

Interview with Avner Gvaryahu and Avihai Stollar, directors of Breaking the Silence

João Paulo Avelãs Nunes, António Rafael Amaro,
Nuno Coelho e Joana Ricarte

João Paulo Avelãs Nunes

UC/FL/DHEEAA e Centro de Estudos Interdisciplinares da UC
ORCID: 0000-0003-0419-9179

António Rafael Amaro

UC/FEUC e Centro de Estudos Interdisciplinares da UC
ORCID: 0000-0002-3843-6577

Nuno Coelho

UC/FCT/DEI e Centro de Estudos Interdisciplinares da UC
ORCID: 0000-0002-1134-0321

Joana Ricarte

UC/FL/DHEEAA e Centro de Estudos Interdisciplinares da UC
ORCID: 0000-0002-5425-3746

https://doi.org/10.14195/1647-8622_21_12

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)

1. Presentation

Following a roundtable discussion at the University of Coimbra on the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territories and Israel regarding the perspectives and activity of the organisation *Breaking the Silence*, the journal *Estudos do Século XX* [20th Century Studies], published periodically by the Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies of the University of Coimbra, deemed this interview worthy of inclusion. This first conversation aims therefore to allow the two ex-soldiers and directors of *Breaking the Silence* to respond to questions posed by four researches from Group 1 – History, Memory, and Public Policy, of the Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies of the University of Coimbra.

Unlike sections such as the “Thematic File”, ‘Interdisciplinary Dialogue” and “Critical Reviews”, which are aimed at publishing humanistic, artistic, scientific or technological texts, the “Interviews” section proposes to share civic-minded or memorialistic responses to questions regarding current but relevant issues in broader intellectual and social terms. Such is the intention, whether by bringing more civilian narratives into an academic journal, or simply noting correlations between humanistic, artistic, scientific or technological knowledge and civic intervention.

This interview was documented, on the one hand, due to the ethical and geostrategic importance of the ongoing situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territories and Israel; and, on the other hand, to highlight the main features and discursive strategy of *Breaking the Silence*. It is important to remember that this organisation is made up solely of Israeli citizens who have carried out mandatory military service in the Occupied Palestinian Territories; and that their discursive strategy prioritises characterising and contextualising/ /comparing specific situations in order to explain value judgements and suggestions for how to bring about drastic change.

We value the existence of such an organisation within Israeli society that, in view of the grave problems in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, explicitly assumes the status of an association of ex-perpetrators. From this standpoint, *Breaking the Silence* defends: a) that Israeli soldiers describing in their own words what is really happening is one way of contributing to end the ongoing systematic violation of human rights in the Occupied Palestinian Territories; b) that victims and ex-perpetrators are entitled to support, should they so wish, in their efforts to overcome the effects of the mass violence that has occurred.

Avner Gvaryahu and Avihai Stollar’s answers are especially poignant. Whether consciously or not, their respective intellectual rigour and ethical self-expectations seem to correlate somehow with the likes of Benedict de Spinoza and Hannah Arendt. The options set forth are also important owing to both the complexity and lengthy duration of the Israeli-Arab and Israeli-Palestinian conflicts, and from the contradictions experienced in Israel, the Occupied Palestinian Territories, and in neighbouring countries such as Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt and Syria. Also considered were the verifiable connections with the overall mindset of the Cold War and the Post-Cold-War period, as well as phenomena such as the Jewish diaspora, anti-Judaism, anti-Semitism and the Holocaust.

As researchers, we try above all to recreate and analyse, to contextualise and compare how communities handle and manage situations in which human rights are violated systematically, even when those responsible for such processes of mass violence are

countries under liberal-democratic or democratic regimes. As citizens, we also recognise how important it is to highlight the individual (or small-group) behaviour of those notable for their profound intellectual rigour and heightened self-expectations. As has sometimes happened in the past, we hope that, both now and in the future, the example set by the fairer minority will be followed by the majority; a majority composed of perpetrators and those who are indifferent to such events.

Coimbra, July 2021

2. Interview

Why was Breaking the Silence created and what are its main goals?

Avner Gvaryahu: *Breaking the Silence* was created back in 2004 by a group of over sixty soldiers that served in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, specifically in Hebron during the peak of the Second Intifada – the second Palestinian mass uprising, which was extremely violent, bloody and deadly for both Palestinians and Israelis. In the midst of all this was the city of Hebron, which is the largest Palestinian city in the West Bank and the only Palestinian city outside of East Jerusalem and where, at the heart of the city, you'll find extreme violence in the community. The reality of the Second Intifada was felt very directly, and some of the most famous, horrific events of the Second Intifada took place in or around Hebron. Before forming *Breaking the Silence*, these soldiers were stationed in Hebron for 8 months straight, so their first and main goal was to break their personal silence, to make sure their families and communities were aware of what they were asked to do in the city of Hebron. They did this via a photo exhibit (the same one that was on display last month in Lisbon), with a view to bridging the knowledge gap between what they were asked to do and what the public actually knew about those actions. Besides being an initial response by a group of individual soldiers to what they were doing – and this really answers the question as to why *Breaking the Silence* was created – was that *Breaking the Silence* very quickly became a much larger project. This happened because the soldiers who initially formed the organisation and put together the photo exhibit quickly realised two things: first, how few Israelis really knew what soldiers were being asked to do, and therefore the importance of silence-breaking on a larger scale; second and perhaps most importantly, that their experience was not unique to them, as soldiers from different units, places and times came forward to say that they'd done the exactly same in other places – or in the same places a few years beforehand – or even that they'd done much worse. That helped move this initial *ad hoc* outcry from a group of people into an organisation, whose main goals are to shed light on the practices within the Occupied Palestinian Territories, specifically the soldiers carrying out these missions, in order to increase resistance to occupation. In short, the main aim is to make sure people know what's happening on the ground in order to ensure they have the tools with which to understand and resist it. It's therefore not only about disseminating knowledge, but also encouraging action.

How would you describe Breaking the Silence's strategy for the production and dissemination of narratives regarding the Occupied Palestinian Territories and how those narratives are then used in civic intervention?

Avner Gvaryahu: Our strategy is based on the political assumption that an extremely important element in bringing about this change, furthering our goal of ending occupation, is the non-violent resistance of that occupation by the Israeli public. So, it's not *only* from within but *also* from within. Our work has been spearheaded by and continues to rely on gathering testimonials from soldiers in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, but the second element, which we've been doing for many years now, is an educational role. Here we concentrate our efforts on speaking with Israeli high-school students: pre-military groups work on campus, and we're actually the busiest anti-occupation organisation in the country. Making sure people truly hear the information we've gathered is a big part of our work. That said, we also ensure that this information is not left solely with the Israeli public, on the understanding that, in order to bring about change and achieve our goal of ending occupation, it has to be a joint effort by both Israelis and Palestinians, although we obviously can't teach them as much about their own experiences. The international community is also a key element in ending occupation, or at least criticising and challenging it, so we also spend a lot of time and effort disseminating our testimonials further afield, particularly amongst Jewish communities living outside of Israel. Often via Zoom, we present talks, lectures and screenings of important films that promote conversation or films that we played a role in producing. After this interview, for example, I'm heading to our local theatre in Tel Aviv, where there will be a screening of a film based on our testifiers from Hebron as part of an important film festival. Another way in which we transmit information is via tours, leading hundreds of tours on the ground in both Hebron and the Southern Hebron hills – the southernmost tip of the West Bank – and we're always thinking of more ways to meet new people and pass on this information. Obviously, besides actual meetings, we spend a lot of time publishing on social media and in the press.

Avihai Stollar: Yes, and in addition to the various methods Avner's described for reaching the public, another 'product' we have is the testifiers themselves. We soldiers are distinct from our stories in that, when we go out and tell those stories, our willingness to break the silence and break away from the widely held belief shared by most Israelis that we cannot criticise this reality, that there is nothing wrong with it... that in itself has real value. The fact that it's Israeli soldiers bringing this reality, Israeli soldiers saying that, just as we were active participants in creating this occupation, we are also active participants in ending it, is an important method for conveying this message.

Avner Gvaryahu: We maintain a very clear, straightforward position regarding our mandate – where are we speaking from, who are we and who are we not? We're not the high-ranking generals who sit around tables making decisions on these matters. Most of us are fairly low-ranking officers, but we can testify to what soldiers are being asked to do on the ground. We've been analysing testimonies for the past ten years based on evidence. Opportunities arise to be pulled into a much more political conversation, but we really try to maintain our position based on where we're coming from. One criticism we face on a daily basis is, "Why are you saying these horrible things about Israeli soldiers?". Our response is, "Well, what do you mean? It's not about *other* Israeli soldiers,

it's about us. We're talking about *our* experiences; I'm talking about what *I did*." That is by no means manipulation, it's honestly where we come from.

Avihai Stollar: Especially within the Israeli peace camp, there is the idea that there are some golden words that would allow us to convey our message to the public. If only we could find the words not to antagonise them, we could get them to listen. I'm afraid that, in my experience, when it comes to the words we use to define the problem – whether or not we use the words 'occupation' and 'apartheid' and so forth – even the most carefully chosen words aimed at peace and finding common ground were no more effective at reaching large parts of the public than more explicit options. There's a good chance that the Israeli public is less sensitive to specific words than to the overall message, and they're more intelligent than we would sometimes like to think. So, when a group is focused on ending the occupation, they understand, regardless of whether or not you use the word 'occupation'. This is also present in the thoughts and speeches of left-wing and human rights groups within the Israeli public.

*Would you say that **Breaking the Silence's** strategy for the production and dissemination of narratives regarding the Occupied Palestinian Territories, and their subsequent use in civic intervention, was influenced by Hannah Arendt's work? Could some correlation be drawn with Yad Vashem's position on the memories of past anti-Judaism, anti-Semitism and the Holocaust?*

Avner Gvoryahu: Well, I wish I could claim to be more of a Hannah Arendt scholar... I only read *Eichmann in Jerusalem* years ago... but I definitely agree with the basic concept of the banality of evil and the importance of understanding *who* the people are carrying out these horrific historical acts. In short, however, I don't think that the creation of *Breaking the Silence* was inspired by Hannah Arendt's work. If we were to look for inspiration somewhere, it would be the testimonies of soldiers who broke their own silence and spoke out in the past, particularly the Americans' experience in Vietnam. It's certainly true that there's a lot of space and importance given to testimony in Israeli Jewish society. That is without a doubt part of the methodology, if you will, of remembering the Holocaust. This concept of sharing testimony was important, but the fact that it was coming not from victims but from victimisers made it that much more impactful and difficult for the public to digest.

I've been part of *Breaking the Silence* since 2010 and Avihai was there before me, but when I started we took an organisational day together, and you'd expect that to be something fun, right? Where did we go? Yad Vashem. And it was actually a really interesting experience – a strange thing to do on your day off – but we did an alternative tour led by a professor called Amos Goldberg. Growing up in a mainstream Israeli school and religious family, I learned about the Holocaust in a very specific way as a connection to what we were supposed to do right after school (join the army). It was very interesting suddenly to view the Holocaust from a different perspective and think about the voices that aren't necessarily mentioned in Yad Vashem, beyond our usual narrative.

Avihai Stollar: I'd like to add one thing to try and explain why this happens. The best way for me to explain it is via my own story. When I was seventeen and in high school, growing up in a typically liberal, fairly progressive, middle-class Israeli family, I was reading Bakunin and Kropotkin and started the 'Cosmopolitan Brigade' with my friends.

We considered ourselves highly progressive anarchists, thinking outside the box, but within six months of being recruited, not only was I ready, but I wanted to kill a person. I reached active duty during the peak of the Second Intifada – every time you turned on the TV you'd hear about buses being blown up. I joined the army out of a feeling of urgency without really knowing anything about what was happening. Living in Israel is not enough to provide you with more sources of information than anybody else, so I grew up on what was available in the media, and what you get in Israel today – and definitely in 2001 – is that sense of emergency. So, then I got to active duty, and I was trained to fight the Syrian army, I was trained to fight another army, and eight months into my training I reached the West Bank: active duty for the first time. I have no idea what my mission is, no idea what's happening here, I don't understand how things are supposed to work ethically or morally. I learn everything from my commanding officers, and very quickly you adopt everything that comes with what it means to be an occupier. Day after day your own red line is pushed further and further, and the only way to understand what's right and what's wrong is by looking around you and seeing the reality, which is made up of your commanding officers' and colleagues' actions. At the end of the day, we're talking about a system full of eighteen- and nineteen-year olds, you know, not usually known for sophisticated ethical thought, but I had an assault rifle in my arms and a lot of power and responsibility, and thus my reality was created. In that regard, I think Hannah Arendt's message is very true: anyone who strapped on the boots, placed in a fundamentally immoral situation, would himself become immoral, and to expect eighteen-year-olds to have the ethical or sensible ability *not* to do those things – let alone prevent them from happening – is a misjudged focus. Change will not come from the soldiers on the ground, or so I understand it, but this is also my explanation as to why, even though we Israelis grow up with the memory of the Holocaust, and almost every Israeli has visited Yad Vashem or some other Holocaust museum while in high school, still we get to the army and do what we do – a completely different story and reality to that of the Holocaust, granted, but a reality of occupation makes you an occupier, it's as simple as that.

Why did you become an activist and Director of Breaking the Silence? What are the effects of that activism on your personal, professional and civic life?

Avner Gvaryahu: Something that's true for many Israeli Jews, certainly in my family, is that both my grandparents were Holocaust survivors. Many have written about the two concepts of Judaism that have risen from the ashes of the Holocaust, and the dominant narrative in today's Israeli public is this idea of 'never again'... but 'never again' solely to us as Jews. I grew up in a family that talked about 'never again to anyone'. I was lucky and privileged to grow up in a family that taught me to think differently to the rest of my society. To challenge, think critically and consider my responsibility. There is a concept in Judaism called 'tikkun olam' that talks about the duty to repair the world, which was a very strong element in my upbringing. Growing up with such ideas, meeting the occupation was like crashing a car at 180mph. Everything you think of yourself and your concept of who you are is shattered when you encounter the occupation.

The process I went through, which led to me breaking my silence and taking responsibility, was composed of a million fragments throughout my service, but perhaps

the most important tactic in which I played a part was a mission known in military jargon as a 'straw widow'. A 'straw widow' is where you take over a private Palestinian house, store or office etc. What matters is its strategic location for the place you want to observe, to be high up and protected, and the idea is to take over that building as a military post for a few hours – anything from 6 hours to a few days. In the latter half of my service, I became the sergeant of a sniper team, so I led many of these missions. When you enter a private residence, you make sure its occupants are innocent. You barge into their house in the middle of the night without them knowing, without a court order of course, and you use their house as a military post. Those experiences really stuck with me and created the walls I was banging my head against, because those were the biggest moments of dissonance between the way I saw myself and the way I was acting. There was one specific case when we entered a house in Nablus belonging to a doctor, who lived near one of the main areas of the city, so we took over his house as a straw widow, and because it was the end of my service, I felt really bad from mission after mission. I felt that I could perhaps speak with this Palestinian and show him that I'm humane, that there's a person behind the uniform. I think that meeting this particular Palestinian in Nablus was what mobilised me to become an activist and join *Breaking the Silence*. There in his own house, he completely shifted the dynamic of that room. Even though I was there with a gun and helmet barging into his house, he managed to explain to me his own life as a Palestinian, along with my place and my responsibility in the larger constellation of events. He said to me, "The same way you barged in here tonight, there are soldiers all over the West Bank. You'll leave tonight, but others will come tomorrow." This understanding of how futile it was to try to become a 'moral' occupier, the absurdity of thinking that I could be one was so clear in that moment, I knew this was something I'd have to deal with and tell someone. Upon finishing my service a few months later, I met Avihai, who was already working with *Breaking the Silence*, and I joined a tour of the South Hebron Hills. I was asked my story and whether I'd be willing to give a testimony, to which I replied, "Sure, but I have nothing interesting to say." They said, "That's what everyone says, so let's meet." I met Avihai a few weeks later at his own apartment in Mahane Yehuda, where I gave my testimony. That moment was very important: not only sharing that specific story but also understanding via Avihai's questions my own responsibility and the things that are of interest to *Breaking the Silence*. In that crucial moment, considering a lot of the things I did, they didn't feel like the banality of evil, just banal. Then understanding them in their wider, political context made me understand how evil they were. That was such an important moment for me. I've been a member of *Breaking the Silence* for eleven years now, and there are definitely personal implications: childhood friends and family members no longer speak to me; and I receive hate mail and threatening messages via Facebook. We have to remind ourselves how small a price we're paying compared to Palestinians living under our control for so many years. I don't think this is a way to fix what we did: the trauma we left behind is still there. This is us taking responsibility, which has eventually led to me spending so much time on this: silence-breaking is key to improving the reality here between the river and the sea.

Avihai Stollar: Yes, I had a very similar experience: giving my testimony was in itself a substantial step in my personal political awakening, if you will. I think that this need

in us as both individuals and part of Israeli society, this duty to take responsibility and become accountable for the reality of the occupation, is very important, but not obvious. In many ways, even amongst more dovish parts of the Israeli political spectrum, we still prefer to refer to the occupation as something external in some way. We use temporary, distant terms, such as 'the situation' or 'that territory' – we tend to think about it as something on which our leaders and their leaders will find common ground, sit in their suits in Geneva and sign an agreement. Then it will end. But as long as that doesn't happen, to some extent, this is not our greatest problem. It's a conflict that we have; it's the situation in the Middle East; it's a lot of things rather than a real problem for which we are responsible. *Breaking the Silence's* message is exactly that: we must become accountable on many levels and understand that we have a big part in this. As obvious as it might sound, from a historical perspective, it's so important to claim that accountability. That for me was definitely the most important aspect of joining *Breaking the Silence* and becoming much more politically active than I used to be.

How would you describe the present situation in the Occupied Territories in terms of ensuring or violating human rights?

Avihai Stollar: If you have a look at the *Breaking the Silence* database, you'll see it's divided according to certain categories. Not all of those categories deal directly with human rights violations, but most of them do. Whether we're talking about upholding a siege or a lockdown, or violence or even killing, these are the bricks that constitute military rule over a civilian population. To return to what I was saying before, *Breaking the Silence* is made up of two parts: the testifiers and the testimonies, both of which expose not only certain instances where human rights were violated, but more importantly its very systemic nature... how it's happening all around the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and how it's happening in 2021 just as it was in 2003. This is also one of *Breaking the Silence's* big contributions. Simply looking at our database, you could pull out thousands of instances at random, not necessarily bloody and dramatic ones, but they'd all demonstrate the various ways in which our military rule violates Palestinian human rights.

I'd also hasten to add that we aren't in any way implying that this is related to the Holocaust. We're not saying that it's genocide at all. If we want to use legal terms, genocide is an attempt at the physical destruction of an ethnic or political group, which I don't believe to be the case here. I don't find this specific historical comparison necessary, because within human history of oppression and injustice, we could find examples that are much more relevant to what is currently happening in the Occupied Territories. It's not just a question of labels, but more accurate definitions of what is taking place. We're not trying to label it, nor say that it's as bad as or worse than something else; we are describing the daily reality, including those things that are not as dramatic or bloody. That's precisely the power behind it: I'd leave it to the political scientists to gather this evidence we provide and attempt to define what it is. In my humble opinion, it's not worth trying to compare it to, let's say, the experience of Nazi occupation in Germany.

Avner Gvoryahu: I totally agree, but it's worth adding that there are a lot historical comparisons that should be made in order for us to learn from them, such as apartheid

in South Africa. There are a lot of differences, both historically and geopolitically, but I do believe that apartheid is currently taking place in the Occupied Territories. That has been acknowledged not only by a variety of human rights organisations, but also by leading Israeli speakers and opinion-makers, and while it's not an organisational position, I certainly believe it to be an accurate and important point to consider. They are far from identical situations, but the criminal element of systematic separation and the fact that this is not a temporary reality, rather one that's endured throughout many years, are significant.

How would you describe the current political situation in Israel? What are your thoughts on present narratives and stances in Israel concerning the Occupied Territories and its respective inhabitants?

Avner Gvaryahu: The Israeli political landscape is not one you can view as a dichotomy of right versus left. We don't have a clear left, nor a clear right, and many parties on the Israeli political spectrum would be seen as right or far-right in another context. I do think it's possible to separate the Israeli political sphere into 3 main blocks. The first and biggest is what I'd call the 'control camp'. Those who believe that, between the river and the sea, there's only room for one sovereign country, Israel. You'll find many promoters of this 'control camp' in Security Establishment, historical Labour... I think Netanyahu also belonged to that school of thought for many years. To the right of that camp is one challenging it, which wants to annex the Territories: a step to the right. This second political camp, the 'annexation camp', is the largest *growing* one – they're not the biggest, which is the 'control camp', but for years now they've managed to grow within the 'control camp'. To the left of the 'control camp' is what I'd call the 'peace camp' or 'quality camp'. In one way or another, whether one state, two states, confederation or by nationalism, people between the river and the sea should enjoy self-determination, equality and freedom – I'm in that camp, and I believe *Breaking the Silence* is, too. In this camp you'll find Palestinian citizens of Israel, Arab-Israelis, the Israeli-Jewish left, and that's how I'd define our political landscape when it comes to the Occupied Territories. As for the 'control camp', which is the largest, you'll also find those who are least interested in the subject, which is the majority of Israeli Jewish society. Within that, we can also better understand the very strange and unnatural coalition that was formed in Israel. Even Labour, which is viewed within Israel as a left-leaning party, propounded in the mid-90s the concept that 'we have to move forward for peace'. That was the narrative. Ten to fifteen years on, however, the Labour party is talking about 'peace later'. Over the past five or six years, it's been that 'peace will never come'. That is a significant shift, and we'll see now with Merav Michaeli leading the party, but you can see that the whole conversation was moved much more into the 'control camp' with this feeling that nothing can actually change. That being the case, *Breaking the Silence* has a key role in making sure that the issue of occupation and the subjugation of Palestinians is on the table, that people are educated about this reality to challenge and discuss it, but we are by no means a majority. We are a minority that can and should be very effective in pulling the 'control camp' closer to the 'peace camp': the very opposite of what the 'annexation camp' has been doing for the past ten years.

What does Breaking the Silence envision for the future of Israel, the Palestinian Occupied Territories and neighbouring countries (Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, Syria)?

Avner Gvoryahu: We focus on a very specific element within the Israeli/Palestinian / Jewish/Arabic conflict. The conflict did not start in 1967. It predates '67, it predates '48, it predates '29, it even predates 1917. There is a historical conflict that, even if we are successful, will not necessarily end. Within that conflict, I am a ninth generation Jerusalemite, with roots, history and connection to this land in the same way that friends of mine living in East Jerusalem or Hebron could claim. Within this conflict, there are different elements that are either keys or roadblocks and that must be addressed in order to move forward to a process of conflict resolution. *The* major roadblock for us is the military dictatorship and control over Palestinians. The fact that we control the lives of children born in Gaza but still registered the Israeli registry, that there are children in Gaza who don't know what a mountain looks like and children in Hebron who don't know what the sea looks like, that's on us. That's our responsibility. There aren't two sides to the occupation. There's one side, and it's Israel. The first and foremost thing we must do is end that dictatorship. I believe that, if we show goodwill and are seriously keen to end this inequality, to change the dynamic of Jewish supremacy over non-Jews, then we can start thinking seriously about ending the conflict. I don't think there's a reasonable solution to consider now regarding Israel or Palestine or the entire region without first ending the occupation. Once we end it, many, many doors will open. In South Africa a while ago, I learned a lot of relevant information, but there were two key moments in the anti-apartheid movement that made it possible. The African National Congress was talking about concepts of equality in the '50s, but it took time to get it right. One important moment for both the Afrikaners and the British colonial powers was understanding that they would have to give up some of their privileges if they wanted to stay in the region. Another important element was that black South Africans also understood that not all the white South Africans were going to leave: they were there to stay, unlike other colonial solutions. Looking at our own region, there are colonial elements, but not a classic colonial or anti-colonial solution. Jews aren't going to return to Hamburg, Poland or Ethiopia, for example. The first step is ending the occupation, in which groups like *Breaking the Silence* will be extremely important for moving towards a post-conflict era, but yes, that first step has to be us taking our boot from their neck. That will then facilitate the next step.

Avihai Stollar: I agree entirely. There's a very normal tendency to seek our end goal first of all, whether it's a one-state or two-state solution, and I honestly think it pretty futile to focus all our efforts on answering that specific question. I've never used the word 'steps', but I feel very comfortable with that idea. Ending the occupation is a cardinal step, but only a step. We need to go there because that's the goal in sight at the moment. Once we've ended this permanent, detrimental state of inequality and injustice, which is constantly pushing us further away from a solution, only then can we start to think about the following steps. Personally, I don't know where we're going to end up, whether we'll have a Palestinian state or one unified state, but even that won't be the last step in the long process of reconciliation. Even when they sign a deal, it's not all going to be fine the day after, so there are many steps to be taken even to end the current injustice. This also depends quite heavily on the region, because events in Syria and Lebanon also

have some influence, whether positive or negative. I'll give one very positive example that, since 2002, the Saudi peace proposal, which is basically a two-state solution module, also incorporates normalising relations with around thirty Arab states, which would bring about dramatic geostrategic change in the Middle East and provide a strong answer to Israel's fear of creating a new Arab State. These are not things we can anticipate; we can only advance toward a tangible goal, which, as Avner already described, is ending the occupation.

