionist enterprise. In effect, the Yishuv assumed the complex role of "vanguard of the Jewish people", with the enormity of responsibilities that this entailed, at least in the initial stage of the Zionist enterprise. This was due in part to the tasks it officially took upon itself with the establishment of the "Jewish Agency", the Yishuv's internationally recognized representative body.

The Holocaust and its multifarious meanings are, therefore, intrinsically linked to Israelis' feelings and the overt and covert roles they assumed, whether consciously or not, whether to the liking of all or only some of them, whether to the admiration or chagrin of world Jewry.

This anthology, marking Israel's 60th anniversary, depicts various encounters between the Holocaust, as a seminal event, and large sections of Israel's dynamic, multisided society. The interim conclusions about consciousness-shaping processes, which the eminent historian Fernand Braudel defined as "long-term" processes, have been reached in a relatively short time-span. Various social groups in Israel were affected by this colossal event, and the scars etched in their bodies and minds still cry out for healing.

Dalia Ofer asks to what degree the Holocaust's presence in the lives of Israelis represents a sincere and tireless effort to understand the event and its role in their lives as human beings, Jews, and Israelis. She explores the

responses to this question as they emerge from the multi-leveled discourse in various sectors of Israeli society and from the contribution of diverse socializing agents.

Daniel Gutwein describes and analyzes the key role played by collective memory of the Holocaust in defining Israeli identity and in the political and cultural struggle that shaped it. He argues that this struggle intensified during the 1980s and 1990s, and that the Israeli privatization revolution, together with the redistribution of economic and political forces, social sectorialization, and the rise of multiculturalism in place of the “melting pot” ethos have influenced—and still influence—the crystallization of Holocaust memory. He discerns three main periods in the construction of Holocaust collective memory in Israel—each period characterized by a dominating memory that outweighs rival memories: “the period of divided memory”, “the period of nationalized memory”, and “the period of privatized memory”.

Shlomo Aronson explores how the lessons David Ben-Gurion learned from the Holocaust shaped his security policy and how his understanding of the War of Independence impacted his decision to embark on the 1956 Sinai Campaign. Attempting to reconstruct the formation of Ben-Gurion’s conventional and unconventional defense concepts, the article analyzes the historical differences between Ben-Gurion’s pre-Holocaust security concepts and those of Ze’ev Jabotinsky, their misinterpretation by Jabotinsky’s followers after their leader’s demise in 1940, and those later developed by Ben-Gurion’s critics and political rivals (such as Yigal Allon and Israel Galili) as well as by Ben-Gurion himself. The article suggests that prior to and after the Six-Day War, the Israeli left and right became captives to their own pretensions that were based on erroneous, ideologically motivated misunderstandings of the realities of the Shoah and the illusion of 1967.

Hanna Yablonka examines how three generations of Jews from Islamic countries (Sephardim–Mizrahim)—new immigrants, their children, and grandchildren—have made their ties to the Holocaust an essential element in Israeli national identity. This overlaps with the move of the Sephardim from the periphery to the center. She describes this phenomenon from the Oriental Jews’ perspective, not the establishment’s, despite the latter’s obvious influence on the events.

Tuvia Friling explores the reasons for the glaring discrepancy between the quality and quantity of reconstructive, analytical, and evaluative research of the Labor Movement and left-wing circles to nation-, society-, and state-building, and that of the right-wing circles. The same gap also exists, with regard to all Revisionist (and other right-wing) activities:

pre-World War II illegal immigration, aid and rescue of European Jewry during the war, participation in combat, clandestine cooperation with the Allies, and fighting in the ghetto uprisings; as well as for the postwar *Bricha* Movement (the organized illegal Jewish immigration from Europe), illegal immigration, arms procurement, and building the Yishuv's armed forces until statehood was attained.

Space limits us from including other sectors in Israel's multifaceted, dynamic society: the Ultra-Orthodox, immigrants from the FSU (the majority of whom began arriving in the 1990s), and Arabs with Israeli citizenship.

Nevertheless, as the articles show, since the end of World War II the Holocaust has become a permanent fixture in Israeli life, its scars being felt in every area of Israeli society. The Holocaust was omnipresent in the survivors who arrived in illegal immigrant ships and forced their way into the country, and in those who arrived later from the detention camps in Cyprus. It permeated the ranks of the Jewish resistance movements—the Hagana, Etzel, and Lehi—that fought to breach the restrictions on immigration.

From its first stages the Holocaust was present in informal encounters, in kibbutz dining halls, and in gatherings in towns and cities. It appears in the key sections of the Proclamation of Independence in the Jewish people's return to its historical homeland. It became a divisive issue in the raucous, heated public debates over reparations from Germany, in Knesset sessions on the "Nazis and Nazi Collaborators Punishment Law", the "Yad Vashem Law", and in discussions on the shaping of Holocaust Remembrance Day and its symbolic proximity to "Memorial Day for the Fallen Soldiers".

This proximity is not accidental. It testifies to Israelis' desire to highlight what constituted important ideological links between what would eventually become the symbols of Holocaust and destruction on the one hand, and the symbols of redemption and national rebirth on the other. The Holocaust was central in discussions on the meaning of "valor" and resistance, on what was defined as "going like sheep to the slaughter", in the "kapo" trials of the 1950s, in research and the public furor over the Judenrat, and in the creation of memorial institutes and sites that sprang up throughout the country.

Whatever did not emerge from all of the above, resurfaced in full force in the Gruenwald Trial—commonly known as the Kasztner Trial—and Kasztner's murder in Tel-Aviv. The impact of the Holocaust was felt by Israeli youngsters in the early years of the state, when the family listened in rapt silence to the daily radio program "Searching for Lost Relatives".

It was a major component in forging Israel's political and military security theory and strategy; in the tension-ridden weeks before the Six-Day War; in the sense of impending catastrophe in the Yom Kippur War; and, paradoxically, in sealed rooms where Israelis sat with gas masks during the Gulf War.

The Holocaust is sometimes employed *ad nauseam* in brainless statements in speeches of politicians and some military commanders who utilize it for current and trivial needs in what can only be termed as facile "lessons of the Holocaust".

Appalling use was made of yellow-orange Jewish stars during the disengagement from the Gaza strip in 2005, when settler children bearing an orange badge held up their arms symbolizing their capitulation to the Israeli army that had come to evict them from their homes—a gesture that was intended to recall the image of ghetto children that had become an icon of the Holocaust.

It serves as an anvil for Israelis seeking to shape an alternative collective memory or history, to create a narrative detached from the Holocaust and that challenges its abiding presence in Israeli life, often without realizing how deeply the Holocaust is entrenched in their own worldview, and to what extent their solution is nothing more than a mirror image of what they perceive and glean from it.

The Holocaust is also linked to the strident, widespread, caustic scholarly and public discourse that began during the Holocaust over the Zionist revolution's degree of "purity", legitimacy, and the justification for statehood as the solution to the anomaly of Jewish existence. Within this discourse aspersions have been cast at what is defined as the "original sin" of the Zionist State: colonialism, militarism, particularism, its irrationality, tribalism and nationalism, its leaders' obtuseness and iniquity, its mistreatment of the Palestinians, Sephardic Jews, and women. From this cornucopia of vilification has emerged the charge that the Zionist Movement and its leaders, the progenitors of these iniquities and miscarriages of justice, also failed in their role toward fellow Jews during the Holocaust by cynically lording over the survivors and exploiting them as a military-social-political tool for attaining Zionist goals. This accusation precipitated a furious debate over the Yishuv's part in rescue attempts and the instrumentalization of the Holocaust by Israelis and their leaders.

Some claim that the 1905 "Uganda Debate" was the turning point in the Zionist Movement's history, when Zionist leaders determined that their responsibility lay only with Jews who chose to bind their fate to a political solution in Eretz-Israel, and that the rest of world Jewry was

of no interest to the Zionist Movement. This led to the “negation of the Diaspora”, whereby the Zionist Movement, whose *raison d’être* was to offer a solution to the “Jewish Problem”, chose to appropriate the “Jewish Disaster” as an instrument for achieving its goals. The Zionist Movement is accused of having concocted the idea of the Holocaust’s “uniqueness” in order to strengthen its position. It did this for political needs, its accusers claim, because the Holocaust is, in fact, not really unique at all. It was part of the Nazis’ overall satanic plan to eliminate or subjugate other nations, and since the Jews were foreign elements on European soil, the Nazis commenced the liquidation program with them. According to this view, Zionists “cooked up” this uniqueness in order to justify two nefarious claims: it served to justify the establishment of the Zionist state despite the “original sin”, that is the expulsion of another nation dwelling on the same land; and it provided the foundation for creating a “Holocaust consciousness” as a manipulative political instrument.

By defining the Jews as the only victims of World War II, they hoped to imbue a sense of guilt into European countries, the United States, and the American Jewish community. On the basis of this guilt a partnership in responsibility for the Holocaust could be built, whose next logical step would be responsibility for Israel’s survival by extending massive political and economic and military support. This has become a cornerstone of Israeli life. Thus, Israel survives (and thrives) on the strength of guilt harbored by the Western-Christian world and Jews of the Western world. The Zionists’ original goal was to rectify the problems of the Jewish people, transforming the calamity of the Jewish people into the basis of its existence. Furthermore, after this success, the leadership upped the ante, warning that a second Holocaust—from the Arab world—was conceivable. This avowal again posits Jewish solidarity on a false and mystical basis, enabling the Zionist state to develop a kind of “security paranoia”—a paranoia that justifies any form of Israeli response to an Arab attack—no matter how exaggerated—as the only answer to what is perceived as the first sign of an imminent Holocaust.

By this line of reasoning, Ahmadinajad and his counterparts are merely a fabrication concocted by the Zionists to be brandished hysterically before the international community. According to this rationale, the Zionists’ cynical, manipulative approach to the Holocaust and Diaspora Jewry also explains the movement’s exploitation of the Jews during and after the Holocaust. It also furnishes an answer to the question of why the Zionist’s traditional, ideologically-based “negation of the Diaspora” led to the introverted, self-centered perspective of the movement and the Yishuv during

World War II, their paramount concern with building the Zionist entity in Eretz-Israel, and the “abandonment of the Diaspora” during the Holocaust. The decades-long debate reverberates throughout this anthology. It has been the main theme of scores of books and articles, and will continue to do so in the academic and public discourse in the years to come.

The Holocaust has also been the subject of public discussion regarding its place in the school curricula, and in recent years the educational rationale of high-school trips to the death camps in Poland has also been brought into question. It was present in the farcical Demanjuk Trial, and is reflected in Holocaust black humor, off-colored jokes that make the rounds almost subversively. The subject also arises, naturally, when discussing whether memory and commemoration patterns that were established in Israel’s first decades are suitable today.

From this point of view, the oft-heard claim in Israeli historiography that the Israelis “discovered” the Holocaust in the Eichmann Trial has become one of the most trumped up statements that has ever taken root. In effect, it seems that over the years the Holocaust has attained a permanent place on the Israeli agenda. Similar to the special chair that Jews leave empty at every family meal, imaginary representatives of the “six million” have been sitting pressed to one another on the same chair in many homes at almost every meal. Gideon Hausner employed his superior rhetorical talents to display them in the Eichmann Trial, and bring them to every Israeli home. However, he did not discover them; they were there all the time. Kidnapping Eichmann to Jerusalem in a complex, brilliantly conceived and performed intelligence operation by the young state’s secret services, bringing the arch-murderer to justice in an Israeli court in Jerusalem, the capital of the Jewish state, with all the trappings of sovereignty, with Israeli policemen leading him into the courtroom and seating him in a protective glass booth—like a centerpiece on display—and the dramatic, blood-curdling testimonies on live radio—all these made the presence of the Holocaust palpably felt in every Israeli home. The trial ended a stage in the crammed, ongoing process of “Holocaust events” that began with the first announcement of Nazi Germany’s liquidation policy. The Holocaust did not suddenly appear out of thin air.

In 2008 Israel planned its 60th anniversary celebrations, events that were viewed cynically by many Israelis as political chaff to divert attention from far greater issues. US president George W. Bush honored Israel with a visit. The press quoted him as admitting during the visit that he “couldn’t begin to imagine what it was like to be a Jew or Israeli.” This admission deeply moved Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni, who felt that she had “to

share with you, especially prior to your visit to Yad Vashem, some private thoughts that I wrote a few years ago about what it means for me to be a Jew, a mother, an Israeli, and a government minister in Israel.”

To be a Jew is to dream about the Holocaust, live the Holocaust, and die the Holocaust—without actually having gone through it. To be an Israeli child is to try to imagine the number ‘six million’ and never being able to comprehend it. To be an Israeli mother is to suddenly realize that you’ve transferred Holocaust collective memory and the Holocaust experience to your children . . . Being a Jewish leader in Israel means wondering if you had seen the writing on the wall . . . would you have made the right decision at the time. [It means] understanding the magnitude of the responsibility and it especially means vowing never to forget.

Doron Rosenblum, a sharp, outspoken journalist, ruminated on her words in an article: “The Text and Its Meaning” (*Ha’aretz*, January 18, 2008), and asked where the minister’s strong connection to the “Holocaust” came from. Not because it was a rehash of the speech the minister delivered a year earlier on a visit to Berlin, when she stood on the station platform from where the Jews were sent to the camps; nor because he wanted to ridicule the minister whom he considered an honest, intelligent, highly capable politician; and not even because he wished to question whether the letter was written from the depths of her heart.

What really intrigued him were the reasons behind her almost knee-jerk response to the president’s query. What did she want to prove to (and demand from) President Bush under these circumstances and in the name of the Israeli collective no less? Why did the relatively young politician—a native-born Israeli—with a background in the Israeli secret service, the daughter of Eitan Livni, a leader in the pre-state underground organization, Etzel, and one of the most valiant fighters for Jewish nationalism in Eretz-Israel, why did she, almost instinctively, refer to the Holocaust—and only the Holocaust—when defining her Israeli and Jewish identity? This question would not be important, concludes Rosenblum, had it been a personal tendency on her part, had it not represented the thinking of many Israelis, especially political and military personalities. But he wanted to give expression to other Israelis too, including the many youngsters who do not think about the Holocaust day and night, but “who fantasize on the young chemistry teacher’s bra size or how many kilometers they trekked on the school trip or the number of cat’s-eye marbles left in their pocket since recess . . . But this was probably only an insignificant number of

natural-born anarchists, children who dream about the same things that most kids in the free Western world dream about at that age.”

He also wanted to point out that when Foreign Minister Livni expressed her thoughts as an Israeli leader, there were others in the country for whom the Holocaust was also rooted in their consciousness and carved in their flesh, but who were looking for a way to free themselves from the living chokehold and surmount the self-righteous sense of victimization to which one easily grows addicted. He wanted to remind his readers that there had been Israeli leaders who envisioned a future with commitments to the past, but also strove to establish an exemplary, free, healthy society emancipated from the memory of genocidal horrors.

President Bush may have expected an entirely different answer to his question about being an Israeli and a Jew,” concludes Rosenblum, “a much more uplifting answer, especially as an outsider who admires what appears to him as the heroism, guts, and dedication of a nation that has built an impressive, magnificent state. Instead, he was smacked in the face with a cold herring, a clump of garlic, and a sack of moans and groans.

Around the same time, *Ha'aretz* published an interview between its reporter Ari Shavit and Zeev Sternhell, the recipient of the Israel Prize in 2008 (7 March 2008). Sternhell is a professor emeritus of political science at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, a well-known leftist, the master of a sharp pen, and a critical, original, fearless voice on the Israeli scene. This interview, like Rosenblum's, presents the mosaic of post-Holocaust Israeli life. I would like to conclude the introduction to this issue with a lengthy section from that interview:

Shavit: When did you first begin thinking about Israel?

Sternhell: Before the war, in Poland. My family was Zionist, and my aunt who looked after me in France was active in the Jewish National Fund. There were posters, and considerable activity. I heard things. As a youth in Avignon I read three newspapers a day and through them followed developments in Palestine. Then came the declaration of statehood in May 1948. Your generation cannot comprehend the excitement that grabbed hold of us. It was only four years since the Red Army had liberated us; six years after the Nazis liquidated the ghetto. The transition from horror and helplessness to a Jewish state that had just won [its war of independence] almost defies description.

As a boy of 13, I was terribly afraid that the Arabs would slaughter the Jews. There seemed to be only 600,000 Jews surrounded by millions of

Arabs. And the fact that a Jewish army had fought and won statehood was beyond my wildest imagination. That Jews who had been herded into the ghettos, hunted down in the streets, killed and butchered, were now standing up and creating their own state seemed to me like a miracle. It was a historic event that bordered on the metaphysical. Suddenly Jews are cabinet ministers, military officers. There are passports, uniforms, a flag. The Jews finally attained what the Gentiles have always had. They are just like the Gentiles. No longer dependent on them. They can look after themselves. For me, the establishment of Israel was like the creation of the universe. I was transported into a state of rapture.

Shavit: What you're saying then is that your excitement over the state's founding was partly due to what happened "there", in the ghettos, which was not only catastrophic but also humiliating.

Sternhell: "Humiliation" doesn't begin to describe it. The ghetto went far beyond that. The Jew had become a grain of sand, into a nothing, into someone whose life was absolutely worthless. That's what was so terrible in those years: the child who sees his mother and sister taken from him, who sees Jews being beaten like animals and driven to their slaughter. And then suddenly in Israel Jews are fighting like people should. Fighting and winning. In photographs and newsreels they look young and tough, with rifles on their shoulders. Yes, they're human beings after all, capable of fighting for their freedom . . . Not animals that can be killed, enslaved, or hunted down. No longer will they be treated like beasts.

Shavit: You're saying something harsh: in the former world—the world of the Holocaust—the Jews lost their human image, and it was restored only with the establishment of the State.

Sternhell: It's not even the loss of the human image—because there never was one. The Jews were nothing there. Nothing! Nothing! Nothing! They were human dust. They were people who were shot not even the way that cats and dogs are shot. I mean they were nonentities, less than animals. You can pity an animal; there was no pity for the Jews. They were subhuman. And in just a few years, the Jew becomes a complete human being . . . He flourishes. He displays human traits of courage and self-sacrifice. For me, in southern France, there was something incredible about this, something I can't define.

Shavit: Watch it, you're starting to sound like a Zionist.

Sternhell: Not only am I a Zionist, I'm a super-Zionist. Zionism was and remains for me the Jewish People's right to determine their fate and future. I believe that human beings have the natural right to be their own masters. The Jews were deprived of this right in their history, but Zionism restored it to them. That is the real meaning of Zionism. It's a profound revolution

that touches all of us. I felt that revolution when I immigrated to Israel alone at the age of sixteen. Only when I got off the ship *Artza* at Haifa did I stop being an object of others' actions and become my own man. Only then did I become a person in control of his destiny and no longer dependent on others.

Shavit: You arrived in Israel in the winter of 1951, a period of severe economic austerity. You had no one. Wasn't it depressing?

Sternhell: The ship brought over a large group of children from Marseille. It was very crowded, but we were happy. I remember that we stood on deck and watched Mount Carmel grow closer. The land was approaching. The Land of Israel. When we disembarked, some people actually stooped and kissed the wharf. I didn't. But I had a strange feeling that I'd arrived, that this was the last stop.

Shavit: What do you mean "the last stop"?

Sternhell: The last stop of drifting, of changing identity, of a falseness that was an integral part of everything, of not being myself. And here, here I suddenly shed that equivocation. Something artificial peeled away, that was sometimes frightening, having to do with the constant need to justify yourself, to explain why you are here. Here in Israel you don't have to explain or justify anything, and that's a very great relief. You don't know Hebrew yet, you don't know what will become of you. You're alone, without anything. But you have a strong feeling that the terrible journey is over.

Shavit: You're a well-known leftist, a critical historian, and now you're coming out of the closet and proclaiming to be an old school Zionist, a bona fide Israeli nationalist.

Sternhell: I'm a Zionist of the old left, in both the national and social sense. Let's say I'm an Israeli nationalist. Some of my foreign friends probably won't look kindly on this, but I've never ingratiated myself upon them anyhow. A person who went through WW II, witnessed the establishment of the state, and immigrated alone before he was even 16, came solely to live in a Jewish nation-state.

There are two issues here. One, I don't believe we can defend ourselves here without a nation-state. I'm under no illusions. If the Arabs could wipe us out, they would do so readily. If the Palestinians, Egyptians, and all those who have signed peace agreements with us had their way, we wouldn't be here which would suit them just fine. The truth of the matter is that we still face an existential danger, and our insurance policy for survival remains our strength. Even though I'm against the occupation [of the West Bank and Golan Heights] and want the Palestinians to have rights identical to mine, I realize that I need the framework of a nation-state for self-defense.

But there's also another issue at stake. I have no religion. I don't adhere to the religion of security or the crutch of religion. Without the nation-state, I'm adrift, detached. There's a paradox in this. Today religious elements speak in the name of a kind of nationalism that I reject because it does not respect the other (Palestinian) nationalism. The truth is that secular Israelis need the nation-state framework much more than religious do. If Israel disappears, I'm left with nothing—stark naked. That's why Israel is so important to me. I cannot treat it as a *fait accompli*, as a regular, normal country. For me, it's something that must be constantly protected; something we have to make sure will not disintegrate through our undoing because things can fall apart easily. That's a lesson we've learned. And things can sometimes disintegrate with amazing speed—from one day to the next.

Shavit: You're receiving the Israel Prize in the state's 60th year. Everything is blooming; Israel is flourishing fifty-seven years after you stepped ashore. Where's the threat of dissolution that you refer to?

Sternhell: I never believed Zionism intended to be a colonial movement. It didn't set out to seize control of a local population or natural resources or a route to India. It needed a plot of land where it could safeguard the Jewish People's right to freedom and security.

But the danger is that because of the occupation of 1967, Zionism will become a colonialist movement. Presently we're in a semi-colonialist state that we can't seem to extricate ourselves from. Unless we muster the necessary mental stamina to evacuate areas beyond the Green Line, we'll reach a *cul-de-sac*. We'll be forced to choose between full-scale colonialism and bi-nationalism. Either way I see the end of Zionism. A colonialist state will ultimately spark a horrific uprising by the occupied population; a bi-national state will solve nothing and terminate in a bloodbath.

I didn't come to Israel to live in a bi-national state. Had I wanted to live as a minority, I could have chosen countries that are safer and more comfortable for minorities. I certainly didn't come to Israel to be a colonial ruler. As I see it, nationalism that is not universalistic, that tramples on the national rights of others, is a dangerous form of nationalism. That's why I think that time is working against us. We don't have the time. What worries me is that the good life here, the free-flowing money, the stock market, homes at Manhattan real-estate prices is creating a terrible delusion. It is obvious that things can't continue like this for another century—in fact, I doubt whether they can go on like this for another decade.

My generation, the generation of Israel's first decade, the generation that saw statehood as a veritable miracle is slowly exiting the stage. It is a tragedy for us to see what is happening. For me it really is the end of the world

because a person wants to provide for his children's and grandchildren's future. As a citizen, I want to ensure the future of the society I live in. And as a human being I dream of leaving a lasting vestige. I want to know that when I "sign out", my daughters and granddaughters will be able to live normal lives here. That is all we ever wanted. Unfortunately today, that normal life does not appear guaranteed. I do not see my daughters' and granddaughters' future so assured. This is what really frightens me. What scares me is the knowledge that what exists today may disintegrate tomorrow.

* * *

I would like to thank Professor Ilan Troen and Dr. Natan Aridan, the editors of *Israel Studies*, the translator, Mr. Moshe Tlamim, and copy editor, Ms. Edna Oxman for their affable cooperation. The issue was prepared while I was a David and Fela Shappel Family Foundation Fellow at The Center of Advanced Holocaust Studies, U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, DC.