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Introduction

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is one of the most prominent political conflicts of our time. Moreover, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is not just a political conflict over territory but has turned into an ethnic struggle between the Palestinian people and the Israeli people. A complicating factor in the conflict is that the Palestinian people have been scattered throughout the world due to the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948. Some, however, remained and received Israeli citizenship. Today these Palestinian Arab citizens of Israel comprise a group of over 1.7 million people out of Israel’s 8.3 million citizens. It has been well documented that the Palestinian Arab citizens of Israel do not enjoy equal rights to those of their Jewish-Israeli counterparts and are considered to be second class citizens by the Israeli state or, as is the case in Shafir and Peled’s work, even considered as third class citizens. Although there has been considerable attention for Israel’s Arab citizens in academia in recent years most of the scholarly research with regard to the Arab citizens of Israel has been done within the framework of Israel as an ethnic democracy. The popular notion that Israel is an apartheid state has also found widespread resonance in academia.

The basic assumption in this thesis is that the societal security dilemma holds an alternative and valuable approach to understanding the relationship between the Arab and Jewish citizens of Israel and the dynamics of unequal citizenship. Societal security dilemmas are “security dilemmas that operate between societies, and thus have identity concerns as their

---

1 For Example See: Menachem Klein. The Shift: Israel-Palestine From Border Struggle to Ethnic Conflict. (New York: Colombia University Press, 2010).
2 In this thesis the Arab citizens of the state of Israel are frequently referred to as Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel because this is how the Arab minority has identified itself in the Vision Documents.
7 For Example See:

central dynamic.\textsuperscript{8} The main research question of this thesis is whether a societal security dilemma can be identified within the state of Israel between the Jewish-Israeli society and the Palestinian Arab society in Israel and if so, what kind of security dilemma. This will help to determine whether there are in fact legitimate societal security concerns at play between the two societies causing their complicated and unequal relationship or whether so-called power-seeking is a more appropriate explanation.

Like the traditional interstate security dilemma the societal security dilemma also consists of an action-reaction process geared towards fulfilling security requirements. Within the societal security dilemma, however, political-legal means are considered to be the tangible markers that signify negation or fulfillment of societal security requirements. Political-legal means can thus be studied in order to measure what threats are being perceived and how these are mitigated.\textsuperscript{9} In this thesis the action-reaction process from the side of the Jewish majority in Israel will be traced through the qualitative analyses of a relevant selection of political-legal measures taken by the Israeli government with regard to Israel’s Palestinian Arab citizens. This selection of political-legal measures covers a time period from 1948 until today because most of the measures still have an effect on the Arab minority today even though some of them were already implemented in the 1950s. From the side of the Palestinian Arab minority in Israel the so-called Vision Documents\textsuperscript{10} will be qualitatively analyzed as part of the action-reaction process. This is due to the fact that the Palestinian Arab citizens in Israel on the one side have limited political influence within the Israeli state and are thus not able to implement political-legal measures and on the other side because Arab society within Israel only fully politically emerged at the end of the Second Intifada (2000-2005).\textsuperscript{11} The Vision Documents are a set of three separate, seminal and unique documents that were published in 2006 and 2007 by Arab civil society organizations in Israel on their view of the future of the state of Israel. The Vision Documents constitute the first time the Palestinian Arab minority

\textsuperscript{10} The Vision Documents:
- \textit{The Future Vision of the Palestinian Arabs in Israel.} (The National Committee for the Heads of the Arab Local Authorities in Israel: Nazareth, 2006.)
- \textit{The Haifa Declaration.} (Mada al-Carmel – Arab Center for Applied Social Research: Haifa, 2007)
- \textit{The Democratic Constitution.} (Adalah - the Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel: Shafa’amr, 2007)
\textsuperscript{11} Baruch Kimmerling and Joel S. Migdal. \textit{The Palestinian People.} (Harvard University Press: Cambridge Massachusetts, 2003) 170
have expressed their view of the future of the Israeli state collectively and are therefore treated as tangible markers of the action-reaction process.

**A Review of the Societal Security Dilemma**

With the end of the Cold War and the unexpected rise of ethnic violence that followed in the 1990s new scholarly perspectives and theories on ethnic conflict and security began to emerge. These new perspectives were mostly geared towards explaining intrastate ethnic violence. Essentially this represents a shift in analytical focus with regard to security. During the Cold War security was primarily interpreted in military terms, the sole actors within international society were considered to be states, and the primary level of analyses were interstate relations in which the condition of these relations served as the main indicator of the level of security or insecurity of a given state. The new perspectives on security on the other side provide a more holistic approach to security in which the definition of security is broadened to entail any real or perceived danger to the maintenance, construction, or both of a specific collective, most often ethnic, identity. Two new security dilemmas were introduced in the 1990s: the ethnic security dilemma and the societal security dilemma.

The ethnic security dilemma was first introduced by Barry Posen in his 1993 article “The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict.” This article aimed to explain the outbreak of ethnic violence between Serbs and Croats in former Yugoslavia as well as the lack of such violence in the case of Russia and Ukraine after the fall of the Soviet Union.

Posen applies “a basic concept from the realist tradition of international relations theory, ‘the security dilemma’, to the special conditions that arise when proximate groups of people suddenly find themselves newly responsible for their own security.” Such a situation, according to Posen, arises when a multi-ethnic empire, such as the Soviet Union or Yugoslavia, collapses as a

---

12 Among Others See:


consequence of which a state of anarchy is caused by the absence of a sovereign. Once in a state of anarchy, it is assumed by Posen’s realist theory, the different ethnic groups in a region will be primarily concerned with their security and thus must assess whether their neighbors are a threat or not. For Posen these threats are still labeled military capacity. However, according to Posen the military capacity of an ethnic group, as assessed by its rivals, will often rather be dependent on their cohesion as a group, the strength of their group identity, than on their actual military assets.\textsuperscript{16} Additionally the emotional power derived from the cohesion of a group can be seen as a powerful independent threat.\textsuperscript{17} In this process of threat assessment the histories of both ethnic groups play an important role. Although Posen’s adaptation of the security dilemma into an ethnic security dilemma is highly innovative, it does not go very far beyond the traditional security dilemma as it still assumes a natural state of anarchy, still speaks about military capacity, and although Posen does touch upon the vital importance of shared group history he does not link shared history to identity. Furthermore, Posen does not consider if and how identities can be challenged or provoked in non-military or non-violent ways. Other realist scholars who have deployed the ethnic security dilemma, such as William Rose\textsuperscript{18} or Allan Collins\textsuperscript{19} show a similar preoccupation with predicting the likelihood of the outbreak of violent ethnic conflict and military capacity.

The societal security dilemma on the other hand shifts in focus from the realist perspective to a more constructivist approach. Kenneth Bush and Fuat Keyman argue that “[…] the search for an effective response to identity-based conflicts requires more than the current [1997] mainstream (read: realist) efforts to fit them into the existing approaches to security.”\textsuperscript{20} Furthermore, they argue “[…] that a relational, historical and dynamic understanding of identity is crucial not only for coming to terms with the connections between security and (ethnic) identity but also for constructing effective strategies for the management or resolution of conflict.”\textsuperscript{21} The societal security dilemma was first introduced by Barry Buzan in his book \textit{Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe}.\textsuperscript{22} Buzan had already coined the term societal security as a dimension of state security in his earlier study.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibidem.
\textsuperscript{20} Bush and Keyman. “Identity-Based Conflict.” 311.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibidem.
People, States and Fear. “Societal security was one of five sectors of security, the others being: military, political, economic and environmental.” In Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe societal security, though remaining a sector of state security, was reworked as a referent object of security by Ole Waever. Societal security in this case refers to the survival of a society which is dependent on the maintenance of its particular identity under changing conditions. Societal security “[…] is about the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture association, and religious and national identity and custom.” However, there have been criticisms, most importantly by Bill McSweeney, that identities are not static and fixed but fluid and the result of historic processes. In a reply to McSweeney Buzan and his colleague Weaver argue that identities are indeed socially constructed but that once an identity has become socially sedimented it can become a referent object for security.

To take identity as a possible object of securitization, one has only to assume that it has a form which makes security discourse possible (i.e. it has a claim to survival as well as a clear image of what non-survival would mean). Usually this demands that the referent has become relatively stabilized in social practice.

Although Buzan introduced the societal security dilemma he never elaborated it into a workable theory. The societal security dilemma, however, was picked up by Paul Roe who worked the concept of societal security into the framework of the security dilemma in his book Ethnic Violence and the Societal Security Dilemma. Firstly, Roe distinguishes between a tight security dilemma, a regular security dilemma and a loose security dilemma. In a tight security dilemma two actors, or two societies in our case, with compatible security requirements misperceive each other’s intentions and thus are caught in a security dilemma despite the fact that both actors are security-seekers. A tight security dilemma may be mitigated if both sides realize their misperception. A regular security dilemma takes place

when both actors indeed have incompatible security requirements but are also both security-seekers. An additional distinction is made between expansionist and non-expansionist security-seekers. Lastly, a loose security dilemma occurs when one of the actors is not a security-seeker but a power-seeker and they are rather interested in expanding and dominating the other actor than in obtaining security. According to Roe societal security requirements are more contextual than their traditional security dilemma counterparts and depend wholly on what is important for maintaining a certain identity. 29

From the perspective of minorities, the maintenance of identity is often tied to control over those institutions responsible for cultural reproduction, and/or over territory to which societal identity is bound. For the majority group, societal security is usually achieved through the preservation of its privileged (political) status and the maintenance of ‘national unity.’ 30

The action-reaction process of the societal security dilemma, according to Roe, can best be conceived in terms of escalating nationalisms due to the fact that threats to societal security requirements often result in measures aimed at strengthening internal cohesion which often requires comparison with others. 31

Societal security dilemmas occur when the actions that groups take to secure their identity cause reactions in others, which, in the end, leave all parties less secure. Societies may try to strengthen group identity through cultural- and/or ethnic-nationalist projects. The assumption of a worst-case scenario provokes a series of measures and counter-measures in which attempts to deny/revoke cultural rights are both implemented and resisted. 32

Violent conflict is not necessarily the outcome of an intra-state societal security dilemma for Roe. “At the intrastate level, harm can precede violence: violence may come later if either side cannot achieve their societal security requirements through political-legal means.” 33 Political-legal means thus constitute tangible markers to negate or fulfill societal security

29 Roe. Ethnic Violence. 72.
30 Ibidem.
31 Roe. Ethnic Violence. 69.
32 Roe. Ethnic Violence. 73.
requirements and additionally allow to measure whether firstly there are perceived threats and secondly whether and how societal security requirements are being mitigated. Along the lines of Ronnie Olesker’s research into the societal security dilemma, “[…] rhetoric alone may not amount to a threat to social identity but bureaucratic and legal actions that are aimed at curtailing the ability of society to express and reproduce its identity certainly do.”

Most of the scholarship concerned with the societal and ethnic security dilemmas focuses on ethnic conflict in Eastern Europe among whom the above mentioned Roe and Posen. There are also some scholars concerned with South East Asia, such as Alan Collins. With regard to Israel Hillel Frisch has addressed the relationship between security, ethnicity and the treatment of Israel’s Arab citizens. Frisch, who investigates the majority-minority relations in Israel overtime starting in 1948, argues that

the relationship between the State of Israel and its Arab citizens is heavily influenced by the broader regional geo-strategic security situation facing the state […]. Israeli policies toward its Arab citizens moderated during the rare periods of relative geo-strategic security and hardened when Israel’s regional position became more precarious.

The societal security dilemma has thus far, however, only been utilized to explain ethnic tensions in Israel by Ronnie Olesker in her article *Israel’s Societal Security Dilemma and the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process*. Olesker argues that the Jewish and Arab Israelis are locked into a regular societal security dilemma with incompatible societal security requirements. She questions specifically whether minority societal security requirements can be met at all in the Jewish-Israeli state although she only examines the threats that are perceived by the Jewish majority. Moreover, the focus of her article lies with the role of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process within the societal security dilemma which she views as exacerbating the societal security dilemma within Israel because Israel’s Palestinian Arab citizens are not in any way partners to it. Although parts of Olesker’s article are convincing the one sided attention for the societal security requirements of the Jewish majority weaken her argument. Furthermore the direct relevance of the role of the peace process within the societal security dilemma is

questionable as Olesker identifies the possible resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict both as a possible solution to the present societal security dilemma and as a possible cause of escalation of the societal security dilemma. Most importantly, Olesker misses the expansionist security-seeking elements present in Jewish-Israeli political-legal measures and concludes that the Jewish majority are non-expansionist security-seekers.

A Short History and Overview of the Composition of Israel’s Population

The Arab and Jewish citizens of Israel share a long and rather complicated history with each other which started during the period of mandate Palestine and is situated within the framework of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. A pivotal moment in their history was the establishment of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948, and the first Arab-Israeli War (May 15, 1948 - March 10, 1949) that followed it. Originally United Nations General Assembly resolution 181 had dictated that mandate Palestine would be partitioned into a Jewish state and an Arab state but at the end of the first Arab-Israeli War\(^37\) the newly created Israelis held “in all 8,000 square miles of Palestine, in contrast to the 6,200 square miles awarded to them in the UN partition plan.”\(^38\) Moreover, notwithstanding that between 800,000 and 900,000 Palestinian-Arab inhabitants fled the area during the first Arab-Israeli war\(^39\) some 160,000 of them remained within the post-1949 borders of the Israeli state.\(^40\)

The ideology of Zionism,\(^41\) which is most succinctly described as Jewish nationalism, upon which the state of Israel was founded and which legitimated the Jewish nature of the Israeli state “had not envisaged the existence of a large, non-Jewish minority population in the future Jewish state […]”.\(^42\) Therefore “areas of Arab concentration were placed under the

---

\(^37\) The First Arab-Israeli War is known by the Jewish-Israelis as Milhemet Ha'Atzma'ut, The War of Independence, whilst by the Arab Palestinians it is known as al-Nakba, The Catastrophe or just The Nakba.


\(^41\) For an overview of the development and history of Zionism see:
- Seltzer. “Secular Jewish Thought in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.” 684-719.

\(^42\) Cleveland and Bunton. “Israel and the Palestinians.” 349
authority of a Military Administration”43 from 1949 until 1966. In spite of this the Knesset passed the so-called *Nationality Law* in 1952. This law granted Israeli citizenship to most of the 160,000 Palestinian-Arab inhabitants of Israel.44 Those Palestinians who had fled during the war were not allowed to return to what was now the state of Israel and became refugees, mostly in the states surrounding Israel. Today there are an estimated 7.1 million displaced Palestinians worldwide.45

The Third Arab-Israeli War46 which took place between June 5, 1967, and June 10, 1967, is another key moment. During this short war Israel captured the West Bank as well as East Jerusalem from Jordan, the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip were taken from Egypt and the Golan Heights from Syria. Estimates by the United Nations provide that an additional 100,000 to 300,000 Palestinian-Arabs became displaced as a result of this war.47 The West Bank, which was estimated to still have 596,000 Palestinian-Arab inhabitants after the 1967 war, and the Gaza Strip, which was assessed to still have 350,000 Palestinian-Arab inhabitants, became what we now know as the Occupied Territories and none of its inhabitants received Israeli citizenship.48 The Golan Heights was under a Military Administration until 1981 when the Knesset passed the *Golan Heights Law* which effectively annexed the region to the state of Israel and was accompanied by an offer of citizenship to the Arab inhabitants of the region although many rejected Israeli citizenship49 East Jerusalem was also annexed but its inhabitants received a permanent residence permit rather than Israeli citizenship.50

As a consequence of Israel’s history its population today comprises a sizable Arab minority. Data released by the Central Bureau of Statistics in Israel in April 2015 show that

43 Cleveland and Bunton. “Israel and the Palestinians.” 349.
46 The Third Arab-Israeli War is also known as the June War and The Six-Day-War. By the Jewish-Israelis it is known as *Milhemet Sheshet Ha Yamim*, The Six-Day War, whilst by the Arabs it is known as *an-Naksah*, The Setback.
47 “Palestinian Refugee Factbox/Timeline.”
48 Cleveland and Bunton. “Israel and the Palestinians.” 363.
Israel’s more than 8.3 million citizens\textsuperscript{51} are currently made up of 6.251 million Jewish citizens, 74.9\% of the total population, and 1.730 million Arab citizens, 20.7\% of the total population. 364,000 citizens fall under the category of other and constitute the remaining 4.4\% of the population.\textsuperscript{52} Data provided by the World Bank state that the joined populations of the West Bank and Gaza were measured to comprise 4.170 million people in 2013.\textsuperscript{53} The Arab citizens of Israel do not necessarily make up one homogeneous minority group as there is a religious and cultural diversity present among them. The Arab minority encompasses Muslim, Druze, Bahai, Bedouin, Circassian and Christian communities of different denominations.\textsuperscript{54} Nevertheless what these communities all share with each other is a broader ethnic Arab as well as a Palestinian identity. In a similar manner the Jewish citizens of Israel also do not necessarily make up one cultural homogeneous majority group as they are an immigrant society consisting of Jewish people from all over the world. However, the Israeli nationality and Jewish ethnicity bond them together as a group. Both the majority and the minority group identities have been relatively sedimented in social practice.

The Israeli State and Majority Societal Security Requirements

Since the establishment of the state of Israel the Jewish-Israeli majority can be said to be in control of the state and its institutions. This has provided the majority with the opportunity to safeguard their societal security requirements through the mechanisms of the state in the shape of political-legal measures and policies from 1948 onwards. Moreover this also enabled them to strengthen their group identity through ethnic-nationalist projects. Majority societal security is most often achieved through the preservation of both privileged majority status and national unity.\textsuperscript{55} Within the context of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict and the broader regional Israeli-Arab Conflict the Jewish majority in Israel has perceived the Arab citizens of Israel as an extension of the enemy and as such as a threat to the survival of the Jewish state, the Jewish-Israeli identity and their majority status. This chapter will attend to the perceived threats to the Israeli Jewish majority identity as well as the reaction to these threats in the form of political-legal measures and policies. For matters of space only the more profound

\textsuperscript{51} Concrete and verified data on the current amount of non-citizen inhabitants of Israel are unavailable.
\textsuperscript{52} “67th Independence Day - 8.3 Million Residents in the State of Israel.”
\textsuperscript{55} Paul Roe. Ethnic Violence. 72.
and long lasting measures with which the Arab citizens of Israel have been confronted will be examined. These measures are Judaization of the land, treating the Arabs along sectarian lines in order to prevent them to identify as a collective, laws restricting reunifications with Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza, state control in the areas of education, language, culture and religion and limitations to political participation.

As stated earlier for identity to become a referent object of security it has to have a claim to survival as well as a clear image of what non-survival would mean. In the case of the Jewish majority in Israel these requirements are not only closely linked to the survival of the Israeli state but also to the survival of its Jewish character. Shafir and Peled, for example, write that “[…] the option of separating state and religion was rarely raised, because it would have meant doing away with Israel’s character as a Jewish state and would have threatened most Jews’ conception of their identity.” As such the survival of the Jewish character of the state can be seen to constitute the main societal security requirement of the Jewish majority. From the perspective of that Jewish majority Israel’s Arab citizens constitute two imminent threats to the maintenance of Jewish societal security. Firstly there is the issue of external security challenges and the discourse of identifying Israel’s Arab citizens with the enemy. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict as well as the broader Israeli-Arab conflict has elicited this discourse. According to Hillel Frisch “[s]ubjective feelings of insecurity in the early years of the state influenced official attitudes toward Israel’s Arab population […], perceptions that Israel’s Arab minority could serve as a potential fifth column were especially widespread among Israel’s political elite in the early years of the state.” This is part of the reason why in the beginning years of the Israeli state there was a military rule over Israel’s Arab citizens. Throughout the years, however, the continued identification of Israel’s Arab citizens with the enemy has also resulted in laws and policies that limited the possibilities of Israel’s Arab citizens to express and reproduce their collective Arab identity. Instead Israeli laws and policies aimed to instill an Israeli-Arab civic identity. Secondly there is the demographic factor which is also closely related to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict and can be seen as an extension of the discourse of identifying Arab citizens with the enemy. As mentioned earlier of the total of 8.3 million citizens within the borders of Israel 6.251 million are Jewish citizens (74.9%) and 1.730 million are Arab citizens (20.7%). However, if the residents of

59 “67th Independence Day - 8.3 Million Residents in the State of Israel.”
the Occupied Territories of the West Bank and Gaza\textsuperscript{60} are also taken into account there are 5.9 million Palestinian-Arabs altogether within the state of Israel and the Occupied Territories. In this sense the Jewish citizens of Israel are just a slight majority; this heightens their sense of insecurity as well as the need to strengthen the Jewish majority identity.\textsuperscript{61}

Since the establishment of the Israel until today the Israeli government has undertaken what has been called the Judaization of the country, a process which alongside the appropriation of lands aimed to turn Israel into a Jewish space and to strengthen the collective national identity if the Jewish majority. The Judaization of the land entailed […] the massive nationalization and Judaization of land; […] the creation of powerful centralized controls over this national land by state and Jewish institutions such as the Jewish National Fund; and […] a selective distribution of limited property rights within the Jewish population.”\textsuperscript{62} This nationalized land was taken from its previous Arab owners under a range of legal measures and although it is legally allowed to lease state-owned lands to non-Jewish citizens on the short-term, one to three years, this rarely happens and long-term leases which span forty-nine years are only legally available to Jewish citizens.\textsuperscript{63} This has had profound consequences for the economic opportunities of the Arab population. From the 1990s onwards the process of Judaization of the country started to take a different shape due to the adaptation of economic liberalism in Israel. Judaization of the land is now mostly practiced through private ownership of land rather than state ownership but the basics of the process have remained more or less the same.\textsuperscript{64}

Alongside the Judaization process multiple policies and laws have been implemented in order to prevent the Arab citizens of Israel from unifying as a collective or identifying themselves with the Palestinian people outside of Israel. One of the policies has been to treat the Arab minority along the lines of the religious sects they belong to. This becomes most evident from the military draft which is compulsory for all Jewish citizens, although refusal to serve is accepted upon religious grounds. However, “[t]he only Arabic-speaking citizens who serve on a compulsory male basis are Druze and Circassians, although some Bedouin and

\textsuperscript{60} “West Bank and Gaza.”


Christian Arabs volunteer.” Muslim Arabs can also serve on a voluntary basis. However, an article by the Jerusalem Post provided that in the year 2012 only 400 Arab citizens of Israel served in the Israeli Defense Forces voluntarily. Another way to prevent the Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel from reconnecting with their kin outside Israel has been to exclude them from the Law of Return (1950) and more recently through the Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law which is a customization of the 1952 Nationality Law and was passed in 2003. This Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law prevents any kind of family reunification between an Arab citizen of Israel and their non-citizen spouses or children, in other words it has become impossible for Palestinians in the West Bank or Gaza to be reunited with family in Israel.

In the areas of education, language, culture and religion there are also several policies geared towards preventing the crystallization of a collective Palestinian-Arab identity in Israel. Due to the fact that Israel’s Arab citizens are identified by the state as the enemy, several limits are imposed through the Israeli educational system. The State Education Law of 1953 dictates that all education should be based in Jewish cultural values and science, but also on love of the homeland and loyalty to the state and the Jewish people. This educational law is still upheld today and has served to develop a curriculum for Arab schools in which it is attempted to forge an Israeli-Arab identity in relation to the state. After the first Intifada (1987-1991) when institutions of higher education in the West Bank and Gaza “were a breeding ground for promoting Palestinian national identity and political organization,” staff for Arab schools were additionally subjected to security checks. For the same reasons requests for the foundation of an Arab University in Israel have been rejected. In the area of language, the linguistic influence of the Hebrew language has been vast. Although Arabic is officially also a language of the state it has little prominence and the state does not utilize Arabic much unless when forced to do so. Additionally, because Arabic has never been a required language in Jewish schools it is not possible to utilize Arabic in the Knesset as well as in other national

65 Frisch. Israel’s Security. 39
69 Frisch. Israel’s Security.57-58.
70 Frisch. Israel’s Security.58.
institutions. Furthermore, there is no institutional autonomy in the areas of culture and religion and the Israeli Ministry of Religious Affairs is, for example, in charge of the religious sites within the country.

With regard to the political participation of the Arab citizens of Israel within Israeli national politics a barrier has been implemented in the form of the 1985 amendment to article 7 of the Basic Law: The Knesset. Israel does not have a constitution but instead opted to draft the constitution as individual chapters called Basic Laws which altogether eventually were supposed to make up the constitution. Until this day no formal constitution has been adopted. Article 7 of the Basic Law: The Knesset attends to the criteria of disqualification of candidate lists from elections to the Knesset. The amendment states that

A candidates list shall not participate in elections to the Knesset, and a person shall not be a candidate for election to the Knesset, if the goals or actions of the list or the actions of the person, expressly or by implication, include one of the following:

1. negation of the existence of the State of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state;
2. incitement to racism;
3. support for armed struggle by a hostile state or a terrorist organization against the State of Israel.

This amendment effectively prohibits any Arab candidates list to address the exclusive Jewish character of the Israeli state or to publicly sympathize or identify themselves with the Palestinian people in Gaza or the West Bank hence limiting political participation of Israel’s Arab citizens.

In conclusion, as a reaction to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict and the broader Arab-Israeli Conflict the Israeli Jewish majority has perceived Israel’s Palestinian-Arab citizens as a threat to their survival from the very beginning of the existence of the Israeli state. The demographic factor has heightened the sense of insecurity amongst the Jewish majority. Central to the societal security of the Jewish majority is the Jewish character of the Israeli state. The societal security requirements of the Jewish majority are in accordance with Paul Roe’s claim that majority societal security is usually achieved through the maintenance of the

---

privileged majority status and national unity. The Jewish majority status is maintained through the process of Judaization of the land, limiting the possibilities for Arab political participation, and the policy of attending to the Arab minority as separate religious sects. National unity is safeguarded through Israeli state control over the institutions that are responsible for the maintenance and reproduction of the collective identity of Israel’s Arab Palestinian-Arab citizens in the areas of education, language, religion and culture. This state control gives the Israeli government the opportunity to instill an Israeli-Arab civic identity and prevent the emergence of Palestinian-Arab nationalism. Additionally freedom of movement of Israel’s Palestinian-Arab citizens is also limited towards this end. All these political-legal measures serve a dual purpose, on the one side they serve to weaken the Palestinian-Arab identity of the minority and on the other side they serve to strengthen the Jewish identity of the majority as well as the Jewish identity of the Israeli state. The Jewish majority thus demonstrates security-seeking behavior. Furthermore, the Jewish majority exhibits expansionist security-seeking behavior because the process of Judaization of the land literally turns Arab spaces into Jewish spaces.

The Vision Documents and Minority Societal Security Requirements

Israel’s Arab minority, as expounded in the previous chapter, has been subjected to a multiplicity of measures geared towards preventing the crystallization of their collective identity as Arabs and Palestinians throughout the existence of the Israeli state. In essence this has prevented the minority from safeguarding their societal security requirements. Therefore, “[…] since it is part of the political fabric of the state, and because it is excluded from legitimate political discourse, the Palestinian minority is forced to express its demands by means that do not put its status at risk.” The Vision Documents constitute this safe way for the Arab minority in Israel to express their societal security requirements. As argued by Roe, minority societal security requirements are oftentimes connected to control over the territory to which a specific societal identity is linked, institutions that are responsible for the reproduction of culture, or both. Within the context of the Israeli state and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in which the Israeli state is involved Israel’s Arab minority has perceived

---

73 Roe. Ethnic Violence. 72.
75 Roe. Ethnic Violence. 72.
the Jewish nature of the Israeli state and the machinery of Israel’s government as the main threat to the survival of their collective identity as Palestinian-Arabs. After an introduction to the Vision Documents and a brief examination of the development of Arab society in Israel this chapter will attend to the societal security requirements of Israel’s Arab minority as they are expressed in the Vision Documents. These societal security requirements, which are most often reactions to Israeli policies and laws, are related to the Jewish nature of the Israeli state, recognition of collective minority rights, the right to self-determination, educational, cultural and religious autonomy and lastly political participation.

The Vision Documents, as they are collectively known, consist of three influential documents that were published independently from each other by three different Arab civil society organizations in Israel in 2006 and 2007.\(^{76}\) The first document that was published is *The Future Vision of the Palestinian Arabs in Israel* which appeared in 2006. It was written by the National Committee for the Heads of the Local Arab Councils in Israel and the High Follow-Up Committee for Arab citizens of Israel. The National Committee for the Heads of the Local Arab Councils in Israel is the national consultative body for the heads of the local Arab councils. The High Follow-Up Committee for Arab citizens of Israel, which was founded in 1982, is an independent political organization that aims to centralize and coordinate the political actions of all organizations of Arab citizens in Israel.\(^{77}\) The committee consists of Arab members of parliament, heads of the Arab local councils and representatives of the different religious movements in the Arab sector within Israel.\(^{78}\) Another collective future vision for the Arab citizens of Israel, *The Haifa Declaration*, was published in 2007. This document was written by “a group of Palestinian intellectuals, academics, and activists from different fields and political viewpoints”\(^{79}\) for Mada al-Carmel - Arab Center for Applied Social Research which is located in the city of Haifa. Mada al-Carmel was founded in 2000 and its primary mission is to generate and provide “information, critical analysis, and diverse perspectives on the social and political life and history of Palestinians, with particular

\(^{76}\) A fourth document was also published in 2007 by the Mossawa Center but because it was written by only one author, was presented as a position paper, has not been ratified by Arab leaders in Israel and because not all researchers agree whether it is part of the collection of Vision Documents it will not be attended to here.


\(^{78}\) *Wa’adat HaMa’akav Ha’Elyon Shel ’Aravi Yisrael*.

\(^{79}\) *The Haifa Declaration*, 4.
attention to Palestinians within Israel's 1948 boundaries." The third document titled *The Democratic Constitution* also appeared in 2007 and was published by Adalah, The Legal Center for Arab Minority Rights in Israel. Adalah, which was established in 1996, is an independent human rights organization and legal center that “works to promote and defend the rights of Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel” and “seeks to achieve equal individual and collective rights for [them].” *The Democratic Constitution* was written by Adalah’s staff in collaboration with their colleagues both in Israel and abroad.

The Vision Documents constitute the first time that Israel’s Arab citizens expressed their own view of the future of the Israeli state. According to Jamal the Vision Documents are an expression of the increasing general will that strives for more homogeneity amongst all of the different groups belonging to the Palestinian-Arab minority in Israel. The reason such an expression took more than fifty years to emerge is that the Palestinian-Arab society that had been present in mandate Palestine was destroyed during the first Arab Israeli War and had to be rebuilt afterwards. This, however, was seriously complicated by the fact that they were disorganized, dispossessed and leaderless after the war, were a heterogeneous group and in addition faced the restricting measures of the Israeli government. As Kimmerling and Migdal state it was only “[a]fter the 1967 war, when the three fragments of historical Palestine – Israel, the Gaza Strip, and the West Bank – were rejoined under Israeli control, many Arab citizens of Israel could again begin to define themselves as part of the larger Palestinian community.” Furthermore, as the same authors argue, the political emergence of Israel’s Arab citizens only took off in the second half of the 1970s.


---
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Notwithstanding that the three above mentioned events could also be treated as acts of resistance against the curtailment of a collective Palestinian-Arab identity Kimmerling and Migdal’s analysis suggests that Arab society within Israel only fully politically emerged at the end of the Second, al-Aqsa, Intifada. This is supported by the work of Jamal who states that, “the mere idea of thinking about a future vision document that defines the identity of the Palestinian homeland minority and its values and goals reflects a maturity that did not exist before.” Moreover the fact that the organizations that have written and published the Vision Documents have only been established in the years 1982, 1996 and 2000 further supports this claim.

The Vision Documents are part of the action-reaction process of the societal security dilemma in the sense that they address the status quo of the Israeli state and attend to the areas in which Israeli government law and policy has sought to restrict the emergence of a collective identity amongst its Arab citizens. All three documents connect the collective identity of Israel’s Arab citizens to the broader Palestinian nation as all of them speak in terms of Palestinian-Arabs in Israel, the Palestinian minority or Palestinian-Arab citizens of Israel. “[T]he documents constitute an expression of the development of a distinctive collective political consciousness that does not separate itself from its mother nation, the Palestinian people, but nonetheless asserts its uniqueness and its special needs and interests.”

The main societal security requirement presented in the Vision Documents is the demand that the Israeli state relinquishes its exclusive Jewish identity. As such the Vision Documents are not only a clear reaction to the status quo but also specifically aim to strengthen the collective identity of the Palestinian-Arabs in Israel and to weaken the Jewish identity of the Israeli state. In the introduction of The Future Vision this becomes evident from the following words:

Defining the Israeli State as a Jewish state and exploiting democracy in the service of its Jewishness excludes us, and creates tension between us and the nature and essence of the State. Therefore, we call for a Consensual Democratic system that enables us to be fully active in the decision-making process and guarantee our individual and collective civil, historic, and national rights.
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Another central societal security requirement, which is closely related to the one mentioned above, is the demand that the Israeli state recognizes its Arab citizens as an innate national minority that has collective rights. The relationship the Arab citizens have with the historic homeland of Palestine plays an important role in this. The fundamental basis of all three Vision Documents is that the Arab citizens of Israel are a homeland, or indigenous, minority within Israel but are also part of the larger Palestinian nation and should be recognized as such. Such recognition would serve to strengthen their collective identity. Moreover, in light of human rights discourse and the right to self-determination this further supports the insistence that Israel should recognize its responsibility for the injustices of the Nakba and the Occupation as expressed in all the documents.

The right to self-determination also constitutes a societal security requirement in itself. The Vision Documents speak explicitly against the attempts to forge a new Israeli-Arab identity as well as against its policy of treating the Arab population along the lines of the religious sects they belong to. For example, The Haifa Declaration states: “[…] Despite all the attempts to splinter us into sectarian groups and to truncate our identity into a misshapen “Israeli-Arab” one, we have spared no effort to preserve our Palestinian identity and national dignity and to fortify it.”90 The Future Vision speaks about the attempt of Israel to create a new identity on the basis of “loyalty to the state” through the Arab educational curricula.91 This is due to the fact that the Arab educational curriculum for public schools still upholds educational objectives that neglect Palestinian Arab culture, history and values as articulated in the 1953 Law of State Education.92 For example, “general Arab history was taught and was presented as complementary to the history of the Israeli state and Zionism.”93 Another example provided by Abu-Saad is the 2004 “100 Basic Concepts” curriculum unit which systematically presented all the concept lists for Arab schools as only relevant for the Arabic sector but simultaneously omitted all history of the Palestinian people.94

From the right to self-determination follows the call for national institutional autonomy in the areas of education, culture and religion which constitute another societal security requirement. In The Future Vision the general demand for institutional autonomy is
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90 The Haifa Declaration, 8.
91 The Future Vision of the Palestinian Arabs in Israel, 32.
93 Kimmerling and Migdal. The Palestinian People. 178.
94 See Abu Saad. “State Educational Policy and Curriculum.” 710-712.
justified as follows: “The relation with the “other”, the Israeli, does not present the relation with Jewish culture but the relation with the State and its Institutions. The State has not determined a position acceptable to us yet in terms of nurturing our Arab culture.”95 In the area of education this translates to an alternative to the above mentioned Arab educational curricula by the state which is “limiting contribution in enhancing the cultural identity.”96 Instead The Future Vision poses that the Palestinian-Arabs in Israel have a right to self-administration of the educational system and self-determination of its policy and should adopt the education objectives drafted by the Follow Up Committee for Arab Education in Israel in 1994.97

In the area of religious autonomy a similar argument is made for autonomous institutions for all the different religious groups amongst the Arab citizens of Israel. The Future Vision expresses that “Israel should no longer be in control of the Islamic and Christian holy sites and acknowledge their right of self-rule as part of the collective rights given to the Palestinian-Arabs.”98 In the area of cultural autonomy the inferior status of the Arabic language is an issue and there is a call for equality between the Hebrew language and the Arabic language. The Democratic Constitution does this through proposing a legal bilingual state in which both the languages “are the official languages of the state of Israel and enjoy equal status in all of the functions and activities of the legislative and executive branches.”99 The authors of The Democratic Constitution base this proposal on their “perception of the essence of an imaginary federal regime.”100 In addition to educational, cultural and religious autonomy The Democratic Constitution proposes that “[e]very citizen is entitled to establish and maintain his or her family, social, cultural, religious and economic relations with members of his or her people or nation, including the right to freely cross borders to them.”101

The last societal security requirement expressed in the Vision Documents lies in the area of political participation within the Israeli state. The possibility of political participation is related to, and dependent on, the demand that the Israeli state abandons its Jewish nature. The Vision Documents view this as a necessity in order to enable equal political access and
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participation. *The Haifa Declaration* phrases it as follows: “a change in the definition of the State of Israel from a Jewish state to a democratic state established on national and civil equality between the two national groups, and enshrining the principles of banning discrimination and of equality between all of its citizens and residents.”102 Furthermore, the Vision Documents advocate “guaranteeing Palestinian citizens in Israel the right of veto in all matters that concern their status.”103

In conclusion, the Vision Documents illustrate how the action-reaction process within the societal security dilemma between the Arab and Jewish societies in Israel takes place. The Vision Documents are a quite direct reaction to the political-legal measures discussed in the previous chapter which are perceived by the minority as threats to their collective Palestinian-Arab identity. The societal security requirements that are presented in the Vision Documents are in line with what would be expected from minority societal security requirements: a measure of control over the territory to which the Palestinian-Arab identity of Israel’s Arab citizens is bound as well as control over the institutions that are responsible for the reproduction of that identity.104 The first is expressed through the demand that the Israeli state relinquishes its Jewish nature, acknowledges the Palestinian-Arabs in Israel as a homeland minority, the advancement of political participation and the insistence that all of Israel’s Palestinian-Arabs are to be able to travel freely to the Occupied Territories in order to maintain social, economic, religious and familial relations. The second is expressed through the demand that Israel’s Palestinian-Arabs receive institutional autonomy in the areas of religion, culture, and education as well as the demand for the elevation of the status of the Arabic language through the implementation of a legal bilingual state. Like the Jewish majority, the Palestinian-Arab minority demonstrates security-seeking behavior in order to safeguard their collective identity, or at least expresses the desire to do so, as the Vision Documents are only a recommendations. On the other side the minority is non-expansionist as it operates within the framework of the Israeli state and accepts its existence. The societal security requirements of the Palestinian-Arab minority, however, mitigate the societal security requirements of the Jewish majority meaning that the societal security requirements of the two groups are incompatible.
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Conclusion

The main research question of this thesis was whether a societal security dilemma can be identified within the state of Israel between the Jewish-Israeli society and the Palestinian-Arab society in Israel and if so, what kind of security dilemma. “Societal security dilemmas occur when the actions that groups take to secure their identity cause reactions in others, which, in the end, leave all parties less secure.”\textsuperscript{105} The Jewish and Arab citizens of Israel find themselves within the action-reaction process of such a societal security dilemma. They are locked into a regular societal security dilemma with incompatible societal security requirements in which the Jewish society exhibits expansionist security-seeking behavior and the Arab society exhibits non-expansionist security-seeking behavior.

Jewish-Israeli society, constituting the majority, has always perceived the Palestinian-Arab citizens as a threat to the survival of the Jewish state as well as to the survival of the Jewish majority within the Israeli state. This threat perception is interconnected with, and dependent on, the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. Jewish-Israeli society therefore behaves as a security-seeker with regard to Israel’s Palestinian-Arab citizens and employs political-legal measures in order to prevent the emergence of a collective Palestinian-Arab identity amongst them. Instead they have attempted to impose a new, Israeli-Arab civic identity upon the Palestinian-Arab society present in Israel. The process of Judaization of the land with its features of land appropriation additionally constitutes expansionist behavior. The Jewish majority legitimately perceives threats to its collective identity, even if some of these threats are misperceived, and is therefore not merely a power-seeker which rules out the possibility of a loose societal security dilemma from the majority side of the dilemma. The possibility of a tight security dilemma is ruled out because the Jewish majority rightly perceived that Israel’s Arab citizens identify themselves as part of the Palestinian people first and as Israeli citizens second and that they disagree with the Jewish character of the Israeli state. Jewish-Israeli society is thus an expansionist security-seeker.

The Palestinian-Arab society in Israel, although it took a long time to rebuild after the establishment of the Israeli state, in turn perceives the political-legal measures employed by Jewish-Israeli society as a threat to their Palestinian-Arab identity. Lacking concrete political power within the Israeli state to influence these political-legal measures they employed the only legal means available to them within the structure of the Israeli state and presented their
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societal security requirements in the Vision Documents. The Vision Documents plead for the official recognition of the Palestinian-Arabs in Israel as an indigenous minority in their historic homeland, minority control over all institutions relating to cultural reproduction and most importantly they plead for the relinquishment of the Jewish character of the Israeli state which would give them equal control over the territory to which their societal identity is bound. However, because the Vision Documents accept the existence of Israel and operate within the framework of the state they are not expansionist. For this same reason the Palestinian-Arab minority is also not a power-seeker and the possibility of a loose security dilemma is therefore also ruled out from the minority side of the dilemma. Due to the fact that there is no misperception about the intentions of the Jewish majority to curtail the collective Palestinian-Arab identity a tight societal security dilemma is out of the question. Palestinian-Arab society within Israel is thus a non-expansionist security-seeker.

The basic assumption in this thesis was that the societal security dilemma holds an alternative and valuable approach to understanding the relationship between the Palestinian-Arab and Jewish citizens of Israel and the dynamics of unequal citizenship. The analysis of the societal security dilemma offered in this thesis contributes to our understanding of the topic in several ways. Firstly, the societal security dilemma is valuable because it is not merely a tool to describe the behavior of different societies on the intrastate level but also offers an explanation of the motivations that inspire certain actions and reactions without having to label societies as racist or necessarily having to utilize international law discourses. Gaining insight in the motivations for the behavior of both the Jewish majority and the Palestinian-Arab minority helps to create a better and more holistic understanding of the situation in the state of Israel. Secondly, utilizing the societal security dilemma as a way to view the societies in Israel opens up the opportunity to constructively think about possible solutions that could reduce the tension between the Jewish majority and the Palestinian-Arab minority in the future. This could help to prevent the further escalation of the currently present societal security dilemma and the possible outbreak of violent conflict between the Jewish majority and the Palestinian-Arab minority in the future. However, this would require further research.
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