



The mental cleavage of Israeli politics

Eyal Lewin

To cite this article: Eyal Lewin (2016) The mental cleavage of Israeli politics, Israel Affairs, 22:2, 355-378, DOI: [10.1080/13537121.2016.1140352](https://doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2016.1140352)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13537121.2016.1140352>



Published online: 04 Apr 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

The mental cleavage of Israeli politics

Eyal Lewin

Department of Middle Eastern Studies and Political Science, Ariel University, Ariel, Israel

ABSTRACT

In societies marked by numerous diversities, like the Jewish-Israeli one, understanding social cleavages might show a larger picture of the group and form a broader comprehension of its characteristics. Most studies concentrate on somewhat conventional cleavages, such as the socioeconomic cleavage, the ethnic cleavage, the religious or the political one; this article, by contrast, suggests a different point of view for the mapping of social cleavages within Israeli society. It claims that the Jewish population in Israel is split into two competing groups: *stakeholders* versus *deprived*. These categories of social identity are psychological states of mind in which no matter how the national resources are distributed, the stakeholders will always act as superiors, even if they are in inferior positions, while the deprived will always take the role of eternal underdog even if all of the major political ranks come under their control. This article brings about a review of over a century of ideological debates within the Zionist movement; it reveals how understanding the logic of the Israeli political discourse as a competition between the two newly defined social groups enables a better comprehension of the inherent tension between them.

KEYWORDS Social cleavage; political sociology; social psychology; Israeli society; Zionist discourse

Social cleavages in Jewish Israeli society

Whereas in cases of cohesive societies the social sub-field of cleavage research may be secondary, in societies like the Jewish-Israeli one, marked by numerous diversities, understanding the cleavages might enable us to see a larger picture of the group and to form a broader comprehension of its characteristics.

Scholarly literature often presents four leading social cleavages within the Jewish population of contemporary Israel¹:

- (1) *Socioeconomic cleavage*, although most of the common as objective figures indicate that Israeli society can generally be defined as a middle-class society.²

- (2) *Ethnic cleavage*: one of the main characteristic Israeli schisms is the one existing between the Jews of Middle Eastern background (Sephardim) and the western Jews of European origin (Ashkenazim). This division splits the Israeli Jewish population into, roughly, two equal groups and encompasses almost all fields of life, indicating clear advantages for Ashkenazim over the Sephardim.³
- (3) *Religious cleavage*: generally speaking, when asked to define their attitudes towards religion, Israeli Jewish respondents tend to fall into four different classes – secular; religious Zionists; traditional; and ultra-orthodox.⁴
- (4) *Political cleavage*: the tension between right-wing and left-wing political perceptions has created a seesaw game in which, during recent decades, political dominance has shifted from one side to another.⁵

The cleavages within Israeli society have often been understood as overlapping. In his book *The End of Ashkenazi Hegemony*, sociologist Baruch Kimmerling coined the term *Achusalim*, the Hebrew acronym for Ashkenazim, secular, local (non-immigrant), partly socialist and partly nationalist. Kimmerling was referring to the elite groups of Israeli society, whose dominance he thought was reaching its end; the term he invented was somewhat equivalent to the American idea of white anglo-saxon protestants.⁶

However, the present article suggests a different point of view for the mapping of social cleavages within Israeli society. Closely corresponding to the two basic sets of differences that characterize all of the opposing groups above, an almost equivalent partition splits the Jewish population into two competing groups: stakeholders and the deprived. These categories of social identity are psychological states of mind in which no matter how the national resources are distributed, the stakeholders will always act as superiors, even if they are in inferior positions, while the deprived shall always take the role of eternal underdog even if all of the major political ranks come under their control.

The sources of the *mental cleavage* presented in this paper go back as far as the early days of modern Zionism. The sixth Zionist congress of 1903 convened after experiencing what can nowadays be considered a modest prelude to the Holocaust: the 1903 Kishinev pogrom, the first major physical attack on Jews in Europe in the twentieth century.⁷

Theodor Herzl, the Zionist leader, developed a sense of urgency about getting the Jews as quickly as possible out of Russia and East Europe, where their future seemed to be highly at risk. Since Palestine was no option, with the Turkish Sultan opposing any massive Jewish immigration to the country, Herzl opened his mind to the idea of a *temporary* national home elsewhere in the world. He strove for a shelter where Jews could lead their lives more safely and more honourably than in Europe, until the time should come when Palestine would be open to them. This was the background to Herzl's acceptance of the offer

initially proposed to him by Joseph Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary. The suggestion was to adopt the East African highlands of Uganda as a place of refuge for the persecuted Jews who would establish a Jewish settlement there. Herzl brought the idea to the Zionist Congress of 1903, where he recommended that the British idea of settling Uganda be considered and that an investigative expedition be sent to East Africa.

This was an offer calling for sense and responsibility, although slightly diverting the national focus from the Zionist yearning for the Land of Israel. However, at the Congress it was the Russian delegates who represented the Jews whose lives were at risk that opposed the Uganda plan and voted against even its mere consideration as an option.

Herzl's proposal for an investigative expedition to Africa was carried by 295 votes to 178 with 99 abstentions, but in the political sense it became a Pyrrhic victory. The Russian delegates walked out when the motion was carried, and during the following months they passionately confronted Herzl until he eventually conceded shortly before he died.⁸

The dispute over Uganda was, perhaps, the first occurrence of the internal clash within the Zionist movement between a logical, secular, practical attitude and a religious – or at best, conservative – and apparently irrational point of view. The West European delegates favoured a course based on political realism, whereas the Russian Jews – whose lives were at stake – clung to the then hopeless dream of Israel. It was a responsible, well-educated, sane Western majority that supported a practical solution, challenged by an irresponsible, deluded Eastern minority who were willing to sacrifice whatever it took. It was the very first instance of the two groups confronting each other; it may have also been the only occasion when the second group, the romantic traditionalists, had it their way.

It is therefore the major assertion of this paper that the Uganda dispute has become the watershed of cleavage between the liberal stakeholders and the conservative deprived. One reason for the Uganda dispute becoming a breaking point and a defining moment in history for the division between stakeholders and the deprived was the fact that this was the event marking the first time in the history of Zionism that a 23-year-old man stepped into Jewish politics, who would from then on play a dominant part in shaping and later cementing the mental cleavage. His name was Vladimir Ze'ev Jabotinsky, and although he admired Herzl he decided to vote according to what he defined as deep feelings that prevailed over any learned arguments.⁹

Jabotinsky was the founder and the soul of Zionist revisionism. His revisionism can be viewed as a Zionist political movement that included a variety of Zionist beliefs, leaders and groups that were not necessarily defined by a particular coherent ideology of their own.¹⁰ These groups had one common denominator: standing in opposition to the vision upheld by the majority-holding Zionist political leadership.

Led by Jabotinsky and by his heirs, Zionist revisionism would become, during the twentieth century, the ideological umbrella under which the deprived constructed their cultural identity – just as at the left pole of a political continuum, the stakeholders took Zionist socialism to be their basic creed. Although it took the deprived dozens of years to reach a significant – yet never a dominant – political stand, Jabotinsky’s name haunted the stakeholders like a phantom long after the revisionist leader had died.

The mental cleavage: a historical survey

Practically, two patterns of engagement have characterized the political relationships between the stakeholders and the deprived: *exclusion* and *double-crossing*. These patterns will henceforth be described through a historical account of a modest sample of nine events, arbitrarily chosen, as shown in Table 1.

(1) *The saison*

Etzel was a paramilitary group that the deprived developed starting in the 1930s as an offshoot of the earlier and larger organization, the Hagana, which was later to become the stakeholders’ military establishment. Lehi was a smaller and more radical group that split from the Etzel in 1940 in order to act against the British in a more decisive manner. Both Etzel and Lehi were shunned by the stakeholders, who referred to them as separatists and dissidents and blamed them for disrupting national unity and damaging the national interest. The Jewish Agency, where the stakeholders enjoyed total political hegemony, managed to publicly create an image of Etzel and Lehi as gangsters whose actions were detrimental to the Jewish struggle for statehood.

Public condemnations were not enough, and the stakeholders would time and again practise organized violence. Teenage members of the revisionist Beitar youth movement suffered savage beatings all over the country as early as 1933 and in one incident a youngster was even murdered by Hagana activists.¹¹

Table 1. Events of exclusion and double-crossing.

Year	Event	Exclusion	Double-crossing
1944	The <i>Saison</i>	+	
1946	The King David Hotel bombing	+	+
1948	The Deir Yassin battle	+	+
1948	The Mishmar Ha-Yarden defense	+	
1948	The sinking of Altalena	+	
1981	The attack on the nuclear reactor in Iraq		+
1982	The war in Lebanon		+
1993	The Oslo deceit	+	+
1995	The Rabin assassination	+	
2000	The second <i>intifada</i>		+

On 6 November 1944, Lehi activists assassinated Lord Moyne, the British minister of state for the Middle East, in Cairo. Alarmed by the thought that the British regime might react against Hagana, the Jewish Agency decided to carry out the *Saison*, the French expression for a free hunting season which referred to the hunting of animals without restrictions. Although the assassination that triggered the *Saison* was carried out by Lehi fighters, the hunting targeted only Etzel members, who formed the more important deprived rivals of the stakeholders' hegemony.

During the *Saison*, people suspected of belonging to the Etzel or supporting it were fired on at their places of work, and their children were kicked out of the school system. Hagana activists kidnapped Etzel members; some of the kidnapped were tortured and interrogated so that they would hand over their comrades, while others were simply turned over to the British police. Some of the top leaders of the Etzel who were captured were deported to Eritrea, one of the British colonies in Africa. In all, over 1000 Etzel members were arrested and interred in British camps, and the organization suffered a severe blow.¹²

Reports of the torturing of captured Etzel fighters outraged their comrades, who demanded immediate action. The survival of the whole organization of the deprived was at stake since the stakeholders had made up their minds to liquidate it by all possible means. However, despite the fact that they were losing their leaders and fighters, Menachem Begin, the Etzel commander in chief, announced clearly: 'There will not be a fratricidal war. Perhaps our blood will be shed, but we will not shed the blood of others!'¹³

Indeed, through the last day of the *Saison*, the Etzel restrained itself from retaliation. When the stakeholders learned that their action had succeeded and, at the same time, that the hope for British fair play towards the Jews following their collaboration against the Etzel had failed, the Jewish Agency called off the *Saison* and ordered the Hagana to enter, with the Etzel, a united resistance movement.¹⁴

(2) The King David Hotel bombing

The Hebrew Rebellion Movement was the framework within which Hagana, Etzel and Lehi joined their forces in 1945 to coordinate attacks against the British military authorities in Palestine. The realization of the stakeholders that counting on British goodwill would prove useless, along with emerging news about the scope of the Holocaust, pushed them to unite in the struggle for the formation of an independent state. The leadership of the joint movement was coordinated by a civilian committee and an operations board that was appointed to endorse or to disapprove any suggested military activity.

One of the operations that were planned by the authorities in the Hebrew Rebellion Movement was to blow up the King David Hotel, where the headquarters of the British forces in Palestine and Transjordan were located. The

bombing was intended to be carried out by Etzel members, though orders were given by Hagana military leaders and approved by all the partnering parties.

On 22 July 1946 the hotel was blown up, resulting in a catastrophe. In spite of the warnings given by the organizers, no evacuation took place and the death toll of 91 British, Arabs and Jews turned the incident into the deadliest raid that had been directed at the British during the whole Mandate era, from 1920 to 1948. Worldwide condemnation followed, with public opinion all over the world inflamed. However, the stunning reaction, for leaders of the deprived, was the one practised by the stakeholders, who suddenly denied having any connection with the event. The Jewish Agency denounced the bombing and called the Etzel members a gang of criminals. David Ben-Gurion announced that the Etzel was the enemy of the Jewish people. The short-lived marriage of the two parties ended with betrayal by the stakeholders, who now distanced themselves completely from their former partners.¹⁵

(3) The Deir Yassin battle

A couple of years after the King David Hotel bombing, in April 1948, another joint venture of the Etzel and Hagana was launched. Five weeks before the end of the British Mandate the strategic situation of the country's Jewish community was dreadful, especially in the Jerusalem region. The road leading from Tel Aviv to the city was practically severed by the Arabs, with dozens of Jewish fighters killed in convoys leading to Jerusalem and its surroundings.

One of the Arab villages near Jerusalem, Deir Yassin, presented a strategic problem for the Jewish forces struggling to gain control over the roads and to fortify defensive lines against the Arab attacks. The village overlooked the western outskirts of Jerusalem from a hill; it controlled the western entrance to the city and its inhabitants could easily block the last stretch of road leading into the city, already disconnected from its crucial supplies due to the Arab control over other parts of the road. In addition, Deir Yassin was in effect a forward outpost covering the southern route that ran from Hebron and allowed constant reinforcement of the Arab forces that were fighting against the Hagana all over the region. With full-blown war taking place, the Etzel and Lehi put aside their rivalry with the Hagana; the deprived committed once again to fight side by side with the stakeholders for the sake of the nation's safety and survival. Thus, the commanders of Hagana, Etzel and Lehi planned jointly to overtake Deir Yassin. They were tightly coordinated, but it was the latter two organizations of the deprived that were to perform the operation. However, the commanders mistakenly asserted that no fierce fighting was expected and that the Arabs would flee, as they had one of the other villages.

The battle took place on 9 April 1948, with Etzel and Lehi fighters weakly armed and lacking essential combat experience. The fighters who came close to the village accidentally ran into Iraqi soldiers and local sentries, who started

firing and immediately injured some of them. Hence, unplanned shootings began half an hour ahead of time and a loudspeaker truck that was supposed to offer the local population an option to leave the place without fighting, arrived when the battle was already in full swing.

Losing the surprise effect, outnumbered and caught in an inferior position in which the local Arabs were fortified in their houses and firing heavily at them, the Etzel squads advanced slowly and suffered more and more casualties. Untrained for frontal combat, after years of underground activity, no basic cover-and-dash tactic was implemented. The Arabs resisted determinedly; when some of them were hit, their women would come out under fire to collect the weapons and take them back into the houses.

Ammunition ran low and injured fighters had to be evacuated. The fierce battle unexpectedly proved to be more than the Etzel could manage, and two squads of the Palmah (Hagana military forces) were called into action. When they entered Deir Yassin, Etzel soldiers and Arab fighters were mixed together in the village; the only remaining way to maintain control over Deir Yassin was to burst into each of the houses throwing hand grenades. On the verge of victory, the Palmah units were ordered by Hagana headquarters to withdraw, to return back to base, and to leave the Etzel to complete the mission on its own.

When the battle was finally over and the village was under Israeli control, Etzel commanders asked their Hagana counterparts to relieve them. According to the initial plan, as in other battles, once fighting ended other forces were to enter and maintain the posts. In Deir Yassin, instead, the exhausted surviving Etzel fighters were forced to be the ones to gather enemy bodies and bury them; Hagana squads that surrounded Deir Yassin threatened to shoot Etzel warriors if they refused to bury the dead Arabs and if they attempted to leave the place. On top of the fact that the fighters were worn out and that maintenance missions are always rather the part of auxiliary forces, the Etzel members were still hunted by the British, who had not yet left the country. The Etzel fighters in captured Deir Yassin knew, therefore, that their lives were at stake; with every passing day the British could easily raid the village in order to execute the remaining Etzel and Lehi forces, which they considered to be terrorists.¹⁶

All Hagana units in the area of Jerusalem were ordered to refrain from any negotiations with Etzel commanders lest they should be tempted to give the fighters there any aid. Eventually, four days after the fighting had ended, a force of Gadna, a unit of 16-year-old boys and girls, was brought to the village. When finally relieving the Etzel warriors, the Gadna commander spoke to the youngsters, telling them that their mission was to clean the place after the Etzel's hooligans had murdered and raped Arabs. That day, the Hagana hung posters all over the streets of Jerusalem, with an announcement:

The last Etzel [...] men ran away from Deir Yassin this morning; our forces have entered the village. [...] We have entered that place with shame; there the [Etzel and Lehi] dissidents defied the human image of the Hebrew soldier as well as the honor of the Hebrew weapon and the Hebrew flag.¹⁷

The Jewish Agency, with hegemonic political control of the stakeholders, sent Transjordan's King Abdullah a message condemning the Deir Yassin killings, calling them brutal and barbarous deeds that had nothing to do with the spirit, tradition or cultural heritage of the Jews.¹⁸

It is important to point out that Ben-Gurion knew beforehand about the planned attack and approved it. He further received a detailed report on everything that had occurred there, from the commander of the Jerusalem region as well as from a secret agent of the Hagana who also participated in the battle. Like many among the stakeholders' leadership Ben-Gurion knew that there had been no massacre.¹⁹

As in so many incidents of the past, once again the deprived experienced how, just as they were finally getting along with the Dr. Jekyll stakeholders, Mr. Hyde would all of a sudden leap out of nowhere and turn everything upside down.

(4) The Mishmar Hayarden defence

The village (*moshava*) of Mishmar Hayarden was founded in 1890 in the upper Galilee, on the route to Damascus, very close to the bridge on the Jordan River leading to the Golan Heights.

The first members of the Zionist revisionist Beitar movement arrived there in the early 1930s. The young men and women were clinging to a remote piece of land, challenged as farmers by the daily hazards of nature and as Jews by the nightly raids of their Arab neighbours.

The hostilities that led to war started in the north immediately after the 29 November 1947 UN partition resolution. Vehicles coming from the south or leaving Mishmar Hayarden were attacked and supply lines to the isolated village were cut. Despite the tense situation in the whole northern region, unlike any other locality, the farmers of Mishmar Hayarden had to hand their weapons over to the Hagana command and were permitted to carry guns only for a restricted number of hours per day.

Starting in January 1948 Jewish convoys of manpower and supplies were constantly attacked on the routes leading to the northern villages and Jews were killed and injured almost on a daily basis. In spite of the strategic importance of Mishmar Hayarden, however, the villagers' pleas to Hagana commanders for landmines, fortifications and additional weapons were turned down. Although theirs was the frontline of defence against a Syrian assault, unlike other villages Mishmar Hayarden received no anti-tank guns and no landmines from Hagana headquarters, and remained far less well equipped with guns and ammunition than other localities.

In April 1948, Etzel sent a reinforcement force to Mishmar Hayarden, including 12 fighters with some 40 machine-guns with the appropriate amount of bullets. On the way to the north, not far from their destination, the armoured

bus was stopped by Palmah members, who took the Etzel fighters off the bus, hit them, confiscated their weapons and locked them in a nearby kibbutz. Saving Israel from the coming Arab attack was important for the stakeholders, but letting the deprived participate in the campaign was unthinkable.

On 17 May 1948, Mishmar Hayarden was struck by both Syrian planes and artillery; only two fighters were killed but some of the houses were destroyed. Since a Syrian invasion seemed imminent, a Palmah force was sent on a commando mission beyond enemy lines. This force was led by Mishmar Hayarden fighters who were acquainted with the terrain and were therefore efficient navigators. They crossed the Jordan river and raided the Syrian army units, blowing up heavy guns and armoured vehicles and killing some 10 Syrian soldiers. The military operation was a success, but the Mishmar Hayarden fighters who were its frontline heroes were forced to hand over to the Hagana the Syrian machine guns they captured. Even in the face of the common enemy, even when demonstrating the best in brave soldiering, the deprived were not trusted.

On 1 June 1948, desperate letters were written by Mishmar Hayarden members lamenting their abandonment by the IDF in the face of an imminent Syrian assault. Indeed, having identified the departure of IDF forces from the region, on 3 June the Syrians invaded Israel through Mishmar Hayarden with an infantry regiment supported by air attacks and heavy artillery crossing the Jordan river and advancing towards the village. The battle lasted throughout the day as the vastly outnumbered and outgunned defenders managed to drive back the superior Syrian forces who retreated by night. Even though it was obvious that the campaign had just began, as soon as the Syrians retreated a small IDF reinforcement unit that had participated in the battle was ordered to leave the place. Waiting for a resumption of the Syrian assault, the heads of Mishmar Hayarden pleaded with the IDF commanders for aid, only to be turned down. Even their request for food was rejected on the grounds that they were not considered to be under siege.

On 9 June 1948, without even attempting to hide their intentions, the Syrians gathered an armoured brigade in broad daylight. When the final assault commenced, about 50 poorly armed Mishmar Hayarden fighters faced some 3000 Syrian troops. As the Syrians entered the devastated village after a heavy bombardment, house to house fighting took place. When the struggle was finally lost, the leaders of Mishmar Hayarden decided to negotiate surrender but the Syrian soldiers murdered anyone waving a white flag. It was only when the Syrian officers arrived that the remaining fighters were taken prisoners. Fourteen defenders were killed; 32 men and eight women were captured. They were beaten by the soldiers then taken to Damascus, where they were tortured and interrogated.

The Mishmar Hayarden prisoners were released after the war, after 13 months of captivity. On 20 July 1949 the area was returned to Israeli control as part of the truce ending the fighting. However, when the returnees wanted

to reconstruct their village, they were astonished to find that their lands had been given to the nearby kibbutzim. Thus, rebuilding the village had become for the farmers of Mishmar Hayarden practically impossible.

In 1954 the Israeli government distributed badges of honour to localities that had demonstrated bravery during the 1948 war. When learning that they were not on the bravery list, Mishmar Hayarden veterans asked to be recognized for their part in the struggle. They were turned down, because the badge of honour was intended only for neighbourhoods that had been restored after the war.

When biblical King Ahab intended to inherit Naboth's vineyard after the latter had been stoned to death following a fake trial framed by Queen Jezebel, the prophet Elijah was sent to ask him: 'Hast thou killed and also taken possession?'²⁰ However, in the case of Mishmar Hayarden the stakeholders went one step further. They neglected the brave warriors who defended the country; they seized their lands once they were killed and captured by the enemy; they handed their agricultural fields to the neighbouring kibbutzim; and then they rebuffed the dispossessed villagers for not being able to restore their village on the lost lands. It took as long as another quarter-of-a-century when in 1980, with the deprived in political power, for Mishmar Hayarden to finally get its badge of honour.²¹

(5) The sinking of *Altalena*

The *Altalena*, named after Jabotinsky's literary pseudonym, was the Etzel's flagship in the full sense of the word: it was purchased and furnished by the underground organization; and it was manned with more than 900 fighters and loaded with 300 Bren guns, 500 anti-tank guns, 1000 grenades and millions of bullets that were desperately needed for the Jewish defence lines all over the country. It left the French port town of Marseilles and was already at sea, heading towards Israel when the state was declared and founded.

Etzel commander Menachem Begin, who oversaw the operation, had been negotiating directly from the very beginning with Ben-Gurion's man, Israel Galili, as to how to distribute the ship's weapons and troops. But the vessel was tracked by various intelligence agencies and blatantly exposed in a BBC news broadcast. A series of disastrous miscommunications, logistical blunders and lack of internal Etzel discipline led to the ship's ill-fated arrival while the Begin-Galili talks were still in progress.

Ben-Gurion approved the ship's landing and the crew was guided to land on the shores near Netanya so that United Nations' aerial surveillance could be avoided. It was in that location, Kfar Vitkin, that Etzel's local leadership headed by Menachem Begin met their followers. As the Begin-Galili talks were proceeding, some of the weapons and almost all of the personnel on board were unloaded in Kfar Vitkin.

However, in spite of Begin's dialogue with Galili, Ben-Gurion feared that the Etzel leader was planning a putsch against his authority. The Hagana troops, by now IDF soldiers, were ordered to fire at the vessel, an order that was immediately carried out. Six Etzel fighters and two soldiers were killed before the ship pulled away, with Etzel commanders on board. It sailed down to the coast of Tel Aviv, where Begin still hoped to positively complete the negotiations, naively unaware that it was Ben-Gurion's decision to postpone any compromise and to violently break his competitor's power. Ben-Gurion insisted on unconditional surrender, and a 26-year-old Yitzhak Rabin was appointed to command a beach battle.

The *Altalena* crew did not submit, as Begin was still expecting a deal with Galili, honestly believing that his talks with the stakeholder authorities had not been in vain. But after ultimatums with unrealistic timetables were allegedly violated, the order was given for a sudden all-out attack on the ship.

Three cannon shells passed harmlessly over the ship. The fourth slammed into the *Altalena*, igniting a blazing fire as tons of munitions exploded. Passengers and crew abandoned ship to swim ashore, while some Israeli soldiers on the beach shot at them. Even when the crew raised a white flag, Rabin's snipers continued to pick off targets bobbing in the waters.

The *Altalena* went down and 19 men lost their lives. Begin himself narrowly escaped death.²² He had only planned to gain enough men and guns to carry on the fierce battle for the nascent Jewish state, but in the rendezvous with the stakeholders he failed once again to watch his back.

(6) The attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor

Starting in the mid-1970s, Iraq commenced expanding its nuclear programme through the acquisition of reactors from France. Though both countries claimed that the reactors were exclusively designed for peaceful purposes, Israeli intelligence estimated that the project was geared to developing nuclear weapons. The reactors were based in Osiraq, close to the capital of Baghdad, about 1600 kilometres from Israel.

Internal discussions on the proper strategy regarding Iraqi nuclear reactor development began in Israel as early as March 1975, during Yitzhak Rabin's first term in office as prime minister. Shimon Peres was then minister of defence and it was under their watch that planning and training for a military aerial operation was started. The stakeholders had always held the basic conviction that Israel could never accept a situation in which any of its enemies possessed non-conventional weapons of mass destruction.

In August 1978 Begin appointed the former head of IDF's military intelligence Aharon Yariv to evaluate the situation of the Iraqi reactor and its ramifications. Yariv did not belong to the deprived leadership; he belonged to the Labour party, and during the 1970s had served as a minister in the Labour

government. His report to Begin was strictly professional, and the conclusions reaffirmed what the stakeholder leadership had long comprehended: the Iraqi nuclear programme was evolving into production of an atomic bomb, and once the process was completed any attack on the reactor could cause the death of at least 150,000 civilians.

In October 1980 the Mossad reported to Begin that the Osiraq reactor would be fuelled and hence become operational by June 1981. No diplomatic channel was left unexplored, with Israeli officials appealing in vain to the French who had supplied the reactor and staffed it, and to the Americans, to do their utmost to halt Iraq's advances toward an atomic bomb. But top-secret diplomacy totally failed.

Although there had been no legal, constitutional or procedural necessity to do so, Begin chose to confer with Peres, head of the Labour party and opposition leader, and in December 1980 updated him on the decision to launch a military operation.

On 7 June 1981, Israeli airplanes undertook one of world history's remarkable military ventures. Flying over hostile countries, operating hundreds of kilometres away from any base, they completed the mission and destroyed the nuclear reactor with only about 20 Iraqi soldiers dead.

International reaction was aggressively antagonistic, with the United States, Israel's staunchest supporter, joining the chorus of criticism. The UN Security Council unanimously passed a resolution condemning Israel. It took a decade before Begin's decision to act earned the gratitude of the whole Western world when in the 1991 Gulf War US forces confronted an Iraqi tyrant who had fortunately been deprived of the ability to possess nuclear capabilities.²³

However, the most insulting reaction came from the stakeholders, whose leadership joined with and fuelled Israel's criticism from abroad. Peres was the first to accuse the government of choosing to carry out the operation for the sake of winning the looming elections. Yet Peres was not alone: in an interview with CBS News correspondent Bob Simon, Chaim Herzog explicitly reasoned that there had been no justification whatsoever for a military operation. It is important to note that Herzog was not only a leading figure in Israeli public life, he was above all very well known in the world following his term as Israel's ambassador to the United Nations, where he had become one of the country's outstanding spokesmen. But now the spokesman, in the midst of a campaign for a Labour seat in parliament, chose to accuse the deprived leadership of abusing state power for the sake of winning the elections.²⁴

(7) The 1982 Lebanon war

During the late 1970s, the PLO took advantage of the Lebanese civil war to create an unofficial state-within-a-state with its forces concentrated mainly in

Beirut and the southern part of the country, where Israeli towns were easily within reach of attack.

Summer 1981 was a tough one for Israelis living in the northern part of the country. PLO rockets and guns pounded Israeli towns and villages, and the IDF's reaction in heavily targeting the Palestinians failed to effectively suppress them. A ceasefire was eventually obtained but it was exploited by the PLO to acquire more heavy guns and to prepare for further assaults on Israel.

Unsurprisingly, then, at the beginning of 1982 the PLO renewed its attacks on Israel and life in the upper Galilee once again became intolerable. In response, on 6 June 1982, Israeli forces invaded Lebanon. Israel's publicly stated objective was to push the PLO forces no more than 40 kilometres to the north so as to ensure, once and for all, a peaceful life in the northern part of Israel. However, the operational targets of the war were to destroy the PLO's military infrastructure, to expel the Syrian occupation army, deployed in Lebanon since 1976, and to bring about the formation of a Christian Maronite government friendly to Israel.

In many ways the 1982 war resembled no other war Israel had previously fought. In military terms the battles could be considered very successful; objectives were attained rapidly and flawlessly and Lebanese territories were taken out of PLO control. The Beaufort Castle, a strategic post overlooking Israel's northern terrain that had been used for years as a launching base for rocket attacks, came under IDF control. Israeli ground forces rolled northward along the coastal plain all the way to the outskirts of Beirut; the Israeli air force completely devastated the Syrian one, downing dozens of airplanes in aerial combats; IDF commando units wiped out surface-to-air missile batteries; and the Israeli navy established itself at sea. All in all, the IDF scored an absolutely stunning military victory.

For a brief moment in history it seemed that Israel had struck the final blow at its tormentors. The Lebanese celebrated Israel's achievements, particularly in ousting the despised PLO terrorists from their villages; the local population threw rice at the advancing Jewish soldiers and handed out flowers, welcoming them with scenes that resembled the hospitality demonstrated toward the American liberators of Nazi-conquered Europe.²⁵

However, world media was about to spread an altogether different story. The PLO's strategy of planting their weapons and bases in highly populated neighbourhoods paid off. Western news reporters took pictures of bombed mosques and churches, but neglected to mention that these had been the places where PLO arms had been hidden; photos of bombarded apartment buildings were distributed by press agencies, failing to note that PLO anti-aircraft gunners operated on their roofs; pictures of attacked hospitals never included the information that even those public buildings had been seized by PLO fighters and turned into military posts; in scenes of devastated schools, the fact that schoolyards had practically become artillery batteries was misrepresented. Lost

in Western world reportage were the extraordinary regulations imposed on all Israeli soldiers and officers to scrupulously avoid civilian casualties. No publicity was ever given in mass media to cases of Israeli soldiers who had been killed because they hesitated while Arab terrorists fired at them from houses where women, children and babies were present and made good cover.²⁶

The behaviour of the West, misrepresenting Israel as the aggressor and turning a blind eye to the PLO's criminal tactics, was aggravating, but the behaviour of the stakeholders was infuriating. Notwithstanding their initial support for the operation, they quickly commenced political attacks in the midst of war. For the first time in Israeli history, the opposition took a public stand against a war while the nation's sons were still at the frontlines. Unlike any other previous war in which the deprived – politically viewed as opposition – gave the government maximum support and rallied around the fighting forces, the growing number of casualties became the groundwork for street demonstrations and rallies supported by the stakeholders. The Israeli media, one of the fortresses of the stakeholders, very much in line with the Western press, portrayed the IDF as the assailant and the PLO as the victim of war.²⁷

There is no doubt that the military success was not without its faults. The operation dragged on for days and weeks beyond the originally prescribed time. Counter to formal governmental orders, the IDF advanced further north, encircled Beirut and moved into some of the city's quarters. Even Arie Naor, former cabinet secretary and one of Defence Minister Sharon's critics, admitted that deviations from the initial governmental decisions had been expected since war has always had its own dynamics and not every enemy move could be foreseen.²⁸

Another seasoned person was Abba Eban, who had fulfilled top ministerial duties throughout decades of stakeholder leadership; never, according to Eban, had Israeli governments practised systematic decision-making.²⁹ Yet it was in this specific war, for the first time, that criticism translated into demonstrations that undermined the Israeli cause while the soldiers at the front were still risking their lives.

The climax of the stakeholders' betrayal, however, was to take place with the Sabra and Shatila massacre. After a long siege over Beirut, the PLO gave in and negotiated an agreement according to which, by 1 September 1982, its fighters would evacuate Lebanon and its arms would be laid down. However, in spite of the agreement, PLO fighters penetrated the western Muslim quarters of Beirut, where the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps were located.

On 14 September 1982, Bashir Gemayel, the newly elected Christian President of Lebanon, who intended to make peace with Israel, was assassinated. The whole fragile political equation of governmental administration in Lebanon was now uncertain, and some of the Israeli military operation's greatest achievements were about to go down the drain. In a desperate attempt

to preserve order and to prevent an ignition of the whole country, Israel sent its troops into West Beirut.

The Sabra and Shatila refugee camps had long been terrorist nests, where violent activists from all over Europe had been trained. Those were densely populated neighbourhoods where heavy weapons were stored and underground tunnels connected them directly to other parts of West Beirut. Hence when Israel's Christian Phalangist allies offered to share the burden of war by suggesting that they be the ones to take Sabra and Shatila, it was only natural that the Israeli leadership would agree.

The Christian troops entered the refugee camps with the whole area secured by IDF forces. In the course of 36 to 48 hours they massacred some 800 men, women and children of the camp's residents.³⁰

The stakeholders were infuriated. Once again, as in 1944 and in 1948, the deprived supposedly stained the moral code of the IDF. As the news of the massacre spread around the world, the stakeholders intensified their allegations and, following world opinion, accused Israel's government of irresponsibility. On 25 September 1982, they led an enormous demonstration, the largest in the country's history, with roughly 10% of Israeli society on the streets, known ever since as the four-hundred-thousand rally. The stakeholder-led demonstrators demanded an inquiry commission.

National inquiry commissions that investigate military incompetence are very rare in the history of the state of Israel, and as of 1982 only one such commission had been formed: the Agranat Commission set up to investigate the Israeli unpreparedness for the 1973 war that led, eventually, to the death of over 2800 soldiers. However, the rule is that when the stakeholders are in office it is the IDF's failures that are inquired into, whereas when the deprived are in office there is no doubt that responsibility goes all the way to the top of the national leadership. Thus, for the first time in Israeli history both army leaders as well as politicians were cross-examined – nearly all of them belonging to the deprived.

The inquiry commission weighed the question of who bore direct responsibility for the massacre and found that the Christian Phalangists alone were to blame, with no Israeli forces present at the camps at the time.³¹ In spite of these clear-cut findings, the commission went one step further, a step never before taken during a reign of the stakeholders, and assigned extra responsibility to politicians, particularly Defence Minister Ariel Sharon, who was now charged with not having taken appropriate measures to prevent the bloodshed.

In a speech at the Knesset, Prime Minister Begin referred to the stakeholders' position on the issue of the Sabra and Shatila massacre:

You are as slanderers who give a hand to the libellers ... A blood libel is being levelled these days at Israel and at the IDF ... but you are walking around lately, sometimes like those who are exulting, that it is the Jews who are at fault ... This is not the first time you cry that the Jew did what was done. Not for the first time in this generation ... In all periods of history when there were blood libels against

the Jewish people they stood united and together until the truth came out. This is the first time [that] ... there is a blood libel against our people and our army, and instead of standing together until we overcome this ... nearly every day I read in the foreign press your articles and announcements. Nearly every day! ... You have become king's witness against Israel!³²

What Begin, who was loyal to his country's good name, did not speak about were the incidents equivalent to the Sabra and Shatila slaughter that had taken place when the stakeholders were in office. Israel had long been assisting Lebanese Christian militias in their struggles against the PLO, when the Christians, with support from Israel in terms of arms and military advice, massacred Muslims in the Karantina district of Beirut in January 1976. In spite of the resemblance between the events, the incident had gone unnoticed in the Israeli public sphere and none of the stakeholders leadership seems to have agonized over them.³³

(8) The Oslo deceit

In the 1992 elections the stakeholders returned to power. It is essential to follow not only the results at the polls, but first the logic of Labour's winning campaign, in order to understand how an electoral majority was established by the stakeholders and how the whole process – leading all the way from the polls to the Oslo accords – was just another instance of the exclusion and double-crossing pattern.

In 1992 the Labour party chose to run for elections under disguise. Realizing that the stakeholders were not wanted in power as such, they decided to wear the costumes of the deprived, and to use cover-up tactics. They set up a masquerade:

- For the first time in its history, the colour red, which had historically represented the communist affiliation of the party, was shoved aside and the colour blue, associated with Likud through the years, was implemented instead. If the popular majority disliked the ideological roots of the party and preferred the national symbols of the deprived, it was easier to erase the old historic codes of the stakeholders, merely for election purposes, and to form the image of a brand new party.
- Labour hid behind one person – Yitzhak Rabin. Despite the fact that in the Israeli system the vote is for a party and not just for its leader, in the 1992 campaign the Labour party chose to conceal itself. With leftist ideologists leading the party's list, Rabin – who had always been associated with the party's right-wing faction – was good camouflage. Hence, instead of propagating the Labour party, the public was called to vote personally for Rabin through slogans such as 'Israel is waiting for Rabin' or 'Rabin – my Prime Minister'.
- The Rabin that starred in Labour's 1992 propaganda was not the 70-year-old politician; rather, he was represented by his pictures taken a quarter of a century earlier when he became the victorious Chief of Staff of the

1967 war. His old photographs in uniform, back in the good old days, reminded everyone that he was first and foremost a man of tough principles on national security. This perception went along with his three personal election promises: never to negotiate with the PLO, never to allow a Palestinian state, and never to retreat from the Golan Heights.

Immediately upon regaining power, the stakeholders tore off their masks. Secret negotiations took place in the Norwegian capital of Oslo, violating Rabin's initial promise to refuse any recognition of the PLO terrorist organization. In addition, Israeli delegates did not obey any of the other principles to which Rabin had publicly committed himself. The Oslo accords, signed in a public ceremony on the White House lawn on 13 September 1993, provided for the creation of an official Palestinian National Authority, one step away from a Palestinian state, and established the withdrawal of the IDF from large parts of the territories – clearly implying that the whole process would lead to total withdrawal. In contrast to any of Rabin's promises, everything had become subject to potential concessions.³⁴

Systematically violating one of his best known declarations, according to which only an irresponsible leader would withdraw from the Golan Heights, Rabin held negotiations in Washington with the aim of handing all the land in dispute over to the Syrians.³⁵

The stakeholders were typically conducting matters as though an opposition to their controversial politics never existed. In fact, any legal opposition was violently crushed. In Jerusalem people were arrested in side streets on their way to a legal demonstration; others were arrested in the city just because they were religious. Mounted police forces stormed into the crowds, turning some of the demonstrations into battlefields. With a one-vote majority in the Knesset, relying on anti-Zionist Arab parties, the stakeholders persisted in completing their political experiment no matter what its ultimate cost would be.

(9) The Rabin assassination

In the public atmosphere of the early 1990s stakeholder-governed Israel, no one had the right to criticize. Rabin led an inflammatory campaign against his opponents, with Likud supporters called ' Hamas collaborators ' and ' the murderers of peace '. The Golan Heights settlers, whose future was at stake, were no more than ' wagon-wheels ' in Rabin's new terminology, indicating that he intended to totally ignore them. The settlers of Judea and Samaria, whose personal security had been sacrificed, were called on by the prime minister to stop crying like babies.

In October 1995, in one of the largest demonstrations against the government, a picture of Rabin wearing an SS uniform was held up. It was years before the true story behind the picture would be publicly acknowledged as a set-up

by one of the state security institutions. Following that demonstration, Likud opposition leader Binyamin Netanyahu, who at the time had no idea that the SS photomontage had been created as a provocation by an official state institution, asked to make an announcement to the parliament. Although Rabin pointedly left the place, Netanyahu insisted on making his statement:

Mr. Speaker ... I want to point out that I had made the first condemnation of this blasphemy the moment I heard about it. Those who did it in the demonstration are a small group of hooligans that probably belong to an illegal movement ... The phenomenon of calling Israeli leaders murderers and traitors has always been unacceptable, no matter which political party is in power ... We have to stand as one against the handful of fanatics. They are not part of us and we are not part of them, and this is the way it shall always be.³⁶

But the stakeholders' Speaker of the Knesset Shevah Weiss, just like the rest of the stakeholders leadership, knew better than that. His comment after Netanyahu's statement was:

Hooliganism has always originated from the Right. [Now] the Fascist foundations of Israeli society are striking once again. Whenever I look at the leaders of the Right in the Knesset I keep having memories from Europe of the 1930s. That is what parliaments looked like in the dark nights when the whole Western civilization was sinking ... I have experienced those twilight days on my own flesh and blood; I have lost my dear ones and left Europe as a Holocaust survivor.³⁷

The deprived's insistence on committing to the democratic rules of the game was no reason for the stakeholders to refrain from excluding them. When Rabin was murdered and the whole crowd of deprived was to publicly bear the blame as a collective mark of Cain, Netanyahu asked to meet Shimon Peres. As the opposition leader Netanyahu wished to make it clear to his political rival that he would lend his support to the succession of Peres as prime minister, and that never in his lifetime would he allow the replacement of governments through force. This meeting was postponed for four days, and then took place secretly – no cameramen were allowed to document anything that could rehabilitate the deprived.³⁸

(10) The 'al-Aqsa Intifada'

Long before the failure of the July 2000 Peace Summit at Camp David, Israeli officials knew clearly that the Palestinians were preparing for a violent round of hostilities. On 28 September 2000, Likud leader Ariel Sharon, together with a delegation surrounded for their personal security by hundreds of Israeli policemen, visited the Temple Mount – the major holy site for Judaism and the third holiest place for Islam. In spite of personal promises given to the Israeli authorities by Palestinian officials that no violence would be practised if Sharon restricted his visit to the Jewish Western Wall, the moment Ariel Sharon came close to the Temple Mount organized riots broke out.

An angry Muslim crowd was guided by the Palestinian Authority officials, by Israeli-Arab Knesset members and by a PLO military elite force. The 45-minute visit was cunningly ambushed by the militant Palestinian leadership who by now had concluded that violence could obtain more for them than peace talks and who had been organizing their forces for months.³⁹

Prime Minister Barak, disappointed by the deadlock with which the July 2000 peace summit had ended, refused at first to blame Sharon.⁴⁰ However, two weeks into the riots, he succumbed to the internal code of the stakeholders: strengthen the blood libel against the deprived and publicly purify your image as the responsible elder; adopt a moderate tone of speech and stab the deprived in the back. Thus, like all his political ancestors since the days when Jabotinsky was scorned and excluded, loyal to the century-old disloyalty of the stakeholders, Barak fulfilled his part in preserving the cleavage within Israeli society by repeating the worst type of deceit practised by his ideological predecessors.

Conclusion

The 1977 political turnover brought the right-wing bloc of several parties that basically represented the deprived, to national leadership for the first time in Israel's political history. This turnover, which was an expression of how the deprived had prevailed, should come as no surprise to anyone well-versed in Israeli social dynamics.⁴¹

The reactions of the stakeholders to the 1977 political turnover are familiar to those who understand the socio-psychology of the mental cleavage. About two weeks after the elections, David Grossman, a leading Israeli novelist, wrote: 'The whole world is falling apart. The Land of Israel, that we are the only ones to represent, is going down the drain!'⁴² Other writers spoke about the feeling of total destruction, the notion that the state of Israel had simply been lost and that turning the wheel over to the deprived (though not using this term, of course) was committing collective suicide. Amos Oz, a leading author, suggested reorganizing the Hagana-Palmah because street fights with Begin's new regime seemed to him the most likely scenario at the time.⁴² Boaz Evron, a leading publicist, found good reasons why even in face of the electoral turnover the Labour party should have remained in power:

We are in all the important posts in the army, in the industry, in the academy; we are the ones who run the country. They, on the other hand, have never played an important part, because they have never really belonged to the Israeli public!⁴³

The fact that they - the deprived - had won a democratic majority could barely dent the logic of the intellectual stakeholders. Israeli political scientist Zeev Sternhell, a leading authority on fascism, presented the case for ignoring the electoral mistake that the people had just made, considering the fact that in Israel two groups, a good one and a bad one, were competing and one obviously could not allow the bad group to prevail:

There is the liberal, moderate, open Zionism of the elderly and educated who are Western Ashkenazim and do well economically; and there is the other Zionism, the extreme, clerical, militant, aggressive one that violates human rights, the Zionism of the Sephardic public.⁴⁴

These are but a small random sample from the Israeli newspapers of summer 1977 that were covered on a weekly basis with the stakeholders' lamentations about how the deprived leadership would eventually destroy the country. Though Israeli politics over subsequent decades have taken the shape of a see-saw game, the psychological stance of each party has never altered. As early as 1977 a strange phenomenon occurred: the deprived never entirely internalized the fact that they had won political dominance and continued to yearn for rehabilitation by the stakeholders. In a way, the state of mind of the deprived reminds one of the battered woman's syndrome, where the beaten woman tends to take the blame on herself and feel guilty for any further battering she may receive; questioning her own character, she will tend to try harder to live up to her violent partner's expectations.⁴⁵

Lacking confidence in their abilities, after the 1977 political turnover the deprived opted for a low-key transition of power. During the first few months only one director general of the governmental administration resigned on the grounds that he could not work under the new minister. The important key position of director general of treasury was retained for over two years by the pre-Likud Labour appointee. Other senior administrators remained in office, including those who were Labour party activists. Some of them declared that they were professionals who would have no difficulty serving a new political master. Even some of the personal staff of Menachem Begin had previously served in the Labour government.⁴⁶

When Begin first came to power in 1977 he was the strongest prime minister of Israel since Ben-Gurion, with the ability to appoint ministers to a large degree according to his personal choices. He inherited an authoritarian party culture that had been shaped by his ancestor and mentor Jabotinsky. Yet at this moment of truth he decided to ignore the claims of veteran party activists and to select for key positions in his government figures that rather represented the stakeholders. Deprived as he and his followers had been for decades, when their time at the helm came, what they felt that they most needed was the legitimacy that only the stakeholders could grant. Begin's choice for foreign minister was Moshe Dayan, the prince of the stakeholders; Dayan had been Ben-Gurion's protégé and at times had even been considered his intended heir. Begin's choice for a defence minister was Ezer Weizman; in spite of his involvement in right-wing politics after leaving the army as a well-known general during the 1970s, Weizman was above all the nephew of Israel's late first president. Together, Dayan and Weizman presented the dominant traditions in Zionism and in Israel, those of the stakeholders who had for years excluded and condemned Jabotinsky, Begin and their followers. Dayan and Weizman, for their part,

symbolized by the act of joining Begin a measure of willingness within the old establishment of the stakeholders to accept the former outsider, the eternal deprived – yet only on his own terms.⁴⁷

Examining the samples of events related in this article, extracted from various points in time, it seems that the mental cleavage remains one social syndrome that is ingrained in the psychology of both deprived and stakeholders, and is therefore bound to rule Jewish Israeli society for the near future.

Notes

1. For a full account of the various cleavages see Horowitz and Lissak, *Trouble in Utopia*, 51–97; Smootha, “Class, Ethnic and National Cleavages.”
2. Horowitz and Lissak, *Trouble in Utopia*, 243–244.
3. Khazzoom, “The Great Chain of Orientalism”; Cohen and Haberfeld, “Second-Generation Jewish Immigrants.”
4. Ben-Rafael, “The Faces of Religiosity in Israel”; Wald and Shay, “Interreligious Conflict in Israel.”
5. Arian, “A Report: 1986–1991”; Arian and Shamir, “The Primarily Political Functions.”
6. Kimmerling, *The End of Ashkenazi Hegemony*, 11–19, 30–44.
7. Penkower, “The Kishinev Pogrom”; Vital, *Zionism: The Formative Years*, 230–264.
8. Vital, *Zionism: The Formative Years*, 267–346; O’Brien, *The Siege*, 95–105.
9. Schechtman, *Rebel and Statesman*, 83–100.
10. Kaplan, *The Jewish Radical Right*, 3–30; Shavit, *Jabotinsky and the Revisionist Movement*, 28–101, 162–175.
11. Lapidot, *The Birth of an Underground*, 36–40.
12. Ibid., 109–123; Shavit, *Open Season*, 88–120.
13. Seidman, *Menachem Begin*, 85.
14. Hurwitz, *Begin: His Life*, 11–17.
15. Begin, *The Revolt*, 212–230; Katz, *Days of Fire*, 212–218.
16. Gelber, *Independence versus Nakba*, 153–161; Golani, *The Myth of Deir Yassin*, 8–101; Milstein, *The Black Paper*, 9–84.
17. Kurzman, *Genesis, 1948*, 181; Milstein, *The Black Paper*, 60.
18. Golani, *The myth of Deir Yassin*, 84.
19. Milstein, *The Black Paper*, 36–40; additionally, for the broad context of the operation and comparison to the much debated *Haganah* guidelines of Plan D see Milstein, *The Black Paper*, 111–128.
20. I Kings 21:19.
21. The detailed saga is fully described in Itzhaki, *A Story of Heroism*, 46–146.
22. For a full and detailed account of the whole affair see Auerbach, *Brothers at War*; Nakdimon, *Altalena*, 11–357.
23. For full accounts of the military operation see Claire, *Raid on the Sun*; Perlmutter, Handel, and Bar-Joseph, *Two Minutes over Baghdad*, 67–112; Nakdimon, *First Strike*, 11–203.
24. Nakdimon, *First Strike*, 279–296; Perlmutter, Handel, and Bar-Joseph, *Two Minutes over Baghdad*, 125–130.
25. Aharoni, *General Sharon’s War*, 27–61; Gabriel, *Operation Peace For Galilee*, 41–77; Schiff and Ya’ari, *Israel’s Lebanon War*, 109–180.
26. Aharoni, *General Sharon’s War*, 99–124.

27. Hurwitz, *Begin: His Life*, 209–216.
28. Naor, *Cabinet at War*, 165–170.
29. Eban, *An Autobiography*, 227–235, 318–320, 596–598.
30. Aharoni, *General Sharon's War*, 50–61.
31. Hefez and Bloom, *The Shepherd*, 371–380.
32. Hurwitz, *Begin: His Life*, 212–213.
33. Harris, *Faces of Lebanon*, 161–174.
34. Ben-Meir, *Failure or Folly*, 23–55; Levin, *The Oslo Syndrome*, 321–342; Seliktar, *Doomed to Failure?*, 27–50.
35. Ma'oz, "Syrian-Israeli Relations"; Rabinovich, *The Brink of Peace*, 235–240; Rabinovich, *Waging Peace*, 60–62.
36. Ben-Simon, *A New Israel*, 72.
37. *Ibid.*, 70.
38. *Ibid.*, 99–100.
39. Harel and Isacharoff, *The Seventh War*, 13–42, 77–89; Pressman, "The Second Intifada."
40. Hefez and Bloom, *The Shepherd*, 552.
41. Arian and Shamir, "The Primarily Political Functions"; Shamir and Arian, "Collective Identity and Electoral Competition."
42. *Chotam*, June 3, 1977: 17.
42. *Chotam*, June 3, 1977: 17.
43. *Yediot*, July 7, 1977: 5.
44. *Haaretz*, September 14, 1977: 4.
45. For an initial account of the phenomenon see Walker, *The Battered Woman Syndrome*, 42–70; for psychological explanations in a broader context see Seligman, *Helplessness*, 33–37, 93–96.
46. Torgovnik, "Likud 1977–81."
47. O'Brien, *The Siege*, 561–593.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Eyal Lewin is Assistant Professor at the Department of Middle Eastern Studies and Political Science at Ariel University, where he is also Chair of the Department of Multidisciplinary Studies.

References

- Aharoni, Dov. *General Sharon's War Against Time Magazine – His Trial and Vindication*. New York, NY: Steimatzky and Shapolsky, 1985.
- Arian, Asher. "A Report: Security and Political Attitudes in Israel: 1986–1991." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (1992): 116–128.
- Arian, Asher, and Michal Shamir. "The Primarily Political Functions of the Left-Right Continuum." *Comparative Politics* 15, no. 2 (1983): 139–158.

- Auerbach, Jerold S. *Brothers at War: Israel and the Tragedy of Altalena*. New Orleans, LA: Quid Pro Books, 2011.
- Begin, Menachem. *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun*. Jerusalem: Steimatzky's Agency, 1977.
- Ben-Meir, Atalia. *Failure or Folly. Shaarey Tikva*, Israel: Ariel Center for Policy Research, 2003.
- Ben-Rafael, Eliezer. "The Faces of Religiosity in Israel: Cleavages or Continuum?" *Israel Studies* 6 (2008): 94–120.
- Ben-Simon, Daniel. *A New Israel*. [In Hebrew.] Ramot Hahavim, Israel: Aryeh Nir, 1997.
- Claire, Rodger W. *Raid on the Sun*. New York, NY: Broadway Books, 2004.
- Cohen, Yinon, and Yitzchak Haberfeld. "Second-Generation Jewish Immigrants in Israel: Have the Ethnic Gaps in Schooling and Earnings Declined?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21, no. 3 (1998): 507–528.
- Eban, Abba. *An Autobiography*. New York, NY: Random House, 1977.
- Gabriel, Richard A. *Operation Peace for Galilee: The Israeli-PLO War in Lebanon*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 1984.
- Gelber, Yoav. *Independence versus Nakba*. Or Yehuda: Kinneret, Zmora-Bitan, 2004.. [in Hebrew].
- Golani, Yardena. *The Myth of Deir Yassin*. [In Hebrew.] Tel Aviv: Hadar, 1976.
- Harel, Amos, and Avi Isacharoff. *The Seventh War*. [In Hebrew.] Tel Aviv: Miskal – Yedioth Ahronoth Books and Chemed Books, 2004.
- Harris, William W. *Faces of Lebanon: Sects, Wars and Global Extensions*. New York, NY: Markus Wiener, 1997.
- Hefez, Nir, and Gadi Bloom. *The Shepherd – The Life Story of Ariel Sharon*. [In Hebrew.] Tel Aviv: Miskal-Yedioth Ahronoth Books and Chemed Books, 2005.
- Horowitz, Dan, and Moshe Lissak. *Trouble in Utopia: The Overburden Polity of Israel*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989.
- Hurwitz, Harry Zvi. *Begin: His Life, Words and Deeds*. Jerusalem: Gefen Publishing House, 2004.
- Itzhaki, Arie. *A Story of Heroism – Mishmar HaYarden 1948*. [In Hebrew.] Mikve Israel: Society for Preservation of Israel Heritage Sites, 2011.
- Kaplan, Eran. *The Jewish Radical Right*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005.
- Katz, Shmuel. *Days of Fire*. London: W. H. Allen, 1968.
- Khazzoom, Aziza. "The Great Chain of Orientalism: Jewish Identity, Stigma Management, and Ethnic Exclusion in Israel." *American Sociological Review* 68, no. 4 (2003): 481–510.
- Kimmerling, Baruch. *The End of Ashkenazi Hegemony*. [In Hebrew.] Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 2001.
- Kurzman, Dan. *Genesis, 1948: The First Arab-Israeli War*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 1992.
- Lapidot, Yehuda. *The Birth of an Underground*. [In Hebrew.] Tel Aviv: Jabotinsky Institute, 2001.
- Levin, Kenneth. *The Oslo Syndrome: Delusion of a People Under Siege*. Hanover, NH: Smith and Kraus, 2005.
- Ma'oz, Moshe. "Syrian-Israeli Relations on the Eve of the Peace Process." In *The Middle East Peace Process: Vision versus Reality*, edited by Joseph Ginat, Edward J. Perkins and Edwin G. Corr, 211–228. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press and the University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.
- Milstein, Uri. *The Black Paper: Blood Libel at Deir Yassin*. [In Hebrew.] Ramat Gan: National College, 2007.
- Nakdimon, Shlomo. *Altalena*. [In Hebrew.] Jerusalem: Eidanim Publishers, 1978.

- Nakdimon, Shlomo. *First Strike: The Exclusive Story of How Israel Foiled Iraq's Attempt to Get the Bomb*. Ontario: Summit Books, 1987.
- Naor, Arie. *Cabinet at War The Functioning of the Israeli Cabinet During the Lebanon War*. [In Hebrew.] Tel Aviv: Lahav, 1986.
- O'Brien, Conor Cruise. *The Siege: The Saga of Israel and Zionism*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 1986.
- Penkower, Monty Noam. "The Kishinev Pogrom of 1903: A Turning Point in Jewish History." *Modern Judaism* 24, no. 3 (2004): 187–225.
- Perlmutter, Amos, Michael Handel, and Uri Bar-Joseph. *Two Minutes over Baghdad*. London: Frank Cass, 2003.
- Pressman, Jeremy. "The Second Intifada: Background and Causes of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Studies* 22, no. 2 (2003): 114–141.
- Rabinovich, Itamar. *The Brink of Peace: The Israeli-Syrian Negotiations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Rabinovich, Itamar. *Waging Peace: Israel and the Arabs at the End of the Century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1999.
- Schechtman, Joseph B. *Rebel and Statesman: The Vladimir Jabotinsky Story. The Early Years*. New York, NY: Thomas Yoseloff, 1956.
- Schiff, Zeev, and Ehud Ya'ari. *Israel's Lebanon War*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1984.
- Seidman, Hillel. *Menachem Begin – His Life and Legacy*. New York, NY: Shengold Publishers, 1990.
- Seligman, Martin E. P. *Helplessness: On Depression, Development and Death*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman, 1975.
- Seliktar, Ofira. *Doomed to Failure? The Politics and Intelligence of the Oslo Peace Process*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Security International, 2009.
- Shamir, Michal, and Asher Arian. "Collective Identity and Electoral Competition in Israel." *The American Political Science Review* 93, no. 2 (1999): 265–277.
- Shavit, Yaacov. *Jabotinsky and the Revisionist Movement*. London: Frank Cass, 1988.
- Shavit, Yaacov. *Open Season: The Confrontation Between the Organized Yishuv and the Underground Organizations (Etzel and Lehi) 1937–1947*. [In Hebrew.] Tel Aviv: Hadar, 1976.
- Smootha, Sammy. "Class, Ethnic and National Cleavages and Democracy in Israel." In *Israeli Democracy under Stress*, edited by Ehud Sprinzak and Larry Diamond, 309–342. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1993.
- Torgovnik, Efraim. "Likud 1977–81: The Consolidation of Power." In *Israel in the Begin Era*, edited by Robert O Freedman. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1982.
- Vital, David. *Zionism: The Formative Years*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Wald, Kenneth D., and Samuel Shay. "Interreligious Conflict in Israel: The Group Basis of Conflicting Visions." *Political Behavior* 16, no. 1 (1994): 157–178.
- Walker, Lenore E. *The Battered Woman Syndrome*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.