

Institute, Prof. Gabriel Motzkin, who, in that capacity, will also be the new chairman of the editorial board of *Theory and Criticism*. I have no doubt that Prof. Motzkin will lead the journal through harmonious, creative and fruitful work with the editorial board.

As this issue went to press we received the sad news that our colleague and friend, Prof. Baruch Kimmerling, had died. Prof. Kimmerling was one of the pioneers of theory and criticism in sociology, and he was a pillar of the journal and of its editorial board. He set the course for two central areas of research in Israel, the study of militarism and of colonialism, and imbued them with both moral and methodological validity. Baruch's passing has pained us all — the editors, the readers, colleagues, and students — and we send our love and condolences to Diana and the entire family.

In her article, “Counter-Theatre: Symbolic Protest and Social Activity in Jerusalem,” *Shulamith Lev-Aladgem* proposes two complementary moves. First, she examines community theater in Jerusalem as the arena of struggle during the Seventies for Israeli historiography. Then, through opposition theater, she proposes a new, if tentative, reading of the history of social protest in Israel. The social history that she proposes tells the story of the arts groups that were active in the neighborhood and the story of their works, such as *Joseph Goes Down to Katamon*, *Reunion*, *Mechanical Youth*, *Partly Cloudy*, and *In a Closed Circuit*. Unlike historiographic approaches that documented protest through fixed historical episodes (the Wadi Salib Rebellion, the Black Panthers, Shas) or continuously, Lev-Aladgem turns her attention to the end of the protest in the very location where the political upheaval of the Seventies took place (or where it seems to us that it took place).

Nili Broyer's essay, “Unplaced Identity: Narratives of Exclusion and Its Exception,” describes her performative behavior, both in practice and in theory, vis-à-vis the authorities that want her to allow herself to be categorized in accordance with normative rules of categorization.

This issue of *Theory and Criticism* also includes an artistic portfolio, edited by Meir Wigoder, with his introductory text, on the activities of Machsom Watch. It also contains the section “Among Books,” which includes reviews on economics (*Dotan Leshem*, *Ilan Talmud*); on literature that deals with the suffering of Germans during World War II (*Gilad Margalit*); and on self-help literature for single men and single women (*Kinneret Lahad*).

This summer, Dr. Shimshon Zelniker will complete his term as director of the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute, and at the same time he will end his chairmanship of the editorial board of *Theory and Criticism*. Dr. Zelniker has been the chairman of the editorial board for the past ten years. These have been years of intellectual flowering for the institute, manifested both in the journal and in academic decisions. Now, with the publication of issue No. 30 of *Theory and Criticism*, I would like to thank Dr. Zelniker in the name of all the members of the editorial board; in the name of the director of the publications department, Sara Soreni; in the name of the text editor and secretary of the editorial department, Orna Yoeli; and of course in my own name, for his leadership, which included setting a course for the journal and defending it admirably against attacks on the freedom of expression. These are not trivial matters, and we are extremely grateful to him and wish him luck in the future. I would also like to take this opportunity to greet the incoming director of the Van Leer Jerusalem

on spatializing the Zionist ideology by means of the modernist concept of planning. But her central claim is that the dialectic and the practices of daily life delineate surprising relations between belonging, memory, and urban planning that challenge the government's planning practices.

The essay of *Irit Katz Feigis*, "Spaces Stretch Inwards: Intersections between Architecture and Minor Actions," uses the deterritorialization movement of Deleuze and Guattari to juxtapose the concepts that define minor literature and those that define the space of the camp (refugee camp).

Talila Kosh-Zohar's article, "Remembering or Forgetting: Gendered Op/positions," proposes a fascinating reading of three works by women that deal with memory of the Holocaust: Leah Eini's story, "Until the Entire Guard Passes" (1991); Lizzy Doron's collection of stories, *Why Didn't You Come Before the War?* (1998); and Aliza Olmert's novel, *A Slice of Sea* (2001).

This reading is based, inter alia, on the metaphor of Lot's wife, in which one can see a counter-interpretation to the Freudian interpretation of the Oedipus myth. In Kosh-Zohar's reading, the forbidden look back of Lot's wife is an act of commitment to memory of the past and an act of opposition to the arbitrary patriarchal command that the past be erased. Similarly, Kosh-Zohar argues, one may find in Holocaust-related Israeli works conflicting gender-related responses in relation to the memory of the Holocaust. According to the reading proposed in the article, women's memory in these works acts in opposition to what is termed "the father's law." *Raz Yosef's* article, "The Politics of Normality: Sex and Nation in Gay Israeli Cinema," critiques the discourse pertaining to homosexuals and lesbians. The Nineties were marked by liberalization in many areas, including the legitimate rights of homosexuals and lesbians in Israel. But the discourse of legitimacy, Yosef argues, while focusing on the demand for participation in the hegemonic institutions, did not dispute the model of the normative citizen. In this sense, many members of the community found themselves excluded not only from heterosexual discourse but also from that of homosexuals. Yosef demonstrates his point by analyzing Eitan Fuchs's film, "Yossi & Jagger," which became the central text of homosexual visibility in Israel. Yosef argues that Fuchs's film fulfilled all the unwritten rules of the hegemonic establishment, as well as the aspirations of the homosexual community to be accepted in the mainstream, and therefore it was such a success. He juxtaposes to "Yossi & Jagger" the films of Amos Gutman, which until now have been rejected by the homosexual community because they present a homosexual image that is considered perverted.

or how the notion of secularization that underlies the “state of all its citizens” (I prefer the version that I will call the “state of all its peoples”) is reconcilable with the fact that it is impossible to classify the majority of the Jewish or the Palestinian populations as secular.

At the heart of *Shai Ginsburg*’s article, “Literature, Territory, Criticism: Brenner and the Eretz-Israeli Genre,” is the notion of space in the work of Yosef Haim Brenner. According to Ginsburg, maps of Eretz-Israel drawn in the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century embody a Christian allegory that shaped Christian maps of the area from the beginning of the Middle Ages. Brenner’s literary and cultural criticism has reflected that spatial conception. Ginsburg’s theoretical discussion deals with the writing of the nationalist literature. He shows that the rationale that shaped the core of nationalist culture was the same as that which was associated with its fringes.

In his article, “The Prime Minister Lies Bleeding,” *Ohad Zehavi* proposes a convoluted reading of the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin, by means of a photograph that was published by all the daily newspapers and circulated “like a virus that could not be controlled.” The photograph, taken by Gershon Shelvinski, appeared without a photo credit, except in one paper that provided it after the picture had appeared. But this photograph, which became almost canonic, did not fit easily into the rules that governed the discourse about Yitzhak Rabin, rules that grew out of the desire for an explicit, clear and exhaustive presentation of the event. This individual incident also has a group name: the need to free political events from the stranglehold of consensual commentary.

Three texts in this issue deal with space. *Haim Yacobi*’s article, “‘The Third Place’: Architecture, Nationalism and Postcolonialism,” looks at space and nationalism. Yacobi proposes the postcolonial perspective for examining the practices of the design of space and the discourse of urban planning and architecture in Israel. According to him, this discourse and these practices are trapped within clear epistemological boundaries, such as reliance on binary categories that organize power relations in a hegemonic manner. Yacobi examines the changes in architectural discourse regarding the “Arabism” or “Orientalism” of the “Israeli space,” and says that both modernist and postmodernist discourse share the same basic assumptions.

Tovi Fenster’s article, “Memory, Belonging and Spatial Planning in Israel,” deals with the national outline plan and the structure of its discourse. Naturally, she shows that institutional planning has difficulty in accommodating Palestinians’ layers of memory and belonging, because the act of planning is inherently focused

The Third Israel, but the journal is committed to it epistemologically, as is apparent from the various articles presented here.

In his article, “Between Anti-Colonialism and Postcolonialism: Critique of Nationalism and Secularism in Brit Shalom,” *Zohar Maor* proposes a new reading of three of the major thinkers in the Brit Shalom movement: Gershom Scholem, Hans Kohn and Hugo Bergmann. In his critique of them he focuses on the connection between Zionism and European colonialism, a critique organized along two constitutive axes: the first, a critique of the concept of secularization that shapes modern nationalism; and the second, the Orientalist axis of the relationships between East and West. This reading, the author argues, creates an elusive and complex picture: the people of Brit Shalom are radically critical of colonialism (and also of European nationalism), but at the same time they accept some of its basic cultural assumptions. Maor is not satisfied with a historical reading of Brit Shalom. He seeks also, and primarily, to examine the link between the agenda of the people of Brit Shalom and that of current postcolonial theory. According to Maor, a substantial part of the agenda of Israel’s Left today, and even of the critical discourse, suffers from a problem similar to that of Brit Shalom, because it accepts the thesis of secularization as the meta-narrative of the political reality.

This analysis touches indirectly on the relations between Jews and Palestinians in Israel. In recent months, Israeli-Palestinian political groups — including the Arab Coordinating Committee; the Musawa Center for Arab Rights in Israel; Adala, the Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel; and Mada Carmel, the Arab Center for Applied Social Research — have proposed ways of reorganizing society and politics in Israel. Underlying their proposals is a demand for recognition of the historical injustices caused to the Palestinians and recognition of the collective rights of Palestinians in Israel. The proposals include a call for formulation of an alternative constitution. These are important proposals, because they highlight the superficiality and the distortion in the campaign titled “Constitution by Consent,” led by the Israel Democracy Institute. The “constitution by consent” plan, one must note, deals mainly with arranging relations between religious and secular Jews in a Jewish state, but it does not have on its agenda the relations between Jews and Arabs. If it does, it brushes it off with the oxymoron “Jewish and democratic.” Nevertheless, even these proposals of the Palestinian organizations are partial, and if they are not broadened, they will remain slogans. They do not address central questions, such as what the rights of Jews are in the democratic constitution (as Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin pointed out recently),

manifests its sovereignty through declarations of a state of emergency, that is, a war. The social/economic sovereign, on the other hand, seemingly avoids exercising its sovereignty by declaring a state of emergency on the Israeli home front. Thus the social/economic sovereign enables the state to retreat from the political and to abandon it to the plutocrats. This Janus face of the state — supervision and abandonment at one and the same time — finds full expression in neoliberal thought. The abandoning relationship does not rule out the supervisory relationship. On the contrary: supervision and abandonment appear as two complementary facets, as critical theory has pointed out. Thus, for example, the state supervises the deportation of migrant workers from its territory, but at the same time abandons them and their rights to the mercy of their employers. It also ensures the deportation of women who are bought and sold in the white slave trade, yet it abandons them to the mercy of their pimps.

In the extreme cases of abandonment relations one may speak of an absolute annihilation of every right, including the right to live. This abandonment stems not from neglect but rather from a systematic agenda.

The Arrangements Law (Hok Ha'Hesderim) is a clear example of the Janus face of the state. This law organizes the areas of the state's abandonment by means of actions taken by the supervisory state. As noted above, the fracture was clearly expressed during the war. The supervisory state declared a state of emergency and entered into an all-out war (that failed). The abandoning state, that is, the one responsible for the society and its subjects, did not declare a state of emergency and thus abandoned a million civilians to their fate. Thus the war highlighted an extreme example of daily reality in Israel. Clausewitz wrote that "war is the continuation of politics by other means." Foucault added the inverse: "Politics is the war continued by other means." Foucault reminds us that in addition to the "external" war there is an "internal" one, which in the past was called the class war or the war between ethnic groups. The internal war in Israel came into clear focus during the Second Lebanon War, which exemplified how wealth makes a more protected life possible and how oligarchs take on the sovereign rights of the government. The Lebanon war also exposed a new social category: The Third Israel. The Second Israel was a category in the discourse of the Seventies and Eighties that referred to the Mizrahi Jews whom the Labor Party had marginalized and whom the right-wing government brought back to center stage. The Third Israel is a poorer category, broader in scope, including many more groups: Mizrahi, Russian, and Ethiopian Jews; Arabs; women; and labor migrants. This issue of *Theory and Criticism* does not deal explicitly with

fundamental moral and political questions: For example, why the state has no political or diplomatic agenda, how it allowed itself to wreak such violence and destruction in Lebanon, and why it continues to ignore the social and class crisis, as well as the ethnic crisis exposed yet again by the war. This does not mean that the discourse of every commission of inquiry generates a teleological rationale of this kind. In many cases, there may be a dialectical dynamic in which the government-strengthening element fails, thus rendering political and social debate possible. Unfortunately, however, that is not how things have developed over the past few months, a fact expressed in the government's sweeping disregard of the many declarations in the Arab world regarding the desire and the need for rapprochement with Israel.

But there has been yet another twist in the problematic relationship between the functional rationale and the moral rationale. Recently I watched a television program that dealt with the question of why in a single month both the chief of police and the chief of general staff had resigned. The debate, which dealt particularly with questions of values and not only with operational questions, focused on the loss of collective values and the ethos of comradeship and the growth of the new, individualistic ethos, which weakens social solidarity. But to my surprise, none of the participants mentioned the structural characteristics of the functional fracture that was revealed: the fact that the Israel Defense Forces has been operating for decades as a police force (that is, as a colonial policing force) rather than as an army, and that the Israel Police has been operating as a branch of the Shin Bet (Israel Security Agency). These two structural characteristics are a clear expression of the moral crisis besetting Israel, which views the occupation as a fact of nature. In this regard we are witnessing, as we have said, the worrisome replacement of the moral rationale by the functional rationale. First, the main ethical question (why the only current political option is war) is replaced by a question with a functional rationale (why Israel failed in the war). Then the main functional question (why the IDF is functioning as a police force and why the Israel Police is operating as an arm of the Shin Bet) is replaced by a seemingly ethical question (how Israeli society lost its unifying values), which is actually a question with a functional rationale.

But the last war revealed more than just the removal of the political-ethical aspect from the debate. It also exposed the split in Israeli sovereignty between the supervisory state and the abandoning state: between the political-military sovereign, which acts as if it were God (the supervisory state), and the social/economic sovereign, which acts as if there were no God (the abandoning state). The political sovereign

reservists and their families; rallies; deliberations of Knesset committees; High Court decisions; and a diverse range of commentary and academic writing.

A commission of inquiry is a well-known institutional response to what are called “crises of legitimacy.” In contrast to the chaos, imperviousness and abandonment of state authorities, the commission acts as an efficient and systematic body, creating a rational halt to the alarming deluge of chaotic government actions. The commission of inquiry represents what the state is supposed to represent: judgment, administrative responsibility, a culture of effective administration, self-examination and identification of the source of failures, perusal of expert assessments, and subscription to the rule of law.

The commission of inquiry concerning the Second Lebanon War is perceived as the state’s rival narrator of the events. It examines, criticizes, and censures. Though it is not totally unrealistic to think of the commission as acting as an independent critical body, one must note two important facts: First, paradoxically, the commission’s criticism of the government strengthens it; by making it look like a body that examines itself and its leaders by democratic means, the criticism renews the government’s moral and ethical status.

Second, the perspective of the commission, and not only of the commission, excludes several important political and moral questions from the debate over the war. It also shores up the rationale of the state, which defined the crisis as an operational and functional failure: for example, the fact that reservists were not mobilized in time, or that there was a widespread misreading of the battlefield, or that the emergency storage depots were not properly maintained. The epistemology of the commission’s report, like that of the protest movements that arose in response to the war, is based on this functional rationale. When a Web site invited readers to take part in naming the war, the proposals focused on the functional failures of the state: *The Losers’ War*, *Operation Granny (Even My Granny Can Fight Better)*, *The Mouse That Roared*, *The Great Disgrace*, *Operation Blah-blah*, *Nasrallah’s Name Shall Not Be Forgotten*, or *The Peace for Galilee Fiasco*. These proposals are responses to a rationale of protest that focuses on the operational failure, while completely ignoring the larger moral questions.

The state’s discourse and the counter-discourse are based on the same assumptions: the government’s mistakes must be corrected to ensure military victory in the future, and to that end large amounts of monetary resources, *inter alia*, must be invested in the armed forces and the defense system. Thus the protest strengthens this rationale and increases the state’s power. But this rationale is devoid of the

Preface

Yehouda Shenhav

In recent decades, a fascinating shift has occurred in the epistemological array of critical theory. Classical critical theory focused on the characteristics of early modernity: capitalism, Fordism, Taylorism, Fascism, and gulags or concentration camps. The basic paradigms for critiquing modernity included Weber's metaphor of the iron cage, Kafka's *The Trial*, Orwell's Stalinist dystopia, the dialectic of enlightenment of Horkheimer and Adorno, Althusser's interpellation and Foucault's panopticon.

The telos, or ultimate end, of this critical theory was liberation from control be it the state, the corporation, bureaucracy, or the law. In the past twenty years, however, especially in light of the worldwide politico-religious crisis, critical theory has changed its course. Instead of seeking liberation from control, it has turned its attention to what is perceived as the diametric opposite of control: relations of abandonment.

This shift, which includes a renewed engagement with law and the philosophy of law, has also involved moving the "political" from the realm of liberal law to the realms of the "anomalous" and the "exceptional" (borrowing these terms from theological criticism of political liberalism). This split in critical theory corresponds to the two "faces" of the sovereign state: the supervisory state and the abandoning state.¹ These two faces are not mutually exclusive, but rather appear in tandem, as was clearly evident during the war we were plunged into last summer and which is now called by its full name, the Second Lebanon War, a point I shall come back to.

Much has been written about the commission-of-inquiry initiative, which has been active in Israel's political arena over the past several months and has served as the main forum for the debate over that failed war. Meanwhile, we have been deluged with texts and actions, including a detailed report analyzing the testimony of politicians and generals and offering partial conclusions; a public protest by military

¹ Adi Ophir, 2006. "The Two State Solution: Providence and Catastrophe," *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 8: 139–182.