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The idea of writing this book first occurred to me a few years ago when I spent a year as a visiting professor at the University of California, Berkeley. The campus had been teeming with debates, protests, and public controversies surrounding Israel – or, to be precise, Israel’s role in the violently conflictual politics of the Middle East. My courses – dealing with the history of Zionism, Israeli political culture, and matters that are usually discussed under the header of ‘religion and politics’ in Israel – were of obvious interest to many students. But there seemed to be a lingering confusion among my students: Were my courses about this conflict? Would the discussions in my classes – the titles of which suggested a focus on issues that are seemingly internal to Jewish-Israeli history and politics – be of relevance to the matters fiercely debated on campus?

I found this confusion among my students to be a telling testimony to some of the major failings of the dominant discourse on Middle Eastern politics, specifically regarding the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians. My students were echoing a predominant sense of a categorical distinction between matters that are internal to Israeli sociopolitics (i.e., what we would usually call national politics), which are supposedly of only implicit relevance to this conflict, and matters that are international, and bear directly on it. The internal issues – dealing, for example, with Israeli/Zionist national identity, religion, and politics in Israel, Israeli political culture, Jewish identity in Israel, etc. – were seen as only remotely and indirectly influencing the actions taken by Israel in its conflictual relations with the Palestinians and the Arab world at large.

This distinction, which lies at the root of the usual framing of the discussion on a conflict that is commonly (as well as incorrectly and rather insensitively) labeled the ‘Jewish-Arab’ conflict, assumes the meaning of these names, or sides, to be obvious. It assumes that the meaning implicit in the designation ‘Jewish’ – which is often
synonymized in practice with ‘Israeli’ – is obvious, an unchallenged
given fact of the conflict. Moreover, according to this conventional
view this meaning is relevant to the politics of the Middle East only in
so far as it frames the conflict between the two opposing sides. (‘Arab’
or ‘Palestinian’ are consequently seen as the essential opposite of the
said meaning.) If debates on the meaning of this Jewishness/Israeliness
are acknowledged, they are assumed to be only peripheral to the main
binary of Jew versus Arab or Israeli versus Arab/Palestinian.

Another way of putting this is to say that this distinction assumes
that the meaning of Israel being a ‘Jewish state’ is a rather clear and
unchallenged issue; that the meaning(s) of Jewish sovereignty, of
nationalist (allegedly secular, or at least ‘non-religious’) Jewish iden-
tity, and of the distinction between Jewish politics/nationalism and
religion/theology is clear, and essentially unchallenged. Even if it does
acknowledge the contested nature of these issues, the predominant
discourse does not view them as immediately shaping the ‘hard’ politics
of a violent ethno-national conflict over land and power. It assumes the
‘sociology’ of Israel to be only remotely of relevance to the politics of
the Middle East.

Confronted with my students’ confusion, I came to realize that what
seemed to me to be an obvious connection – an essential interde-
pendence between the sociology, culture, and internal politics of Israel and
the conflict in the Middle East – often went unacknowledged by large
swaths of the discursive field in which we all – students, teachers,
politicians, activists, and protesters alike – found ourselves. Having
studied Israeli sociopolitics extensively, it was apparent to me that we
cannot truly understand the one without the other; that a disciplinary
distinction between international relations, political science, sociology,
and cultural studies may make organizational-institutional sense, but
discursively has been caustically misguided.

Searching for reading assignments that would render this interde-
pendence explicit was a frustrating endeavor indeed. A vast field of
scholarship on religion and politics in Israel, for example, rarely draws
the connection between its immediate subject matter and its implic-
ations regarding the Jewish State’s self-positioning in the Middle East.

It was easy enough to find books and articles that would acquaint
my students with the alleged secularity of Zionist ideology, of the
alleged religious-secular cleavage among Jews in Israel, of the history
of the controversies on the legal definition of Jewishness in Israel, etc.
But only rarely could I come up with a reading assignment that would tie these in with what was being debated outside of class, on campus, and in the public sphere at large. In the same vein, books that address the conflict – whether critical of the political status quo of Israeli/Zionist dominance or propagating Zionist apologetics that justify this status quo – tend to focus on the relations between the two conflicting sides, and often fail to problematize the ways in which these rivals negotiate and construct the various aspects of their histories and identities.

Indeed, as a colleague once commented to me in private, debates on secularism, religiosity, and politics in Israel (i.e., among Israeli Jews) sometimes amount to a discursively violent erasure of the very presence of Palestinian-Arabs in Israel, as the dominant discourse assumes the debate to be of no relevance to non-Jews in Israel, while the whole issue of Israel’s Jewish identity is constructed exactly around (non-Jewish) Palestinian-Arabs.\(^1\)

This book, then, is primarily an attempt at correcting this lacuna, at least as far as a study of the Israeli side is concerned. I make the connections between the ‘internals’ of Zionism and Israel and ‘the conflict’ apparent. This book deals with what is commonly titled ‘religion and politics’ in Israel: with the meaning of Israeli nationhood and the various ways in which it corresponds with the State of Israel’s self-identification as Jewish; with the ways in which this self-identification of the state shapes the state’s stance vis-à-vis its non-Jewish, mainly Palestinian-Arab, citizens; with the ways in which this apparent entanglement of ‘religion and politics’ shapes Israel’s position in the Middle East; and with the ways in which the State’s claim to Jewish identity shapes Jewish-Israeli nationhood’s relations with Jews outside of the Jewish state.

The book tackles these issues, and others derived from them, by refocusing the discussion on the Israeli nation-state’s unresolved relationship with its own claim to a nonreligious, or ‘secular’ Jewish

---

\(^1\) This insight is echoed in Ian Lustick’s analysis of the political implications of Israel’s immigration politics, which he summarizes as constituting ‘Israel as a non-Arab state.’ I. S. Lustick, ‘Israel as a non-Arab state: The political implications of mass immigration of non-Jews,’ *Middle East Journal*, 53/3 (1999), 417–33. In this context see also Y. Yonah, ‘Israel’s immigration policies: The twofold face of the ‘demographic threat,” *Social Identities*, 10/2 (2004), 195–218.
identity – or, as the title of this book suggests, with Israel’s Jewish identity crisis. I argue that this is a key to understanding not only the intricacies of intra-Jewish sociopolitics, but also Israel’s positions and actions in international affairs. If we wish to understand the Israeli–Arab conflict we must try and decipher the meaning of Israeli nationhood, and especially the way it understands its own Jewishness.²

At the same time, it should be clear to the reader that the main subject of this book is far from being an Israeli or Zionist idiosyncrasy. To a significant extent, this book is about the modern, liberal, so-called nonreligious nation-state as such; it takes Israel as a specific case history that sheds light on the broader issue of the theopolitics³ of the nation-state. Specifically, the book offers a view into the ways in which the dichotomy between religion and politics serves the allegedly ‘secular’ state and the limitations of this service.

***

Before I introduce my argument in a more comprehensive manner, a quick return to my Berkeley experience may be in place, for it sheds light on the charged nature of the discourse that I will analyze.

One day a guest appeared in my ‘Religion and Politics in Israel’ class. The young man, in his early 20s, was an Israeli-Jewish cousin of one of my American students. He came to the United States for a family visit, and when he heard about the class, he told me, he had to come and see it for himself. He was happy that his American cousin is learning about Israel and wanted to see what the class is like. The topic of the discussion that day was the implicit-yet-all-too-dominant identification between Israeliness and Jewishness in Israel. We necessarily also discussed the exclusionary, discriminatory implications that this sociocultural fact has for non-Jewish, mainly Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel, rendering them, by practical definition, Israel’s Others. (This is also, of course, a major topic of discussion in this book.) The Israeli visitor, who kept silent during the class itself, approached me afterwards, and in a rather familiar tone kept for insiders, chided me for what went on in class. Surely, these are all facts of the Israeli reality, he said, but they

do not reflect nicely upon Israel. One has to be careful when talking about such sensitive matters ‘to them’ (i.e., non-Israeli Americans, in this case), for they, unlike us Israelis, do not see ‘the whole picture.’

I understood this to mean, as one so often hears in intra-Jewish-Israeli discussions, that while these, and other elements of our reality, are indeed problematic, often ugly facts of our lives, we nevertheless have to accept them in practice, since ‘they,’ our alleged enemies, are much worse than us; were it not for this or that discriminatory policy or practice, for example, the state would no longer be, and the fate of the whole Jewish people will be in jeopardy. They, non-Israeli-Jews, do not know this, or they may not care for the state as much as we do. Hence, one has to be careful when talking to them.

Indeed, this has been one of the more profound implications of the establishment of Israel in the shadow of the Holocaust, as the state positions itself as the guarantor of the very survival of Jews worldwide. As such, it is, in an important sense, beyond critiquing. Unjust and misguided as its policies may be, they are nevertheless justified by the menace of the alleged alternative, namely a precarious existence of stateless Jews. This binary, unidimensional and fallacious as it is, nevertheless shadows much of the debate on Israel. One is assumed to be taking a position in this binary, and in it alone: Either one is critical of the state – and hence assumed to be wishing for its demise, or one is supporting the very idea of the state, and hence expected to eventually, almost unreflectively, justify its actions. (Needless to say, this is obviously a simplified image of a complicated field of shifting red line, on both sides of this binary.)

Regrettably for my visitor-cum-critic, I accept neither this binary, nor the statist narrative that propagates it. My position is critical; it challenges the status quo and seeks to shed light on and problematize those unmarked aspects of our political reality, those taken-for-granted significations and meanings, that carry overwhelming political consequences exactly because they go unnoticed, working, as they are, as the infrastructure of the way our very reality is constructed. This necessarily is a disturbing exercise. It brings to the surface arguments, notions, meanings, and other facts of our political world, which may be uncomfortable to acknowledge explicitly, no matter how prevalent they are when working silently ‘in the background.’ Yet, I believe it is an
inescapable fact that without confronting these truths we may never be able to truly understand our reality. Hence this book.

***
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