**If the left does not want to write the epilogue of the Zionist story**

**Shaul Arieli, Ha'aretz, January 4, 2019**

[**https://www.haaretz.co.il/opinions/.premium-1.6806424**](https://www.haaretz.co.il/opinions/.premium-1.6806424?fbclid=IwAR0Db6ts-_4IInB1Ud9-YltQ59PUiUd9cVE6C_65aE2RBgNJcBAaNGFgvGo)

The 2019 election period has begun, and it seems that Benjamin Netanyahu and the members of the coalition have already won the most important campaign in Israel's history. They continue to determine the nature of public discourse. The fact that their adversaries adopt their behaver gives them a built-in advantage, which will be almost impossible to overcome.

Each of us possesses a conceptual framework through which he interprets reality, shaped by his values ​​and beliefs. Like the value of freedom, and like the difference between those who believe that the world is a jungle in which the weak must be devoured, those who believe that it should be domesticated and make way to a social order based on equality between individuals. This framework explains the events that make up reality, determines the positions and creates the identification with the person who represents them. The complexity of reality makes it difficult for us to fully understand and act accordingly. Therefore, we seek "anchors" that will facilitate labeling the events as "right" and "wrong", "good" and "bad", and "just" or "unjust". These anchors are made up of opposites. Netanyahu, more than anyone else in the political system, was able, first of all, to remove from this set of values ​​and beliefs, social solidarity, fairness, transparency, peace, coexistence, natural rights, universal values. Secondly, he maintained and strengthened the "anchors" in the form of the rifts in Israeli society and the rift between it and the Arab and international sphere: between Jews and Arabs, between the religious and the secular, between Mizrahim and Ashkenazim, between the periphery and the center, between Orthodox and Reform Jews, between Israel and the Arab world, and between Israel and Western Europe. He cultivated these rifts by controlling the hegemonic instruments of the government, and labeling all the former in the above pairs as belonging to the "right" and all the latter as belonging to the "left."

In order to maintain the beliefs that nourish and shape this interpretative framework, the Netanyahu government adheres to a complementary policy on two levels: On the political-security level, it frightens the public and convinces it that it is "a people that shall dwell alone" and that the entire world is anti-Semitic. On the domestic level, it demands that the "unity of the people" be demonstrated by unqualified support for the leadership and full backing from the judicial system and the media. Creating such a reality ensures that the opposition will not have the necessary conditions to replace the government. To this end, Netanyahu has carefully chosen ministers who will undermine the pillars of Israeli democracy, and they have performed their duties faithfully.

Ayelet Shaked was placed before the Supreme Court and civil society organizations, and laid the anti-constitutional foundations for future annexation. Miri Regev promoted culture on the scale of her own values, as she said: "I look up and ask for truth, and it works for me." In other words, the Minister commissioned for ensuring pluralism believes that she has a monopoly on the truth as she receives it from on high. The Ministry of Communications is held by the Prime Minister - the man who initiated the previous elections because he detests free media. Naftali Bennett has been placed for Minister of education, ignoring the diversity of society and applying the educational model on which Yeshayahu Leibowitz wrote the sharp warning: "When one accepts the view that the 'state', 'nation', 'homeland', 'security' etc. are the supreme values, and that unconditional loyalty to these values ​​is an absolute and sacred duty - one will be able to commit any abomination for this sacred interest, without conscience".

What do those who seek to replace Netanyahu and his colleagues in the coming elections offer? On the grounds that most of the Israeli public belongs to the "moderate right," the candidates - old and new - adopt Netanyahu's conceptual framework. They believe that clever use of it will lead the public to choose them, as those who symbolize the "moderate right," or even move from "moderate right" to "moderate left."

There is no chance for this approach. It is hard to define "moderate right," "moderate left," or "center." These camps are the result of the influence of a vocal minority, which fights for its views. Moreover, it is impossible to turn a "moderate right" into a "moderate left" by presenting the positions of a fictional "center." We must present clear leftist positions for this purpose. Those who want to replace Netanyahu must return to the set of values ​​and beliefs that he and his friends have removed. A final status agreement can not be reached while excluding the value of "peace" from the discourse. At the same time, they must instill in the public a different conceptual framework of reality that will rely on other "anchors" and heal the rifts.

The first and most important anchor that must be instilled is the distinction between "Zionist" and "anti-Zionist" - between the "left" who believes that every nation has the right to liberty and independence, and believes that the two-state solution will fulfill the Zionist vision of a democratic state with a Jewish majority, full equality for all its residents, and Netanyahu's "right," which seeks to grant the Palestinians only an autonomy or of Bennett's, which proposes annexation of Area C; or of Yoav Kish and Orly Levi-Abekasis, members of the Greater Israel Lobby, or Uri Ariel and Bezalel Smotrich, who believe that the Arabs deserve only the right to be uprooted or to live under a discriminatory regime.

The "left" raises the banner of social justice and solidarity, unlike the "right" of Bennett, who opposed supervision on the price of basic goods; or of Regev, Yariv Levin, Tzipi Hotovely, Moti Yogev and Shaked, who opposed the promotion of the Prohibition on Housing Discrimination Law - and lastly even the Fair Rental Law. The "Left" supports the separation of powers and the maintenance of the independence of the Supreme Court, which upholds the rule of law and protects the rights of minorities and the weak, in contrast to Regev, Ze'ev Elkin, Oren Hazan, Levin, Shaked, Samotrich, Bennett and Yogev, who accused the court of a number of baseless accusations: detachment from Jewish society, malice, immorality, elitism, anti-Zionism, anti-Judaism, anti-democratic, and undermining security.

The "left" places man at the center and believes that all human beings are equal before the law, contrary to Regev, Levine, Hazan, Hotovely, Elkin, Yogev, Shaked and Bennett who voted against a bill to add the principle of equality to the Basic Law: Human Dignity and Liberty. The "left" seeks to separate religion and state, in contrast to Yogev's view that the Chief of Staff's intention to limit the authority of the military rabbinate is of "harm to the strength of the IDF, to the spirit of fighting and to Israel's security." The "left" recognizes the freedom of religious worship for all, in contrast to Regev, Hotovely and Yogev, who promoted a bill prohibiting the use of a public address system in prayer houses directed against Muslims. The left recognizes religious pluralism as opposed to Levin's view of the Reform movement in the US. The Left views the right to property as a basic right reserved for everyone, contrary to Yogev and Hazan's approach to the construction of settlers on private Palestinian land to the approach of the initiators of the "Regulation Law".

The "left" believes in freedom of art and culture, as opposed to Regev's "right," which initiated the "Loyalty in Culture" bill, which will support cultural institutions in their show of loyalty to the state. The "left" believes in the freedom of expression and the right of the minority to conduct a public struggle for public opinion, in contrast to Shaked, who initiated the NGO Law.

The Left believes that Israel should be a member of the family of nations and respect international law and practice, as opposed to Bennett and his colleagues, who are interested in accustoming the world to Israeli annexation of Area C and the West Bank. Or Hotovely, who announced the suspension of political dialogue with the European Union in response to the marking of settlement products. The "left" strives to maintain a pluralistic and liberal society, in contrast to the "right" that seeks to exclude minorities and women from the public sphere.

The Netanyahu government has written a sad new chapter in the history of Zionism, which is liable to become the final chapter of the Zionist vision. Those who seek to replace it must not maintain their interpretive framework or their "anchors", because even if they win the elections, they can only write the epilogue of the Zionist story in the Land of Israel. If they are the "left" as mentioned above, they must announce a new conceptual framework, shaped by a different set of values ​​and beliefs, and promote it with civic courage.