

Come on it's the implementation of it.

Smoke is prohibited by law. Yes but if everybody is telling but if everybody is telling you and you are asking it's not me, it's the law, it's independent of me.

The fact is you lose completely contact with reality immediate reality, and that 1 to 1 you know there is no.

So what's fucked up here. It's not the very fact that a law is being enforced it's the ignorance, the misunderstanding the understanding the non-understanding of what this law is for or why we should.

What? I can't even find anything wrong with that no no no I am not caring about this I am talking about the fact that it allows the rules, the rules, for everything I know for everything allowance.

The 1 that are immediately in contact in charge in implementing them not to think that's the problem the thing is that they don't see anymore of course there is the problem is not the problem about smoking during the 3 hours the problem is not the existence of anti-smoking or smoke which bans law, a law which bans smoking yes it's in the way people substitute law for thinking what do you mean people? Many people around here the place where I come from there is no problem the law is just an obstacle something I have to get over on my way to what I want in this country and other countries like this the law is therefore a very is something that's respected.

It's something that's respected of course it is respected the only problem is the implementation and the enforcement of law because also it's the law that by law you can disrespect other people of course it's respected it's respected because it just it's a displacement of responsibility it's out of laziness the very displacement of responsibility is fine I mean that is the social contract. It's the social contract I defer the responsibility. We are not talking about the law the social contract we are talking about the smoking contract. Smoking contract. The smoking. What about it. What about it? You are not allowed to smoke but you are allowed to drink I mean drinking is kind of you know this is okay this is not a problem. Do you want to fight for it you want to set up a lobby for pro alcohol to banish alcohol. I don't want to banish alcohol you might even be able to pass a law in some Parliament.

NEW SPEAKER: I am talking about coherency it's a question of a trend, just a question of a trend I mean this non-smoking bullshit is just a fantastic way B maybe sometimes when you are radical and keep challenging things you forget simple truths. What do you mean? The law the anti-smoking law and the laws which do not prohibit the consumption of alcohol in the same way

we can drink here not smoke these are the laws of this country they've been passed through Parliament based on social norms in a society that is changing itself its attitudes, I think if enough people in the country would have wanted an alcohol banishment or a smoke a law permitting smoking that's the way it would be here. There is 1 difference who are we to judge the coherence of the law makers here. Right now I am telling you something the only thing is that it is not presented like this it is presented in an absolute objective with objectives that figures, that's the danger with figure with objectivity with measures. That's the danger that's the danger. Nobody will set aside in our tradition in our civilised progressive European humanistic tradition we consider that to smoke dope yes, this is kind of unaesthetic while to get drunk in a party this we consider as an acceptable behaviour and this is why we want to make a law that will ban what we consider as unkind behaviours like smoking it's not presented like this it's presented in reports with scientific with people, why, others laws, in what is called non-democratic countries in traditional countries which present them as in the name of tradition it's considered as barbaric irrational. This is what I mean. Okay. The rationality the rationality scientific objectivity, is used in order to explain non-rational behaviours. When you come and you say this is non-rational it's because of my belief and because of my tradition this is something we considered so in fact in or d to come and say why we wear a scarf and we keep beards if you present it scientifically you will make a study about the hair of women and the fat and the dirt and it's more a journey about a beard it would be accepted this is what I am talking about.

NEW SPEAKER: I agree to this, this is what is wrong in this kind of situation that the rationality the attack suddenly to rationalise something which is rather historical in a way arbitrary certainly very incoherent but nevertheless I would define this as the will of the collective of the body politic, and instead of presenting that as that and of teaching each and every member of this body to explain or provide exactly this kind of explanation to ask anyone to suspend the law or create an exception her representing the sovereign.

NEW SPEAKER: No no no no no no no no.

NEW SPEAKER: We either have escaped from responsibility for saying that and we have rationalisation.

NEW SPEAKER: Dan I am talking about the fact that this is part of a tradition, which is the idea of that says order order, goes together with property, property cneanless not property erm properedness with.

NEW SPEAKER: Property proprietary and appropriate are.

NEW SPEAKER: Appropriate way it's order and hergenics and this fucked up permanent desire it's a source of violence it's a sofers implementing a permanent governance by it's also a fantastic and elation of I think okay this is what I am trying to say.

DAN DOLBERGER: Right I have been very very preoccupied with this during the last year I have discovered that many people I know or am in touch with in my everyday life, do not think they don't think but it's becoming a problem for me it's a call centre I talk to maybe my daughters teacher at school it's many people it's not my friends and the people I work with are thinking people but every now and then especially my children unfortunately I suddenly discover that they are not being taught how to think at school that's a problem once a child forgets or never learns how to think he or she become very disturbed and antagonistic when asked to think. It's kind of a pain once the faculty of thinking gets either never develops or or or or kind of erm, becomes dysfunctional or unnecessarily or when thinking is not adaptive to a situation where you study as a child or in your environment then thinking also becomes painful and adverse once you attempt it or are challenged to do it.

EYAL SIVAN: So? Okay but you started something there are many people that are not thinking and.

DAN DOLBERGER: What I wanted to ask you is a question I think I never asked you in a very sharp way now I am asking it on tape and there are people watching us I hope and reading us maybe they are not but it's on tape. So think well before you answer.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes okay.

DAN DOLBERGER: I have known you for a long time, and for years upon years upon years upon years upon years I have known you as a critic, of society, of culture of imperialism, of violence of racism, of fascism, of unthought or non-thought of Zionism, ever any conceivable thing you will find or you will have a very good and fascinating critique of, but what I wonder sometimes is what do you believe in.

EYAL SIVAN: Critique.

DAN DOLBERGER: Besides critique. What is your positive idea.

EYAL SIVAN: Why do you put critique on the negative side.

DAN DOLBERGER: Critique naturally negates because that's what it is there for. It is there to challenge, to deconstruct to take apart, to make way for other stuff to create a vacuum.

EYAL SIVAN: To create a place for other stuff.

DAN DOLBERGER: What then have you ever wondered or ever been tempted to look at the you know I once wrote a story, erm, and the story is it happens in an imaginary universe or world and in this world it's a kind of a technological speaking it's a medieval world a very simple agrarian world and in this world there is a particular group of people it's a kind of movement of anarchists called the iconoclasts or Xclasts they break everything and wander around in bands through the countryside they are never very organised because it goes against their very definition of being anarchists and going to break everything and every village they go into they go to the centre of the village and smash the statue of the local God to begin with and they break gods they break temples that's all they do and then there is a vacuum then what happens is that the peasants are looking at their God being smashed some of them are outrageous and some of them weep, and then after this vacuum is left, after you know, the statue is lying on the floor all broken up then they take the iconoclasts and they put him on the pedestal and make him the next God and he agrees. So, to me in many senses you are an iconoclast.

EYAL SIVAN: Why.

DAN DOLBERGER: You constantly break mythos constantly you constantly smash and bash the gods.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: What then? Do you care? .

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean if I care.

DAN DOLBERGER: About what next or do you just go on to newer next smashing machine.

EYAL SIVAN: Trying all the time to construct or organise to put in order. This is a permanent movement.

DAN DOLBERGER: You realise power is necessary. .

EYAL SIVAN: Power is not necessary the power is not a question of necessary. This is the big issue and the big problem of Leftist erm erm thinking, post modern, a struggle against power the struggle against power, power is, power is right. It is a permanent attempt to take power.

DAN DOLBERGER: You are not against power as such? You understand the power is, an inherent feature of society.

EYAL SIVAN: Power is a feature simple. A moment that you experience on different levels power I mean being? I am part of power you are in a situation of power but this is okay power is.... the construction you think you are breaking all the time and breaking all the time the permanent movement of breaking if you want criticizing finding {inaudible} looking at things this is by itself by itself a construction.

DAN DOLBERGER: A what a construction of what what are you constructing Eyal you are constructing works films, I

recognise that, but in a world of ideas, what are you constructing I would really like to know.

EYAL SIVAN: It's a critic this thing we need the world of ideas what exactly what world of things, {inaudible}. My work is part of you are putting things as if there is, I mean this is a lady 10 years within the height.

DAN DOLBERGER: You are saying I am obsessed with the product. Let me ask you another question.

EYAL SIVAN: This is exactly the thing to have something that's in the end you know it's a product and it's a machine of improvement and it's something that change really, right it's measurable but in this.

DAN DOLBERGER: No no no no no no no no no no no no no no no we won't it's not going to be that easy I know I am obsessed with the product and this is my format of thinking what I actually ask is were you in the position of power, .

EYAL SIVAN: But I am not and I don't want to take, in what position of power? I mean the power to have a space of critique is a position of power. Once again what do you think the power have only 1 image you are in position of power what do you mean if you are president Prime Minister.

DAN DOLBERGER: I want to know.

EYAL SIVAN: This is not the only way of power this is the power.

DAN DOLBERGER: No no no no no forget about the heavy undertones of the question, just flow with me and try to humour me try to tell me if you were Prime Minister if you were elected to a position of national or international political influence, what would you do and why would you take care of.

EYAL SIVAN: Damn this is a crap question.

DAN DOLBERGER: Is it.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes it's if my grandmother had erm wheels she would have been a bus I mean what is this if.

DAN DOLBERGER: You know.

EYAL SIVAN: You are talking as if.

DAN DOLBERGER: Rulers rulers the people who.

EYAL SIVAN: If you were the hand of the centre of research council what have you done. Why this political power it's the power of decision.

DAN DOLBERGER: Let me tell you something, you know you might not like this very much but could it be that you are as much a part of the same system or reality or regime as any US president pharmaceutical erm company Chairman of the board, Prime Minister or just a church cleric.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean I am a.

DAN DOLBERGER: You just have your no no no no no no no no no no because you are telling me you are just doing

your job. You don't want, you are.

EYAL SIVAN: No.

DAN DOLBERGER: You are telling me it's a stupid question it's a stupid question to ask what what I would do if I were president I am not president I will never be president it's not my concern with the president it's my concern to have this constant critique of what President's and there like are doing.

EYAL SIVAN: I am not talking about President's you are talking about politicising power. The work of the politic is about power the question is how do I behave in those places where I do have power right this is the real question the question because you know in certain society being a male and so you have a certain power how do you behave. As being a professor at university being a professor at university we know from Israel university for example on the part of, there are a bunch of professors that are abusing from the position of power towards students usually women students female students right the thing is how do you use power when you have it? This is the question what is the critique of power from a position and not to come and to make this separation which is as to the power. There is a moment you have power.

DAN DOLBERGER: Wonderful.

EYAL SIVAN: You imagine in the way you implement power in those spaces where you have power you would do exactly the same thing if you were the if you meet the fucking president of the United States or the Pope.

DAN DOLBERGER: Let me rephrase my question knowing Eyal when you have power what do you do with it.

EYAL SIVAN: I am trying to share it I am trying to share it especially trying to avoid accumulating it. And not because I don't like it because I know what it brings. Because obviously when you have power obviously when you have power it's like a capital, a financial capital you've power you want to have more power you have money you want more money you know it from all the last 10 years I mean what people in the hi-tech wanted that were around to have more money.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: More than to have an invention that will be kind of wow.

DAN DOLBERGER: Oh no no no no no people many times settle for being the inventor.

EYAL SIVAN: Settled it for and this is the problem of capitalism is it creates the desire to have more capital.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes. It's very problematic. Let me ask you an unrelated question.

EYAL SIVAN: Unrelated?

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes. We can go on yes do what you want.
Can you make animals like.
EYAL SIVAN: No no no no no no.
DAN DOLBERGER: You can't?
EYAL SIVAN: No. I once knew how to so what you were
saying? You wanted to ask me a question.
DAN DOLBERGER: No that was the question.
EYAL SIVAN: If I know how to make animals {laughter}
DAN DOLBERGER: We don't have to be that serious all the
time {laughter}
EYAL SIVAN: But it's strange this question about it's
like it's like asking me.
DAN DOLBERGER: Did it piss you off.
EYAL SIVAN: No it didn't piss me off at all it's kind of
a strange thing it's kind of if there is critique is
negative and there is a positivist way of looking what
you want to build or do.
DAN DOLBERGER: That's what I am aiming at yes not that
critique are unnecessary but that it is all negative this
world has to be run somehow yes. It has to run somehow.
EYAL SIVAN: What you mean it has to run somehow this is
what I am trying to say as I talk about power it runs.
DAN DOLBERGER: It runs badly.
EYAL SIVAN: Of course it run badly and it will run
badly.
DAN DOLBERGER: Do you have any idea of how it should
run.
EYAL SIVAN: You are building an idea roles in his book
is trying to build a theoretical society he is taking a
pre-society and saying okay let's imagine society doesn't
exist and if we had to build it this is an exercise it
(coughing) which as interesting as.
DAN DOLBERGER: Fine good good good good good.
EYAL SIVAN: You are talking about another thing which is
our permanent permanent permanent discussion. What's the
permanent discussion about is that you are saying we have
to build in a way you are saying, a critique has its
place in our action in the world if we are trying to
build a model a better 1 an improvement okay and I am I
don't believe in this thing of improvement in progress,
in that, I believe though in that you've to break
complete and make a kind of re-start like a computer it's
blocked it's blocked, error this and this, kind of
release and this re-start is exactly this idea of a
revolutionary idea of course it's sounds as though it's
commie it's from the past what you mean this
revolutionary I am saying it's exactly this kind of
thinking which is the refusal to think in revolutionary
terms that continue to be in this kind of thing a big
pool of shit.
DAN DOLBERGER: Are you willing to pay the price.

EYAL SIVAN: Of what?

DAN DOLBERGER: Of this re-start.

EYAL SIVAN: Of course I am.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yourself.

EYAL SIVAN: It's exactly what I said I am someone who have a 250 square metre apartment in Paris and a job in London and I know that I need to be the first to be at in the revolution okay, of course.

DAN DOLBERGER: What revolution.

DAN DOLBERGER: How does the revolution look like for which you would be head it's not just any revolution you don't just contribute your head to any passing revolutionary so what kind of revolution would you.....

EYAL SIVAN: Exactly this moment that accepts to grab and to interrogate what is called the fundamentals, this exactly does things that says things are like that you know this revolutionary moment and I know there is no revolution without violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: Without?

EYAL SIVAN: Violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: Oh really that's too bad.

EYAL SIVAN: What is too bad why because you live in this non-revolutionary moment we live in a place where there is no violence?

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: Come on. This is exactly.

DAN DOLBERGER: No I don't like violence.

EYAL SIVAN: Of course you don't like violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: I think the real trouble.

EYAL SIVAN: Of course you don't like violence you know in a moment, in a moment where violence is totally diffused nobody is safe after violence and I know this idea an permanent contemporary idea about security is a certain person in our security while the others are put in absolute unsecurity.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am so sorry I am so sorry to learn that you are not personally I am not talking personally about you I am sorry conceptually, to learn or ethically or to.... as my wisdom goes, that to hear that your idea of a revolution or a change, what about if we didn't talk about revolution what about if we spoke about fundamental change? Not calling it revolution or evolution I am talking about a fundamental change in the way we people we homo sapiens run our affairs on this planet.

EYAL SIVAN: okay.

DAN DOLBERGER: Does violence have to be part of that.

EYAL SIVAN: I am saying that the revolution this moment of the re-start will it's a violent moment, it's a violent moment.

DAN DOLBERGER: Necessarily.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes it is a violent moment it's the displacement of violence diffusion of violence the moment we are living now it's also a very violent moment but we are in a group of person in an area I mean even you living in Israel any way you are in a neighbourhood which you are kind of aside from the violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: Very close to it.

EYAL SIVAN: In a revolutionary moment I am saying the risk is exactly these places which are safe places not difficult neighbourhoods, you know you have difficult neighbourhoods, those kind of neighbourhoods which are statistically difficult so let's say this non-difficult neighbourhoods the easy neighbourhoods might become difficult ones it's a question of displacement.

DAN DOLBERGER: I want to tell you something in principal before I relate specifically to what you are saying I think the true revolution the true sense of revolution is the ability to bring about change fundamental change in a non-violent way and for as long as you have violent revolutions you have no revolutions you just have more of the same it's like an animal.

NEW SPEAKER: It's like camembert yes non-violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: You don't believe in do you.

EYAL SIVAN: This is European aesthetics Western aesthetics no violence what do you mean what is it to bring change with no violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: I can tell you what I think I can tell you, you can go on with the labels little stickers you can do that if you like and really try to really try to understand what I am saying.

EYAL SIVAN: I understand very well.

DAN DOLBERGER: I don't think so.

EYAL SIVAN: What you don't want to acknowledge is the displacement of violence in the same moment you are talking can we think of change without violence I am telling you this without violence it is just a question of perspective because in the eyes of others they are in permanent violence this is what we were trying to read yesterday about Benny Amin. The point the tradition of the oppressed is teaching us the state of acceptance it's not acceptance it's the rule it's just a question you say yes the violence but the violence there are people living now under violence here in this city okay you come and you say to me can we think about a change without violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes because okay let's leave the stickers aside now the stigmas aside, I am not really a pacifist not at all pacifist.

EYAL SIVAN: You were in the army I wasn't.

DAN DOLBERGER: Does that make me a pacifist my fact of

having served in the army does not make me pacifist or non-pacifist I am sure the fact you were not in the army does not make you a pacifist you are probably being asked to fight a war you didn't feel was your war.

EYAL SIVAN: Right.

DAN DOLBERGER: I also went in I to this day I don't understand whose war I was fighting you are probably truer to your feeling and much clearer about your feeling than I was at the time but my, you were trying to be different? And succeeding.

EYAL: At the time.

DAN DOLBERGER: I think that there is no such thing as news, and there have been no real news during the past 5,000 years.

EYAL SIVAN: How do you mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: I mean people as a species are erm.... there is technological progressive progress, progressment.

EYAL: Progress.

DAN DOLBERGER: Or advance measured as improvements measured in the state of the arts and there is ethical progression, measured by the increasing ability to be able to see things through the eyes of the other and there is I would call it emotional progress what is today called emotional intelligence.

EYAL SIVAN: Where.

DAN DOLBERGER: Pardon.

EYAL SIVAN: Where.

DAN DOLBERGER: These are dimensions these are concepts which I use to look at the situation and I will look at the situation of the human race humans are humans ability to advance technologically by far outstrips their ability to advance emotionally and that means that as time goes by people have more and stronger and stronger technologies and more and more lethal weapons but they have their increment in emotional intelligence can't catch up with that advance.

EYAL SIVAN: But this is true with the wheel and the erm and everything I mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: You find we find our self-today.

EYAL SIVAN: It's not our time it's just permanency.

DAN DOLBERGER: I don't think we have progressed much to our relative to 5,000 years ago in terms of being as humans as species we are as barbaric.

EYAL SIVAN: You know progress is a Chris Christian concept we Jews don't believe in progress.

DAN DOLBERGER: I know what I believe in I believe in when I measure things I am not putting a moral judgement or not being normative about it I measure speed or rate of technological advance and the rate of change and the rate of emotional ethical change and I see that 1

outstrips the other. Evolution evolution, so, I think the real revolution is that when people's emotional intelligence and ability to see things through the eyes of the other or to feel when something happens to the other as if it feels it's happening to me in some sense when people reach this stage it will somewhat create an equality or it will equalize with the pace of the technology.

EYAL SIVAN: Why do you've to equalize with pace of technology.

DAN DOLBERGER: To finally be able to have something above technology right now we are living in the religion of technology.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean religion of technology.

DAN DOLBERGER: Means the way of doing things is much more superior interesting and attractive and valuable economically than what is being done.

EYAL SIVAN: I didn't get it.

DAN DOLBERGER: The method of doing something that's the technology that's the technique the way of doing it is much more important you get you score points on innovation in the way new ways of doing things, and once you have you know genetic engineering for instance biometrics the very fact you can do it you find a way to do it that's more important that kind of almost justifies doing it. Now they used to say if there is a will there is a way and today if there is a way there is a will.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: Things have changed.

EYAL SIVAN: But I don't get how it is related to this thing of violence change or not violence in a meeting that violence it's not to meet evil that's what I am trying to say violence is part.

DAN DOLBERGER: It's not the ultimate evil.

EYAL SIVAN: Violence is part of, it's not kind of a climate of horror violence is part of.

DAN DOLBERGER: No no no no no no there is a violence of the sovereign and there is a violence of the little child and there is a violence of the soldier in war, and violence of the criminal there are many violences here but if we are talking as a species knew how to manage our emotions better or remembered how to feel and how to think and how to balance our thoughts and emotions and we didn't hold technology as a superior value and it was not our religion then that would be the real revolution and I somehow don't see this change happening by another mass blood shed the American revolution the human revolution the Chowchekow revolution or that whatever that was that can grew court or the Russian revolution so I hope you are not talking about more of the same kind of

revolutions.

EYAL SIVAN: No nevertheless I am talking about a moment where the question exactly the aesthetics of violence change.

DAN DOLBERGER: What's aesthetics of violence.

EYAL SIVAN: The violence we are living today it's can I of acceptance now in Britain or violence in Israel it's kind of accepted aesthetics.

DAN DOLBERGER: Look every time I call a call centre and the caller gets disconnected and nobody gets back to me I feel violence is being directed to me.

EYAL SIVAN: It's an accepted violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: It's all over how do I change it massacre the call centre poison the management.

EYAL SIVAN: Now we are asking me a question of acts and first of all I am talking to you about the fact of changing conscience we are there to accept exactly what we were just talking about is aesthetics accepted aesthetics of violence the fact that you have the underground London announcement telling you today the train will be late today 5 minutes or 10 minutes sorry because of the failure of the system it is accepted violence and when the person the in the call centre press button or when you come to a place which is a place supposed to be a place where art takes place it means that you cannot plan in advance everything and you are talking about performing for instance a performance with a human being means they have the individual relations and the European rules you are not allowed to smoke this is a violence it is interference in your own will and wishes and needs this is considered as a legitimate violence it means it is an extension also of the gragarian legitimate violence of the day but it's legitimate violence of the community or legitimate violence of your class and the legitimate violence et cetera.

DAN DOLBERGER: That is good.

EYAL: it's kind of I don't know Mahmood (Hebrew) certificate quality system if you ask me if it's good it's the most industrial my rude I have never eaten I had good fortune of eating.

NEW SPEAKER: It's produced by clammy brothers in Jedda kingdom of the Saudi erm Arabia it's designed reference of 10 of December 07.

DAN DOLBERGER: God bless Halwany but 1 thing.

EYAL SIVAN: I want to come back.

DAN DOLBERGER: I want Halwany from this place (eating) Can we have a comical relief moment we are so serious all the time, why not? Why not?

EYAL SIVAN: Let's finish this. Don't turn your back.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am not turning my back I am just having a moment of relief.

EYAL SIVAN: You had a question you wanted to ask me for a long time.

DAN DOLBERGER: Can we smoke already. {Laughter} what she said we are going to be funny {inaudible} yes I said let's have a Comic Relief I said let's have a Comic Relief.

EYAL SIVAN: He is trying to change the subject. I have to be.

DAN DOLBERGER: Do you want to change the subject or pee.

EYAL SIVAN: I want to leave you with a thought what I am telling you I am talking about changing the aesthetics of violence and acknowledge that a certain kind of.

DAN DOLBERGER: Everything is fine.

NEW SPEAKER: You want some tea.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes please.

EYAL SIVAN: There is a kind of violence which is accepted as a considered as a non-violence or normal violence which have another aesthetic considered as bad violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: A violent violence and non-violent violence.

EYAL SIVAN: What I am talking about is the moment that you say you can change and there is a certain violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: There are some problematics here though.

EYAL SIVAN: I go to pee.

DAN DOLBERGER: I will go for a smoke.

EYAL SIVAN: Where are the toilets.

DAN DOLBERGER: Out the door and outside. Out here. To the right.....

DAN DOLBERGER: Because it was centralised there was an operator that connected all the various notes and if you destroyed the operator then they would not me any communications and the solution was to create a system to create a decentralized system you see, and that way you can't destroy the centre because there is no centre to destroy, to any kind of attack such as a nuclear bomb it did make very vulnerable to violence now when you talk about violent violence and the non-violent type of violence.

EYAL SIVAN: I am talking about recognise as such.

DAN DOLBERGER: So the tactic here is not to blow up the call centre yes but to employ a non-violent violent tactic against the non-violent violent oppression.

EYAL SIVAN: Didn't get it at all try again.

DAN DOLBERGER: Okay, if I had some sort of way of knowing of operating, thank you very much, if we had a way of knowing the activation various activation codes so called cheats the passwords little codes that enable us to interfere with the call centre system, then we

would have a way of fighting back this non-violent violence.

EYAL SIVAN: No I am talking about the fact that to realise that the call centre in fact the problem is not the call centre let's take your example the call centre it's not really a good 1 but anyway to say even the call centre is considered a source of violence you are opposed to this violence by another way of violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: I didn't understand what you are saying.

EYAL SIVAN: The symbolic not the symbolic to design sorry to designate the call centre as a source of violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: What would that be?

EYAL SIVAN: To attack it as such.

DAN DOLBERGER: You mean blow the call centre.

EYAL SIVAN: No I am not talking about annihilation I am talking a general idea which is first of all starting with the way that you discuss violence that you just discuss violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: Here we are discussing violence or engaging in a subversive activity now.

EYAL SIVAN: No we are not changing yet the way of talking of violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: Okay what would it be.

EYAL SIVAN: First of all exactly what you are approaching which is this permanent critique and break of erm.... perspective of looking at things.

DAN DOLBERGER: What's your outrage.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: Your outreach how many people you are reaching your impact.

EYAL SIVAN: It's what I said before about why should it be measurable you don't measure in, Dan, why, it's really a question, erm I mean, why it should come down into a possibility to measure impact to measure or make up I mean why can you not consider there are things that are not measurable? Changing discourse it's not a measurable issue it can be done over years and years but this is exactly the thing the moment that you go out, you step out from the only things that have value those that have weight that can be capitalized this is what I am talking about you see what I mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: Frankly? I think I have a difficulty seeing what you mean it's probably my problem and not I am not very used to this way of thinking.

EYAL SIVAN: Maybe IM bullshitting I don't know maybe I cannot I mean you don't acknowledge there are things that have kind of inference and you cannot measure you cannot we don't have.

DAN DOLBERGER: You know, I am not talking about measurement I am talking about some indication that

things are happening we live in the real world so to speak I don't know how real it is but erm you know usually we don't have this vague sense of reality around us even though there are so many virtual realities and the borderline between reality and fiction is.... is getting you know very is very erm hard to see sometimes but still I mean do you have an agenda? Do you have an agenda?

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean do I have an agenda what's an agenda.

DAN DOLBERGER: Do you want to see things around you really change during your lifetime.

EYAL SIVAN: Ah, lifetime. This is a measurement a measurement between now and in the next 40 years.

DAN DOLBERGER: Life times okay generations. Do you want ever to see anything happen differently direct or indirect of your thought of your erm work, or do you just enjoy doing it and you are not really thinking.

EYAL SIVAN: I think already the joy of doing it and the desire is already a guarantee for its existence of the future. In the future.

DAN DOLBERGER: Okay I think I understand. We can move on to the next question.

EYAL SIVAN: Why question.

DAN DOLBERGER: Pardon.

EYAL SIVAN: My question is this is a question issue. I mean I want to understand you go out you smoke a cigarette someone is coming asking you for a cigarette you forget your cigarettes in the room you leave your cigarettes outside with me you come in the room why not take with you the cigarettes.

DAN DOLBERGER: Smoking is not allowed here.

EYAL SIVAN: But it would only be a second. No.

DAN DOLBERGER: Basically if we were in my office, and I smoke outside of my office which is in Israel then I would probably continue to hold my cigarette while going into the office to bring something for outside but I think this place has other expectations and I respect them.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean this place has expectations.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am not at home here it's not my home so the respect for the law here is part of what connects me to this place what makes me a temporary part of this place.

EYAL SIVAN: If I behave here it means I am highly respected.

DAN DOLBERGER: Depends what you do at home.

EYAL SIVAN: Nevertheless.

DAN DOLBERGER: If all of the a sudden a smoke detector goes off while I am here with a smoke it would really be

an issue I don't want to see that happen or cause that I don't want to be part of that it would bring me discomfort.

EYAL SIVAN: This is a complete different issue it's a question of order and.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes yes.

EYAL SIVAN: Why the Fire Brigade should come.

DAN DOLBERGER: I can rock the boat sometimes I think in advance should I rock the boat or not I don't automatically rock the boat every time I get a chance to I need a good reason to rock the boat.

EYAL SIVAN: In fact if I understand if you have a notion of normality right.

DAN DOLBERGER: I have a very notion of normality {inaudible} in what sense.

EYAL SIVAN: Social normality you mean normativeness.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: I don't I think.

DAN DOLBERGER: You don't.

EYAL SIVAN: No.

DAN DOLBERGER: Your kind of asocial.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes but a nice way.

DAN DOLBERGER: I love you.

EYAL SIVAN: Kind of asocial I think no no no for a second you usually are saying come somewhere and you can always adapt.

DAN DOLBERGER: No but you are not a beast you are very erm gentle and considering person considerate person.

EYAL SIVAN: Nevertheless.

DAN DOLBERGER: When it comes to society on the wider scale this is where you are, you are all social on the most general level of society you are asocial but you are very polite and considerate person on a 1 to 1 person or small group basis but when society as a whole presents itself to you then you really get the urge this burning urge this itch to be asocial. Don't you.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes. You think I should work with my shrink maybe.

DAN DOLBERGER: No no no no no I don't think so it's not an issue for your shrink.

EYAL SIVAN: It's not.

DAN DOLBERGER: It's good vodka Stolichnia Stolichnia. What's the building on the label there is a building on the label.

EYAL SIVAN: Vodka is generally Russian vodka.

DAN DOLBERGER: Is that the Ministry of vodka {laughter}. It's the Ministry of vodka {laughter}. 1 time before the Soviet Union became what do they call them now.

EYAL SIVAN: Russia ex-Soviet Union.

DAN DOLBERGER: No another name for it.

EYAL SIVAN: United republics of.

DAN DOLBERGER: Before that the label said produced in the CCCCP now it says produced in Russia for SPI group. And it has 4 medals on it 1 carries the democratic former democratic.... enterprises. It has this medal of it has a medal.

EYAL SIVAN: When you started to say the {inaudible}.

DAN DOLBERGER: Pardon when did you start to say oh I think my mother says that you are just a you are washing my brain I am being brainwashed by you.

EYAL SIVAN: By me it's my fault?

DAN DOLBERGER: My mother would say that.

EYAL SIVAN: I met your mother only twice what she thinks about me.

DAN DOLBERGER: We will leave it to another conversation maybe.

EYAL SIVAN: Please please please.

DAN DOLBERGER: She thinks that you are washing my brain let's start with this and leave it with that. You are asking about my Zionism let's keep that let's stick to that for now so I think she is right I think that after she is right in her way I think after so many conversations with you I become convinced I don't really wish to be a Zionist and I am not anti-Zionist the problem with Zionists is once anyone who is not a Zionist is considered anti-Zionist that's not really fair.

EYAL SIVAN: What is it to be Zionist.

DAN DOLBERGER: Some of my best friends are Zionists.

EYAL SIVAN: Some of my best friends are anti-Zionists I have some Zionist friends.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am sure you do I don't think Zionism is adaptive anymore I think it has it just cannot.

EYAL SIVAN: What are boundaries between Zionists and anti-Zionists if you try to explain it to me.

DAN DOLBERGER: definition of Israel as a Jewish state.

EYAL SIVAN: No anti-Zionism.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am not anti-Zionist I just don't believe in Zionism does that make me an anti-Zionist if I don't believe in something listen no no no no no I don't believe in the Hindu religion it doesn't make me an anti-Hindu. I don't believe in Kabullah.

EYAL SIVAN: At the moment you are putting Zionism as a level of belief already your perverting the question the issue is not Zionism as a belief but Zionism as erm a way of governance a way of life so you are saying I am not Zionist I am not living the Zionist way.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am living in a very Zionist way I am living in a Zionist country a citizen of a Zionist Republic I pay taxes and Social Security to whatever the Zionist enterprise I pay my taxes to it I pay my part to it I am just not very comfortable with it I don't think

it's the right way of doing things I think it's run its course it's a dead horse.

EYAL SIVAN: You don't think there is a need to fight it.

DAN DOLBERGER: To fight it?

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: You know I have been too busy fighting other little wars so I never got round to fighting Zionism, and anyway if I don't want to fight Zionism I want to understand it and understand its alternatives and whatever other ideas I have about how things should work I would like to understand these ideas better.

EYAL SIVAN: Do you support the {inaudible} against Zionists.

DAN DOLBERGER: No because that is too general the struggle Zionism is always a struggle for something don't talk to me about the struggle against Zionism talk to me about the struggle for what. Say something positive.

EYAL SIVAN: The struggle for a state of its citizen a state of the Jewish state a place where Jews are.

DAN DOLBERGER: If there was a struggle.

EYAL SIVAN: The Jews are not privileged this is the Hamas struggle this is the be lows struggle.

DAVID COLLINS: Am not for the Hamas struggle I think the Hamas struggle is being A appropriated in ways I cannot accept no more than I can accept what my own government is doing I cannot what Hamas is doing I think they are a perfect fit for each other like each collective is perfectly deserving of its regime then each part each side of a conflict is perfectly deserving of its other side they form 1 system so I am not I don't believe in Zionist I believe it has run its course and really connecting to the previous part of our conversation it's really a question I think my real fight my real fight would be on the level of having people more emotionally intelligent.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: Bringing people to a point where they can see things let me finish where they can see things from the point of the other when they can imagine another perspective of looking at things other than their own that's the key.

EYAL SIVAN: If we start from the beginning of our discussion and the beginning of our discussion tonight it's exactly the same discussion, what's the difference, you have been asking me about my critique and I have told you the notion of the critique is exactly the thing as to oppose another perspective not the perspective but another perspective.

DAN DOLBERGER: No no no no no no no no excuse me.

EYAL SIVAN: The question you asked me.

DAN DOLBERGER: The difference is that you stop at the

point of opposition, you annihilate something you take something apart deconstruct something and expose something you break the gold statue and you leave the pedestal empty and your job is finished I am looking at the empty pedestal and think what the hell can we have instead of what was on the pedestal or instead of the pedestal itself something has become dysfunctional pardon.

EYAL SIVAN: Rubble.

DAN DOLBERGER: You mean bullshit.

EYAL SIVAN: No.

DAN DOLBERGER: What's rubble.

EYAL SIVAN: Change.

DAN DOLBERGER: Change has implications so I am asking what now, and what my personal conclusion is that it is really a matter of changing people's emotional intelligence making it better.

EYAL SIVAN: It's critique you are showing that you have the freedom to look at things from another point of view.

DAN DOLBERGER: Accidents happen on the way.

EYAL SIVAN: On the way this is what makes the difference with ideology it's not the right way, another way.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes there are unintended consequences to critique which just stops at being critique I think the French revolutionaries or philosophers whose philosophy was part partly enabled the French revolution did they really intend to see such a barbaric butcher the course of the revolution to eventually run into the third empire did marks really intend the Soviet Union something went wrong.

EYAL SIVAN: Did Jesus really intend to.

DAN DOLBERGER: No.

EYAL SIVAN: If Jesus fought institution if marks thought what was class struggle this is the thing he didn't okay also the merits of these critique that specific comment the thing is that you've also to think to think why are we criticizing our struggle for example or supporting our struggle in my case I think there are situations in which our struggle is an absolute legitimate necessary way. .

DAN DOLBERGER: That's problematic. .

EYAL SIVAN: This is problematic only for tense of years.

DAN DOLBERGER: No no no thousands of years there is something very problematic about being a sovereign it means you are above the law and below the law subject to the law and you are making it at the same time and it's a very problematic status. No thanks we are okay we are good. When you are a sovereign you make the laws and you also have the right to break the laws and create an exception it's a problematic status. It's problematic within it's very core okay there is another problem when you oppose oppression when you pose violence of

oppression the violence of luka tour or the violence of the Tsar or the violence of George the.

EYAL SIVAN: W Bush?

DAN DOLBERGER: No the George during the American revolution George III when you oppose violence and pose violence with violence you don't, really get very far you just wrench sovereignty from someone to your own hands that's all you do.

EYAL SIVAN: No you displace the centre of violence the horrible thing.

DAN DOLBERGER: What's revolutionary about that.

EYAL SIVAN: The revolutionary is all about the fact that violence is in certain places violence is among when you have protected areas also in Liverpool London and Tel Aviv where you live there is a protected area violence which is closed within an area maybe 20 minutes from your house which is in the occupied territories right so it means I am talking about displacement of violence and this would be the Hamas it means that the fact there is violence in the occupied territories in the moment the Suez Suez bombing I think it's a bad strategy I think it's a bad it's a very a very depressed action of struggle but anyway when the, Sue's bombing.

NEW SPEAKER: Despair.

EYAL SIVAN: There is a displacement of the violence instead of the violence there will be only concentrated amongst the occupied territories suddenly violence is shared by people in Tel Aviv means they are living violence which is the same kind of violence as the occupied territories it's a revolutionary moment it's changed the normality of the space where violence takes place.

DAN DOLBERGER: It sounds very nice very symmetric very philosophical somewhat French but I think it's just I don't think answering violence by violence leads to anything else but more violence.

EYAL SIVAN: You didn't give an argument you came back to the generalisation which is to give violence against violence, no no no no no answer about my idea of the displacement of the space of violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: Displacement of the space of violence is a very nice and European intellectual way of saying that now Tel Aviv or ashtord or sterord are getting bombed, the shit out of them.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: Like people in Gaza are being bombed which is closer to the hortontic ethics of we rape their women and burn there houses now they come and rape our women and burn our houses what's changed what's new what's revolutionary displacement has been happening all the time.

EYAL SIVAN: You have another dialogue the thing you talked about changing of the conscience or the perspective thinking from the point of view of the other of course one of the things is the people today in the South of Israel right are suffering and they are becoming much closer to the people of Gaza than they are to the Leftists in Tel Aviv talking against occupation but don't bear no responsibility.

DAN DOLBERGER: That's a very problematic argument.

EYAL SIVAN: Why.

DAN DOLBERGER: It can't be leveraged for anything unless you see the people of Sterord and Gaza are creating a common front to fight their respective regimes.

EYAL: Why respective regimes I think they will fight Tel Aviv together.

DAN DOLBERGER: Oh, I don't know about that.

EYAL SIVAN: Why?

DAN DOLBERGER: I don't know about that it could be interesting but I will never happen.

EYAL SIVAN: This is the oppression that capitalist tick power is imposing it will never happen we are too weak we don't have the means this is exactly what I was coming to.

DAN DOLBERGER: You will start a civil war.

EYAL SIVAN: So what.

DAN DOLBERGER: Have you ever been to a civil war yes you have.

EYAL SIVAN: No.

DAN DOLBERGER: You went to Bosnia and Romania is that fun.

EYAL SIVAN: No.

DAN DOLBERGER: What does it breed what is the ultimate is Romania today really essentially better than it was during the Communist regime.

EYAL SIVAN: What's the greatest event and most important event in the history of America.

DAN DOLBERGER: Most important event in the history of America? Well that's a very open question.

EYAL SIVAN: What's the fundamental event.

DAN DOLBERGER: The foundation I guess.

EYAL SIVAN: Foundation of America.

DAN DOLBERGER: Rebellion against the British empire or kingdom.

EYAL SIVAN: Or the civil war right? And it was a civil war. .

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes it was.

EYAL SIVAN: It was so bad.

DAN DOLBERGER: Was it bad. I think for the revolutionists it was very good is it good for the guy homeless and freezing to death now under some bridge in New York is it good for him? Is it good for the world?

Is it good for this planet to have United States of America winning this kind of power managing this kind of economy creating money out of debt and debt out of money so freely irresponsibly we are looking at the E long-term resource of that is it a great thing.

EYAL SIVAN: You think the civil war of America it was all good?

DAN DOLBERGER: Good for us having an America.

EYAL SIVAN: What's French revolution if not a civil war?

DAN DOLBERGER: Are you happy about what's come out of France? Are you happy about France.

EYAL SIVAN: No but.

DAN DOLBERGER: Are things in France fundamentally different fundamentally different than they were the way things were run back in the 16th 17th or 18th century.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: In what way.

EYAL SIVAN: Which is the, this is why when French people want to change something they go down the street not like in Britain they kind of debating in the Parliament clapping their hands on the table erm kind of trying to make the competition of politeness yes a kind of.

DAN: so there was a president Thatcherism created a president in the power of large masses to change thereby heralding what we call the modern period okay, I think that I agree I mean I don't know anything about that I think another revolution that this enabled was the emergence of the so called non-violent violence, so it's very hard to judge over a long long period of time the value of revolution, very hard.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: It's very problematic.

EYAL SIVAN: Once again we are coming to measures I am just saying that to believe in the conscience and I mean to acknowledge the fact that the revolution including the violence which is implement to revolution.

DAN DOLBERGER: As what.

EYAL SIVAN: Violence.

EYAL SIVAN: That is inherent to revolution I am not trying to say the revolution is not violent. I am saying that acknowledging the possibility of the revolution as an action as a way of action including the inherent violence which is incorporated with them in the revolution it's a perspective it's a different way of a perspective on what today's habits are and what today's education transmission of knowledge is.

DAN DOLBERGER: I think that today the very word or term revolution is very problematic is very hard and difficult to understand. Once you say revolution I hear 2 things, I hear the commercial interpretation of that word the

commercialisation of this word there is a revolutionary detergent a revolutionary way of working on the computer a revolutionary way of communicating, there is a revolutionary car with a revolutionary engine that's 1 type of the uses of this word.

EYAL SIVAN: This is part of sterilising the notion of.

DAN DOLBERGER: I agree and another way of looking at revolution is in the somewhat stale old-fashioned sense of let's look at history and see a look at these points which have been labelled revolutions and that's revolution and then trying to apply that now and somehow I don't see another French revolution happening or another.

EYAL SIVAN: Come on.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am taking you somewhere. Where I am taking you is that at very concept of revolution is probably something we need to re-invent we just can't import it from the past as is. We can't borrow it from the commercialised sense we need to reinvent what it means and see if it's necessary to use that word that word may have run its course.

EYAL SIVAN: Why.

DAN DOLBERGER: Because there is change there is violent change there is mild change there is dramatic change and there is revolution so what do we really need that word and what does it mean today.

EYAL SIVAN: You are saying French revolution, today I don't see another French revolution coming I am not thinking of the French revolution is an example the example of the ideal revolution but saying the sentence I don't see another revolution coming like saying being in the middle ages and saying I don't see the renaissance coming of course not 10 years before French revolution nobody saw the French revolution for 20 years.

DAN DOLBERGER: Having seen, 3, 4, 5 revolutions.

EYAL SIVAN: Before the wall of Berlin was taken down.

DAN DOLBERGER: after 5 revolutions we have an institution called revolution we turn to when we want to change and think of revolution revolution as implement of change it's worked in the past and it's a ready made thing of the shelf to think about change and maybe effect change and I wonder I think we should revolutionise our concept of revolution.

EYAL SIVAN: Come on.

DAN DOLBERGER: What {laughter}. It looks so disgusting.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean revolutionise our concept of revolution we have to come back to the concept revolution is part of our possibilities it's one of the tools in our tool box.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am telling you this tool is probably very rusty by now very outdated. There aren't that many

screws around which it can open or nails it can pull out or walls it can really break. I think today's nails and screws and walls are require new tools.

EYAL SIVAN: This is part of general idea of brainwash.

DAN DOLBERGER: Pardon.

EYAL SIVAN: Would have to change tools and think about new ones the old ones don't work et cetera this is part of the permanent brainwash.

DAN DOLBERGER: Not brainwash.

EYAL SIVAN: We have to re-think new tools.

DAN DOLBERGER: Are you telling me I have been brainwashed.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: You agree with my mother you I ask if you agree my mother thinks I have been brainwashed by you.

EYAL SIVAN: Why you bring your mother in, you do not tell me what your mother thinks about me beside the fact you said you think I brainwash you but what she thinks of me.

DAN DOLBERGER: She thinks you are an enemy of the people recently I have been able to change her perspective.

EYAL SIVAN: Why.

DAN DOLBERGER: I told her more things about you she reads about you in the paper and in Israel what they write about you is not very true or honest. She read something someone wrote about the Eichmann specialist film he distorts the film re-invents the archive to say something it's not saying. It's very easy to hate you you know.

EYAL SIVAN: While I am a good guy.

DAN DOLBERGER: You are a great guy the only problem is that once you, as much as you are a social on the large-scale on the macro scale so society is somewhat on the macro scale.

EYAL SIVAN: Unsocial to me right I knew that.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes it's not just your problem. I think you and mass media don't go together very well you have to be on the side of the camera once you are on the other side of the camera you can be easily manipulated and you must never be made an object of your own camera must never be an object of the camera you must always stay on the right side of the camera.

EYAL SIVAN: You mean I made a mistake coming here.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes well you know I hope we didn't.

EYAL SIVAN: Because I went in front of the camera.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes you don't do this very often do you it's a rare document.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes. In fact it was I was wondering I wanted to make kind of a film with more person in and more voice over but.

DAN DOLBERGER: You don't have to it's something I would

do.

EYAL SIVAN: I don't dare it seems to me yes it seems to me worse than.

DAN DOLBERGER: Suddenly you sit with your back to the camera {laughter}.

EYAL SIVAN: It seems worse than farting in public.

DAN DOLBERGER: Pardon.

EYAL SIVAN: It's worse than farting in public to come in front of the camera it's.

DAN DOLBERGER: It's worse than farting in public.

EYAL SIVAN: I prefer farting in public.

DAN DOLBERGER: You think of yourself as a kind of fart {laughter}.

EYAL SIVAN: There is this thing of coming in front of the camera which is really a place I am not so good I was only in.... I mean badly treated by cameras right by journalists critics.

DAN DOLBERGER: I think so even if I did a film about you.

EYAL SIVAN: You would treat me bad.

DAN DOLBERGER: No God forbid would like to think what type of film I would like to do about you even if I did a film about you someone would eventually clip it up in such a way to serve as evidence against you.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes so, this in a way the solution to avoid or to bridge it or to make my person felt to go from behind the camera and talk and be seen I am doing my own.

DAN DOLBERGER: I don't think you are a very good object for your own camera, I think you are much better directing the camera at other things than yourself.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: In fact I am a very bad PR person.

DAN DOLBERGER: You are a very good PR of yourself but on the microsocial level.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: When people meet you face to face, they really they can't they fall in love with you like we went to that interview in Tel Aviv, channel 10.

EYAL SIVAN: I have it. I have it I asked it, in fact I realised that I wasn't so bad as I thought I am but I wasn't good.

DAN DOLBERGER: Okay.

EYAL SIVAN: I mean it's incredible I went to this studio what was it talk show or whatever and I behaved quite well I mean I was too polite.

DAN DOLBERGER: Too polite.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: That's part of the problem you see you would be willing to fight any time anywhere but within a camera or a TV studio doing a live show very old fart

let's see you fart there.

EYAL SIVAN: I am like all this progressive Leftist white shit.

DAN DOLBERGER: Now we are making progress.

EYAL SIVAN: I am behaving you know as belonging to my class being expected from me.

DAN DOLBERGER: Now we are making progress.

EYAL SIVAN: That's all. I mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: Now you are talking.

EYAL SIVAN: I was educated as they say I was educated. This is part of the thing, this is part exactly of the thing when the Jews Eastern European Jews started to believe that they are whites when they were from Jew street and they are non-white people they started to perform white Europeans and I am third generation of that my parents were already believing they are white and European and their kind of debonair my great great parents were persecuted in Eastern European because they were non-European non-whites my parents already believed.

DAN DOLBERGER: Where does that argument lead.

EYAL SIVAN: I was educated on what is supposed to be well education nicely speaking respectful polite you know my mother what she say all the time Eyal the problem is not Europeans the problem is the way that you express them and it's aesthetic issue, it's not what I am saying but it's how I am saying it. It would have been great if you said something but say it in another way be less aggressive more polite.

DAN DOLBERGER: That's rubbish.

EYAL SIVAN: This is my mother.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am very surprised to hear her giving you such advice. I think she is actually speaking to herself more than to you.

EYAL SIVAN: It's true you also were saying it to me from time to time you remember what was this thing you were telling me when I was going to that studio when there were everybody knew I am going to be lynched and hanged and crucified it was in the middle of the Jaffa fair remember what you told me what you've told me.

DAN DOLBERGER: I told you that should speak from the second person plural that you should say us, you should say we, you should bridge the gap between yourself and the audience and you will not wear this jacket.

EYAL SIVAN: Exactly what was bothering you was I had the jacket.

DAN DOLBERGER: I wasn't bothered personally I was acting as your PR adviser I thought you would maybe people would be having an easier time agreeing with you if they saw a figure on the screen which is visually similar to them which would seems lack one of them one of us it's like

one of us on screen saying or criticizing we can accept what he is saying because he is one of us not from the outside he is not different he is not the other and this jacket made you the other.

EYAL SIVAN: It was just a fact of wearing a jacket. This jacket?

DAN DOLBERGER: It's never just a jacket you signify something it means something you convey something it's a message come on you are the French intellectual now {laughter}. It's never just a jacket. Anyway never mind.

EYAL SIVAN: I don't agree no because.

DAN DOLBERGER: It's a simple thing to see.

EYAL SIVAN: I always find I always have been pressured that you are in a permanent struggle between kind of invisibility normality invisibility kind of a genuine desire almost innovation to what is visible to what is acceptable and this I don't understand this.

DAN DOLBERGER: What is normative you mean.

EYAL SIVAN: Abnormative yes yes yes yeah on the 1 hand you want you are absolutely.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am the model child on the 1 hand model citizen model child and citizen mainstream conforming and on the other hand I am kind of subversive.

EYAL SIVAN: You admire subversion and the struggle I don't understand this.

DAN DOLBERGER: I will explain it to you.

EYAL SIVAN: Please do.

DAN DOLBERGER: You know that I like Ikea very much.

EYAL SIVAN: {Laughter} yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: So I bought an armchair, and I sit in my armchair and there I do my revolution. So I am an arm chair revolutionary it's pathetic isn't it.

EYAL SIVAN: No this is not an explanation I want to really understand this distension. I am looking at my Blackberry.

DAN DOLBERGER: Everybody knows you are doing something now.

EYAL SIVAN: It's the first time that I have been really respectful.

DAN DOLBERGER: You should do it more often.

EYAL SIVAN: Explain this tension.

DAN DOLBERGER: Well, it's very hard to explain, it's really very hard to explain.

EYAL SIVAN: You agree?

DAN DOLBERGER: I agree I have a journey to make.

EYAL SIVAN: I am not trying to change you.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am not very comfortable.

EYAL SIVAN: In what?

DAN DOLBERGER: I think there is an inner tension a big contradiction or a distance between what I think and what

I do. And I also know when this dizziness will go away.

EYAL SIVAN: When.

DAN DOLBERGER: When I do what I think.

EYAL SIVAN: And when it will be.

DAN DOLBERGER: Pardon.

EYAL SIVAN: When it will be.

DAN DOLBERGER: Tomorrow at 12 {laughter} I don't know when it is a very embarrassing moment for me actually I hope nobody is reading this {laughter}

EYAL SIVAN: Really.

DAN DOLBERGER: I hope the room over there is empty it's a very embarrassing realisation for me that I have erm lived many years in my life, not really doing what I think. But then I have to forgive myself I guess and go on and finally find a way of life where I do what I think, yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: Not many people sit in a room with this guy typing everything that comes out of their mouth and everybody is reading this now I hope they really fell asleep now I am so totally embarrassed like it's good to be like everyone and with everyone where everyone is lying to everyone and everyone is making like they are all doing what they are thinking and nobody is questioning anybody else they are all on that side drinking tea and listening to the piano.

EYAL SIVAN: In fact you are in a situation which you will refuse to be right.

DAN DOLBERGER: What do you mean.

EYAL SIVAN: You are visible while you are not.

DAN DOLBERGER: Usually I am not visible I don't want to be visible or go you know I would hate to go to a television show or talk show and be interviewed for television unless I have something very important for me to say and frankly I am further embarrassed to say I have never found something important enough for me to stand in front of a TV camera and say it that's kind of strange because I could be saying something important.

EYAL SIVAN: You are saying a lot of important things but it's maybe because you are not generous enough.

DAN DOLBERGER: Not generous.

EYAL SIVAN: Enough. You don't shares.

DAN: you have always said that.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: This is why you don't publish.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes. Yes. Yes. Can we change the subject now {laughter}.

EYAL SIVAN: What's this English sentence how they say I think that we.....

DAN DOLBERGER: Will be erm.... finished or the subject or not.

EYAL SIVAN: Resumed or erm.

DAN DOLBERGER: You said it yesterday. Erm.

EYAL SIVAN: Anyway the sentence finishes but let's move on right.

DAN DOLBERGER: Gets move on right.

EYAL SIVAN: I don't want to move on I will say to you what I said to the {inaudible} you move when you come back you will find me.

DAN DOLBERGER: Have it your way.

EYAL SIVAN: I think that this is the risk of being put under. A public judgement.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes. Well.

EYAL SIVAN: And not only a private 1.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes yes this is something probably I don't feel very comfortable with.

EYAL SIVAN: This is all linked to the same thing debate about violence and revolution and about changing and about taking kind of a visible place and a not just struggling within the system and within convention it's coming up from the same place this is the real kind of issue, which this is what I try to say from the beginning it's a question it's aesthetical question it's a question of aesthetics.

DAN DOLBERGER: Again that word again aesthetics I never understand how you use it. While I have been away the Haitic people have been using this word no while I have been away after having studied philosophy in university in 1983 and having left this field totally behind me I now come back to discover there are new ways of using this word that I totally don't understand in the way you used it. What's aesthetics got to do with it what's aesthetics got to do with me about the way I express or not express.

EYAL SIVAN: It's a combination of aesthetics of expression or aesthetics of politics of expression or politics of behaviour I mean the permanent thing of the there is an accepted aesthetics like there is an accepted violence and a non-accepted violence there is violence which is just the permanent violence of the Metropole over its citizens in the class relations in the power relations among Western society this is kind of aesthetics that it's kind of accepted but slaughtering people people bleeding on the street this is kind of a non-acceptable aesthetics you see so this is the way that.

DAN DOLBERGER: I understand.

EYAL SIVAN: People being dying from enroxia and how you call it.... erm.

DAN DOLBERGER: I understand your point.

EYAL SIVAN: That's what I am talking about aesthetics for example.

DAN DOLBERGER: What does that have to do with me.

EYAL SIVAN: You are trying to keep kind of aesthetics which is kind of would be a mainstream white Western aesthetics right.

DAN DOLBERGER: You know erm, my dream.

EYAL SIVAN: Male I forgot heterosexual aesthetics {laughter}

DAN DOLBERGER: Are you trying to are you trying to say anything about my sexual preferences.

EYAL SIVAN: No no no no no no no I won't get into your sexual preference. I am talking about aesthetics which is white Western male heterosexual aesthetics.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am white kind of Western kind of Jewish or student and turned Western coming in from Western side of things and I am a male and that's almost undisputable, so why should I.

EYAL SIVAN: You said nothing about heterosexuality.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am a male heterosexual and then so what's.

EYAL SIVAN: All together it's the aesthetics of it.

DAN DOLBERGER: It goes with the aesthetic you know what do you expect me to do go in high-heeled shoes and wear a Jala beard to prove I am Western white heterosexual that.

EYAL SIVAN: No but.

DAN DOLBERGER: Doesn't have that aesthetic what's your point.

EYAL SIVAN: Where it comes from.

DAN DOLBERGER: Where what comes from.

EYAL SIVAN: This permanent need to perform it.

DAN DOLBERGER: What's the alternative.

EYAL SIVAN: Ah.

DAN DOLBERGER: What's the alternative.

EYAL SIVAN: There is no alternative. This is the.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am not saying there is not an alternative I am an open-minded Western heterosexual male white what's the alternative I am not saying there is no alternative.

EYAL SIVAN: There are many alternatives. First of all the 1 alternative is to criticise this performance.

DAN DOLBERGER: This what.

EYAL SIVAN: Performance.

DAN DOLBERGER: Oh I criticise it on my armchair.

EYAL SIVAN: On your Ikea am chair how is your Ikea armchair.

DAN DOLBERGER: The cat is sticking it's fingernails the cat I got this new sofa he is scratching everything and he is driving me crazy.

EYAL SIVAN: What was the story with the.

DAN DOLBERGER: I had a short fling with Ikea recently I bought a lamp, I was looking for some frames for the pictures. No harm done just a lamp and 1 picture frame,

I think I have I am not addicted to Ikea anymore. I finished my addiction I am done now. Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: You seem pissed.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am not pissed I am just stolchniav (Hebrew) I get too emotional now.

EYAL SIVAN: How do you mean too emotional.

DAN DOLBERGER: You reminded me I don't really do what I think that kind of got me erm, asking myself what do I really believe in, and what am I willing to do for what I believe in. What is my red line? What are the prices I am willing to pay these are questions I have always been avoiding.

EYAL SIVAN: Do I do what I think?

DAN DOLBERGER: Erm, would you like to answer that?

EYAL SIVAN: I would love to have.

DAN DOLBERGER: I think you do exactly what you think. But the only question is what do you really think I think sometimes I think {laughter} my God this is very embarrassing (farting) This is on tape you farted on tape. {Laughter}

EYAL SIVAN: I feel at home.

DAN DOLBERGER: In my own this is not home. This is not home.

EYAL SIVAN: It's our home for the next few hours. .

DAN DOLBERGER: I got to.... it's 10, 43 we have another erm, would you mind not doing that again please. I am embarrassed I am a Western heterosexual white male and I am normative with appropriate aesthetics and as such I am offended and {laughter} disgusted, by this. By this fart. Okay. Okay. Just, for the end of this conversation would you mind not farting again this is very {laughter} this is very embarrassing. Oh, {laughter}

EYAL SIVAN: How can you.

DAN DOLBERGER: There is camera here it is taping it's just sitting here doing that.

EYAL SIVAN: I am as human as all the others.

DAN DOLBERGER: Everybody knows you are human you don't need to prove that so in that way and your mother is right.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: She says why say it like this and I understand her. Ohly {laughter} this was really very embarrassing. {Laughter}.

EYAL SIVAN: Aesthetically you mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: Whatever. You know if I knew if someone told me in advance we would be sitting here and you would be farting I wouldn't, what is this circus?

EYAL SIVAN: We have been sitting together for how many years?

DAN DOLBERGER: For what.

EYAL SIVAN: How many years we been sitting together more than 25 right and usually kind of eat drink smoke.

DAN DOLBERGER: We never go anywhere we don't go places we don't travel together go to the movies theatre don't do concerts.

EYAL SIVAN: Nothing.

DAN DOLBERGER: Just talk.

EYAL SIVAN: How many words were expressed.

DAN DOLBERGER: Probably not many but we say the same words over and over again I am not sure if our vocabulary is that big. It's not just measured by the amount of words but what is this a retrospective.

EYAL SIVAN: No no no no no no.

DAN DOLBERGER: Summing-up.

EYAL SIVAN: No we never sum up I was wondering I am surprised by your surprise.

DAN DOLBERGER: By what.

EYAL SIVAN: The fact you are surprised at my behaviour.

DAN DOLBERGER: If you were presenting to the Board of Governors of I don't know what would you fart, in advance.

EYAL SIVAN: Oh in advance. And.

DAN DOLBERGER: Am I not worthy of the same kind of respect and decency.

EYAL SIVAN: Much more.

DAN DOLBERGER: Would you mind not farting in my presence in front of a camera just for a second.

EYAL SIVAN: It means that I feel familiar with you close to you confident in you.

DAN DOLBERGER: Familiarity breeds contempt didn't you hear that phrase before.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes but very comfortable and shrewd why don't you take it as a compliment {laughter}

DAN DOLBERGER: That's one of the most original compliments I have ever had. Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: It seems like a shift suddenly right.

DAN DOLBERGER: A shift in what.

EYAL SIVAN: You present usually kind of the rational right behaviour and suddenly just because I said yes but I mean on 1 hand you attempt to be mainstream well-behaved kind of conventional with your absolute originally originality in terms of thoughts you are trying to perform convention.

DAN DOLBERGER: Let me tell you a story you must know this story it's one of our rabbi Nacman asleib stories, it's a story about a king who had a son who was sort of psychotic in the son decided he was a Turkey, and he was behaving as a Turkey and making sounds like a Turkey and actually at dinner time when there was the nightly {laughter} he would stuff himself and eat erm all kinds of the crumbs left by people while they were eating and

he would do it under the table and have his entire dinner consuming the crumbs people were letting fall down and he was also making the sound of you know like a Turkey, and the king commissioned or decreed that or declared that he invited many wise people to come and cure his son, and the wise men came 1 after the other and each suggested some other kind of therapy 1 suggested psycho analysis another suggested {inaudible} analysis and 1 suggested behaviour and 1 suggested {inaudible} therapy and the 6th or 7th wise man came down 1 evening to dinner and went under the table together with the Prince and started acting exactly like he was acting and then suddenly the young psychotic Prince noticed this guy and told him hey who are you and wise man said I am a Turkey and he says I am a Turkey too let's go find some food together and for several nights that's what they did until this wise man got the trust of the Prince at which stage suddenly 1 day the wise man sat at table eating together with everyone and Prince showed his head from under the tablecloth asking the wise man what are you doing aren't you a Turkey anymore and then the wise man said yes I am a Turkey but to be a Turkey I don't have to eat and spend time under the table at dinner time I can be a Turkey and sit with everyone else the Prince came and sat with him and then he was cured. So I really have this fascination with the idea of being mad or that madness doesn't need any dramatic external aesthetics. And that not that I I think I am not a great man I am a very ordinary person whatever creative about me or original about me I don't need any kind of I don't need to fart in public to you know just because I am I don't know special or different or don't need to wear anything different or don't need to rebel no I want to be a Turkey on the inside and very normative on the inside is that possible.

EYAL SIVAN: So do you, is the statement I am a Turkey that doesn't understand I can go out from eating under the table and to sit with everybody else.

DAN DOLBERGER: I don't think you are a good example of a Turkey. I think you are more normative than you think. I think you are much closer to me normatively speaking than to that psychotic Turkey guy. Bottom line.

EYAL SIVAN: Still I don't understand this need of permanence measuring so called well behaviour right behaviour normative behaviour.

DAN DOLBERGER: You know normative is not a value for me in itself it's not my personal, I just I want to get through my day and if I have something to fight about which is very.... I have very few principles very few things I think are worth fighting about or rebelling but I do have them inside I know if someone really steps on

my foot, or steps on my then I will.

EYAL SIVAN: Do you recall any moment of struggle do you take risks.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes. Yes. I do.

EYAL SIVAN: You think so?

DAN DOLBERGER: There was 1 situation which very much brings to mind this situation, I was during my divorce I was erm I had to go to an interview with a social.

EYAL SIVAN: During divorce.

DAN DOLBERGER: When I was first divorced what you mean first divorce I only had 1 divorce.

EYAL SIVAN: Official.

DAN DOLBERGER: What you mean official.

EYAL SIVAN: 1 religious {inaudible} divorce and 1 separation which was a divorce there was a lawyer.

DAN DOLBERGER: Anyway, during the divorce the real divorce I had a meeting with a social worker and had my children with me and her thought of the way the meeting should take place is that she had me sit on 2 or 3, had us sit on 3 armchairs and she went to another Connor of the room and sat beside a desk facing us and said to us okay act natural I am going to observe you.

EYAL SIVAN: Who said that.

DAN DOLBERGER: The social worker she was a really stupid woman just act be yourself I am going to observe you now and your family and I said.

EYAL SIVAN: You were how many all your family.

DAN DOLBERGER: No me and my 2 children and I said no I am not going to behave this is not a zoo I am not a theatre an not going to be observed by you so you are going to sit with us and have a conversation or this meeting is finished so does that count.

EYAL SIVAN: Does that count for you.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes that counts for me and every time someone on the call centre or someone.

EYAL SIVAN: What do you have, against call centres.

DAN DOLBERGER: I have a lot against call centres.

EYAL SIVAN: You are pissed with call centres.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am pissed with call centres.

EYAL SIVAN: Why.

DAN DOLBERGER: Because this place is erm these places have Alzheimer's.

EYAL SIVAN: Those are workers that are really paid bad it's a kind of {inaudible} mainly in countries which are outside of Europe trying to pretend they are European having Indian accents it's usually Israelis' you cannot think about people in Philippines starting to learn Hebrew in order to become {inaudible} you know the people in the call centre are paid kind of nothing to work there there is kind of a loop {inaudible} society in the call centre.

DAN DOLBERGER: My heart goes out to these people and the problem is every time I feel frustrated by some injustice done by the company serving me I time and again face the same vacuum and same empty chair or same gap between chairs this non-person this non-function which is non-responsibility the constant evaluation of responsibility the fact that the man in the call centre is not responsible for the decisions he takes and the people responsible for the decision he takes are not there in the call centre to talk to me so I am always stuck in the middle I need to take it out on someone.

EYAL SIVAN: Dan these are people that are exactly the people that invented that.

DAN DOLBERGER: I never take it out on them I say you are really nice guy but the people who manage your company are perverts.

EYAL SIVAN: This is the {inaudible} in the last 15 years.

DAN DOLBERGER: Not new year. oh yes you are right absolutely. You know everybody makes mistakes you know I am not there anymore I have I want tea yes please. Tea great. .

EYAL SIVAN: This is part of it where comes from this energy and tolerance to be part of it for so many years.

DAN DOLBERGER: Erm, well we were going into some very deep places here now and I am not sure I want to go that deep. But I know what I have been doing there.

EYAL SIVAN: You do.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes and I am sure I don't want to do that anymore I am going somewhere else now.

EYAL SIVAN: I understand I am not judging it. I always thought that it was kind of 15 years anthropological research.

DAN DOLBERGER: It's a nice way of telling that story but it's not really anthropological research it was me trying to be part of something and succeeding in being part of something and now it's probably something wrong that's all that's all. And I may have some experience I can take out of it but it's not like I was doing research all the time I was just making a living.

EYAL SIVAN: I say research because you were not totally contaminated by capitalist thinking hi-tech thinking you kept kind critical distance despite the fact you were {inaudible} inside in the last 15 years.

DAN DOLBERGER: Sometimes I was more critical sometimes I was less critical sometimes I identified myself more with the system I was part of sometimes I got very alienated towards the system and kind of questioned the fundamentals of and the reasoning behind this operation but I think I never took a very clear position, .

EYAL SIVAN: What do you mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: I never really did what I thought, thank you.

EYAL SIVAN: But you were part of it.

DAN: yes I was part of it we were all part of it they were very nice people very nice people.

EYAL SIVAN: I didn't get it what do you mean.

DAN DOLBERGER: I was part of a very S nice group of people.

EYAL SIVAN: The hi-tech people.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes I was part of them and I enjoyed Y being nice.

EYAL SIVAN: So what was the problem.

DAN DOLBERGER: What was the problem there wasn't a problem. It's not a problem really it's just time to move on.

EYAL SIVAN: I think next time the system should be improved to have the loop inside of this room.

DAN DOLBERGER: The what.

EYAL SIVAN: Loop.

DAN DOLBERGER: You want to take a leak.

EYAL SIVAN: Physically I must.

DAN DOLBERGER: Fine go ahead.

EYAL SIVAN: I have to take the electronic key.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: I have an answer I forgot it.

DAN DOLBERGER: What's all this respect for the law all of a sudden.

EYAL SIVAN: It's my desire. Ask me the question again and I will give you an answer what was your first question.

DAN DOLBERGER: What do you believe in what do you really believe in. what starts after your critic after you lay down your scalpel knife analytical tools deconstruction tools, after all that's left is rubble and you have a very good way you are a rubble factory {laughter}.

EYAL SIVAN: A rubble factory?

DAN DOLBERGER: Institutions come in concepts ideas, states ideologies even small innocent acts, and they come in through your machine and they come out on the other side rubble dust.

EYAL SIVAN: You have kind of new material you can do with something.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes pardon.

EYAL SIVAN: Isn't it a good answer the fact that you have kind of a new material.

DAN DOLBERGER: That was the question I am waiting to hear the answer.

EYAL SIVAN: The question is I am fabricating new materials.

DAN DOLBERGER: That's unfair that's not fair you are

extending my analogy, you are saying if something comes out as rubble then it can be new raw material for something else so you are like the erm, the reaper, you are like the reaper you know the reaper?

EYAL SIVAN: Yes.

DAN DOLBERGER: the angel that reaps you reap everything and so you make sure the cycle of life has ended has closed down upon itself then new things can bloom again but you finished your job that is what you are telling me is that the answer.

EYAL SIVAN: I don't know. I had an answer but suddenly I am hesitating. I have an answer which is the permanent illustration I mean a constant enterprise, it works towards the demonstration that good manners.

DAN DOLBERGER: Good manners.

EYAL SIVAN: Good manners is a way of justifying vulgarly evil.

DAN DOLBERGER: What does it have to do with my question I don't really understand how this answers my question.

EYAL SIVAN: What is your {inaudible} a permanent illustration that good manners is just a form of justification.

DAN DOLBERGER: Is that all.

EYAL SIVAN: This is not bad.

DAN DOLBERGER: Is that all your career will converge on I mean an achievement.

EYAL SIVAN: Once again we are coming again to once again what's the product?

DAN DOLBERGER: Erm, do we have to go back to that question I think you answered it very well the first time so why go back to it. You told me that there is no product that being obsessed with finding the product all the time, products are not the only, the only point in the value in doing something is not only having a product at the end and you also answered that if to the extent that if you've a product a product is making people think and actually having known you for as long as I have erm, you made me think, you made me think a lot you made a very fundamental difference in the way I think today, I think you probably made me think in places I was not at all busy thinking before and that is a kind of a product or this is a kind of an outcome.

EYAL SIVAN: This is mutual this is erm our level of equality because I would say the same thing and why do we have a complete different aesthetics of morals.

DAN DOLBERGER: ultimately even though you fart in public and I don't we basically have the same aesthetics we are not very different.

EYAL SIVAN: You struggle in order to keep good manners and I am struggling against good manners I think good manners are this kind of erm fitrin on fitrine of

vulgarity.

DAN DOLBERGER: Would you care to mention 1 manner I sustain and you don't as a manner not as a conviction for example I am convinced if someone if I see someone falling in the street and I can prevent it I will help him or her would you. Is that manners so aren't you capable of small talk of polite small talk if you met the Queen of England.

EYAL SIVAN: What you mean?

DAN DOLBERGER: If you met the Queen of England would you go with the little small talk that goes with the situation.

EYAL SIVAN: I would have tried to avoid meeting the Queen of England {laughter}.

DAN DOLBERGER: That's a nice answer but suppose you are walking in the street and from 1 corner here comes the Queen of England unannounced in front of you unavoidable they shut you in a room with the Queen of England would you behave differently.

EYAL SIVAN: Shut me in a room, and so I have a discussion and I say Queenie how are you today I think my answer was clear, I would avoid it no way why should I am not really interested I have nothing to say to her and she has nothing to say to me thank God and if I find myself in a situation I will have to and need to or being like to I would ask myself deep questions about myself and my position.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes? Okay so we can consider this question closed.

EYAL SIVAN: This is a closed question.

DAN DOLBERGER: What do we do now.

EYAL SIVAN: I think in fact, in the last 6 month 4 month since we met last time we kind of have a big change.

DAN DOLBERGER: Me? Yes yes I think so.

EYAL SIVAN: Do you think it's linked to the financial crash.

DAN DOLBERGER: No I think it started before the financial crash but yes I think I am undergoing a change a big change yes. .

EYAL SIVAN: It's a big change while it didn't really change right.

DAN DOLBERGER: Not in my manners which I don't think will change in the foreseeable future or ever.

DAN DOLBERGER: .

EYAL SIVAN: At the same time you are keeping a distance from the conviction that there is the way our way of behaviour I mean {inaudible} about the city.

DAN DOLBERGER: I am learning myself yes.

EYAL SIVAN: Why so.

DAN DOLBERGER: I decided to fight fear. I want to get rid of fear in my life I want to be like you I don't want

to be afraid of anything. I want to learn from you how to stop being afraid.

EYAL SIVAN: It's not true I am not afraid.

DAN DOLBERGER: Not to be afraid of what you are not afraid of. I know you must be I know you have your own fears but things you are not afraid of, I would erm, be very glad to stop being afraid of myself.

EYAL SIVAN: What are those things you consider I am not afraid of, let's put it in another way.

DAN DOLBERGER: You know you are not afraid of the Zionist enterprise Zionist enterprise it's long arm it's apparatus in a wider more general sense you are not afraid of power, you are not afraid to speak your mind, you are not afraid.... to do what you think. You are not afraid to be creative. You are not afraid of what generally I mean not totally but sometimes in many senses relatively you are not afraid what people will think about you. Is it's not that you don't have any well total disregard for what people think about you but generally speaking you are less afraid than I am about what people will say.

EYAL SIVAN: Where do you think it comes from. .

DAN DOLBERGER: Well you probably erm what does Auschwitz have to do with it let's leave Auschwitz to Auschwitz. As far as I know you do not come from Auschwitz.

EYAL SIVAN: In a way we all come from Auschwitz.

DAN DOLBERGER: Who you me and the lamp no I don't come from Auschwitz.

EYAL SIVAN: Don't you. I come from Auschwitz graduate through my conscience.

DAN DOLBERGER: Are you.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes. .

DAN DOLBERGER: In what way.

EYAL SIVAN: {Inaudible} the idea that 1 day they would come.

DAN DOLBERGER: Do you think so do you live with this.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes yes they will come again against the lecturer.

DAN DOLBERGER: Is that something you are afraid of.

EYAL SIVAN: Afraid no I am not afraid.

DAN DOLBERGER: Do you really have this refugee consciousness.

EYAL SIVAN: Oh yes absolutely.

DAN DOLBERGER: I never knew that.

EYAL SIVAN: Refugee what you mean I have this conscience of being what you said erm I know I said before I have the conscience of being asocial.

DAN DOLBERGER: I remember.

EYAL SIVAN: Any system that wants to clean up whatever are those acts.

DAN DOLBERGER: I remember during the trial you had with

claud what's his name.

EYAL SIVAN: finkle count.

DAN DOLBERGER: Some things were said against you in court which made you very sorry made you feel very bad.

EYAL SIVAN: Like.

DAN DOLBERGER: I won't repeat these here but certain things in court were said about you and you felt it hurt you.

EYAL SIVAN: I, sued, I don't know if it made me sad or angry but anyway it was unjust.

DAN DOLBERGER: Of course it's not just what you thought you kind of felt the pain it made you feel painful they managed to hurt you.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes of course they managed to hurt me come on even, even a worrier when he is getting wounded it hurts.

DAN DOLBERGER: That's a point where not being afraid doesn't work.

EYAL SIVAN: What you mean I am not afraid of being hurt. I am not afraid of being hurt I am afraid of being hurt unjustly and when you are going to war you understand you can be hurt I am afraid of being hurt I too am afraid of being hurt from an unaccepted place. You know a bullet can come from everywhere.

DAN DOLBERGER: Well yes. There was a bullet wasn't there.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes I got a bullet through the mail but I wasn't afraid when I got the bullet saying in the envelope saying the next bullet will come through mail I wasn't afraid.

DAN DOLBERGER: Do you have an idea who sent it.

EYAL SIVAN: I know who sent it he went on trial the thing is not who is the person who put the bullet in the envelope what I am interested in what was the system that put in the mind of this man ideas that were interpreted by him as a bullet put in an envelope sent to Eyal Sivan. The guy who put the bullet in the envelope he was caught and brought to trial and got 8 month under condition they found in his place a lot of arms weapons and whatever bombs he was not even 1 day in jail because he was 60 years old good French white Jew he if he would have been a Muslim with a beard he would have still been in prison this is something that hurts me. This guy that treated my life sent me a bullet in an envelope was released with no jail while I know it was only because he was a white Jew and even in court it says he doesn't regret and would do it another time and still he was released and if this guy in the few 2 years after there was this French philosopher professor professor of philosophy of high school that was treated through e-mail by a Moroccan guy and this guy was protected by the police the philosophy

professor protected by police promoted into the National Institute of research all French intellectuals came around him to protect and freedom of expression he wrote a an article against, and everyone was around him around freedom of expression and the horrible terrorist act of treating him, I was treated my was treated my family's life was treated there was not 1 article defending me by a French intellectual, this frightened me much more than the bullet I got in the mail.

DAN DOLBERGER: I understand that I finally understand it you have your own fears. And probably I would never be able to imitate your lack of fear of things you are indeed afraid of because it's not that you don't fear them you fear them.

EYAL SIVAN: It's not the fear of standing up opposing Israeli policy considering the struggle of Hezbollah during the summer 2006 in resistance against Israeli army with all the critic I have of Hamas the struggle of Hamas is a just legitimate struggle against Israel I am not afraid of speaking out. I am afraid when I am seeing all those intellectuals they don't dare to say what they really think this frightens me though this is and this is my conscience of a refugee this is my Auschwitz conscience, the what Hannah call the moral failure of the good German society.

DAN DOLBERGER: Edmond Burke.

EYAL SIVAN: The good German society and good British society the good French society, I am not afraid of the violence that are coming from the townships and poverty I am afraid of this well-behaved proper clean violence.

DAN DOLBERGER: You are afraid of me. You are not sure what I would do. You think I represent that. You think I would stand by and let things happen you think I stand by and let things happen.

EYAL SIVAN: The paradox is that I know that you are not I mean I am afraid but I know you are not because I know that you are performing a standbyer but you are not.

DAN DOLBERGER: No I am not.

EYAL SIVAN: You are performing it so it's a strategy and I am really really intrigued by this subversive strategy.

DAN DOLBERGER: So am I.

EYAL SIVAN: So it's right, I mean I am exercising facing you I mean you represent because of your performance what I am afraid of and at the same time and this is I mean this is my love to you is that in fact you allow me to exercise because I know what you are not what you are performing I know it's kind of a performance. What I don't understand is why you are performing it and it intrigues me because I know that in fact it's kind of a yes it's a strategy but it's strategy of what it's obviously enough for me that it is a strategy of

struggle, it's not a struggle it's not a strategy of pacification you pretend you want to pacify.

DAN DOLBERGER: I think there comes a point in any struggle that you need to make very clear choices and once you make these choices you choose sides you cannot really go on maintaining your civil politeness and normativeness and at the same time you are fighting with something and I don't believe this time this moment will come for me.

EYAL SIVAN: In fact I have a question which is completely different while you are performing on a scene you are wondering there are people that can look at you and when you are a lonely man like me you can find a gentle feminine character that will be intrigued or attracted by you because over your appearance do you think that this text on the screen can have the same function.

DAN DOLBERGER: Pardon? Can you repeat the question in simple terms.

EYAL SIVAN: When you are performing when you have a physical appearance right on 1 hand right you can assume you can attract somebody.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes.

EYAL SIVAN: In my case I am interested in attracting women of course do you think that through this text on the screen which is this blurb of non-prepared completely improvised discussion which should and does have a lot of sense do you think someone will be intrigued about me {laughter}.

DAN DOLBERGER: No.

EYAL SIVAN: Never.

DAN DOLBERGER: No the contrary I think {laughter}

EYAL SIVAN: Kind of a repulsive figure.

DAN DOLBERGER: No I think you have never been a good virtual virtual media was never good for you. They have the face to face the face to face is your medium.

EYAL SIVAN: This is what I love in this exercise I am absolutely conscious.

DAN DOLBERGER: What is this question all about highly improper and unnormative {laughter}

EYAL SIVAN: You are embarrassed.

DAN DOLBERGER: In fact I am. I hope they shut down this thing it's past 1130 so I hope they are not typing this anymore.

EYAL SIVAN: I have the impression.

DAN DOLBERGER: I hope the guy who is typing went to the loo or something.

EYAL SIVAN: The notion I don't really understand this idea of embarrassed.

DAN DOLBERGER: You don't know what it means to be embarrassed.

EYAL SIVAN: I think so I mean I know it but I don't really.

DAN DOLBERGER: When was the last time you felt embarrassed it's a great question.

EYAL SIVAN: What embarrassed what's in Hebrew embarrassed.

DAN DOLBERGER: Hevuha, nevuha, let's talk about when you were a child.

EYAL SIVAN: Give me a break.

DAN DOLBERGER: When or what was the earliest time in your life you felt embarrassed.

EYAL SIVAN: I remember when we were growing as kids to sigh high to the desert of Sinai and started to go in the 60s or to the beach or something and we were changing clothes and trying to hide and everything always our mother say to us what you hiding what you hiding you didn't steal nothing from nobody.

DAN DOLBERGER: Ah I see. I see. Eyal you are embarrassed to be embarrassed. embarrassment is very embarrassing to you. Now I get everything. Now I see this. It's like you couldn't have thought to be embarrassed it was really embarrassing for you to be caught embarrassed and when it was time it became a fear an attitude toward things but deep down inside don't you really feel this sometimes this urge or this wish to feel just a little embarrassed. Okay okay we will change the subject. Well.

EYAL SIVAN: I have to think about it. Are we done here.

DAN DOLBERGER: Yes it would be complicated, it would become complicated between us I mean if you start to criticise I mean to have a kind of critical way of looking at normativity, I mean we are becoming.

EYAL SIVAN: We are becoming very dangerous together I mean this is having a really strong revolutionary potential.

DAN DOLBERGER: What are you talking about.

EYAL SIVAN: Stolichnia okay Russian vodka. So are we done here.

DAN DOLBERGER: And if they will never open the door we are stuck, this is we have to slip.

EYAL SIVAN: Break a window and get out.

DAN DOLBERGER: We have to sleep here we will stay here we have food for how many days.

EYAL SIVAN: I have a refugee mentality of course I do. In fact it's really kind of yes it's a big surprise.

DAN DOLBERGER: What.

EYAL SIVAN: For years and years you were defending kind of the idea of normativity and even this year today questioning I mean you are a genius you are a genius you are really courageous.

DAN DOLBERGER: Am I.

EYAL SIVAN: Yes incredible courageous.

DAN DOLBERGER: That's a very good time to hear that.