

**Marc Lenot**

**Disillusionment: Vilém Flusser and the Israeli-Palestinian  
Conflict**

In the context of Vilém Flusser's relationship with Judaism and with his own Jewishness—to which the present issue of *Flusser Studies* is devoted—this essay presents a dozen texts written by Flusser about Israel and the conflict with the Palestinians (together with a few letters by him on this subject). Without taking sides on such a delicate subject, it attempts to shed light on Flusser's view of Israel. Other essays in this issue evoke Flusser's "essential" relationship with Israel; here, we attempt only to set forth his political view (even even though the two are inseparable).

According to a recent biography, the teenage Flusser adhered to Zionist ideas (Bernardo / Guldin: 289) but soon turned his back on this ideology, perhaps—though this is only a hypothesis—after discussions with his father, a well-integrated agnostic Jew who in 1938 refused to make his *Aliya*, which would have allowed him to become a professor at the University of Jerusalem (and would, in retrospect, have saved his life). Or perhaps, as suggested by Bernardo and Guldin (*Ibid.*), it was a consequence of his flight from Prague at the time of the Nazis invasion, though the causal connection is not clear. Admittedly, Flusser was always proud of his Jewish origins, and of his Jewish culture in particular. However, particularly during the first of his two trips to Israel (from April 28 to May 21, 1980), he developed an original reflection on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the dead-end of Zionism. We shall attempt to present that reflection here from the angle of "disillusionment," the title of the essay he wrote during that first stay. Although many other non-Israeli Jewish thinkers, from Albert Einstein and Hannah Arendt to Stéphane Hessel and Dominique Vidal, have expressed their doubts and criticisms about Zionism, and although Israeli thinkers such as Shlomo Sand, Ilan Pappé and Ariella Azoulay (among others) have recently done the same—often more radically—Flusser stands out for the historical and philosophical dimension of his thinking on the subject.

Apart from contacts with family members who emigrated to Israel, especially his first cousin David (born Gustav, a historian, living in Israel since 1939 and a professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Vilém Flusser seems to have taken no particular interest in Israel before 1967. Further research may bring additional information, but it

seems that Flusser never considered emigrating to Israel. In a letter of April 28, 1966 to his friend the lawyer Celso Lafer (also a Brazilian Jew, and the future author of a book on the thought of Hannah Arendt), he wrote that his appointment by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as cultural ambassador to Brazil might take him to Israel, mentioning the country in passing among a list of others (Flusser 1966).

On May 26, 1967, just before the so-called Six Day War, Flusser wrote an essay in Portuguese entitled “The Israeli Crisis” (Flusser 1967), published in the *Israelite Chronicle* of São Paulo. Believing that the nascent crisis required him to either affirm or deny his Jewishness, he claimed that the latter option—the abandonment of Judaism, “an existential and irrevocable decision”—would give him an objective view of the conflict: “In that case, I can compare the position of Arabs and Jews, I can analyze the motives of the (socialist, religious, nationalist) Arab movements, I can assess the feelings and resentments of those who have been robbed and offended by the Jews, and I can likewise judge the commitment of the Jews, their various socialist, religious, nationalistic and messianic tendencies and the achievements of those tendencies.” But he added immediately, “I can do all that, it will be my freedom. But I will no longer be able to say that I am Jewish.” On the other hand, if he decided “not to deny his Judaism,” it would be for reasons “too complex to be analyzed lucidly and conclusively; it would not be entirely rational.” And in that case, he would lose his freedom to think, he would allow his thought and behavior to be governed by non-objective values, he “would no longer seek an objective truth, but his own truth (which is Jewish),” he would no longer be “in search of an objective good, but of his own good (which is the Jewish good).” He would then be condemned to subjectivity, and, worse, to acting within the framework of that subjectivity. His conclusion—an extraordinarily lucid one for the time—was that the Israeli crisis would force him to accept or reject his Judaism; he could not take refuge in ambivalence, in an alleged “Jewish objectivity” which would be unauthentic: he had to decide for himself. And he could not do this symbolically or ritualistically (e.g. by giving money, making fine speeches or writing good articles), because that would make him a “bastard” (in the Sartrean sense of the term). Nonetheless, he had to take the chance of choosing, of committing himself. As might be expected, he did not reveal his decision... This text by Flusser sheds remarkable light on the necessarily irrational nature of Zionism and of support for Israel which, for a Jewish thinker, would go against freedom of thought. It should be remembered that, in 1967, the whole of the Western world—its thinkers, politicians and journalists—supported Israel, and the entire Jewish diaspora even more so; the few criticisms of Zionism from the

West were essentially formal (that of Général de Gaulle, for example) and did not challenge what Flusser already referred to as “the Jewish truth.” Flusser's position at the time, therefore, was relatively innovative and radical.

In March 1972, when tensions were rising in the Middle East, Flusser wrote two articles in Portuguese for the *Folha São Paulo* under the joint title “Peace in the Middle East?” In the first, “The Jews in Israel” (Flusser 1972. a), he returned to the inherent ambiguity of Zionism and of support for Israel. For him, Zionism in Central and Eastern Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century was “a typical petty-bourgeois movement, caught between the wars of big money and the proletarian revolutions,” but slightly more “exotic” than the other nationalist movements; however, it was also a “secularization of Judaism, and thus an attempt to transfer the Jewish 'mission' from religious, mystical and ritual ground to a political and social terrain.” Historically, Divine Will intended Jewish lives to serve as models for the rest of humanity, so “Judaism only made sense in relation to the rest of the world”: to be Jewish was always uncomfortable, therefore, and even dangerous. But Zionism proposed “a curious solution to this problem”: building a Jewish state in which Judaism could exist by itself, with no more discomfort or danger, and making this state (rather than individual Jews) an experimental model, a laboratory for other states (including its neighbors). Despite some utopian initiatives (the kibbutzim, a non-professional army, a neither capitalist nor socialist economy, etc.), the experimental goal of serving as a model for other nations failed, partly because of the external environment (the hostility of neighboring countries and Arab intellectuals, the state of siege, American influence) and partly because of internal conflicts (chauvinistic nationalism, ethnic and religious problems). But, as Flusser went on to say, all this could change immediately if there were peace. A “clear and brutal” problem would ensue: what gives one human group the right to set itself up as a model for others? There is no intellectual, ideological or existential answer; there can only be an answer if the Israeli Jews take up the task, if the Jews of the world support them, if the Arabs agree to collaborate and if humanity as a whole permits it.

This utopian vision was somewhat undermined in the article written the next day, entitled “Jews in the World” (Flusser, 1972.b). It begins with an analysis of the perception—among non-Jews and among some Jews too—that Jews are more loyal to Israel than to the countries they live in, and that Israeli leaders speak in the name not only of their citizens, but also of Jews from all over the world. Flusser's analysis is a brilliant historical résumé: in the Middle Ages, Jews were a well-defined social class rather than a religion or a people; the revolutions of the eighteenth century (and the French Revolution in particu-

lar) freed them from this status, just as the serfs were emancipated. But while the serfs became assimilated and formed the proletariat, the Jews—whose feudal status was already partially similar to that of the bourgeoisie—became, once emancipated, rivals of the bourgeoisie, also participating in the economic, social and cultural aspects of the industrial revolution (and in the criticisms of that revolution). Even when they succeeded, they were never completely assimilated into the bourgeoisie, which closed in on itself in the face of Jewish competition. This closure formed the basis of a nationalist and racist ideology (totally different from feudal, religious anti-Semitism), to which emancipated Jews reacted by developing a nationalist ideology of their own: Zionism. In the first half of the twentieth century, anti-Semitism, culminating in Nazism, was the main obstacle to the assimilation of Jews, but the second half of the century saw Zionism become the main obstacle to assimilation. Today, assimilation is desirable for Jews because it would end the tragic alienation that torments them, and for non-Jews because it would eliminate a point of friction and enrich the common culture. But as Zionism, on the one hand, asserts the existence of “Jewish values” that need preserving, and anti-Semitism, on the other hand, insists on “purity” of culture or “race,” these two ideologies that are “apparently so opposed, actually collaborate to avoid the assimilation of Jews.” Flusser believed that these ideologies should be fought by the Jewish and non-Jewish elites, who should “form a united front against the ideological front of 'anti-Semitism-Zionism'.” And, he concluded, this possibility should also be explored in Israel itself. Flusser's thinking on the subject was far in advance of contemporary ideas: to consider Zionism and anti-Semitism as allies in the construction of the Zionist state was properly revolutionary in 1972 (and still is today), although various studies have clearly shown that this *de facto* convergence existed historically, for political actors and for anti-Semitic thinkers (such as Maurras and Céline).

In March 1973, Flusser expressed his reservations to his cousin David (Flusser 1973.a), telling him that he had no desire to go to Israel as a tourist and that he was afraid, if he went, of having to commit himself either for or against the conflict. He saw the nature of Israel as contradictory: for him, to be Jewish meant to be open and dedicated to others, but he wrote, “The reality of Judaism (and especially of the Jewish state, which does not allow itself to be distinguished from Judaism) consists instead of closing in on itself, asserting itself.” And he added, “Judaic reality diametrically contradicts my idea of Judaism.” His plan to visit Israel was later thwarted by the war of October 1973 (Flusser 1973.b).

It was probably then that he wrote an unpublished text in English entitled *The Jewish War. A testimony of commitment* (Flusser XX); although undated, its reference to the October

1973 war suggests that it was written shortly thereafter. Further to a geopolitical analysis of the conflict, Flusser emphasized the perception of the specifically Jewish nature of the war. As Jews consider that “everything that is Jewish cannot be fully understood through general categories, because 'Jewishness' seems to be a species which does not fit well any classification,” they also believe that “Jewish religion is unlike religion in general, Jewish people are unlike people in general, the Jewish state is unlike any other state in general,” so the Jewish war cannot be classified as “border clashes.” The belief that being Jewish is something special and not easily generalizable is an important aspect of Judaism. Flusser raised the following paradox: if Jews tried to deny the specificity of Jewishness, this Jewish “normalization” would lead to the disappearance of Judaism; if non-Jews denied it, this would lead to the acceptance and assimilation of Jews into a non-Jewish environment—and thus also to the disappearance of Judaism. In other words, the acceptance of Jewish specificity counts as anti-Semitism among non-Jews, and as loyalty to Judaism among Jews. But for anti-Semites, Jewish specificity is a cultural or biological characteristic, whereas for Jews it must be “some sort of special and non-generalizable obligation toward mankind assumed by every true Jew.” But according to Flusser, “the Jewish state is the result of an attempt to 'normalize' Judaism, to deny Jewish specialness, and therefore to refuse the specifically Jewish obligations.” Their leaders, and the majority of Israelis, would like this war to be considered like any other, so “they don’t do what they ought to do as Jews, but what any other state does.” He added, “Had the Israeli state assumed its Jewishness, it would have assumed itself as a model for individual and social behavior in the future, as did all truly Jewish experiments of the past (biblical Judaism, original Christianity, Spinozism, Marxism, structuralism and so on). Israel would have assumed itself to be a model for the liberation of the so-called ‘Third World’, as Christianity was a model for the liberation of the slaves, and Marxism for the liberation of the workers. But Israel failed to do so (except for small experiments like the kibbutzim) and therefore it is correctly being excluded from all Third-World attempts at liberation and attacked by those who advocate it. This is an ‘explanation’ of the present war, and it means that Israel is being attacked because it has concentrated its energies and imagination, not to assuming a model place within the third world, but to impose its alienating presence on the third world. It has failed in political, social and religious imagination, which means that it has failed to be Jewish.” Flusser tempered this extremely radical critique of Zionism with a rather utopian conclusion (though he denied that this was so), counting on a revolution in Israeli awareness (and in that of the Jewish diaspora):

“What is needed is not an enforcement of the will of the Israeli establishment on Arab establishments, but a true and open understanding of, and collaboration with, Arab oppressed masses and oppressed masses of the third world.” For Flusser, it was only by leading the Third World’s struggle against domination that Israel would be truly Jewish; this would be a new phase in the history of Judaism and, however unlikely it seemed, “he who assumes himself to be Jewish” should “commit himself to his specifically Jewish obligation.”

Another unpublished English text by Flusser, entitled *How the Germans see Israel* (Flusser YY), is not dated; according to Rodrigo Maltez Novaes, it was written in the 1970s, probably after the 1973 war. When reading German press coverage of the conflict, Flusser noted above all—“with embarrassing frequency for a Jewish reader”—the almost ritual nature of proclamations of German responsibility for the present state of the Jewish people, as if it were above all a question of “tranquilizing German self-doubts.” He observed “a sort of uncommitted sympathy for the mythical ‘Israeli’ nation” but with no mention of Jewishness, and a malaise linked to the historical (not only Nazi but also more distant) past. The German nationalist and romantic ideology was founded, he said (assuming the caricature), on the claim that “We Germans are the true chosen people, and the Jews, the false chosen people, must disappear if we are to be truly Germans.” So, unlike Russian or French anti-Semitism, German anti-Semitism “links German identity with the Jewish problem.” This was reflected in the way the German press identified Israelis to Germans: “The Israeli army behaves as if it were the Wehrmacht. The Israelis do what Germans are no longer allowed to do, and in this sense they ‘represent’ old Germany for Germans. Israelis are being blamed for their ‘arrogance’, which is, as every German knows, a typical German characteristic.” And, continuing his analogy, “Those Germans who now love the Jews because they are heroes are exactly the same that a generation ago hated them for being cowards. Philosemitism and anti-Semitism spring from the same root. [...] one-eyed Dayan is a sort of Jewish Wotan, an uncomfortable Wagnerian motive.” And again, likening the two countries to David against Goliath, “Like Germany, that pure and simple society of poets and thinkers, which was surrounded by malefic hereditary enemies (*Erbfeinde*), so the Israelis are surrounded by brutal superior forces, but they win thanks to their *Geist*, like the Germans,” and he concluded, “The hidden ideology behind all this is a rather unhealthy identification of the ‘repressed’ German identity with the Israelis. Not much good can come out of such a muddle.” In this rather radical text, further to historical reflections on Germany, Flusser did not hesitate to associ-

ate the Israelis with German chauvinism and Nazism in this surprising fashion, on the pretext of an analysis of German press articles.

Vilém Flusser finally went to Israel with his wife, Edith, from April 28 to May 21, 1980. He began by giving a lecture on the act of writing at the Van Leer Foundation in Jerusalem, where he visited the Old City. On May 4, he went to Rehovot (south of Tel Aviv), as a guest of the Weizmann Institute of Science, a university center for research in social and natural sciences. While staying in Rehovot, he gave a lecture on the philosophy of photography at Tel Aviv University and visited the Museum of the Jewish Diaspora on campus. It was in Rehovot, on May 8, that he wrote the short essay in Portuguese entitled *Disillusionment* (Flusser 1980.a), which Edith Flusser later translated into German as *Die Enttäuschung* and which was included in the posthumous compilation *Jude Sein* (Flusser 1995: 38-41). In this fairly radical text, under the aegis of the Platonic opposition of action and contemplation, he considered that Israel had demonstrated the “sinking of committed idealism” since 1967, and that a more distressing spectacle would be difficult to imagine. Before 1967 (the Six-Day War and the occupation of Palestine), “the majority of the founders of the Jewish state thought they could more or less create a fairer, more humane model of society,” but “the occupation of the conquered lands showed how fragile the moral basis of this commitment was,” with the result that they lost their self-confidence and the moral support of the rest of the world. If Israelis were still capable of sacrificing themselves for Israel, it was no longer for an ideal, but for self-defense—“a sacrifice of the disillusioned.” The moral defeat of the Zionist ideal stemmed from the decision to apply this ideal in practice, beginning with “the first attempts to colonize Palestine at the end of the last century.” Ultra-orthodox Jews—those from the Mea Shearim neighborhood, who dress like eighteenth-century moujiks and throw stones at cars driven during Shabbat—rejected the very idea of a Jewish state because “the ideas of Judaism should be contemplated and not applied.” The equally ultra-fundamentalist Marxist Jews considered socialism to be unenforceable without class struggle and refused to go to Israel—two forms of Platonic reasoning. So the founders of the Hebrew state came up against the Platonic dilemma of the application of ideas. The tragedy of Zionism sprang from the gap between the idea to be applied and the reality to be transformed: “Zionism is tragic because it aims at the impossible and does so with extreme dedication.” Flusser said, not without irony, that before visiting Israel he did not understand why the whole world did not admire the grand spectacle of this brave state: after persecution by the Cossacks, extermination by the Nazis and beheadings by Islamic fanatics, the survivors of this

decadent and exhausted society came together, not to find a refuge where they might lie quietly down and die, but where they might build the model society of the future. “Why did all humanity not hold its breath to witness such a fascinating drama?” But, he added, once in the country he understood: “This tragedy is a repulsive show, because it demonstrates the extent to which commitment to these ideals is irrational and frustrated.” Back in London, on June 10, Flusser wrote to his old friend Alex Bloch, another Jewish Brazilian from Prague (Flusser August 1980.b), clearly expressing his doubts about Israel—and about the kibbutz system, for example—and concluding that, in his view, it was not a valid model. He would return to this in another letter to Alex Bloch on March 7, 1981 (Flusser 1981.a).

Flusser was invited to a debate organized by The Institute of Jewish Affairs (the think tank of the World Jewish Congress) in London in October 29, 1980 (“Meeting of the Study Circle on Contemporary Jewry and Zionism at Hilel House”). There, he presented a contribution in English entitled “Two different kinds of Jew” (Flusser 1980.c), in which he made a distinction between Judaism for Jews and Judaism for non-Jews; his suggestion was to overcome the “Nazi-Zionism syndrome” in order to “assume again the basic Jewish dialectics”. Particularly disappointed by this conference (which he described as violent, grotesque and anachronistic), in March 1981 he published a text in Portuguese on the death of Zionism in the São Paulo journal *Shalom* (Flusser 1981.b), describing Zionism as “an ideology based on irreconcilable postulates” since it aimed to turn the Jews into a nation like any other. For him, Jewish specificity was incompatible with the idea of nationality; consequently, “the Jewish state fails because it must either be a state, or be Jewish” so that “Zionism can be considered dead or ‘in extremis’,” i.e. dying. He regretted that the debate had not touched on the Arab question or Israel’s submission to the United States, considering Zionism as an exclusively Jewish problem, “as if Israel were a phenomenon suspended in the void.” The only topic of discussion he found interesting in the debate was anti-Semitism: for some participants, Zionism had failed because it had not solved the problem of anti-Semitism, fueling it instead with new arguments; for others, Zionism had triumphed over traditional (religious, racial, economic) anti-Semitism, but had created a new, political and social anti-Semitism, modifying the image anti-Semites have of Jews. However, Flusser regretted that no one raised the point that the Jews themselves were changed by Zionism. He noted that the trauma of Auschwitz prevented any critical discussion of Judaism in general and of Zionism in particular, any radical criticism addressing the roots of the problem. Observing that the debate concluded with a proposal to reformulate and update Zionism, without any reference to the Palestinians, he “came out of



the meeting with a feeling of despair.” Noting that the Zionist movement had become a powerful apparatus with major investments and a body of well-integrated employees, he believed that the apparatus would continue to operate as such, regardless of the program, adding “even if Zionism as an ideology or a movement is dead, the Zionist apparatus will continue to function” whatever its program, thus applying his concept of the apparatus to Zionism. And he added, ironically, that in his view, this confirmation of the power of the apparatus was the only positive element of the debate.

On August 25, 1982 Flusser published in the newspaper *O Estado de São Paulo* an essay in Portuguese entitled “Israelis and Palestinians” (Flusser 1982), where he suggested that the term “Israelis and Palestinians” should be replaced by the words “Jews and Arabs” in order to shift from a dialectic of territorial disputes to an attempt at cultural integration. For him, the “cultural vigor of the Jews must operate in accordance with the body in which it is implanted.” “Instead of being an invader, the Jewish implant in the Arab body must become a catalyst for latent forces, and the presence of the Jews must enliven the potential that has been dormant for centuries in Arab society.” He expressed the hope that one day “the Zionist dream (model society, ‘light of the nations’) and the pan-Arab dream (a humane alternative to the deadly Western project),” would merge, but doubted that he would live to see it. He called for the building of bridges and cooperative relationships between the two parties, for the terminological and ideological mystification used by both sides to be combated and the atrocities and hatred minimized. He suggested referring thenceforward to “Jews” and “Arabs” rather than “Israelis” and “Palestinians”. If the intellectuals of the two peoples were to unite, “the utopia of a synthesis between the two groups [would] cease to be a utopia, and become a project.”

Flusser published his final text on the subject, in German, in the Berlin weekly *Freitag* of April 26, 1991. Entitled “Neo-Zionism. A universal manifesto” (Flusser 1991.a), it returned to Zionism’s inability to succeed in the region. According to Flusser, by achieving its goal Zionism had become “a shameful synonym for anti-Semitism,” doomed to failure “not because its neighbors want to destroy it, but because it has repressed its own madness and obsession with God to subject them to the reason of State.” He saw Zionism as “a disaster because it has achieved its material objective, a nationalistic state, and has missed its immaterial goal, God.” And he imagined a giant “neo-Zionist” holographic projection that would take Israel to Spitsbergen or the Kalahari...

On September 22, 1991, Vilém Flusser made his second trip to Israel where he spent a week with his wife, Edith, and his friends, the photographers Joan Fontcuberta and Andre-

as Müller-Pohle. The latter, who was also his German publisher, procured him an invitation to the third Israeli Photography Biennial, entitled “The Persistence of Memory,” at Ein Harod (a kibbutz in the North with a museum of contemporary art), organized by the director of the Galia Bar-Or museum and the Greek photographer and writer John Stathatos. Müller-Pohle remembers that Flusser arrived in a rather bad mood, complaining about the travel conditions, finding the landscape between the airport and the kibbutz “miserable,” and claiming that Iranian culture was infinitely richer and prouder than Hebrew. But he went on to enjoy the exhibition and the fact that he, rather than John Stathatos, was soon seen as the star of the festival. His lecture in English on history and photography (Flusser 1991.b) was a great success; he developed the theme of how photography modified the course of history, and briefly discussed the “emotional, unreasonable” nature of the Arab-Israeli conflict. His lecture was the intellectual high point of the festival, and Flusser stayed late at night talking with the participants at the Biennial. Then, although Flusser was rather concerned about the “stone war” (First Intifada), the four friends visited occupied Palestine (Jenin, Baqa ash- Sharqiyya, Tulkarem and Jerusalem, where Fontcuberta took two pictures of the Flussers and Müller-Pohle). Flusser also met several Israeli photographers, including Aim Deüelle Lüski to whom he promised an article about the photographer’s work using the scores for the *Brandenburg Concertos* (an article he did not have time to write before his death two months later), and Avi Ganor (who later initiated, with Lüski, the translation of *For a Philosophy of Photography* in Hebrew in 2014). [1]

How could we synthesize the various texts written by Flusser between 1967 and 1991 on Israel, Zionism and the conflict with the Arabs? Though Flusser defined himself as a Jew who had lost faith and had no particular knowledge of the Jewish religion (Bernardo / Guldin: 290), he remained obviously proud of his Jewishness and very attached to Israel, if only because of the presence in that country of his cousins, including David Flusser. For him, to be Jewish was to exist for others, dedicate oneself to others; other essays in this issue address this same subject. Flusser’s critique of the state of Israel stemmed from this vision of what Judaism should be. First of all, he considered the very existence of a national state to be contradictory to the ideal of Judaism, and that Zionism was therefore doomed to failure; he even saw Zionism and anti-Semitism as having certain characteristics in common. Although this analysis overlapped with that of certain ultra-Orthodox Jews, Flusser made his criticisms from a moral standpoint; he considered that the Jewish humanistic ideal and the nationalistic contingencies of a state were hardly compatible. He went on to criticize Israel’s relations with the Arabs (and more generally with the Third World),

making a political analysis of the colonial domination that had been established there; in particular, he emphasized the collapse of the original moral ideals of Zionism after 1967. On several occasions he called for a solution to the conflict, a rapprochement between Jews and Arabs in the construction of a new model, freed from Western influences; although it might seem utopian (all the more so in 2018), Flusser showed absolute confidence in the ability of Jews to face these challenges, once liberated from nationalist contingencies. The tone of his essays is fundamentally disillusioned, however; the hopes he tried to formulate seem very uncertain, and the words “failure of Zionism” and “disillusionment” frequently recur in his lucid writing.

Translated by the author, edited by Sally Laruelle.

## Bibliography

The essays mentioned in this research, available on the website <http://www.flusserbrasil.com> or published in this issue of *Flusser Studies*, are (except Flusser 1972.b) those typewritten by Vilém Flusser himself; their titles and, in a few cases, their wording might have been slightly modified in the published version. The quotations from Flusser’s letters were taken from the Bernardo/Guldin book; the authors of this biography, following the Flusserian praxis (see p. 104) do not give the exact references of these letters in the Flusser Archives.

Texts translated from the Portuguese by the author; the text Flusser 1991.a was translated from the German with the assistance of Juliana Borinski, to whom I extend my thanks.

Bernardo/Guldin: Gustavo Bernardo & Rainer Guldin, *O Homem sem Chão. A Biografia de Vilém Flusser*, São Paulo, AnnaBlume, 2017

Flusser 1966: “Carta para Celso Lafer” [letter to Celso Lafer], 28.IV.1966, *apud* Bernardo/Guldin, p. 124

Flusser 1967: “A Crise Israelense” [The Israeli crisis] in: *Crônica Israelita*, São Paulo, 31.V.1967, p. 12 (published in this issue of *Flusser Studies*) (2 typed pages)

Flusser 1972.a: “Os Judeus em Israel. Paz no Oriente Próximo?” [The Jews in Israel. Peace in the Near-East?] in: *Folha de São Paulo*, 11.III.1972 (published in this issue of *Flusser Studies*) (4 typed pages, double spacing)

Flusser 1972.b: “Os Judeus no Mundo. Paz no Oriente Próximo?” [The Jews in the world. Peace in the Near-East?] in: *Folha de São Paulo*, 12.III.1972 (published in this issue of *Flusser Studies*)

- Flusser 1973.a: “Carta para David Flusser” [letter to David Flusser], 1.III.1973, *apud* Bernardo/Guldin, pp. 289-291
- Flusser 1973.b: “Carta para David Flusser” [letter to David Flusser], 7.X.1973, *apud* Bernardo/Guldin, p. 289
- Flusser 1980.a: “Desilusão” [Disillusionment], text written in Rehovot (Israel), 8.V.1980. Translated into German by Edith Flusser, and published under the title “Die Enttäuschung” in Flusser 1995, pp. 38–41 (published in this issue of *Flusser Studies*) (2 typed pages)
- Flusser 1980.b: “Carta para Alex Bloch” [letter to Alex Bloch], 10.VI.1980, *apud* Bernardo/Guldin, p. 292
- Flusser 1980.c: “Two different kinds of Jew”, 1980, <http://www.flusserbrasil.com/arte183.pdf> (1 typed page)
- Flusser 1981.a: “Carta para Alex Bloch” [letter to Alex Bloch], 7.III.1981, *apud* Bernardo/Guldin, p. 293
- Flusser 1981.b: “Estarà morto o sionismo?” [Death of Zionism?] in: *Shalom*, São Paulo, March 1981, pp. 26–27. <http://www.flusserbrasil.com/art489.pdf> (2 typed pages)
- Flusser 1982: “Israelis e Palestinos” [Israelis and Palestinians] in: *O Estado de São Paulo*, 25.VIII.1982, p. 30. <http://www.flusserbrasil.com/art231.pdf> This essay was also written by Flusser in French, typescript reference in the Flusser Archives in São Paulo [SEM REFERENCIA]\_2425 (1.5 typed pages)
- Flusser 1991.a: “Neo-zionismus. Ein immaterielles Manifest” [Neo-Zionism. An immaterial manifesto], in: *Freitag*, Berlin, Nr. 18, 26.IV.1991, p. 6 <http://www.flusserbrasil.com/artg282.pdf> (3 typed pages)
- Flusser 1991.b: “Photography and History”, conference in Ein Harod for the 3rd Israeli Biennale of Photography, 23-28 September 1991 <http://www.flusserbrasil.com/arte131.pdf> (4.5 typed pages)
- Flusser 1995: *Jude Sein. Essays, Briefe, Fiktionen* [To be Jewish. Essays, letters, fictions], Mannheim, Bollmann, 1995. Edited by Stefan Bollmann & Edith Flusser. Postface by David Flusser.
- Flusser XX: “The Jewish War. A Testimony [*sic*] of Commitment” (published in this issue of *Flusser Studies*) (4 typed pages)
- Flusser YY: “How the Germans see Israel” <http://www.flusserbrasil.com/arte68.pdf> (3 typed pages)

[1] Personal messages from Andreas Müller-Pohle, Joan Fontcuberta and Aim Deüelle Lusk, to the author, who expresses here his warmest thanks.