More American Jewish women than American Jewish men joined the Zionist movement and made aliyah in the pre-state of Israel era. Yet few studies have examined the nexus between American Jewish women and Zionism. An outgrowth of a conference on American Jewish woman and Zionism held in 1999 at Brandeis University, this book is an attempt to rectify that situation.

Part I, “Three generations of American Jewish women and the Zionist Idea,” examines the Zionist vision and activities of Emma Lazarus (1849–1887), Henrietta Szold (1860–1945) and Marie Syrkin (1899–1989). Arthur Zeiger describes Lazarus’s proto-Zionist ideas and contends that “to no one in the nineteenth century, belongs so much responsibility … for keeping Zionism alive as Emma Lazarus” (17). However Lazarus, whose stirring call to “give me your tired, your hungry” called upon America to be a haven for the oppressed, actually urged American Jewry to support resettlement of its “tired and hungry” Russian Jewish brethren in a restored Jewish ancient homeland Palestine! Zeiger, however, does not explain or even note this obvious paradox.

The book’s second section deals with women’s Zionist organizations and reveals that these groups often proved more robust than their male counterparts. Baila Shargel explains how Bessie Gotsfeld, the founder of Women’s Mizrahi of America (WMA), resisted domination by orthodoxy’s patriarchal culture. Shargel exposes Gotsfeld’s discreet accommodation (or perhaps subterfuge?) in WMAs fundraising promotion for a technical high school that actually prepared Orthodox girls for the workplace but underscored its teaching of “domestic science [so that these] future housewives [could] function more efficiently in the kitchen, laundry and garden” (80). Two essays in this section raise the question of Hadassah’s success and the role of gender. Mary McCune notes that by focusing on “facts of life projects: birth, bread and shelter and disease” Hadassah provided a female “gendered perspective” (90). For Mira Katzburg-Yungman, Hadassah’s “facts of life projects” reflect not a female perspective but rather the traditional Jewish ideals of Zedakah (philanthropy), Gemilot Hasidim (acts of loving kindness), and Bikur Holim (caring for the sick). By the early twentieth century, Mira Katzburg-Yungman, notes, American
Jewry was no longer an orthodox community. By participating in Hadassah facts of life projects, Katzburg-Yungman contends, non-observant women could fulfill a secularized version of traditional Jewish ideals.

Mary McCune examines Hadassah’s success in attracting members of the non-Zionist National Council of Jewish Women to join sewing circles for Palestine. Esther Carmel-Hakim’s essay describes the Hadassah-WIZO merger in Canada. In both cases, the scholars found, it was the non-ideological projects that enabled Hadassah to attract other women and women’s organizations and gain wider acceptance of the Zionist program.

Mark Raider’s essay relates the success of Pioneer Women, the women’s organization of the American Labor Zionist movement, to the role of certain shlihot (female emissaries from Palestine). Raider describes how Pioneer Women followed the direction of its Palestine sister organization, Moetzet Hapoalot (Council of Women Workers) in promoting a labor-led society in Palestine. But if Shargel’s Bessie Gotsfeld refused to accede to the domination of Mizrahi, the same could not be said for Pioneer Women vis-à-vis their counterpart in the Land of Israel. Pioneer Women was willing to accept the leadership and follow the dictates of the Palestinian women labor leaders. Here the issue is less about gender differences than about Diaspora-Israel relationships.

The section on American olot presents scholarly and inspirational essays, which depict the individual stories of four women who helped build the Yishuv: a kibbutz founder who became a health service provider in the upper Galilee; the upper middle-class socialite who secured funds for the then illegal Hagana defense force; a wealthy American woman who provided financial and political support for a left-wing kibbutz; and the fourth prime-minister of Israel. The common thread of these essays was the self-fulfillment these women attained living in Palestine and contributing to the Zionist enterprise.

The last section of the book consists of documentary portraits, mainly based on memoirs and letters written by women themselves. These first-person accounts enable the reader to vicariously appreciate the life-altering experiences of women who made aliyah and provide still another way of understanding how American Jewish women related to the Zionist enterprise.

The diversity of the volume’s twenty-three chapters is both its strength and weakness. The multiplicity of perspectives serves as a warning not to generalize about American Jewish women Zionists, although the many varied approaches sometimes create confusion. The editors’ introductions to each article seek to find common threads among the many chapters and while they help the reader focus on each article’s central message, they do not always succeed in stitching together the uneven essays in a coherent whole. Perhaps the definitive book on this issue cannot yet be written. Indeed, the 1999 Brandeis conference was only the second gathering to address the role of women in Zionism. American Jewish Women and
the Zionist Enterprise provides an excellent foundation for beginning the scholarly analysis of the phenomenon.

Jerry Kutnick
Gratz College


Jacob Lassner and S. Ilan Troen present a wide ranging and original account of the Arab-Jewish conflict over Israel and the Palestinian territories in Jews and Muslims in the Arab World: Haunted by Pasts Real and Imagined. Their foremost thesis is that both sides employ narratives of distant pasts to construct identities and shape politics. “Whether real or imagined, the past filtered through collective memory has had and will continue to have an enormous influence on how Jews and Arabs perceive themselves and others … Western observers are impatient that the drama … is still without a final act. … No other conflict has been scrutinized so closely … yet this surfeit of attention has not led to a profound understanding of the issues” (ix).

This book tries its best to present both Israeli and Arab narratives and examine the nuances of each. Their examination runs the gamut from the most basic—what is the meaning of the word “Arab”?—to the more obscure, such as the role of the Copenhagen School of Archeology in “denying the historicity of all Hebrew scripture” (229).

Troen and Lassner position their book at the forefront of recent debate about and accusations against Israel. They address forthrightly the claim made by Jimmy Carter and others that Israel is becoming an apartheid state. The authors assert that comparisons to apartheid or colonialism make “for a concoction that tastes flat to a cultivated historical palate” (xi). They authors eschew simplistic accusations and descriptions in favor of richer detail and analysis. Although attempting to provide an original narrative, the authors stick with a chronological unfolding of well-known history. The first half of the book examines the development of Arab nationalism and the subsequent rise of Islamism among the Palestinians. The second half examines the origins of the Jewish people, Zionism and the creation of Israel. The book includes numerous interesting digressions, such as an entire chapter on the role of Biblical scholarship and the competing claims of the authenticity of the ancient kingdoms of Israel.

This volume provides an original discussion of the Ottoman and Mandatory Arab school systems and their role in the development of Arab nationalism. The discussion of the rise of the PLO and Hamas is less nuanced and merely repeats
what has been written elsewhere. Although the authors acknowledge that Christian Arabs once made up a large and influential community in Palestine, they focus on the role of Islam because diminished Christian numbers has meant diminished influence as well. Although the competing narratives that dominate the modern conflict are primarily between Muslim Palestinians and Jewish Israelis, the neglect of the Arab Christians who played an important role in crafting the early Arab opposition to Zionism is unfortunate. In fact, early Zionist leaders made much greater inroads among traditional Arab Muslim leaders than they ever made among the more urbanized and politicized Christian Arab elite.

In discussing proposed “solutions” to the Jewish-Palestinian conflict the authors discount binationalism, saying it is the realm of “cosmopolitan talking heads who dismiss all forms of nationalism and monoculturalism as vestigial appendages in a rapidly shrinking globe” (167). This is an important observation because binationalism has recently reemerged as a proposed solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the subject of new scholarship. Lassner and Troen address this phenomenon with high-minded prose, making this work neither shrill nor dry.

In discussing the controversial question of whether Zionism was a form of colonialism, the authors provide the full context of Herzl’s “a land without a people” and note that “Zionism never imagined the land was unpopulated” (303). The authors connect the idea of Palestine as a semi-deserted, or at least underpopulated, landscape with the concept of terra nullius (land belonging to no one) and established norms of European settlement in the New World and Australia, where courts defined the land as not having been owned by anyone and thus open for immigration and distribution to immigrants. Though this may irk readers who dislike connections between Zionism and colonialism, this study presents the idea in such a fashion so as to not make Zionism illegitimate but rather to provide contextual depth to Zionist thought. However the very notion of terra nullius seems ill-applied here because whereas the English settlers in Australia actually believed the land was owned by the English crown—which had the right to distribute it—rather than belonging to the aboriginals, the Jewish settlers in Palestine purchased much of their lands directly from Arab landholders.

But the most important part of the book is its conclusion that “those who seek a just solution to the conflict ought to consider the delicate balance of today’s world in assimilating the lessons of history … the first step is to recognize difference without falsely demeaning the other’s culture” (352). Herein lies real nuance, a book on the Arab-Israeli conflict that goes beyond stereotypes, simple explanations, shrill name-calling, and seeks to provide depth to a very rich discussion about the role of “real and imagined” narratives of the past and their role in the present.

Seth J. Frantzman

*Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

In this eloquent and insightful anthropology of tourism in Israel between the 1993 Oslo negotiations and the aftermath of the second Palestinian uprising, Rebecca L. Stein follows the itineraries of (mostly Ashkenazi) Israeli Jews in their leisurely consumption of Palestinian tourist destinations. It was a short-lived period of mutual recognition and talk of co-existence, all the more poignant against the backdrop of the violence and terror that followed. New perceptions of Israel’s Palestinian citizenry were being crystallized, transcending the salient conception of them as a political threat. Tourism came to reformulate what Stein calls “national intelligibility,” designating what is recognizable according to the dominant national script (2–3). Its material affects were shot through with symbolic resonance, as state officials, private entrepreneurs, and tourists began reimagining and rewriting the terms and boundaries of national identity. Stein reconstructs the terms of this negotiation in multiple and complementary sites, beginning with media accounts of Israelis touring (or composing fantasy routs into) the Arab Middle East, wherein normative boundaries and practices warded off the threatening prospects of porous borders dissolving the nation-state into the open expanse of an Arab political and cultural horizon; and ending with the cafés of Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv emptied of their terror-stricken patrons, being infused with the symbolism of beleaguered European-inflected culture in the throws of a civilization war.

At the heart of the book is a decoding of the Israeli-Palestinian tourist market in the Palestinian towns and villages of the Galilee and in the culinary tourism of Abu Ghosh. In these sites, protocols of Palestinian civic identity, spatiality, and normativity were inscribed in the architecture and practices of hosting villages, hospitality tents, music festivals, markets, home-based attractions, and ethnic restaurants—where they were sometimes challenged. Conflict is introduced here into an otherwise peaceful veneer, because the contestation of the landscapes of leisure repeatedly takes shape as Palestinian historicity and political grievances. The isolated, unpredictable, and often shrill outbursts that Stein witnesses at the Palestinian Heritage Museum in Sakhnin or the kitchen of an Abu Ghosh bakery seem out of place in light of her account of the carefully wrought facade of familiar and often banal tourist practices. Yet the contrast is deliberate, because one of her goals is to demonstrate the shaky ground on which actors traffic in a deterritorialized “oriental allure” (63). Boundary-testing is only possible, it appears, with a protective overlay of commoditization, complete with the trappings of multiculturalism (47), fortified by Palestinian performances of patriotism (68), and etched into the quasi-authenticity of stone walkways, ancient walls, and domed roofs (83)—func-
tioning, in effect, to denude these spaces of tourism of their political valence and to bracket their troubled history.

A question that remains unresolved is that of agency or determination. What accounts for the range of material and symbolic effects so richly described? The issue is broached in the introduction, where Stein suggests that “tourism provided a convenient toolbox with which to forge new notions of national identity befitting an altered regional landscape” (3). The actors she identifies as wielding these tools are multiple, from state officials and ministries, Jewish Israeli consumers and consultants, to Palestinian hosts, entrepreneurs, and middlemen, all with their distinct desires, interests, and agendas. The outcomes of these contestations, however, are highly predictable and not unique to Israel: the production of differentiated and standardized consumer niches, their depoliticization and erasure of injustices and inequalities, and their ultimate incapacity to seal the floodgates of a bracketed reality fraught with hostility and violence, kept provisionally at bay—are all common denominators in contemporary catastrophes in international tourist destinations. The global economy, which Stein mentions in passing as an enabling factor for the symbolic negotiations she describes, merits closer examination in that respect. From the perspective of the newly liberalized market in Israel, tourism could be conceived of as an extension of a global dynamic that transforms active cohabitants and rivals into passive consumers of pleasure. Perhaps an overriding logic is at work, which could go a long way in explaining why challenges to the common narrative are so sparse and inconsequential, as Palestinian entrepreneurs rush headlong to cooperate with well-meaning left-leaning Jewish-Israelis in keeping the national wound festering in darkness while capital is being generated. Such propositions invite further analysis of a topic for which Stein blazes a promising trail.

Hadas Weiss
University of Chicago


In Arab-Israeli Military Forces in an Era of Asymmetric Wars, Anthony Cordesman offers a systematic analysis of the military forces and security challenges of six countries in the Middle East: Israel, Syria, Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, and Palestine. The volume is based on an impressive array of data related first to the quantities and types of weapons at the disposal of the air, naval, ground, and para-military forces of these actors; and second, and perhaps more important, on key develop-
ments related to personnel, doctrine, evolving modes of operational action and continuing strategic challenges and possibilities. The volume places a special focus on asymmetric conflicts and the ways in which each force has adapted to the challenges posed by such struggles; on the impact of the revolution in military technology on modes of waging combat; and the internal security threats characterizing each country. Apart from six chapters, one devoted to each case, the volume also includes a short introduction and conclusion and two substantive chapters that cover major trends in force strength and the impact of recapitalization and force modernization on military effectiveness.

Empirically, data for the book is derived from newspapers, popular magazines, government reports and documents, Web sites, various editions of Jane's security assessments, and academic books and articles. This very rich data set allows Cordesman both to present exhaustive information as well as comparative analyses. The data, moreover, is presented in clear figures and graphs that allow readers to see developments over a number of years.

Along with praise, the book also deserves some criticism. First, it lacks an index, which makes it relatively difficult to locate information on specific issues or phenomena in a text that runs over 400 pages. Second, it could have benefited from a reading by someone who knows Hebrew (I cannot vouch for the level of Arabic). There are a number of mistakes—for instance, Hei instead of Heil (for corps) or Kushet instead of Keshet (for rainbow)—that mar the text. Third, although this paperback edition was published in 2008, the original hardback edition appeared in 2006 and therefore even the paperback does not include the Second Lebanon War that took place in the summer of that year (a short epilogue could have easily brought the volume up to date in this respect).

For readers of this journal, Cordesman's volume provides an excellent evaluation of the military power of Israel and its immediate neighbors. Although written from the point of view of security experts and analysts it will be a good sourcebook for scholars interested in security, strategy, and the armed forces. For scholars interested specifically in Israel, the volume offers a mix of security, political and economic analysis. Thus for instance, Cordesman is careful to illuminate the background and the future implications of such actions undertaken by Israel as erecting the separation barrier between it and Palestine, targeted killings, countering Palestinian smuggling and manufacturing of weapons or joint (inter-service and inter-organizational) missions. The volume, moreover, is written in clear prose with little academic jargon making it very accessible to a variety of readerships.

Eyal Ben-Ari
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

This book examines U.S. arms transfers to Israel from the administration of President Harry Truman to that of Ronald Reagan. Two principal themes emerge. First, during the 1960s the United States became Israel’s principal arms supplier, adding the security dimension to the economic assistance it already extended to the country. The United States thus acquired a certain degree of control over Israeli policy, evident in Israel’s acceptance of the August 1970 ceasefire ending its War of Attrition with Egypt and the decision not to strike first in October 1973, when an attack on it was imminent. Second, a patron-client arrangement, rather than the binding framework of an alliance, has been the basis for U.S.-Israeli relations, both sides preferring to abstain from commitments that would impose strategic constraints. This is what Rodman succinctly terms the “security-for-autonomy” bargain.

Rodman devotes far more attention to the 1960s than the years preceding and following that period. This is partly justified, because that decade brought a series of “breakthroughs” for Israel. In 1962 the United States consented to sell Israel Hawk anti-aircraft missiles, in 1965 M-48 (Patton) tanks, in 1966 A-4 Skyhawk combat planes, and in 1968 the far more advanced F-4 Phantom jet fighter. Rodman has written elsewhere on U.S.-Israeli arms deals and in this book, too, he explains cogently the circumstances in which Israel acquired military hardware from the superpower that by the end of that decade became its patron.

This study makes the subject of U.S. arms to Israel highly accessible and in that manner fills a gap in the literature on U.S.-Israeli relations. The author explains in clear and lucid fashion the strategic background to several major arms deals. At the same time, his analysis places in perspective both the issue of Israel’s nuclear capability and the role of the pro-Israel lobby in the United States. Thus, Rodman makes effective use of the literature on Israel’s nuclear opacity to recount how successive U.S. administrations turned a “blind eye” to its development of a nuclear military option, the product of its reactor at Dimona. He explains the limits on the influence of Israel’s supporters in Washington, juxtaposing U.S. strategic interests with the extent of that lobby’s sway. U.S. policy toward the Arab states and the background of the Cold War are also dealt with in a balanced manner, thus providing the overall context both for earlier U.S. reluctance to sell Israel military hardware and for later decisions to provide it with arms.

The brevity of this work (97 pages of text) apparently made exigent the rather cursory treatment that marks several important junctures in U.S.-Israeli relations. The author provides no details of the important arms deals of 1972, 1973, and (following the Yom Kippur war) 1974. There are no figures on the U.S. arms airlift to Israel during the 1973 war. The Ford administration’s threat in 1975 to “reassess”
relations and withhold arms from Israel is left virtually unexamined. The administra-
trations of Carter and Reagan are covered in only seven pages, creating a certain
imbalance in the attention accorded each period.

These limitations notwithstanding, this book is a concise and well-written ac-
count of the evolution of the framework in which the United States sells Israel
arms. Rodman argues convincingly that the type of relationship he describes is
clearly in the interest of both countries and likely to remain the setting for their
bilateral ties for a long time.

Zach Levey
University of Haifa

Risa Domb, ed., *Contemporary Israeli Women’s Writing* (London and Port-
land, OR: Vallentine Mitchell, 2008), pp. 339, $30.00 (paper); $75.00 (cloth).

This is Risa Domb’s second anthology of fiction by Israeli women writers. The first,
*New Women’s Writing from Israel*, came out in 1996. The late 1980s and the 1990s
were a period when Hebrew writing by women achieved dramatic new successes,
and Domb was among the trendsetters in bringing this phenomenon to English
reading audiences. Her new book showcases a fine assortment of authors, some of
whom also appeared in her first collection: Ruth Almog, Leah Aini, Chana Bat Sha-
har, Savyon Liebrecht, and Nurit Zarhi. Domb also includes other well-established
writers, such as Judith Katzir, Nava Semel, and Maya Bejerano, along with some
(such as Orna Coussin) who are less published in English.

The current volume does not come equipped with an extensive critical intro-
duction or a well-defined theoretical framework. In her opening remarks Domb
refers vaguely to “feminist” writers in the sense that is usually meant” (1). This is
an unfortunate formulation, because the word “feminism” means many different
things to different people. However, Domb does provide useful discussion of the
stories and the trends they represent. She points out especially the erotic dimen-
sions of the fiction and notes that these female authors, in contrast to most of their
predecessors writing in Hebrew, demonstrate new openness in expressing women’s
emotions and sexual feelings. The stories highlight multiple facets of motherhood,
new angles on marriage, and lesbian relationships.

An anthology of this sort is particularly valuable for teaching. Most people read
Israeli literature in translation in order to better understand Israeli society, and for
that purpose the most effective stories are those that explicitly address tensions
between the personal and the political, individual experience and social milieu.
What will work best from this selection? I would place my bets on the stories that
deal with religion: Judith Rotem, Michal Govrin, and Chana Bat Shahar deftly por-
tray women’s roles within the Orthodox world; the intertwining of Israeli and American haredi communities; and the fluidity of Jewish identity as Jews move from secular life to observance and vice versa. Yet these are primarily stories of personal life. Israeli literature in recent years has often turned away from collective issues to focus on private circumstances. Esty G. Hayim’s “Eilat” illustrates that dynamic in a notably direct way. In this story a vacation creates the opportunity for a love affair between two women. Trying to escape nightmares about terrorist attacks, trying to avoid listening to the news for a whole week, two friends spend a few days in Eilat and briefly, with unresolved feelings of transgression, slip loose from their usual heterosexual boundaries as they seek asylum in a realm of private feeling. The relationship of private to public spheres is more ambiguous in Judith Katzir’s “And the Clouds Sail On.” This is centrally a tale of miscarriage and infertility, but it broadens into an exploration of lost childhood, lost love, and other losses. National tragedy is in the background of all the narrative events, but does the background magnify what is in the foreground? Or does the foreground imply critique of the society in the background? It is hard to say. One of the certain strengths of the writing is the detailed description of place and time that vivifies memory and persuasively conveys the protagonist’s nostalgia. Other topics that emerge in this volume include the suffering of Holocaust survivors, the allure for Israelis of travel abroad (in Dorit Peleg’s “Encounter”), and kibbutz life (in Savyon Liebricht’s “Kibbutz”). Liebricht is a marvelous author, but be forewarned: this tale is one of her most bitter, a sharply disturbing attack on failed ideals of the Zionist pioneering ethos. In contrast, Shva Salhoov’s “Rainbow” does not directly invite national political reading, but it is a gem of a story about childhood alliances and power struggles and about cruelly different parental expectations of little boys and little girls.

Risa Domb died in 2007. In a short tribute to her at the front of the anthology, Nicholas de Lange notes both her path-breaking role teaching Modern Hebrew literature at Cambridge University and her wider efforts to promote appreciation of Israeli culture in Great Britain. Readers are fortunate that she has left us one more book.

Naomi Sokoloff
University of Washington


Land Expropriation in Israel is a powerful exploration of the political and cultural tensions between law and individual rights. Yifat Holzman-Gazit explains why Israel’s Supreme Court typically upholds the legality of land expropriations initi-
ated by the country’s executive branch, frequently in contrast to generally accepted ideas of civil rights. Holzman-Gazit places culture and politics at the center of her explanation. In so doing, she sets in motion several captivating arguments concerning the constraints not only of a parliamentary system on judicial activism but also, and more important, of the difficulties of constructing laws that override or ignore the cultural beliefs of the population.

Yifat Holzman-Gazit shows how Supreme Court justices could have forged available legal precedents into arguments for limiting the expropriation of private lands. Israel’s laws are drawn from Ottoman and British sources and a rich legacy of Jewish traditions. Though Israel’s nationalist ambitions would seem to have demanded a rejection of its colonial past, the government has relied heavily on a 1943 mandatory law allowing land to be transferred from private to state ownership for public use. Ironically, a legal instrument of colonial rule became, for Israel, a means of imprinting a national identity on the country’s land.

Although justices were eventually emboldened to grant hearings to people whose property was expropriated by the state, they embraced that protection only after a 1986 ruling from Israel’s Attorney General. Holzman-Gazit poses the question as to why this extraordinary judicial deference. Why did the justices accept the government’s legal reasoning even when the sources of law offered resources for crafting results contrary to these actions? In her answer, Holzman-Gazit depicts a complex picture. First, although the Jewish state won its War of Independence in 1948, it neither secured its borders nor was it granted full recognition over this land that continues to be contested by divergent national claims and competing holy writs. Second, the Supreme Court had not yet established its own latitude for interpreting and tempering executive orders let alone parliamentary mandates. Justices exhibited what Holzman-Gazit calls an exaggerated formalism, a type of legal reasoning indicating that nothing could be done beyond applying and enforcing the literal commands of the law. At Israel’s founding, Supreme Court justices were also effectively limited in the exercise of their authority by the uncertainty of their tenure and the difficulty of enforcing their judgments against the will of the executive or of the legislature. The embattled condition under which these justices did their work and rendered their decisions helped to contribute to their deference to executive authority.

Perhaps because the country had no written constitution and thus could not provide the Supreme Court with a textual reference, Israel’s justices were not only divided on how and when to exercise the authority of judicial review; they also questioned whether they possessed the prerogatives of that authority. The 1992 Basic Law on Human Dignity and Liberty provided the conceptual framework for the Court to broaden its protection of individual rights—including the right to private property—and to withdraw some issues from the realm of nation-building to the context of universal principle. But even when the Supreme Court moved beyond
the strictures of formalism with regard to the civil rights of Israel’s citizens, it still ruled largely in favor of the expropriation of privately owned land.

Because the culture of Zionist nation-building possessed such a deep animus toward private property, it left relics not so much in the form of Israel’s economic policies as in assumptions underlying the country’s public discourse. Without deeming the idea of private interest illegitimate, Israelis are inclined to regard it as compromising the public good. Hence, although the notion that Israel expropriated lands as a matter of advancing its political interests against Palestinian Arabs may be widely accepted, it does not fully explain why the Court’s rulings have sustained the expropriation of privately owned Jewish as well as Arab property. Whatever one thinks of these decisions, they are all impossible to understand without reference to the country’s deeply ingrained cultural values. Israel is a country whose norms and values run decidedly against the idea of protecting private property as an important natural right.

Various traditions have always converged, then, in the cases on land expropriation. The Zionist ambition to remake Jewish identity was deeply infused in the idea of physical labor on national land as redemptive. The intense pressure to accommodate the urgent needs of a large flow of immigrants during Israel’s first years evolved as a cultural and moral mission that encouraged the transfer of land from private to public and national use. The Supreme Court could only establish its legal authority and earn the respect of Israel’s citizens if it reflected the country’s fundamental convictions and beliefs.

Just as Israel’s Supreme Court writes and conveys its opinions within the medium of the Hebrew language, it conceives its judgments within the web of cultural understandings that it shares with the people it serves. Because expropriation of land is a concrete manifestation of sovereignty, as long as Israel is besieged, the Supreme Court is likely to commit its rulings to what is widely understood as a defense of Jewish statehood.

Donna Robinson Divine
Smith College


The first two chapters, examining Arab-Jewish relations in Mandatory Palestine, and arguing for regarding social identities as the crux of individual agency offer a glimpse of Kimmerling’s theoretical innovation. Chapter 2 also harbors the concept behind the book’s title. Alas, it debuts in passing and does not reappear. Kimmerling was adamant about incorporating the Arab-Israeli conflict as an integral variable in the sociological analysis of Israeli society. The “clash of identities” does not refer to the conflict between the Arab-Muslim-Palestinian identity vis-à-vis the Jewish-Israeli identity, but to ongoing intra-community identity tensions (31). All too often, Kimmerling tells us, this clash within the self is inflicted on the “significant other.”

Chapter 3 focuses on that “other,” namely the Palestinians, and examines the formation of their unique identity in the Ottoman and Mandate periods. Based on his joint research with Joel Migdal, Kimmerling cautiously contends that the 1834 revolt against the Egyptian regime “may have set the preconditions for a new self-consciousness or collective identity” (68). Kimmerling regards the much older, Jewish identity (in its Zionist reformulation) as poised between primordial and civic definitions of collective identity, corresponding to an ongoing tension between Eretz Israel and the State of Israel (chapter 4). The tension is subsequently developed, as “oscillation between universalist and particularist tendencies” (131) to account for the seeming paradox of state autonomy and the “apparent weakness on Israel’s part in the areas of making and implementing decisions” (130). The much-contested postulation of Israeli society as militarist is expounded on in chapters 6 and 7, emphasizing its origins in the Zionist interpretation of the collective (150).

Though often targeted (and sometimes praised) as post-modernist and post-Zionist, Kimmerling rejected both labels. “Perhaps a total or pure objectivity is never completely achievable,” he argued, “but it must definitely be our aim and desire” (156). Always critical of Zionism and Israeli society, he nonetheless described himself as a Zionist. However, the book clearly reflects the increasingly critical tone and content of his arguments. Although the portrayal of Israeli Jews as an immigrant-settler society, potentially comparable to other colonialist societies, was there all along, the book epilogue portrays Israel as “born in sin, on the ruins of another culture that had suffered politicide and partial ethnic cleansing.” Indeed, the main reason that “the Zionist state did not succeed in annihilating the rival indigenous culture” is that “it lacked the power to do so” (294).

This change of tone and content become apparent following the first Intifada. Thus, for example, in 1983 Kimmerling held that “the Arabs’ perception of Zionism as standing in a zero-sum position to their national aims became, to a large degree, a self-fulfilling prophecy” (26). By the 1990s, however, the “self-fulfilling prophecy” was more the result of Zionist “military preparedness” (152) and “sacredness of the land” (165). In 2002, referring to the “Basic Law: Human Dignity and Freedom,” Kimmerling was able to conclude with no difficulty that the law is applicable only within Jewish ethnic boundaries, making Israel a constitutionally
more exclusive state now than it was before 1992” (198). The book’s final chapters are markedly pessimistic. The prominence of the “primordialist” values and identities in the Israeli Jewish society undermines the “land for peace” approach (chapter 9), the chance of rapprochement between Israel’s Jews and Arabs (chapter 10), and the Oslo agreement (chapter 11), reaching an almost inevitable conclusion in Ariel Sharon’s grand plan of “politicide” against the Palestinians (chapter 12).

Kimmerling, a public intellectual, was happy to engage in polemics. It thus seems only fitting to end with one, regarding the role of land in Zionism, which Kimmerling held to be decisive. Consider then the “British Uganda Programme” (1903), the extraction of Transjordan from the British Mandate (1923), the Peel Commission plan (1937), the UN Resolution 181 on partition (1947), the withdrawal from Sinai without peace with Egypt (1957) and with (1978–1982), the non-annexation of the West Bank and the Gaza strip (since 1967), and finally the unilateral evacuation of the latter (2005) and of southern Lebanon (2000). All were endorsed (and sometimes initiated) by Zionist leaders. Might it be that demography—preserving a clear Jewish majority, and by extension at least a formal democracy—rather than the acquisition and sanctification of land, is the true hallmark of Zionism? The lively voice of Baruch Kimmerling on this, as in many other key questions, is sorely lacking.

Uriel Abulof
Princeton University


Poetry illuminated by biography is the linchpin of Nili Scharf Gold’s exhaustively documented Yehuda Amichai: The Making of Israel’s National Poet. Based on Amichai’s papers at Yale University’s Beinecke Library, and a private cache of love letters he wrote in 1947–1948, Gold demonstrates that Amichai—the representative Israeli poet—consciously constructed himself as such, and “camouflaged” the fact that he was the product of German culture.

Amichai (1924–2000) emigrated with his parents from Würzburg, Germany, to Mandatory Palestine at the age of 12. According to Gold, Amichai “consistently minimized Wuerzburg’s role as his hometown, especially in interviews he granted in Israel” (21), and “repeatedly used the phrase ‘my childhood in Jerusalem,’ as if his experiences before his migration to Israel had never occurred” (54). Gold observes that “Despite Amichai’s firm denial that he had ever written poems in German, there are long series of uninterrupted lines in German that can be read as complete poems” (117). She writes about Amichai’s notebooks in the Beinecke,
adding that Hebrew and German are frequently interwoven in his private writings. She finds that the “infant stages of some of Amichai’s most famous poems are hidden in these pads—a number of them originally written in his mother tongue” (118).

Gold’s meticulous juxtaposition of Amichai’s early life with his writings reveals sources of his imagery, such as snow, obviously uncommon in Israel (318). Her material on his life in Germany will interest those readers for whom the poet is a popular icon. But it should not be surprising that Amichai was influenced by his first language and culture. In fact, dozens of multilingual Central and Eastern European poets wrote modern and avant-garde Hebrew poetry at the dawn of the twentieth century, and many contemporary Israeli poets, most of them not famous outside Israel, switched from their mother tongues to Hebrew and became part of Israeli culture and helped to construct it.

Perhaps Amichai’s unprecedented popularity in English—and the appearance of a biographically focused work in English rather than Hebrew, the language of his poetry—has everything to do with his adopted Israeli persona. The image of Amichai is the one that many American Jews want to have of Israelis: a bit less macho than the stereotype, a bit more familiar with Jewish sources, warmhearted and democratic, accepting of the other, particularly, of the Palestinian. It may well be the case that, as Gold argues, that Amichai masked the Germanness of his poetry. But knowing this does not mean we have finished reading his work, for it is also about the world his poems create—and here we could use a critical guide to Amichai’s poetry.

For example, at the opening of the 2008 Jerusalem International Film Festival at the Sultan’s Pool, a well-known Amichai poem, “An Arab Shepherd is Searching for his Goat on Mount Zion,” was projected on the screen in English and Hebrew, presumably because the poem is situated exactly in that space. An Arab shepherd and a Jewish father are presented as equal, in that both have lost something. But the Arab is only missing an animal, a goat, while the Jew is missing a child. In the end they joyfully recover both animal and child. The poem hints at the violence of religious ritual, and the problem of scapegoating, but there would seem to be no scapegoat, no victim here. The Arab recovers his animal. Yet when the poem was flashed on the screen, the Swedish journalist sitting next to me was extremely disturbed by the obvious inequity of the goat-child equation.

In the section “Jerusalem 1967,” the Jewish speaker, whose father’s store “was burned there [in Nazi Europe],” offers a kind of mercantile kinship to an Arab store-owner in the Old City. The “Arab’s hole-in-the-wall shop” is likened to “an open Ark,” imputing an improbable Jewish holiness to the Arab’s space (and a romanticized holiness ascribed to shop keeping). “I told him in my heart that my father too / had a shop like this,” the speaker says. But the speaker does not actually communicate with the Palestinian; he talks to himself. The Arab is depicted
lowering his shutters in the third stanza, without our being told what he thinks: is he closing off his physical space (Palestine) to the persecuted Jews? Is the friendliness offered by Jewish immigrants falling on deaf ears, or has it not been expressed loudly enough?

We need to ask not only where poetry comes from, but where it is going. I sometimes despair to think that poetry does not matter, but it might mean more if we were to stop encouraging people to find biography—the real poet—in the poem, and begin to read poems beyond the ideas that we take for granted.

Lisa Katz

Hebrew University of Jerusalem


Definitions of history intersect with literary analysis in *The Israeli Memory Struggle*. The book presents six essays on history, imagination, discourse; post-nationalist discourse on Israeli history; history and irony; replacing history and identity; back to the Diaspora; history on TV: the Tekumah series; and post-nationalist discourse, globalization, and a new Jewish ethnoscape. The scope of the book is broad and at times, overreaching. Though identifying himself as a non-representationalist (12) Feldt nevertheless presents a critical overview of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in concrete, even positivist terms. Although describing his writing as a “re-weaving” which does not come closer to how things really are, Feldt foregoes tentative conjecture for a definitive version of post-Zionist reality with a one-sided recreation of historical events. His writing could have been less judgmental and more nuanced, particularly regarding the motivations and intent of conflict partners. Juxtaposing strategic suicide bombing with the intentions of the Israeli military is one example of a strong position taken by Feldt. He notes in an offhand manner that when an Israeli soldier kills a Palestinian child he considers it “beyond discussion that it happens intentionally” (167). Yet terror is described more vaguely as a counter-attack to “the continued colonization of Palestine” and not the intentional killing of Israeli civilians.

Although Feldt terms texts not to be messages but unfinished vocabularies (13), his definitive conclusions regarding a complicated conflict and heavy-handed language scream out as anything but a request for continued conversation. Ostensibly aiming for nothing less than an informed and coherent inquiry into the use of history in Israeli texts from the 1990s (14) Feldt validates only one view. In his discussion of Zionism as part of European colonialism Feldt terms “Zionist
apologetics” those who present a more nuanced form of Zionism as differing from other types of colonialism, because it did not spring of a mother country, as full of “nonsense” (33). Elsewhere in the book—such as when Feldt refers to the 1967 conquest of the occupied territories as the first major challenge to the hegemony of the Labor Party (35)—he makes a similar political generalization by omitting such events as the Lavon Affair or the Kastner trial, which occurred earlier and were considered serious challenges to the government, although they were not directly linked to the occupation.

Once one gets beyond Feldt's position as the sole dispenser of legitimate morality, the book can be a guide to shifting perceptions of Israeli identity. Feldt's detailed analysis of the 1998 television series Tekumah provides a critical look at Israeli preparedness to investigate cherished national memories and acknowledge that some are actually myths, and reality is much more complicated and perhaps not as noble. A thoughtful overview comments on the work of new historians such as Benny Morris. The book will be particularly useful for those interested in Morris's career following the publication of a 1998 article in Tikkun, which sparked debate over the 1948 war and the Palestinian refugee problem.

Although the book is recommended for those familiar with the theoretical constructs of cultural studies, it is less accessible in terms of style and content for non-specialists. Feldt deconstructs elements of cultural studies and historical philosophy and provides a theoretical background for the juxtaposition of the literary work of Orly Castel Bloom and Etgar Keret with earlier Hebrew literature. This section could have used more examples in terms of what Feldt describes as the way in which the work of Etgar Keret breaks with “the canon of modern Hebrew writing.” This break is described as having disturbed “the historical imagination of Jewish-Israeli experience and identity” by using anti-representational and anti-foundational writing as opposed to that which had been inseparable from Zionist ideology and the construction of modern Jewish nationhood (113). Feldt however seems to be out of touch with the changes in perception of identity in Israeli society in which Keret, married to a scion of the Dayan family, functions as a card-carrying member of the intellectual establishment.

Miriam Shenkar
Ohio State University

Anat Helman, Or v’Yam Hekifuha: Urban Culture in 1920s and 1930s Tel Aviv [Hebrew] (Haifa: Haifa University Press, 2007), pp. 343, NIS 68.

More than any other achievement of the Jewish community in pre-1948 Palestine, the growth of Tel Aviv—the “first Hebrew city”—can serve as a metaphor for the
success of the Zionist enterprise. The evolution of Tel Aviv from a small neighborhood (Akhuzat Bayit) on the outskirts of Jaffa to a large metropolis, second only to Jerusalem and in many respects surpassing it as the core of the Jewish community (Yishuv), illustrate well the dynamic nature of the “state in the making” during the interwar period. While the formation of small collective or semi-collective agricultural communities (kibbutzim and moshavim) may have better represented the fulfillment of the Zionist ideal of creating a “New Jew,” Tel Aviv provided the Yishuv with as much material sustenance, social framework, and cultural identity.

As Tel Aviv celebrates its centennial in 2009, Anat Helman’s book adds a new dimension to the dozens of books devoted to its history, social structure, culture, and material life. The uniqueness of this study is twofold. First, it focuses exclusively on the development of Tel Aviv during the interwar period, namely the first two decades of the British Mandate over Palestine. Second, it emphasizes daily interaction and popular culture among Tel Avivians of that period, rather than on the institutional organization of “high” culture and local politics. Helman treats “cultural history” as the opposite of “intellectual history” and sets to study not the “actions of individuals” but the “characters and categories of group activities” (15).

The first of the book’s six chapters delineates the city’s profile, starting with architectural changes from the eclectic style of the 1920s to the Bauhaus planning of the 1930s. It then looks at the public spheres: roads, sidewalk, parks, noises and sounds, and all two- and four-legged living creatures that inhabited that space. Chapter 2 concerns special events, holidays, and other celebrations that separated the festive from the mundane. Special attention in the chapter is given to the legendary Purim Adloyada carnivals for which Tel Aviv became known.

Chapter 3 deals with consumption trends in the first Hebrew metropolis, juxtaposing the bourgeois hedonistic reputation of Tel Avivians against the austere socialist pioneering ethos. A clear example of the constant tension between the two could be found in the spread of advertisements for imported luxury goods, which collided with the official ideology calling for modest consumption of “Blue and White” produces. Also included in this chapter is a survey of shopping institutions: shops, open markets, and peddling. Of particular interest here is the attempt by the municipality to limit the presence and eventually eliminate from the marketplace Arab vendors from Jaffa and nearby villages.

Chapter 4 looks at ways in which Tel Aviv’s residents tended to spend their leisure time, including popular modes of entertainment. By the 1920s, Tel Aviv had already become the cultural center of the Yishuv, offering the widest range of activities: museums, theater, libraries, and so on. Going to the movies became a particularly popular leisure activity, as were dancing parties and eating in restaurants and cafes, particularly those stretched along the seashore. This proximity to the Mediterranean enhanced Tel Aviv’s self-image as a cosmopolitan metropolis, a European outpost in the heart of the “Orient.”
In chapter 5 Helman profiles various sub-groups and sub-cultures that inhabited the first Hebrew city, such as the Jewish-Yemenite population or the urban socialist working class. In the final chapter, she discusses the emergence of civil society characterized by voluntary bodies that organized to represent interest groups. Unique among those bodies was the “Hebrew-Language Defenders Battalion,” which sought to eliminate the use of Yiddish and other foreign languages from the public sphere. Although the ideology of that body was largely endorsed by the city’s officials and intellectual elite, the unconventional methods its members often used to deliver its message were widely condemned.

It is worth noting that this book on Tel Aviv, which has already become a co-recipient of the prestigious AIS Shapiro Best Book Award for 2008, originated as a Ph.D. dissertation at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Moshe Gershovich

*University of Nebraska at Omaha*


In this book sociologist Aziza Khazzoom sets out to investigate the effect of ethnicity on occupational attainment in the first decade of the Israeli state. Prior research on ethnic inequality in Israel argued that (1) Ashkenazim advanced a binary construction of ethnicity, which simplified the actual ethnic heterogeneity: “western Ashkenazim” versus “eastern Mizrahim”; (2) bifurcation in the realm of representation shaped and justified an unequal distribution of resources; (3) the eventual confluence between discursive construction, objective life conditions, and the Orientalist discourse’s justification of inequality between easterners and westerners made the divide among Jews obvious; (4) and that the main reasons for these moves were economic: veteran Ashkenazi “gatekeepers” excluded Mizrahim in order to obtain more resources for themselves. Khazzoom accepts the first three arguments but in place of the fourth suggests a different dynamic: it was not the monopolization of material resources that was at stake, but rather the allocation of economic goods (better jobs) in exchange for the possession of symbolic resources: one’s perceived contribution to the Jewish project of westernization.

Khazzoom’s argument is based on analysis of the 1961 census and specifically on a comparison between different Ashkenazi and Mizrahi descent groups’ returns on education; that is, the extent to which higher educational attainment resulted in higher prestige occupations. What emerges from the analysis is an “Iraqi paradox”: generally Ashkenazi groups received similar and relatively high returns on educa-
tion, and Mizrahi groups received similar and relatively low returns, except for the Iraqis, whose returns were similar to that of Ashkenazim. Therefore the Iraqi case problematizes the assumption that what occurred in the Israeli labor market in its early days was a straightforward discrimination along ethnic lines.

Khazzoom examines—and rules out—the option that Iraqis were discriminated against like other Mizrahi groups but successfully fought back. Based on a meticulous examination of her data she shows that only those Mizrahim who were able to “prove” westernness—those who possessed performable western cultural capital (represented by mastering a Western language and education in non-traditional institutions—two components which are measurable)—were not discriminated against in the labor market. Because the Iraqi westernization project was relatively successful, more individual Iraqis fitted the western ideal.

Zionist commitment to westernization, Khazzoom argues, is part of a longer process, which began during the Enlightenment, when Jews in Western Europe were stigmatized as oriental. As a result, Jews became invested in westernization, and one group would often construct itself as western through the portrayal of other groups of Jews as eastern. Then, to prevent “stigma by proxy,” in sociologist Erving Goffman’s terms, these newly westernized groups would alternate between distancing themselves from those they saw as more eastern and working to westernize their eastern compatriots. Exclusion tended to occur when one group threatened another group’s westernization project. In Israel the mass immigration of Jews from the Arab world, in the context of Israel’s geographic location, and the incomplete state of westernization of both Ashkenazim and Mizrahim, constituted such a threat. At the same time, the national project posited that all Jews merited equal treatment, which explains why individual Mizrahim who managed to achieve westernness were included.

This is an important book on several accounts. First, in its innovative methodology: although the core of the book is quantitative, Khazzoom uses qualitative theories to interpret her findings. Second, Khazzoom departs from the usual assumption of Israeli particularity by using the Israeli case study to draw general theoretical conclusions about the emergence of ethnic boundaries and social closure. Third, this book is unique in showing the centrality of non-material concerns to the formation of ethnic boundaries in Israel, and of the project of westernization to the formation of Israeli society and culture. Finally, this work deserves attention for its effort to trace the exact nature of discrimination. In this context, one of the most important points Khazzoom makes is in the concluding chapter of the book. It could be, she writes, that the discrimination experienced by westernized Mizrahim was more about ethnic degradation—about always having to prove that one was acceptable—than about occupational attainment (203).

Khazzoom’s book is well written, and her thesis is strong and convincing. One thing that is missing from the analysis is a discussion of the project of westerniza-
tion in the context of the Zionist colonial project. Although Khazzoom mentions that in Palestine it became more urgent for Jews to distinguish themselves from the East, this cannot be attributed to the process of Orientalization and stigma management alone. Rather, westernization (and the absorption of Mizrahi Jews), is inextricably bound with the Zionist colonial project and its very material interests. Even if the Zionist project of westernization is structurally similar to other westernization projects, its historical specificity should not be overlooked.

Dafna Hirsch
Open University of Israel

Leonard Grob and John K. Roth, eds., Anguished Hope: Holocaust Scholars Confront the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2008), pp. 263, $25.00 (paper).

This collection of essays by Holocaust scholars dealing with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in moral terms offers a fresh perspective on the conflict. The book is organized around the themes of “challenges,” “risks,” and “possibilities.” Following each essay, the other contributors pose questions to be addressed by that essay’s author.

In “Challenges,” Grob and Roth write that the “specter of the Holocaust haunts the turmoil in the Middle East” (2). Two of the themes running throughout the book, either explicitly or implicitly, are the Manichaestic tendency on each side to demonstrate the total falsity of the “other” and a tendency of each of the sides to the conflict toward radical discourse. Peter J. Haas argues that these are facilitated by the closeness of the basic assumptions on the part of all three religions. Roth suggests that although Christian anti-Semitism provided the necessary, if not sufficient, conditions for the Holocaust to take place, the Holocaust has not granted Israel immunity from criticism. Yet he warns that post-Holocaust Christians should be cautious before taking steps that jar Jewish sensibilities and trust. David Blumenthal communicates a change in his own positions following his involvement in negotiations with Palestinians and Muslims. He charges his “partners” (51) with politicizing all discussions, refusing to acknowledge any responsibility for the conflict and candidly approving terrorism. Some co-contributors accuse Blumenthal of the same partisanship he detects among Arabs.

In a particularly compelling essay, Britta Frede-Wenger argues that a sense of guilt opens the door to two adverse consequences at the guilty side: over-identification with the victim, or over-identification with the perpetrator. In both cases a negative symbiosis between the victim and the perpetrator is formed. This symbiosis prevents normalization of the relationships. This guilt haunts the Germans
who are looking for a more positive identity. Hence, Frede-Wenger proposes to exchange the notion of guilt with the notion of responsibility. Through her discussion of the dangers of guilt, one can infer the danger of developing a victim mentality.

In “Risks,” Myrna Goldenberg refers to the guilt of American Jews stemming from America’s passivity during the Holocaust. Thus, American Jews should work pragmatically toward a just, secure Arab-Israeli peace. Using Jewish texts and thinkers, David Patterson claims that a Jewish state is essential to maintaining a Jewish presence in the world. Such a haven can exist only in the land of the Jewish covenant. He asserts that much of the Arab-Israeli conflict is driven by a metaphysical hatred toward Jews and that Jews are responsible for transforming this hatred into mutual respect by leading the Arabs to see each other’s humanity.

Margaret Brearly maintains that the Arabs and the Palestinians should stop equating Zionism with Nazism. She adds that Israel should model better behavior by treating its neighbors and opponents with equity. Didier Pollefeyt criticizes the post-Holocaust Manichaeistic conceptions that dominate Jewish thought and rejects the use of the Holocaust for the political legitimation of Israel. His notion of dangerous memories is linked to Grob’s recommendation that Israel should forget the elements of the Holocaust that prompt Israelis to embrace perpetual victimhood.

In “Possibilities,” Henry F. Knight sees prospects in moving beyond the logic of scarcity and conquest with regard to the religious “other.” This requires “a strong dose of political realism” (185) that will end the zero sum game between Israelis and Palestinians. Hubert Locke argues that in order to facilitate harmonious relationships in the Middle East, the parties must surmount centuries of racial hostility between and among them. The Holocaust can serve as a warning against its dangers. Amy H. Shapiro suggests that because realities are socially constructed, they can be reconstructed. She finds hope in education focused on critical thinking about self-identity. The closing essay by Rachel N. Baum further emphasizes the significance of narratives. She argues that in order to achieve a lasting peace Israelis and Palestinians should reconstruct their narratives of suffering “in ways that move beyond the simple lines of allegiance and sympathy” (221). This can be accomplished by emphasizing survival over victimhood.

I find the book stimulating, particularly because it does not sketch any operational program, of which there are so many, but rather thinks of the problem in moral terms. Yet, I cannot help but ponder the fact that no Muslim voice is included in this collection. I find this omission rather jarring.

Ruth Amir
Max Stern Academic College of Emek Yezreel
Tamir Sorek, *Arab Soccer in a Jewish State: The Integrative Enclave* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 240, $96.00 (cloth).

In this entertaining and thoroughly researched study, Tamir Sorek seeks to explain how soccer has emerged as what he terms an “integrative enclave” for Palestinians in Israel. He defines an integrative enclave as “a social sphere that is ruled by a liberal-integrative discourse of citizenship” (2), and he employs an impressive range of research methods, including archival research, textual analysis, interviews, surveys, and participant observation at dozens of soccer games to construct his argument. Ultimately, he contends that though a battle over the meaning of the game continues, at least for the time being, “the integrative orientation of soccer takes precedence in present-day Israeli soccer” (8).

Sorek sets forth his argument in the introductory chapter, followed by two chapters devoted to the history of soccer in colonial Palestine and, later, Israel. He explains that although a similar game already existed in the Arab world, European immigrants imported a more codified version of soccer to Palestine at the beginning of the twentieth century. Shortly thereafter, the British mandatory government, hoping to use soccer to encourage interethnic integration, established sports clubs that it invited both Arabs and Jews to join. At the same time, however, Arab and Zionist sports clubs—which kept Arabs and Jews separate—were established by each community. Thus, Sorek illustrates soccer’s long and politically charged history in the region. Next, Sorek traces the roots of soccer as an integrative enclave to the 1950s and 1960s, when the Israeli government organized soccer clubs in Arab towns as a means of dependency creation and cooptation in order to supervise and control what was viewed as a potentially separatist minority. Concurrently, the Histadrut’s propaganda efforts emphasized the positive role of sports in strengthening the friendship and brotherhood between Arabs and Jews. One of Sorek’s most compelling arguments, although a minor one, is that since the mid-1970s, market forces related to the commodification of soccer made it increasingly difficult for small, ethnically homogenous local teams to achieve athletic or financial success, which in turn encouraged the integration of Arab players into Jewish teams and vice versa.

Sorek goes on to explain the disproportionate financial support for and popularity of soccer in Arab municipalities in Israel. Based on interviews with town mayors, he suggests that support for soccer reflects a desire to foster local pride and identity and a need to fill the time of energetic youths who might otherwise get into trouble. He also notes an interesting correlation between Arab men’s attendance at soccer games and a tendency to vote for Zionist parties. In chapter 5, he examines differences between Arabic and Hebrew press coverage of soccer, finding that the Arabic sports press employs more nationalist language, whereas the Hebrew press emphasizes the integrative dimensions of the game.
The final three substantive chapters are narrower in focus and more detailed than the preceding ones, offering three diverse glimpses into the world of Arab soccer in Israel. First, Sorek examines the fraught position of Arab fans of Jewish teams such as Maccabi Haifa. Next, he describes the autonomous Islamic League, established by the Israeli Islamic Movement. Finally, he presents the case of Sakhnin, a town known for both its strong Palestinian national identity and soccer excellence.

*Arab Soccer in a Jewish State* provides a wealth of insight and information. Yet the book would benefit from clearer organization, as it reads more like a series of essays related to a general theme than a cohesive and convincing argument about the political meaning of soccer in Israel. In addition, much of the evidence presented could be interpreted as undermining rather than strengthening the argument about integration. For example, numerous anecdotes relating Jewish fans’ use of anti-Arab epithets, as well as Arab fans’ strategies for coping with the presence of Zionist symbols at games do not seem particularly integrative. Furthermore, the Islamic Soccer League, to which Sorek devotes an entire chapter, calling it an “exception to the rule” (128), represents the Israeli Islamic Movement’s broad strategy of separation from the state and the Jewish majority. Finally, Sorek may indeed be correct that soccer is a relatively integrated arena in the larger, more divided context of Israeli society, yet he does not clarify the direction of causality—does soccer somehow make Arabs more likely to assimilate into Israeli society or is it just that better assimilated Arabs are more likely to take an active interest in Israeli soccer?

Sorek correctly recognizes the fragility of this integrative enclave and remarks that “there is no evidence yet that the integration in the sphere of soccer contributes to the Arabs’ acceptance by the Jewish majority as citizens with equal rights” (188). Despite a few minor shortcomings, *Arab Soccer in a Jewish State* is a perceptive and thorough study, which will undoubtedly interest both scholarly and lay readers.

Sarah F. Salwen
*University of Pennsylvania*

**David N. Myers,** *Between Jew & Arab: The Lost Voice of Simon Rawidowicz* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2008), pp. 308, $35.00 (cloth).

The title of David Myers’s book derives from the name of what was supposed to have been the final chapter of Simon Rawidowicz’s monumental book *Bavel vi-Yerushalayim* (*Babylon and Jerusalem*), which was published in 1957. The chapter, which deals with the Palestinian refugees from the 1948 War of Independence and which called on the Jewish State to allow the refugees to return to their homes, was
ultimately left out of Rawidowicz's book. Myers's book provides the first English translation of this important text, which is preceded by two chapters: an intellectual biography of Rawidowicz, and an analysis of Rawidowicz's unpublished chapter in its historical context. This is a unique book in its composition, and it provides an important contribution to the fields of Israeli/Zionist history and modern Jewish thought.

Simon Rawidowicz (1897–1957) was the quintessential peripatetic Jewish intellectual. Myers's biographical chapter follows both his intellectual and academic journey, which took Rawidowicz from Poland to Berlin, where he studied, and then to England and later to the United States, where he held teaching positions in Chicago and then at Brandeis University. Myers provides a detailed portrayal of Rawidowicz's failed attempts to secure for himself a position at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, which might have provided him with a stable home; instead Rawidowicz was a wanderer, and as Myers forcefully argues, his physical wanderings contributed to shaping his views on the Jewish tradition and history. Rawidowicz believed that Judaism should have two viable centers: Israel and the Diaspora. Babylon and Jerusalem; the wanderer and the sovereign; the powerful and the marginal: these are the poles that informed Rawidowicz's worldview. And it is this position—as the ultimate outsider—that, Myers claims, provided the backbone for Rawidowicz's critique of Zionism and early Israeli policies vis-à-vis the Arabs who remained in Israel and the Palestinians who became refugees in 1948.

Most informed readers might assume that it was only in the late 1980s, with the emergence of the New Israeli Historians, that the question of the Palestinian refugees entered the Israeli (and the broader Jewish) public debate (for Palestinians and the Arab world this never ceased to be a crucial issue). What Myers's study reveals is that this assumption might hold true for the three decades before Benny Morris's *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem* (Cambridge, 1989) but that during the 1950s there was a vibrant debate around that issue in Israel and in the broader international community. Rawidowicz held a unique position within this debate, making the argument that allowing the refugees back into Israel had practical, economic considerations—but that it was predominantly a moral issue: Israel, as a moral entity, could not stand upon the destruction and uprooting of another people. In this regard, Rawidowicz was the diasporic equivalent of S. Yizhar, the Sabra writer who participated in the 1948 War and then described in brutal realism (*Hirbet Hizah*) Israel's culpability in creating the Palestinian refugee problem. Rawidowicz addressed Yizhar in his chapter and Myers appropriately dedicates an important part of his own analysis to Yizhar's work and its reception. Yizhar's realism represents a characteristically Israeli take on the refugee question that was born out of the war experience. Rawidowicz offered a position that was rooted in the Jewish moral tradition, one that embraces the Diaspora and its moral horizon (the position of he who does not have power, i.e., the refugee par excellence)—but
which ultimately was not heard at that time. In this regard, the full title of Myers's book is very apt: Rawidowicz is indeed a lost voice that needs to be heard when questions about Jewish nationalism and power and their consequences are debated. Myers's book does a wonderful job revealing and reclaiming this lost voice and giving it the important and critical place it deserves.

Eran Kaplan
Princeton University

Alexander Yakobson and Amnon Rubinstein, Israel and the Family of Nations: The Jewish Nation-State and Human Rights (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 246, $140.00 (cloth).

Is a “Jewish and democratic state” an oxymoron? For many decades this question has fueled both academic and public debates. There is a growing minority among Israeli scholars and public figures who reject the idea of a “Jewish state” in favor of a “binational” state. Supporters of this view argue that the concept of a Jewish state discriminates, by its very nature, against non-Jewish citizens and that it runs counter to international human rights norms.

In Israel and the Family of Nations, Alexander Yakobson and Amnon Rubinstein challenge these notions. They claim that there is in fact no inherent contradiction between democracy and universal human rights and the principle of a Jewish state. The authors further contend that it is the very denial of the Jewish state and its legitimacy that undermines the principles of universal equality and rights, in that it denies Jewish people, and only them, the right for self-determination and national independence.

The book opens with a rather lengthy chapter on the 1947 debates in the United Nations General Assembly surrounding the partition plan and the establishment of Israel. Next comes a short but powerful chapter in which the authors take on contentions regarding Zionism as a colonialist phenomenon and regarding Jewish nationalism as a construction and convincingly show that these have little empirical validity or analytical value. The next three chapters expand the authors’ contention that Zionism does not collide with international human rights norms and that there is no inherent contradiction between a Jewish state and a Democratic state. The final chapter takes on the issue of “neutrality” in democracies. Yakobson and Rubinstein bring multiple comparisons of Israel to other countries (mostly democracies) and show that no other democracy actually lives up to the ideal of complete state neutrality.

Israel and the Family of Nations is a well-written book, which both scholars and the wider public may find helpful and informative. For the most part, Yakobson
and Rubinstein bring persuasive and well-supported arguments. Though their main claims are not new, they are integrated into a coherent and solid narrative that successfully confronts many of the challenges and accusations made against the Israeli state. The primary strength of the book lies in its historically and legally informed comparisons of the Israeli case with European democracies and other nation-states. The authors reject the common tendency to see the Israeli case as particularistic. Rather, they bring a meticulous analysis of the cultural, legal, and political systems and constitutions of other countries (most notably Greece and Armenia) and show the many similarities between them and Israel.

The book is not without weaknesses. The first chapter, bringing very detailed citations from UN debates surrounding the establishment of Israel, is too long, and not always well connected to the arguments in the chapters that follow. More substantially, the authors’ narrative lacks a broader and more critical engagement with the Israeli occupation of Arab lands. One is generally left with the impression that it is only a matter of time before the occupation is over, and that the serious challenges it entails to Israeli democracy and human rights policies are temporary and marginal. Also problematic is the lenient account of the institutionalized discrimination of the Israeli Arab minority in chapter 4. The authors mention some discriminating practices, but maintain that they are gradually diminishing and pay little attention to ongoing examples, such as the “Judaization of the Galilee,” the refusal to award building permits, or the continuous exclusion of Arabs from most public service positions. This neglect undermines the otherwise well supported and enlightening arguments of the book.

Despite these downfalls, Israel and the Family of Nations is an important book. It exposes the hypocrisy of those who reject the existence of a Jewish state, while at the same time supporting the establishment of a Palestinian state and indeed, of all other nation-states. Unlike other “in defense of Israel” manifests, Yakobson and Rubinstein avoid the pitfall of the particularistic approach, and are thus able to show the many points of similarity between Israel and other nations.

Eran Shor
State University of New York at Stony Brook


The newly established Institute for National Security Studies (INSS), which has recently incorporated the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, has continued the tradition of producing annually a high quality strategic and military assessment of
the Middle East region. The latest Middle East Strategic Balance sets out to analyze the region's principal political, military, and strategic developments over a period of eighteen months in 2005–2006.

Such developments are systematically examined throughout the book and can be subsumed under the overarching trend that Mark Heller describes in his introductory chapter as the “triumph of identity over democracy” (7). The book explains that despite massive efforts by the United States, and others, to encourage democratic principles and structures of governance within the Middle East, such a campaign has so far failed. This has happened because that attempts at pushing for democratic reforms and elections either failed, as a result of continued local resistance to such efforts, or backfired as a result of the election of Islamist parties that are hostile to such “Western” reforms, but take advantage of them in order to gain power and push their own Islamist agenda.

In other arenas, such as in conflict-ridden Lebanon and Iraq, ethno-religious cleavages, particularly between Sunnis and Shi’ites, proved to be a major contributing factor influencing, for example, local alliance politics among Maronite, Shi’ite, and Sunni groups in Lebanon. The domestic and regional consequences of such politics are examined in successive chapters by Eran Lerman, Ephraim Kam, and Daniel Sobelman.

Also closely examined are Iran’s place and role in the Middle East and its campaign to acquire nuclear weapons. U.S., European, and regional diplomatic attempts at stifling Iranian efforts are considered, but given the international community’s inability to reach a definite judgment and unified stance vis-à-vis Iranian nukes, Emily Landau, Ephraim Asculai, and Noam Ophir end their analysis with the chilling observation that “though the international community continues to debate what to do and how to act in order to halt the Iranian program … it will also have to start thinking seriously about the implications of a nuclear Iran” (47).

The first part of the book ends by providing, among other things, a detailed strategic assessment of Israel’s “new agenda,” centered on former prime minister Ariel Sharon’s plan on unilaterally “redrawing Israel’s borders and determining the permanent boundaries of the state” (136). It concludes by presenting gloomy prospects for peace or even stability within the Arab-Israeli conflict arena given the fact that unilateral withdrawal plans have not reduced Israeli-Palestinian tensions in the region.

The second part of the book offers substantial data on the region’s armed forces and weapons procurement programs. Despite the extensive use of military acronyms throughout the second part of the book, a glossary of military terms is absent, which might prove frustrating for those less familiar with specific weapons platforms. Moreover, it tends to be more of an almanac-like inventory of military resources and capabilities than a lucid explanation of the strategic consequences that such arsenals and current weapon procurement trends may have on the region.
as a whole. Although such an examination is provided in part throughout the first part of the book, a greater analytical linkage between the strategic assessments and the balance of armed forces and weapons procurement inventories would have been welcome.

Yet, taken as a whole, the *Middle East Strategic Balance* is an essential book for all those interested in Middle East security and defense issues. Editors Zvi Shtayber and Yiftah Shapir have proved capable to continue the *Middle East Strategic Balance*’s tradition of providing key insights into the causes, processes, and consequences of the various conflict and security dilemmas currently facing the volatile Middle East region. As such, this book is a must read and would be a valuable addition to any library specializing on the Middle East.
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